

# Ludwig Alsdorf's Studies in the Āryā\*

Klaus Bruhn

L. ALSDORF's studies in the āryā, published more than thirty years ago, are among his most remarkable contributions to Indian philology. However, the character of the material, the scattered form of the publication, and ALSDORF's high expectations from his reader (more obvious in this case than elsewhere) seem to call for a consolidated and systematic review. Such a review can supplement the earlier efforts in the field of ALSDORF reviewing. We have therefore prepared the present paper which is primarily a supplement to a booklet published in 1990 (*Ludwig Alsdorf and Indian Studies*). However, it may also be viewed in the wider context of the publication of L. ALSDORF's *Kleine Schriften*. The first volume of his *Kleine Schriften* was published in 1974, and a second volume is forthcoming.

It seems practical to consider A.'s studies in the *Prakrit* āryā and in the *Pali* āryā separately (§§ 2 and 4). His studies in the *Prakrit* āryā clearly point beyond the text pieces from *Uttarādhyayana* which he actually examined, and for this reason we have tried to describe the wider context of his *Prakrit* studies in a separate section (§ 1). On the other hand, we have included two short contributions on the āryā of Buddhist Sanskrit texts in the section on the *Pali* āryā (§ 4).

## § 1. Studies in the *Prakrit* Āryā I (the Context)

ALSDORF's work on the *Prakrit* āryā concerns mainly classical āryā.s appearing as late elements in the group of the four so-called senior texts of the Śvetāmbara canon (Ācāra, Sūtrakṛta, Daśavaikālika, *Uttarādhyayana*). However, *Utt.* is the only text to have an appreciable number of āryā.s (see ALSDORF *Ut*: 5-6). *Utt.* has thirty-six chapters, and A. has published five contributions on *Utt.* altogether: three articles dealing with *one* chapter each (1955, 1957, 1962), one article dealing with *four* chapters (1962), and a monograph dealing with *seven* chapters (1966). Not in all but in most

---

\* We are grateful to C. CAILLAT who provided a short note on L. ALSDORF for the present paper. This note has been appended to our review of the *Études Jaina* on pp. 41-42.

of the fourteen chapters he discussed, A. could detect āryā verses. If we add that the āryā.s were by no means always in the centre of his chapter analyses, one can understand that A.'s studies as selected by us are concerned with several subjects, with the āryā and with *Uttarādhyayana*, with the āryā and with the *ākhyāna problem*, with the āryā and with *Jaina dogmatics*, and with *Uttarādhyayana* in general. This state of affairs requires special bibliographical efforts. Generally speaking, we treat all *Uttarādhyayana* studies by A., and all the individual parts of these studies, in the same manner; they may be relevant to the āryā or not.

We are not concerned with the history of *Uttarādhyayana* studies, but the names of E. LEUMANN, H. JACOBI, J. CHARPENTIER, and W. SCHUBRING should be mentioned. A.'s critical attitude towards CHARPENTIER is evident from more than one passage. Even then it must be admitted that *all* four scholars paved the way for A.'s work. It should be added that the *Jaina-Āgama-Series* edition of Utt. (JĀS 15.1977, see CAILLAT Cr: 235) did not and obviously could not take A.'s studies into account.

Āryā or no āryā, most of A.'s Utt. studies are concerned with *general problems*, or develop special issues into general ones. We have followed A.'s intentions by highlighting the general observations instead of enumerating all details. Furthermore, on the basis of the *Jaina Concordance* in Berlin (pp. 17-18), and as a part of our short bibliographies (p. 19 etc.), we have given verse parallels for verses quoted by A. in his treatment of the "seven dogmatic chapters" (pp. 23-38). These parallels help to trace *tracts*, which occur in different versions (*infra*) and which might call for more extensive studies. Therefore, the present paper is also a sort of test for the place of the *Jaina Concordance* in future research. (Refer for the *Concordance* to BRUHN/TRIPATHI Co: 68-69, and to TRIPATHI Bi.) It is not likely that the *Concordance* (which could have been used by A. after its completion in c. 1970) forces us to revise A.'s conclusions in many cases. On the contrary, later studies by other authors tend to confirm his findings in a striking manner. Previous studies in a number of texts and perhaps also a "sixth sense" enabled A. to find most of the parallel verses which he needed *without* using any tools. However, even A. might have made additions and improvements, had the *Concordance* with its c. 50 000 cards been consulted by him. The cards are not only helpful for the normal Jainologist, they also await the interest of the more specialized scholar.

It is obvious that A.'s interest in the āryā was a side effect of his interest in early forms of narrative literature (*ākhyāna problem*) at the beginning. He took interest in narrative forms where the "skeleton" was separate from the "flesh". This interest primarily involved the way in which the "skeleton" was preserved in an early metrical form, and thus early canonized, whereas the "flesh" existed in a more variable form (oral literature, literary prose, later metres) which was only fixed at a later date.

The standard examples outside *Jaina literature* were the *Vedic ākhyāna.s* (*saṃvāda.s*) and the *Pali Jātaka.s*. It seems that A. entered this field of research in 1957 when he published an article on Chapter 13 of Utt. which contained the well-known story of Citta and Sambhūta. A similar, but much longer paper on Nami followed in 1962 (pp. 20-21 *infra*), and in his article on the *ākhyāna problem*, published about two years later, ALSDORF refers to the Nami paper, stating: "The Jain material thus confirms the existence of the old literary type called *ākhyāna* by Oldenberg" (p.\*46). But at that time it was already obvious that A. viewed the āryā material from more than one angle. Metre being one of his earliest fields of specialization, he had by now discovered that metrical analysis was an excellent instrument for textual criticism in the case of a text like *Uttarādhyayana*, which demonstrated the *transition* from earlier metres, mainly śloka, to the āryā metre. This new insight was reflected in a paper which appeared in the same year as A.'s article on Nami (St, 1962), and which formed the basis for his later *Uttarādhyayana* studies (Ut, 1966). "Transition" implies not only combination of śloka and āryā pāda.s in one and the same verse but also metrical ambiguity of one and the same pāda. Such conditions necessitated philological intuition combined with a thorough knowledge of the metre (rigidity of the āryā versus relative flexibility of the śloka). A. was an expert in both respects: He possessed both "*Einfühlung und Erfahrung*" (Pa: 6-7). Expressed in quantitative terms, he isolated about 130 āryā.s in the whole of Utt. However, what mattered was not the greater or lesser number of āryā.s (only some virtually "discovered" by A.) but the general analysis of the transitional text material.

On p. 7 of Ut, ALSDORF states that "109" out of the "about 130" āryā.s traced in Utt. are found in "seven of the dogmatic and disciplinary chapters of the last third of Utt." (pp. 6 and 7). He adds: "Of these 109 stanzas, I have so far been able to trace 46 in younger texts such as the PANNAVAṆĀ, PIṆḌA- and OHA-NIJJUTTI, ĀURAPACCAKKHĀṆA, and MARAṆASAMĀHI." (Capitals ours.) "Younger" means in this case: younger than Utt. (i.e. Utt. before the intrusion of the āryā.s). It is from these and other younger texts that the 109 āryā.s of Utt. have been taken (ALSDORF Ut: 8). In other words: all seven dogmatic chapters contain not only āryā.s, but āryā.s for which A. could partially trace parallels in works of the younger literary stratum. A. is here entering an immense literary field, *Niryukti.s*, *Bhāṣya.s* et alia, *Śvetāmbara* and *Digambara* texts, a field which we would like to call "late canonical and postcanonical verse (i.e. āryā) literature" (L.V.L.). Furthermore, he is to some extent continuing LEUMANN's studies in the internal structure of this material. *Uttarādhyayana* itself is an early canonical text with L.V.L. material embedded in seven of its c. thirty-four metrical chapters. "Āryā detection" and "metrical restitution" of āryā.s, to use A.'s terms, require considerable experience, but observations of this type answer to clear

methodological requirements, and they are not even the last step in Uttarādhyayana studies. A. proceeds in the case of the seven dogmatic chapters from the depiction of stratification to efforts at *reconstruction*, often reconstruction on the basis of parallel versions, and here a more demanding methodology is required. It is not unusual in L.V.L. to find sequences of three, four, or more verses in different versions, and it is this parallelism which makes it sometimes possible to reconstruct an *Urform* (p. 36) or to describe in outline the literary processes which produced the present form of the text. In a number of cases, A.'s statements are hypothetical, but on the whole we can say that there may exist alternative solutions to A.'s suggestions, but that there will hardly be alternatives to his general method.

The expression "reconstruction" implies that the present form of the texts is the result of transformations. But to say or to guess what happened by way of transformation in a particular case is one thing and to describe the general situation in a plausible manner is another matter. Such a description requires at any rate the consideration of "parallel versions" (BRUHN Se II: 37-39). Parallel versions may help to explain the ruptures and obscurities in a given text, but the very considerable number of parallel versions in Jaina literature primarily creates additional problems. Different versions of dogmatic topics and of stories may contain any number of differences, some easily explained, some inexplicable, and as a consequence one has to isolate, tentatively at least, specific lines of transformation in order to explain the diversification of the textual evidence in a general manner. Transformations are ubiquitous, and they can be studied on the basis of a *single* text or on the basis of *several* texts. Again parallel versions are numerous; they may show *significant differences or not*. In fact, we do not know which was first. Did the demand for parallel versions call for transformations, or was the dynamism of transformation at the root of the numerous parallel versions?

Transformations can be described in terms of addition, reduction, merger, splitting, rearrangement (change in the order of verses), substitution (replacing one verse by another verse), change of metre, change of language (Prakrit → Sanskrit), prose → verse transformation, and verse → prose transformation. But rather than forming the basis of a sound typology, this indicates only that the processes under review were mechanical rather than creative. From the point of view of content, we can detect in L.V.L. two, but only two, clear trends, both mutually related, viz. implantation of later doctrines on earlier ones and scholastic elaboration. The addition of supplementary text (prose or verses) to the metrical *ākhyāna/saṃvāda* skeletons can perhaps be mentioned as a further trend, but it concerns only a limited corpus of L.V.L. material. With considerable interest, ALSDORF described in Ut the numerous cases of disturbed transmission due-to-transformation, but the material did not

encourage systematic theorizing. Some observations in Ut (pp. 16-17: contamination) were therefore A.'s only precise statement on transformation. Under the circumstances, the development of early, and also later, Jaina literature remains intransparent. We cannot distinguish between authors and compilers, and we do not know by which principles the responsible individuals were guided. It must be added that the transformations as discussed here on the basis of A.'s studies are basically connected with metrical material, but that they also affect the prose literature (Cūrṃi.s and Ṭikā.s) which forms a complement to the verse literature under discussion.

A. was interested in the wide field of early Buddhist and Jaina verse texts with their peculiar metrical and textual fluctuations, but he did not say which texts exactly met with his special interest. In Ut, he excluded from his search for parallels certain āryā texts of the L.V.L. corpus (mainly the Bṛhatkalpa-, Nisītha-, and Vyavahāra-Bhāṣya.s), perhaps because he thought them to be later. However, an age difference would have been irrelevant, since any later text might have contained parallels to earlier texts. Actually, there are parallels in the three Bhāṣya.s, but they are not very numerous. Be that as it may, the question remains, whether or not there is a detectable lower time limit for the textual transformations within the āryā literature of L.V.L. – the lower the limit, the greater the scope for A.'s method, i.e. for the specific form of his philological approach as demonstrated in ALSDORF Ut.

Problems of a different type arise if we study L.V.L. and its prose pendant under the aspect of literary form.

This problem is connected with the structure and nomenclature of the exegetical part of L.V.L. The ancient authors and redactors distinguished between different exegetical categories, and there seemed to emerge a basic tetrad of four classes (Niryukti.s and Bhāṣya.s in verse, Cūrṃi.s and Ṭikā.s in prose). Modern scholars therefore felt that all these classes had to be defined, that their historical relationship had to be described, and that they had to be brought into a clear relation to the relevant body of mūla texts (Daśavaikālikasūtra etc.). This problem (which may be called the "genre problem") has given rise to a complicated model published by E. LEUMANN (Da: 591-92) and followed by related hypotheses proposed by other scholars (SCHUBRING Do: § 43, ALSDORF Ét: 37-39, ALSDORF Ex, BRUHN Äv: § 4, TRIPATHI Pa: 120, KHADABADI Ex). Only a very recent study has avoided a discussion of the issue (BALBIR Äv: 474-78). It can be claimed that the study of selected portions of the exegetical material (ViĀvBhā and samavasaraṇa on p. 12, the seven dogmatic chapters on pp. 23-38) has now helped to solve the problem, but it can also be argued that such studies have, on the contrary, demonstrated that a solution of the genre problem is hardly possible. We still do not know what a Niryukti (Bhāṣya etc.) actually is, i.e. we have to this day not been able to isolate a substantial common denominator of all

works known as “Niryukti.s” (“Bhāṣya.s” etc.). A. was clearly embarrassed by this problem (ALSDORF *Études ... Dṛṣṭivāda ... Exegetical ...*), but he could not solve it and became a victim of his occasional rashness, when he suggested, probably under the influence of certain views expressed by LEUMANN (Da: 592), that the Bhāṣya.s were versified Cūrṇi.s (Ex: p. 5). He also had not noticed other observations by LEUMANN which pointed in a different direction (Üb: 32a, lines 34-44). Recently, B.K. KHADABADI has demonstrated in detail that A.’s hypothesis cannot be reconciled with the facts (KHADABADI Ex). The general possibility of versifications is not affected by this controversy, but versification requires demonstration in each individual case.

In actual research, one must realize that genre terms like “Niryukti” do not stand for well-defined classes of works, and that cross-relations between apparently unrelated works create additional problems. There is some osmosis for example between the “Āvaśyaka literature” and the “Bṛhatkalpa literature.” Those who have studied LEUMANN Er have noticed differences in the headers of the booklet. Page 6 has an ĀvNi header, p. 7 has a combined header (ĀvNi and ViĀvBhā), pp. 8-13 have only ViĀvBhā, and pp. 14-48 again have ĀvNi. This reflects the fact that the basis for the Āvaśyaka prose is not always ĀvNi, but sometimes *ViĀvBhā*. Moreover ViĀvBhā may in its turn agree with *BṛKaBhā* (Er: 20 etc.), so that the verse basis becomes even more uncertain. This example is sufficient to show that we have no general formula for describing the relationship of the various Āvaśyaka texts, and that external connections with other L.V.L. clusters or “literatures” add to the internal complexities of a given cluster. It may therefore become necessary to prepare – prior to the writing of complete synopses for different works – simpler devices such as conspectuses for single texts, “narrow synopses” for two to three texts, or “short synopses” for limited pieces of text. In connection with LEUMANN’s *Āvaśyaka-Erzählungen*, we can add that the entire material has now been studied by N. BALBIR in her *Āvaśyaka-Studien* (e.g. compare Āv: pp. 126 and 231-44 for “Viśesh. I, 863-862-861”). The same author has included a demonstration of Āvaśyaka complexities in BALBIR Sa. She has shown that, in the samavasaraṇa portion, the Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi is not in conformity with the Āvaśyaka Niryukti. It omits six secondary verses of the ĀvNi (“post-cūrṇi insertion”), which are also missing in the Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya (BALBIR Sa: 75-76). Moreover, in the implementation of the dvāra verse on the samavasaraṇa (Sa: 74), ĀvCū and Kṣemakīrti (= BṛKaBhā, Ṭikā) go partially together versus (*gehen teilweise zusammen gegen*) the version recommended by Haribhadra (= ĀvNī, Ṭikā).

L.V.L. (including the prose) forms a continuum which cross-cuts the conventional boundaries between *late* canonical and *post*-canonical texts, as well as between Śvetāmbara and Digambara texts. We may add that an analytic essay on LEUMANN’S

studies, *Übersicht et alia*, would be an important step towards a better understanding of this material. It would also be complementary to several LEUMANN titles, published recently or forthcoming: (i) BALBIR Āv, (ii) *Kleine Schriften* of ERNST LEUMANN, (iii) TH. OBERLIES’ study of the Brahmadata tales (in the present volume), and (iv) PLUTAT Li.

A generalizing term like “L.V.L.,” which includes exegetical (pseudo-exegetical, para-exegetical) and non-exegetical literature, produces a degree of disorientation, but at the same time it removes the burden of problematic classifications.

Comparisons, or mere juxtapositions, of L.V.L. verse with L.V.L. prose have up to now been the exception rather than the rule. We mention as examples LEUMANN Üb: 32a, lines 34-44 (Bhāṣya.s, Cūrṇi.s, Ṭikā.s), “Dṛṣṭivāda” (ALSDORF Dṛ: ĀvCū and ViĀvBhā), the “five negative bhāvanā.s” (p. 27 infra: prose from Aup. and Ṭhāṇa), and the “time-table” (ALSDORF Ut: 40-41 – prose of Droṇācārya). Instances of extensive parallelism of verse and prose are not rare in the *narrative* literature of L.V.L. One example is Kāṣṭha Ṛṣi (METTE Oh: 97-102: OghNi tradition et alia, verse and prose), and further examples can be found among the Āvaśyaka stories, e.g. “Viśesh. I,927,1-3” (BALBIR Āv: 253-69: Āvaśyaka and Bṛhatkalpa traditions, verse and prose). More extensive studies would possibly help in some cases to determine the direction of the transformation (verse → prose, or prose → verse). It can be objected that, instead of “L.V.L.,” a term should have been coined which includes the verse corpus and the prose pendant (Cūrṇi.s and Ṭikā.s). However, we need a term for the verses, and a second, more comprehensive term for verse and prose is not required in the present context.

In any case, future work will not be oversensitive to the genre problem but rather try to explore the unwieldy text material of L.V.L. This may be done with the help of pointed studies in narrative or dogmatic “tracts” which occur in different versions. We have already mentioned the *samavasaraṇa*, and we can add that, in her study of the subject, N. BALBIR uses the term “tract” more or less in the same way in which it is now used by us. Further examples of “tracts” are the *Āvaśyaka nikṣepa* (ALSDORF Ni, HANAKI Aṇ: 8-10, BALBIR Āv: 231 f.), “*Rṣabha’s prebirths*” (LEUMANN Üb: 30<sup>b</sup>-31<sup>a</sup>), “fifth samiti” (p. 24-26 infra), the *five negative bhāvanā.s* (p. 26-28), *jīva-and-ajīva* (p. 28 infra), *sāmāyārī* (METTE Oh: 5-7), and *vinaya* (LEUMANN Üb: 17b; OKUDA Di: 140-48). Tracts are not a homogeneous class (in particular their sizes may vary), and we use the concept mainly as starting point for intertextual studies in the area of L.V.L. Any analysis of a *complete* L.V.L. text will suffer under the burden of constant comparison with other texts, reflected in endless synopses (supra), whereas “tracts” are smaller units which can be handled more easily. Naturally, each synopsis (LEUMANN et al.) and each conspectus enumerates besides single verses

sequences of verses or “blocks.” But “blocks,” as we use the term, are elements of rough text segmentation, while “tracts” are historical entities which must be isolated from case to case and which belong to the field of intertextual studies. In our paper we use “tract” also as a general term which is neutral with respect to the distinction between “tracts” and “blocks.”

The concept of “tracts” has a strong analytic bias. It implies that a considerable part of the verse material is multitextual so that the status of the individual texts as ordering factors is reduced. The concept also implies that dogmatic concepts (e.g. *vinaya* or *ahimsā*) cannot be studied without reference to concrete tracts, whenever tracts which are relevant to these concepts can be isolated. Tracts in the sense of intertextual units may or may not be isolated on a large scale, but intertextual relations *in general* are not confined to such pieces. Structural topics like the *nikṣepa* are further intertextual components, so that the status of texts will be disputed from at least two different sides. The result of intertextual studies is a network of cross-connections running from text to text.

As a *bibliographical study* the present article answers directly to the call for “organization of research” in our second paper on sectional studies (Se II). The concept of *L.V.L.* follows from the necessity to subdivide Jaina literature in a plausible manner into periods, i.e. into historical units (Se II: 19). Our double concept of *transformations and parallel versions* (in *L.V.L.* and elsewhere) can now be included as a compact “subsection” in the section of “literature in general” (Se II: 10); this is an improvement on the arrangement in Se II (pp. 12, 34/35, and 37-39). The discussion on *tracts* follows from the strategy of “distinction” (Se II: 19-21). We “distinguish” between the text plane and the plane of intertextual components (tracts etc.), and likewise between concepts in the standard definitions and concepts viewed as parts of individual texts and tracts. Here and elsewhere, “distinction” is understood as an instrument which produces a diversification of a complex subject and thus helps to view it from all sides. The consideration of tracts also settles the question of “major genres” or “medium-sized genres” as described on pp. 21-22 of Se II. We may add that our “sectional” approach (Se II) is perhaps more easily understood if we call it *systematic*. The strategies employed in this approach answer more or less to the ordinary views on systematization.

To avoid misunderstandings, we have to admit that our critical approach must be taken for what it is worth. In a way, a *Cūrṇi* still is a *Cūrṇi* (genre problem) and a text still a text (issue of tracts etc.). These categories will always remain useful within their limits. A different theoretical problem arises, or seems to arise, in connection with semantics (synonymy, homonymy etc.) and transformations (elaboration, contamination etc.), in so far as it is in both cases difficult to devise a satisfactory logical

organization of the phenomena. But in these two cases (Se II: 36-37 and 37-39) the theoretical problems are minimized by the limitation of the area: semantics in Jaina dogmatics, and only there; transformations in Jaina literature, and only there. Convincing definitions and typologies are not the *sine qua non* for studies in specific phenomena, as long as the area is small and easy to survey (compare the analogous argument used by us on p. 22 of Se II in a different context).

ALSDORF's textual criticism was radical. And yet, we have to introduce a distinction. A. was exceedingly successful in the tracing of parallels, in śloka restoration, āryā detection, text correction, text interpretation, and in the detection of “breaks” in the texts. But as we have seen, A. also tried to reconstruct the disturbed verse texts of Uttarādhyayana, following the principle of “higher criticism” (Et: 47-48). Here, one hundred percent dependable results were the exception rather than the rule, but in these cases A. himself was also his chief critic, not deceiving himself or his readers. He admitted in most cases that he could only present probabilities. Future research might show more clearly what was possible and what was not.

Considering the importance which is as a rule attached to the idea of “understanding,” we should not pass over the fact that proper understanding was in a way the basic ethos of A.'s studies. More than others he has accentuated the oddities of Jainism, but more than others he has tried to restore the rational element in apparently confused traditions. Had he spent more time on Jaina dogmatics he might have opened a new chapter in the study of this field. A. wanted above all *clarity*, a tendency which is reflected in his publications in more than one form (although occasionally the reader wishes that A. had explained his point in more detail). A. was a harsh critic of ancient as well as of modern authors whenever they had made clear mistakes or produced manifest incongruities (see p. 21). As for his own person, he could never suppress the dissatisfaction which he felt when he had not understood a text properly, and this frankness implied, that in most other cases his translations could be relied upon. It can be added that he possessed a stylistic virtuosity which not only helped him to convince his readers in a general manner, but enabled him also to put special lines of research (e.g. comparison of parallel version and reconstruction of transformed texts) on a firmer footing.

A.'s studies in the seven dogmatic chapters are to some extent a continuation of SCHUBRING's *Doctrine*. In the case of ALS DORF Ut, the number of topics is limited, but A. was more concerned with the aspect of development and relative chronology than SCHUBRING (ALS DORF Ét: 49). It is evident from A.'s studies that there are many cases where we have side by side an earlier and a later form of a doctrine, one expressed in śloka.s and one in āryā.s. Of course, the pattern of the historical con-

clusions differs from case to case, so much more so since in many cases the discussion cannot do without external evidence. But ALSDORF used external evidence in the majority of cases. That he paid attention mainly to textual parallels and did not consider mere content parallels is true, but it had, on the whole, not much influence on his philological findings.

As a rule one must acknowledge that both SCHUBRING and ALSDORF tried to study each individual dogmatic topic on the basis of *several different texts*. This often helps to make Jaina dogmatics more lucid, as it paves the way for historical evaluation. Treatment of dogmatics on the basis of a limited number of texts always runs the risk of describing Jainism as uniform and inflexible. Generally speaking, one should not underrate the necessity of investigating the entire area in greater depth. P. THIEME recounts that W. SCHUBRING in his day admitted “we have just scraped the surface” (of Jaina dogmatics).

As is natural, ALSDORF made full use of the available *Ṭikā.s* (Śāntisūri, Droṇācārya et al.). These *Ṭikā.s* must be consulted with caution (ALSDORF *Ét*: 39-44; ALSDORF *St*: see p. 21 *infra*), however, and they are of little avail in the discussion of more intrinsic textual problems. In this connection, A.'s former students remember his very pronounced and often-expressed scepticism vis-à-vis Sāyana's *Ṛgveda* commentary. A. could use a commentary published as “*Cūrṇi*” (Daśavṛ: p. 46 *infra*), and in ALSDORF *Ét* (pp. 37-39) he stressed the general importance of the *Cūrṇi.s* for textual criticism. However, he never studied a *Cūrṇi* text very closely, and he had not seen the *Uttarādhyayanacūrṇi* (ed. 1933). No doubt, the *Cūrṇi.s* offer interesting textual variants as recorded in the *JĀS* editions (CAILLAT Da, Va, and Cr), but, however valuable, this evidence does not provide something like a new basis for our understanding of the texts.

It follows from our numerous quotations (*infra*) that A. had his own peculiar “mental habits”. Apart from his indebtedness to the methodology of higher criticism, A. preferred in a general manner the earliest stratum (early *Āgama*, early *Tipiṭaka*) to the later strata, largely because he appreciated its quasi-classical simplicity. In his article on the *Vidhurapaṇḍitajātaka*, he quoted H. LÜDERS who called the *Jātaka* verses “literargeschichtlich unschätzbare[n] Zeugen der alten Volksdichtung” (Vi: \*380). This partiality for the *Jātaka.s* was even stronger in the case of ALSDORF. It must be viewed in connection with A.'s occasional studies of Jaina scholasticism, which he analyzed systematically – when circumstances made it necessary – but which he never studied without fully exposing its eccentricities (see p. 30 *infra*). A.'s preference for the natural against the artificial (and for “living” literature against “lifeless” literature) is seen in connection with later Jaina literature in reverse chronological order. As is well-known, A. started his Indological studies with Apa-

bhramśa literature, and in his thesis A. expressly mentioned the new sentiment (*den neuen Geist*) in the *Gujarati rāsa.s*. These *rāsa.s* were related to Apabhramśa literature but showed a clear departure from the didactic and technical conventions of the preceding periods (ALSDORF *Ku*: 34-43). It was always the human element which attracted ALSDORF's interest, and on the whole he felt that early literary sources brought him closer to Indian life as he knew it from personal experience, than did intervening phases of shastric sophistication and literary perfection. Perhaps one should mention in this connection also his comparison of *satya* in the *Veda* with *satya* in the philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi.

The individual parts of our §§ 2-4 can be designated as “reviews”. However, they are neither criticisms (or true reviews) nor extensive summaries, but aids for the interested reader. In the case of ALSDORF's Prakrit studies, more particularly in the case of Ut, the “reviews” have been extended in more than one respect, and we have also included some observations of our own. A strict formal separation has not been introduced, however. The present paper is meant to be read in connection with A.'s text, and the reader will thus easily distinguish between the primary matter (ALSDORF) and our extensions. The extensions are mostly bibliographical and mostly contained in the “Bibliographies” which are appended to our reviews. The bibliographical addenda (concerning original texts as well as modern literature) are diverse in character and include for example references to SCHUBRING's *Doctrine of the Jainas*, appearing at the beginnings of all the sections for the seven dogmatic chapters.

In the case of these chapters (pp. 23-38), we have supplied in the “Bibliographies” a number of parallels traced with the help of the *Jaina Concordance* (verse concordance). However, those who are familiar with the texts know that verses which are only marginally connected often have the same beginning (mainly in the form of a chain of terms), whereas closely related verses may show different beginnings. The *Concordance* is, therefore, no plethora of parallels, and it mainly helps to trace related text portions in a general manner. If the same subject is treated in two different texts, one can expect, that there are at least one or two verses on both sides which belong to the discussion of the relevant subject and which agree in their beginnings if not in toto. It is with the help of such verses that the user of the *Concordance* can find his way from text A to text B, and so on. Again, the user may not expect textual parallels but merely treatment of the same term, or rather concept, in other texts. In this second case the *Concordance* will almost invariably offer useful information, since most terms occur in a great number of verses. The parallels can be traced in one way or another, but how this should be done is a matter which need not be discussed here (a verse concordance has its limitations). Our efforts to trace relevant parallels, main-

ly complete verse parallels, for the seven dogmatic chapters must at any rate be viewed in connection with the character of the material and in connection with the limited opportunities offered by a system of punch cards. Also we have supplied parallels only in the case of verses which have been quoted by A. in full. The reader will find a *list of the texts* included in the Concordance in BRUHN Co: 68-69.

We would like to add that the Jaina Concordance is closely connected with the name of the late C. TRIPATHI (p. 53). He contributed to the organization of the Concordance in more than one way, and without his active support the project would never have been started. His knowledge of the relevant Jaina texts was considerable, and this enabled him to suggest which texts should be included and which not. In this selection he was perhaps guided to some extent by A.'s publications, which he knew very well. TRIPATHI was also involved with the problem of verse numbering and provided some pothī editions in the library of the Institute with new numbering.

## § 2. Studies in the Prakrit Āryā II (Uttarādhyaṇa)

Following the chronological order, we start with A.'s four *articles* (seven chapters, mainly narrative) and present afterwards the *monograph* (seven dogmatic chapters). The last item is ALSDORF It (Sūtrakṛtāṅga, old āryā). Three of the fourteen relevant Utt. chapters have *no āryā.s* (12-15-25), and four chapters (10-12-13-15) have basically been composed in *other metres* than the śloka. Our *arrangement* of the fourteen chapter-studies is 22, 13, 9, 10-15-12-25 (the four articles) and 24-36-33-26-28-30-34 (the monograph). Two Utt. chapters (19-20) have one āryā each, but have not been studied by A. *in detail*. The *total* of chapters containing āryā.s is thirteen. The āryā.s are "composed ad hoc", produced under special circumstances (Ch. 10), or the result of "secondary insertions" (L.V.L. material); see ALSDORF Ut: 6-8.

Refer for the subject of the present section also to p. 39 *infra* (discussion of Uttarādhyaṇa chapters in ALSDORF Ét) and to METTE Al: 91-92. ALSDORF Ut has been reviewed *inter alia* in CAILLAT Re 1968 and in BRUHN Rv 1972.

We supply Prakrit terms in their sanskritized form, except the chapter titles of Utt. and a few terms where the Prakrit form was preferable. The Sanskrit forms include "samiti" for samī, used by the Jaina authors instead of the correct Skt. form "smṛti".

*vāntam āpātum*. Chapter 22,1-49: RAHAṆEMIJJAM. – A. pp.\*178-85. LAI no. 28 (1955). See also Chapter 15 (pp. 22-23 *infra*).

A. demonstrates that the phrase "vāntam āpātum" (vāntam ... āveum), which occurs in a crucial verse relating to the *Rahaṇemi-Rāyamaī episode* (Utt. 22,42 = Dasav. II 7), is a common figurative expression – eating (: coveting) what one has vomited

(: abandoned), i.e. one's own vomit (: the world). In other words it describes a relapse into worldly existence after renunciation. A.'s treatment is primarily an account of exegetical errors, all connected with the verb *vam-*, which had not been noticed by earlier scholars, but it also concerns the usage of the verb *vam-* (and of the adjective *gandhana*: "disgracing etc."). The three āryā.s of the chapter have been inserted between vss. 20 and 24 and contain secondary matter. They have no bearing on the subject of *vāntam āpātum* and are merely discussed in a footnote (fn. 6).

BIBLIOGRAPHY. K.R. NORMAN extends the comparison of Utt. 14,38 (vāntāsi ...) with Jātaka 509,17-18 (pp.\*183-84) to the verses Utt. 14,44-45 (bhoge bhocā ..., ime ya baddhā ...). This confirms a point of detail in A.'s argument: The original verse order in the Jātaka is 18-17-19. See NORMAN Us: 22-23.

THE STORY OF CITTA AND SAMBHŪTA. Chapter 13,1-35: CITTASAMBHŪJJAM. – A. pp.\*186-92. LAI no. 29 (1957).

The different versions of the story of Citta and Sambhūta had been studied by LEUMANN and CHARPENTIER in a comprehensive manner. ALSDORF concentrates on the comparison between Utt. 13 and Jātaka 498 (Cittasambhūtajātaka). The Utt. chapter is basically a composition in *upajāti* verses. LEUMANN had already noticed that the āryā.s 1-3 and the śloka.s 4-9 (except 6) were later additions. A. observes: "As a matter of fact, it is only a small minority even of the Upajāti stanzas that is common to Jātaka and Utt., and only in a very few cases is there complete correspondence between two stanzas; there are others which agree in one *pāda* only, while the rest is totally different. This can only be taken to mean that there was indeed an old poem in Upajāti metre which became the source of both the Jāt. and the Utt. ballad, but that both the Buddhist and Jaina redactors, while keeping to the Upajāti metre, dealt with this old poem in the most arbitrary manner, feeling at liberty to make any number of alterations, additions and omissions. Under these circumstances, it is not quite so easy as CHARPENTIER imagined to "piece together" out of Utt. XIII and Jāt. No.498 "an accurate reproduction of the ancient legend" (pp.\*187-88). When comparing the contents of the two compositions, A. stresses emphatically the importance of the old recognition verse ("We were Caṇḍāla.s / slaves ...") for the proper understanding of the story: "The only suitable, nay the only possible contents of the recognition stanza(s) ... consist of a reference to an enumeration of the former births. And the most natural, the most probable form of test verse and answer is the two hemistiches of one *Śloka* [in the kathānaka], not two full Triṣṭubhs and a third Triṣṭubh [in Utt.]" (pp.\*188-89). On pp.\*189 A. shows that the old recognition verse (Jātaka 498,16; Utt. 13,5-7; "kathānaka": JACOBI Er: 18) has its place *at the beginning* of the verse

composition, so that Utt. 13 (vss. 5-7 [see p.\*189 for vss. 1-4]), and not Jātaka 498 (vs. 16 [vss. 1-3 are the *secondary* recognition verses]), demonstrates the original order. But even then the original narrative structure is only apparent from the Jaina kathānaka and from the Jātaka prose (p.\*188, lines 21-26). Refer also to pp. 275-78 (and pp. 300-01) of the paper by TH. OBERLIES in the present volume.

**NAMIPAVAJJĀ.** Chapter 9,1-62: NAMIPAVAJJĀ. – A. pp.\*215-24. LAI no. 31 (1962); ALSDORF Āk: \*45; → ALSDORF Ét: 74.

A. analyzes the Utt. version of the well-known story of Nami's pravrajyā and comes to the conclusion that the kernel of Chapter 9 is an “old *saṃvāda*, composed entirely in *ślokas*” (p.\*216) and also “composed on very regular lines and according to a well-thought-out plan: one introductory stanza (6); ten single stanzas spoken by Indra (7, 12, 18, 24, 28, 32, 38, 42, 46, 51) to which the King replies in single stanzas with the only exception of the first answer comprising two stanzas; every change of interlocutor is marked by the same formal stanza repeated nineteen times; and, corresponding to the introductory stanza, one narrative stanza (61) concludes the whole” (p.\*224). The original prose of the *saṃvāda* (existing in the form of oral literature) “was replaced by fixed metrical additions” (p.\*224; ALSDORF Ét: p. 74, lines 4-10) in the āryā metre. “The redactor(s) of the Uttarādhyayana made to the ancient verses the minimum of additions that would create a self-sufficient whole, intelligible without reference to a fuller prose tale. These additions in most cases betray their later origin by their different metre; in particular where we find *āryās*, so characteristic of the latest layer of the Jain canon, we may almost automatically assume that they are secondary additions” (p.\*215). This “process of creating an independent ballad” (p.\*189) was already in evidence in the story of Citta and Sambhūta. Refer for the *saṃvāda* / ākhyāna issue furthermore to the following observations in ALSDORF Āk: “... the Jain redactors of the Utt. dealt with the same kind of material as the Buddhist redactors of the Jātakas, but in a somewhat different way. The Buddhists invested with canonical dignity the ancient verses only, the indispensable prose supplements lacked a fixed wording and therefore remained outside the canon. The Jains disliked the fragmentary character of the verses; for inclusion into their canon, they made the minimum of metrical additions which would make the tales self-sufficient. That no more was intended is shown by the fact that besides these canonical texts there exist numerous full versions of the tales in the vast commentary literature: they are the counterparts of the Buddhist *Atthavaṇṇanā*” (p.\*45).

ALSDORF Āk was published in 1963/64, and his characterization was endorsed in 1965 by general observations on the narrative elements of the Uttarādhyayaniriyukti (ALSDORF Ét: 23-24). Refer for a narrative specimen of UtNī also to ALSDORF Vo: 18

and ALSDORF Ar: 21. ALSDORF returned to the ākhyāna subject in 1968: In Pa (p. 60, fn. 2) he emphasized the primacy of the verse versions in “double tales” (prose version followed by a verse version).

**UTTARAJJHĀYĀ STUDIES.** Chapter 10: DUMAPATTAYAM; Chapter 15: SABHIKKHŪ; Chapter 12: HARIESIJJAM and Chapter 25: JANNAIJJAM. – A. pp. \*225-51; LAI no. 32 (1962). – There are no āryā.s in Chapters 12, 15, and 25.

At the beginning of his paper, A. makes the following observation (pp.\*225- 26): “Every attentive reader of canonical Jain texts cannot fail to make two observations. First, even the oldest and best commentators are completely unreliable. We are greatly indebted to their traditional knowledge and shall always carefully examine their suggestions; but in countless instances they misunderstand and misinterpret perfectly clear passages and offer fanciful explanations for palpably corrupt ones. Second, many, if not most, of the real textual corruptions are very old, much older in fact than all our commentaries, let alone even the oldest Mss. This is why high hopes based on the old palm leaf Mss. at last becoming accessible have been and will be largely disappointed. We are not only entitled but bound to disregard the commentaries wherever necessary or advisable and to correct the text even against them and the combined authority of all our Mss. I hope to give some convincing proofs of these contentions on the following pages.” A.'s criticism must be viewed in light of the fact that CHARPENTIER had declared in the Preface to his edition of Utt. *expressis verbis* that he proposed to “restore as far as possible that text of the *sūtra* which was used by the commentator Devendra” (p. 5). If a stimulus was needed to direct A.'s attention to the inadequacies of the old commentaries, it was provided by CHARPENTIER's trust in Devendra's *sūtra* text. ALSDORF St is in fact mainly concerned with textual criticism, including some critical observations on Devendra.

*Chapter 10,1-37: DUMAPATTAYAM.* – A. pp.\*226-30 and ALSDORF Ut: 7; → ALSDORF Ét: 74. – Utt. 10, named after its incipit “*Dumapattayaṃ*,” deals with the difficulties of reaching salvation (in technical language *anityatva* and *bodhidurlabhatva*). Each verse ends with the same exhortation to Goyama (“do not squander your opportunity,” p.\*228). There is an interpolation of eleven verses on the possible incarnations of a *jīva* (Utt. 10, 5-15: “driest dogmatic statistics,” p.\*229). Moreover: “The interpolator has indeed tried to adapt his product to its metrical surroundings, but with only partial success” (p.\*229). The eleven verses are “a strange patchwork of Vaitāliya and Āryā pādas” (ALSDORF Ut: 7) with a total of “eleven odd [āryā] pādas and three quarters of a [āryā] stanza” (ALSDORF Ut: 7). “When this interpolated passage is removed ... there remains a poem of 26 pure and nearly perfectly regular Vaitāliya stanzas”



(p.\*230). Utt. 10 is one of the four *vaitāliya-aupacchandāsaka* chapters of the Jaina canon, the others being *Sūyagaḍa I 2* and *Utt.15/Dasav.X* (see p.\*226, fn. 4).

**BIBLIOGRAPHY.** Refer for anityatva and bodhidurlabhatva as members of the anupreṣā list also to BHATT An. The verses 10,5-15 teach the inverse relationship between the degree of organization of a being and the number of consecutive existences in the relevant class of beings. This view is relevant to the topic of rebirth speculation (see DELEU Vi: 263, topics 20-21 in Bhag. 24 [reference from S. OHIRA]).

*Chapter 15,1-16: SA-BHIKKHŪ; Dasav. X 1-21. – A. pp. \*230-43. – Chapter 15 deals with the true monk, and it is named after its burden "... sa bhikkhū." A. supplies text (with notes), commentary, and translation of Utt. 15, as well as text (with notes) and commentary of the closely related Chapter X of Dasav. For the translation of Dasav. X, A.'s reader is referred to SCHUBRING Da: \*233-235. The metrical structure of Utt.15/Dasav.X is complex: "The conclusion seems inevitable that the Tr[īṣṭubh]/Jag[ati] pādas and stanzas are late intruders and accretions to the old sa-bhikkhū-stanzas in Aup[acchandāsaka] metre: when these were collected and incorporated into Utt. and Dasav., they were supplemented at the beginning and end of the chapters with pādas and whole stanzas in the closely related and (by then) less unfamiliar and obsolete Triṣṭ./Jag. metre" (p.\*243). The situation is explained by the fact that "an Aup[acchandāsaka] and Upajāti pāda are of practically equal length and, though characteristically different in their first, are identical in their second halves ... [moreover] That it is the identity of the second halves which leads to the 'curious mixture' of Aup. and Upajāti is confirmed by the fact that no such mixture occurs in the Vaitāliya chapters (Utt. 10 and Sūyagaḍa 1.2)" (p.\*243). A. summarizes his metrical analysis by a short list of the non-aupacchandāsaka pādas in Utt. 15 and Dasav. X (p. \*242). He describes this list as "metrical scheme", but the expression is misleading, and I am grateful to A. METTE for the interpretation. A. returns to the present discussion in ALSDORF Vi: \*383-84. A.'s critical edition of Dasav. X includes variants taken from DaśavVṛ and mentioned by him as "Cūrṃi". He had no access to DaśavCū, but on a later occasion (Ét: 38) he mentions the two "Cūrṃis" of Dasav. and suggests a comparative analysis. Apart from the burden, the text of Utt. 15 shows no points of agreement with that of Dasav. X. SCHUBRING observes on p.\*114 that Dasav. VI, VIII, X, and XII provide "a general survey of the practical and ethical demands of the monkish [monastic] life." Utt. 15 is likewise an ethical appeal to the monk, but it is less technical than Dasav. X.*

**BIBLIOGRAPHY.** The word *vanta(ya)* is not only found in Dasav. II 6-7 (ALSDORF Vā: \*178-79), but also in Dasav. X I and XI 6. See ALSDORF St:

\*239 and SCHUBRING Da: \*233 and \*236. Refer for Utt. 15,5 (no sakkaim) also to CAILLAT Da: 73-74.

*Chapter 12,1-47 and Chapter 25,1-45: HARIŚUJJAM and JANNAIJJAM. – A. pp. \*243-51; → ALSDORF Ét: 40-42. – Chapters 12 and 25 deal with the motif of the withheld alms. Both chapters had been studied by CHARPENTIER along with Buddhist parallels, and recently the first of the two chapters has been subjected to a fresh analysis by C. CAILLAT (Br). Utt. 12 can be connected with Jātaka 497 (CHARPENTIER Mā), and Utt. 25 with Suttanipāta and Dhammapada (CHARPENTIER Ja). A. praises the two chapters as "most interesting specimens of 'ascetics' poetry" preserved in the Jaina Canon" (p.\*243). He analyzes Utt. 12 (*triṣṭubh*, pp.\*244-48) and Utt. 25 (śloka, pp.\*248-51) together in the third section of his paper. A. characterizes Utt. 12 as "one of several chapters where to an original old poem [in *triṣṭubh*] is prefixed a later introduction in different metre [in śloka]" (p.\*244), and he refers to the "considerable number of dark or corrupted passages" (p.\*244) in both chapters. The relevant section in A.'s paper is thus not a reconstruction of the entire chapters but only an analysis of single verses, mainly Prakrit verses from Utt. In the śloka Utt. 25,7, ALSDORF changes "je ya veyā-viū vippā, jannaṭṭha ya je diyā" into the metrically correct reading "... janna-jatṭhā ..." (p.\*249). The word *jatṭhā* is not found in Prakrit, but *yaṣṭr-* is in Sanskrit. A. adds: "If my conjecture is accepted, as I trust it will be, it is of some significance for the textual history and criticism of the Jaina canon. It means that for Utt. 25,7 the whole tradition available to us, including not only all extant Mss. but even the oldest commentaries, goes back to one single individual manuscript (not oral tradition!), in which through an ordinary clerical mistake one akṣara had been omitted" (p.\*249). A. attaches much importance to this case of *janna-jatṭhā* which he considers a paradigm of erroneous transmission, mentioning it also in ALSDORF Ét: 40-42. He could certainly have made similar claims in connection with other successful conjectures in his Utt. studies, but he accentuates this specific case.*

**BIBLIOGRAPHY.** There are several summaries of the narratives surrounding the motif of the withheld alms: CHARPENTIER Mā (pp. 171-72: Jātaka 497 [sic]), JACOBI Jn II (p. 50, fn. 1: Utt. 12), BROWN Ut (pp. 16-17: Utt. 12), METTE En (pp. 131-33: Utt. 12), CHOJNACKI Vi (Vol. II, p. 36: Utt. 12), BROWN Ut (p. 36: Utt. 25).

**THE ĀRYĀ STANZAS OF THE UTTARAJJHĀYĀ.** Chapter 24: PAVAYANAṀĀYĀ; Chapter 36: JĪVĀJIVAVIBHATTĪ; Chapter 33: KAMMAPPAYADĪ; Chapter 26: SĀMĀ-YĀRĪ; Chapter 28: MOKKHAMAGGAGĀI; Chapter 30: TAVAMAGGAGĀI; Chapter 34: LES'AJJHAYANAṀ. – A. pp. 1-68; LAI no. 12 (1966).

A. explains the order of the chapters in ALSDORF Ut as follows: "Of the seven chapters containing Āryā quotations, we shall first deal with 24, 36, and 33, in order to leave together the somewhat parallel and similar chapters 26, 28, 30 and 34" (p. 8). He begins his study with āryā statistics (pp. 6-8), although he admits that, under the circumstances, it is difficult to give exact figures (p. 6, fn. 1). In the four preceding articles (Chapters 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 22, 25) the number of āryā.s was small. Ch. 9 had 8½ āryā.s, Ch. 13 had 3½, Ch. 22 had 3 āryā.s, and Ch. 10 had "eleven odd pādas and three quarters of a stanza", while Chapters 12, 15, and 25 had none (see p. 6, fn. 2). Chapters 19-20 (mere reference on pp. 6-7) have one āryā each. In A.'s presentation, "five of the fifteen legendary chapters" (9, 13, 19, 20, 22) have seventeen āryā verses, Ch. 10 is a case in its own right, and "seven of the dogmatic and disciplinary chapters of the last third of Utt." (24, 26, 28, 30, 33, 34, and 36) have 109 āryā.s.

A. thus felt obliged to supply, as far as possible, verse totals for the individual āryā verses. This is in conflict with his actual diction where he often prefers the neutral "stanza" to "āryā" or "śloka," or introduces the verses merely by their numbers. It was in fact difficult for him to describe a verse as "āryā" ("śloka" etc.) unless it was an absolutely correct specimen. There is also the special problem for A.'s readers in that A. often prints his Prakrit verses without metrical and textual adjustments (ĕ etc.), so that in *metricis* the reader is thrown back to his own resources.

In order to make A. better understood we have to add that there are actually several different processes in the seven dogmatic chapters: insertion of additional āryā.s, replacing original śloka.s by āryā.s, and gradual transformation of śloka.s into āryā.s. All these cases have been duly considered by A., but on p. 8 he merely refers to the insertion of āryā.s which have been taken from other texts.

\*\*\*\*\*

*Chapter 24,1-27: PAVAYANAMĀYĀ. — A. pp. 8-10. — SCHUBRING Do § 173 (five samiti.s). — A single spurious āryā (24,16) had already been recognized by H. JACOBI. However, A. had found parallel verses in the Oghaniryukti, and this tempted him to reconstruct the development of two text pieces (4 verses in Utt. and 3 plus 16 verses in the Oghaniryukti), or to account at least for the present state of affairs. The subject of the chapter are the eight pavayaṇa-māyāo (five samiti.s and three gupti.s: vss. 4-18 and 20-25), and the subject of the verses to be discussed is the FIFTH SAMITI: voiding dirt of the body (excrements [uccāra] etc.) at a suitable place, primarily at a place which is free from living beings. The five samiti.s form a methodical concept which partially helps to translate the abstract principle of ahimsā (mahāvratā I) into concrete instructions for the daily life of a monk. ALSDORF discusses the following verses:*

Utt. 24	OghNi
15 (uccāraṃ)	./.
16 (āryā : aṇāvāya-)	= 296
./.	297-312; āryā.s derived from 296
17 (aṇāvāya-)	= 313
18 (vitthiṇṇe)	= 314

In this case, A.'s figures are not quite accurate. He writes on p. 10 erroneously 298 instead of 297 (lines 2 and 9; 298 correct for OghNi<sup>S</sup>), 297 instead of 296 (lines 4 and 11; 297 correct for OghNi<sup>S</sup>), and 17 instead of 16 (line 11).

A. observes that 24,16 is an intruding āryā ("the only Āryā of the chapter" [p. 8], "secondarily developed out of v.17" [p. 9]), that 24,17 and 24,18 are both śloka.s which belong together, and that 24,15, also a śloka, is grammatically incomplete (no verb), and can also not be connected with 24,17.18. JACOBI had called 24,16 "... a later addition ... probably ... taken from an old commentary, the Cūṛṇi or the Bhāṣya" (p. 9). A. sees two interrelated problems: (i) the existence of the verse triad 16-17-18 (296-313-314) in *both* Utt. and OghNi; as well as (ii) the incongruous character of the verse tetrad 15-(16)-17-18 in *Utt.* For (ii) he suggests two alternatives: either 17 and 18 — syntactically a self-contained unit — attracted 15; or verse 15 was the remainder of a longer tract on the FIFTH SAMITI, with 16-18 added after the loss of the other verses in order to fill the gap.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (FIFTH SAMITI and related subjects: tentative compilation). (i) *Introduction.* DEO Mo: 326 ("easing nature"); 429, 461-62 (funeral ground). CAILLAT Ph: 50-53 ("phāsuya"). METTE Oh: 131 (uvvariya, or remnants of food [Rest]), 138-39 (uvvariya, Pariṭhavaṇavihi), and 140-41 (uvvariya, OghNi 586 foll.); METTE Gi (on the Pāristhāpanikī-Niryukti in the ĀvNi). — (ii) *Conspectuses.* ĀvNi. BALBIR Āv: p. 72 (Pariṭhāvaṇiyā-Nijjutti). — OghNi etc. METTE Oh: p. 13, lines 8-10 (paḍilehaṇā, thaṇḍila); p. 13, lines 21-23 (uccāra); p. 15, lines 18-24 (Pariṭhavaṇavihi). — Māc. OKUDA Di: p. 18 (vs. 55: vidi-ginchā davve); pp. 18-19 (five samiti.s). — (iii) *Semantics.* Utt. 24 uses "samiti" both for the pentad (24,19) and for the octad (24,3). māyā (in pavayaṇa-māyā) is an instance of semantic change (p. 8, fn. 2). — (iv) *Translation.* OKUDA Di: 124-33 (five samiti.s).

(v) *References to the texts.* OghNi, paḍilehaṇā/thaṇḍila: OghNi 296-321 (see the synopsis supra), OghNiBhā 178-85. — OghNi, Pariṭhavaṇavihi: OghNi<sup>S</sup> 596-625, OghNi-Bhāṣya 305-8. This is preceded by the uvvariya section (OghNi<sup>S</sup> 586-595, OghNi-Bhāṣya 283-300): METTE Oh: pp. 15 and 138. — Māc., vidiginchā davve: V 55-56. — Māc., FIFTH SAMITI: V 124-28. Refer for

Utt. 24,15-18 to OKUDA Di: text and transl. of V 56, V 124-25; etymology of *ajjhusira* in Utt. 24,17 supplied by OKUDA on the basis of Vasunandin's commentary on V 124. – *Āyāranga*, *uccāra-pāsavaṇa*: JĀS 2,1: §§ 645-668. – *ĀvNi*, *Pāristhāpanikī-Niryukti*: *ĀvNi* 1272-73, *ĀvNi-Bhāṣya* 205-206, block of 83 verses (= 1-83), 1 *prakṣipta* verse (vss. 1272-73, 205-06, and the *prakṣipta* verse will be found between vss. 4 and 56 of the “block”, see “*ĀvNi*” in § 5). Refer for Utt. 24,15-18 to vss. 80-82 of the “block”. – *BṛKaBhā*, *thaṇḍilla*: 417-70 (443-44 = Utt. 24,17-18). – *BṛKaBhā*, *vicāra-bhūmi*: 2063-68 (2063 = Utt. 24,16).

(vi) *Further references (relevant to 24,15a.b)*: The first five members of 24,15 (*uccāraṃ ...*) recur in *Sūyagaḍa* § 707, *Dasav.* VIII 18 (OKUDA Di: pp. 49 and 109), *ĀvSū* § 24, and *Māc.* V 56 (*jalla* in 56d, see above). Related forms of the list (3-4 members identical) occur in various contexts. – (vii) *Pali parallels* to the *saṃiti* topic: see *uccāra*, *passāva* etc. in *IBR*.

\*\*\*\*\*

*Chapter 36,1-267: JĪVĀJĪVĪVIBHATTĪ*. – A. pp. 11-26; → *ALSDORF Ēt*: 75-76. – *SCHUBRING Do*: § 167 (*bhāvanā* topic). – A. begins his analysis with a short summary of Utt. 36 (p. 11). In Utt., the actual subject (*jīva* and *ajīva*: Utt. 36,1-248) is followed by an appendix which was added at a later date. This appendix comprises a fragmentary text on fasting to death (249-54: six *śloka*.s) and two short tracts in *āryā* metre: (a) A tract on the five wrong *bhāvanā*.s or blameworthy forms of behaviour which lead to *durgati*.s or undesirable forms of rebirth (36,255.262-65); and (b) a general soteriological tract (36,256-61). Tract (a) consists in principle of six versus memoriales (Utt. 255, 262, 264, 263, 265) including the “*ummagga-desao*” verse which is missing in Utt. Parallels to (a) and/or (b) could be detected in several other texts (mainly in the four verse texts *Āp.*, *Ms.*, *Mār.*, and *Māc.*). The complete *āryā* sequence of Utt. consists of twelve verses (Utt. 36,255-66).

The examination of “a” and “b” follows on pp. 12-24: synopsis of the “a” texts and “b” texts (p. 12), dogmatic analysis of the *bhāvanā* tract (pp. 12-14), “a” texts (pp. 14-16), mutual relationship of the “a” texts (pp. 16-17), partial *śloka*.s in the “a” text of *Māc.* (pp. 17-18), discussion of the six memorial verses in the “a” texts (pp. 18-21), discussion of Utt. 36,266 (solitary *āryā*, pp. 21-22), the “b” texts in Utt., *Māc.*, and *Āp.* (p. 22), relationship of all texts (a and b: pp. 22-24). A. observes on p. 12: “As a term of Jaina dogmatics, *bhāvanā* has at least three meanings ...”

On p. 23, A. remarks in connection with the synopsis on p. 12: “Whether actually, i.e. historically, Utt. and *Māc.* are combinations of the two versions [two texts] represented for us by *Āp.* [b] and *Ms./Mār.* [a]; or whether p. and *Ms./Mār.* illustrate

the two opposite ways [a or b] of improving an original version Utt./*Māc.* [a and b], cannot be decided with full certainty considering the unlimited possibilities of contamination.” However, A. is ultimately in favour of combination, as found in Utt./*Māc.*

Several passages in A.'s text characterize the situation. In connection with the transmission of “a”, *ALSDORF* states on pp. 16-17: “The confusing picture of agreements and divergences of the different versions [of “a”] changing almost from line to line is clearly the result of wholesale contamination. Probably no single one of the texts quoted is dependent on only *one* other – apart from the fact that we have of course to reckon with sources and prototypes unknown or lost to us.” With reference to *Māc.* (a), *ALSDORF* observes on p. 18: “There can thus be no doubt that *Māc.* preserves considerable remnants of an older set of memorial *Ślokas*, of which we are watching the gradual transformation into *Āryās* in progress.”

A. is primarily concerned with the verse texts (Utt. and four other texts), but he gives also the necessary information about the two prose texts, viz. *Aup.* and *Ṭhāṇa* (with *Abhayadeva*). Refer for *Ṭhāṇa* (“*cauvvihe* [!] *avaddhamse*”) to fol. 260b-262a and JĀS 3: § 354. The prose texts are also mentioned in the résumé on p. 24, but there is no detailed statement on the relationship between verse tradition and prose tradition.

The original chapter (roughly speaking 36,1-248) consists of late *śloka*.s and meets with A.'s interest only on account of its metre (see below). However, A. traces within this text one plus four *āryā*.s plus a half-*āryā* (pp. 24-25); these verses deal respectively with the three subjects of *Īsipabbhāra* (description), rough earth (enumeration), and gross wind (enumeration).

Observations on metre which apply to the late *śloka*.s of the chapter, but which claim more general interest, appear on pp. 25-26: “That the changed metrical taste should have produced a strong tendency to replace *Ślokas* by, or to transform them into, *Āryās* is only natural, and to know, and constantly to reckon with, this tendency is of great importance for every critic of Jaina texts.” And again: “Secondary transformation into *Āryā* is probably also responsible for at least part of the odd [*śloka*] *pādas* of 7 syllables, regarded by *SCHUBRING* as precursors of the *Āryā* [*SCHUBRING Wo*: 3], in which our chapter fairly abounds. It has about 40 *pādas* of 7 syll. which are regular *Āryā* *pādas*, and it can indeed hardly be doubted that the present text bears witness to a metrical feeling to which an odd *Śloka* *pāda* and an odd *Āryā* *pāda* had become of equal right and more or less exchangeable.” Refer for observations on the relationship between *śloka* and *āryā* also to A.'s studies in the old *āryā* (*ALSDORF It*: \*196-97; *ALSDORF Pa*: 20-22) and to the description of the new *āryā* on pp. 9-12 of *ALSDORF Pa*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR FIVE NEGATIVE BHĀVANĀ.s. *Note*: A. uses the continuous numbering of Māc. and does not mention that all his verses belong to chapter II. We can add that, in the case of “gāhā 4”, almost the entire Māc. tradition preserves the “regular” verse mantābhoga besides the “irregular” verse abhijunjai (see Ut s.v. “gāhā 4” and s.v. Māc. 65). – (i) *General*: **BrKaBhā**, six gāhā.s: 1293, 1295, 1302, 1310, 1315 correspond to Utt. 36, vss. 255, 262, 264, 263, 265 (“gāhās 1-5”); 1321 corresponds to ummagga-desao (“gāhā 6”). There is partial agreement between BrKaBhā and the other versions, including Utt. – Mār., deva-dubbhagatta/ deva-duggaī : vss. 1951-55. The vss. 1953, 1954, and 1955ab correspond respectively to Utt. 36,262/264; 263/265; and to ummagga-desao. 1955: “sammohaṇāḍe kalam karittu Dodundugā (probably Dogundugā, cf. Utt. 19,3) surā hunti, annaṃ pi deva-duggaī uvayanti virādhayā maraṇe.” – **BhāPrā** 13ab [āryā, first line]: five bhāvanā.s mentioned. – (ii) *ummagga-desao* as a single verse: **BrKaBhā** 6424, **JiKaBhā** 2047, **PaKaBhā** 1360. – (iii) Refer for *āsuriya* to Sūyagaḍa II: JĀS 2,2: § 706 (... āsuriesu kibbisiesu ṭhānesu ...), to Sūyagaḍa I: JĀS 2,2: § 151 (... āsuriyaṃ disam; CAILLAT Āy: pp. 28, 39-40), and to Sūyagaḍa I: JĀS 2,2: § 310 (... āsuriyaṃ ... °abhitāvaṃ). [References from B. BHATT.] The sequence kandappa, kukkuiya, mohariya (ALSDORF Ut: 15 [“gāhā 2”]) is also used for the anarthaḍaṇḍa transgressions 1-3 out of 1-5 (HOERNLE Uv: § 52; TS VII 27). Generally speaking, “kandappa” stands for the sin, for the sinner, and for the god (or form of rebirth). See p. 19 and the PSM.

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR TWO TOPICS (EARTH AND WIND). ALSDORF discusses these two subjects only in two paragraphs (p. 25), but the issue is taken up again by K. OKUDA in connection with Māc. V (Di: pp. 93-94 and 95). The lists for earth and wind are actually part of a large six-jīva tract which can be studied in Utt. 36,69 ff., in Māc. V 8 ff. (OKUDA Di), in ĀcNi 68ff., and elsewhere. OKUDA examines the entire tract on the basis of Māc. V and considers also the other versions. A systematic discussion of the material would form a small monograph. [Reference to Māc. V from B. BHATT.]

\*\*\*\*\*

*Chapter 33,1-25: KAMMAPAYADĪ*. – A. pp. 26-27. – *SCHUBRING Do: § 87 (eight kinds of karman); § 82 (darśana tetrad)*. – Utt. 33 is a short tract on karman where karman types I and III-VIII have been treated in śloka.s, while type II (darśanāvaraṇīya/°āvaraṇa karman) has been described in two āryā.s which combine its two different versions. Utt. 33,5 gives the pentad (nidrā, nidrā-nidrā, pracalā, pracalā-pracalā, styāna-[g]ṛddhi), while 33,6 gives the tetrad (cakṣur-darśanāvaraṇīya, acakṣur°, avadhī°, kevala°). A. does not say which version he considers the earlier one, but he

has little doubt that the combination of both chains is late and that our text originally had a single śloka with a single version. A. regards the different metre as a hint that the double version is the result of a later combination. He leaves the second question, as to which version is earlier, explicitly unanswered. Is the niddā pentad with its Buddhist vocabulary (infra) the lectio difficilior and the tetrad a later normalization?

BIBLIOGRAPHY. In Māc. XII 188 (1231) and TS VIII 8, both karma chains are likewise juxtaposed (see JACOBI Ta on VIII 8), and the twofold tradition is also presented in GLASENAPP Ka (pp. 22-23). P.S. JAINI mentions in connection with darśanāvaraṇīya only the tetrad (JAINI Pa: 132). Refer for thīṇ'addhī alone to ViĀvBhā 502 and JiKaBhā 96 and 2539. See thīna-[m-]iddha, pacalāyanā etc. in IBR for the Buddhist usage (nīvaraṇa pentad et alia).

\*\*\*\*\*

*Chapter 26,1-53: SĀMĀYĀRI*. – A. pp. 27-48; → ALSDORF Ēt: 76-77. – *SCHUBRING Do: § 148 (description of the “routine duties” of a monk on the basis of Ch. 26); SCHUBRING Do: § 136 (sāmāyārī)*. – Only the first seven śloka.s correspond to the title of the chapter, while the rest (26,8-53) are taken up by “a detailed time-table for the monk's day and night, divided into four porisīs each” (p. 27). After the introduction (pp. 27-28), ALSDORF discusses verses 26,8-23 (time-table up to vatthāim paḍilehae: pp. °28-29, 30-31; four āryā.s = 26,15.16.19.20), verses 26,24-31 (eight āryā.s on the vattha paḍilehaṇā: pp. °29, 31-41), verses 26,32c.d-35 (kāraṇa topic: pp. °29, 41-45; three Ārya.s = 26,33-35), the sequence 26,22-36 in its entirety (pp. 45-47), and the verses 26,37-53 (time-table after vihare muṇī: pp. °30, 47). We have marked all page references for the chart on pp. 28-30 with a circle. Refer for vs. 26, 32 to pp. 42, 45, and 46; and for vs. 26,36 to pp. 42-43 and 46. At the end, A. presents a “tentative synthesis” for 26,8-52 (pp. 47-48).

The problems of interpretation and reconstruction are considerable: “What must be supposed to have been originally a clear and well-ordered plan was changed into a disorder which cannot fail to strike every attentive reader and which it is not easy to disentangle” (p.28). A. discusses in great detail two inserted pieces on which we shall concentrate: the EIGHT PADILEHAṆĀ ĀRYĀ.S (technical details of the *vattha paḍilehaṇā*) and the KĀRAṆA TOPIC (six reasons for eating and six reasons for fasting: part of the prescriptions for the *begging tour*).

The EIGHT PADILEHAṆĀ ĀRYĀ.S have been quoted by the redactor of Utt. from the Oghaniryukti, as shown below (Utt. 26,24-31: pp. 31-32). Moreover, in the Oghaniryukti, five of the EIGHT PADILEHAṆĀ ĀRYĀ.S (264-68) are explained by eight Bhāṣya āryā.s occurring in OghNi (p. 32) and by one āryā occurring in Abhayadeva's commentary on Ṭhāṇa (pp. 33-34). The EIGHT PADILEHAṆĀ ĀRYĀ.S contain “techni-

calities concerning [morning] inspection (*paḍilehaṇā*) of clothes” (p. °29) and are preceded in Utt. by two śloka.s on the morning inspection in general, including inter alia a *short reference* to the inspection of clothes (verses 26,22-23: pp. °29 and 31). Verse figures for parallels to verses occurring in the time-table sequence (26,8-52) are supplied in fn. 5 of p. 27. (P. 31, line 1: the four OghNi verses are 283-86, as mentioned in fn. 5; refer for Thāṇa, also mentioned in fn. 5, to our bibliography.) This is the synopsis (Utt./OghNi) for the EIGHT PADILEHAṆĀ ĀRYĀ.S:

Utt.	OghNi	OghNi-Bhāṣya
26,24	= 264	OghNi-Bhāṣya 159 OghNi-Bhāṣya 160
26,25	= 265 (also in Thāṇa)	OghNi-Bhāṣya 161 chap purimā (Abh.)
26,26	= 266 (also in Thāṇa)	OghNi-Bhāṣya 162 OghNi-Bhāṣya 163
26,27	= 267	OghNi-Bhāṣya 164 OghNi-Bhāṣya 165
26,28	= 268	OghNi-Bhāṣya 166
[cf. Śāntisūri: p. 39]	269	
[cf. Śāntisūri: p. 39]	270	
[cf. Śāntisūri: p. 39]	271	
26,29	= 272	
26,30	= 273	
[cf. Śāntisūri: p. 41, fn. 1]	274 (ghaḍagāi-)	
26,31	= 275	

The core of the EIGHT PADILEHAṆĀ ĀRYĀ.S is the description of the meticulous inspection of the garment as found in verses 26,24-28: By shaking the garment the monk removes living beings which might otherwise come to harm when the garment is used.

A.'s judgement on the strange procedure is contained in the following two sentences: “The details of the paḍilehā may seem to many tedious and paltry in the extreme, and the considerable amount of labour and space spent on their elucidation out of proportion to their intrinsic importance. On the other hand, we have come to know and understand a very characteristic specimen of Jain monastic discipline in its late scholastic phase” (p. 41). This critical view of the procedure is not unwarranted, but we must realize that the handling of the cloth is obviously a ritualized form of ahimsā, the cloth being hardly more than a ritualistic requisite. The paḍilehaṇā exemplifies a type of ritual which reduces demanding observances to a symbolical and abbreviated act – either as a substitute for or as a supplement to the true observance. See Yašovijaya Sa (citra 10-22) for the present form of the paḍilehaṇā ritual.

It follows from A.'s text that the eight āryā.s were not an ad hoc text but an element of the dogmatic discourse. The wording shows “that our set of eight Āryā.s is not one homogeneous treatise but a compilation or collection of different sets of rules partly overlapping, supplementing or even contradicting one another” (pp. 36-37).

The Utt. verses that actually say *which* beings are to be protected through the vattha paḍilehaṇā are 26,30-31 (OghNi 273.275). In connection with OghNi 274, A. observes on p. 41: “It is clear that the two closely parallel stanzas 273 and 275 cannot originally have been separated by any other stanza; moreover, 274 is easily recognizable as a secondary insertion by its markedly different style. There can hardly be any doubt that 274 was subsequently added because a need was felt to substantiate in pedantic detail the somewhat general and sweeping statement of 273.” In fact, whatever the exact meaning of OghNi 274, it reflects at least partially views on ahimsā which deviate from the classical “six-jīva” ahimsā; compare BHATT Se: 135-41.

The begging tour takes place in the third porisi of the day. We now supply the synopsis for the KĀRAṆA TOPIC with the basic verses Utt. 26,33 (six reasons for eating) and 26,35 (six reasons for fasting). A synopsis based on pp. 43-44 (refer also to METTE Oh: 138 for PṇNi 667-68) will facilitate the understanding of A.'s analyses (pp. 42-47):

Utt.	PṇNi	Māc.	Ms.	Thāṇa
26,32c.d				
26,33	661 662 663 (“Bhāṣya”) 664 (“Bhāṣya”) 665 (śloka)	VI 59 VI 60	36	43 (JĀS 3: § 500) PṇNi 663 quoted PṇNi 664 quoted
26,34				
26,35	666	VI 61	39	44 (JĀS 3: § 500)

In contrast to the treatment of the vattha paḍilehaṇā (and verses 26,13-16), A. used for the KĀRAṆA TOPIC only the Piṇḍaniryukti, but not the parallel Oghaniryukti, which was later studied by A. METTE (see for the relationship of OghNi and PṇNi the synopsis in METTE Oh: 22-23). A. METTE also uses the *Obb.* which is unedited to this day (except for the portions now edited in METTE Oh). A. had himself prepared a microfilm of the *Obb.* while in India, but he did not use it for his studies. In the Oghaniryukti, the vattha paḍilehaṇā is separated from the KĀRAṆA TOPIC. See METTE Oh, p. 13 (“265-76”) for the vattha paḍilehaṇā and p. 15 (“581-585”) as well as p. 131 (“Begründung”) for the KĀRAṆA TOPIC. The vattha paḍilehaṇā is outside the portions studied by A. METTE, but the KĀRAṆA TOPIC is part of the selected text and has been dealt with on pp. 136-38 of METTE Oh.

For the comparative analysis of the KĀRAṆA TOPIC in Utt. on the one hand and in PṇNi on the other, ALSDORF gives a résumé on p. 45, which corresponds to the first two columns of the above synopsis for kārāṇa. Below, we supply the verse figures (not given by A.) along with the pratīka.s:

Utt. 26,32c.d (chaṇḥaṃ)	PṇNi 661 (chahi)
Utt. 26,33 (veyana-)	= PṇNi 662 (veyaṇa-)
—	PṇNi 663 (n'atthi): Bhāṣya
—	PṇNi 664 (iriyam): Bhāṣya
Utt. 26,34 (niggantho)	PṇNi 665a.b (ahava na)
—	PṇNi 665c.d (pacchā)
Utt. 26,35 (āyanke)	= PṇNi 666 (āyanke)

A. argues that an old śloka version of the KĀRAṆA TOPIC was the precursor of a later āryā version (each version – Utt. and PṇNi – showing traces of the old śloka version). A. METTE has afterwards shown that the two half-śloka.s PṇNi 665a.b and c.d can be made complete with the help of two Obb. half-śloka.s, thereby corroborating A.'s argument (pp. 44 and 45). See METTE Oh: 137 (transl.) and METTE Oh: 222-23 (text). These are the two completed śloka.s which form a fragmentary but intelligible śloka text on the KĀRAṆA TOPIC:

Obb. 2164a.b:	chahī kārāṇehī eehiṃ āhārejja su-saṃjāe
PṇNi 665a.b (= OghNi <sup>S</sup> 583a.b; Obb.om.):	ahava na kujja āhāraṃ chahiṃ thāṇehī saṃjāe
[Obb. 2164c.d: chahī ceva kārāṇehiṃ n' āhārejja imehiṃ tu]	
Obb. 2168a.b:	dehaṃ caittu-kāmo vā tahā saṃjama-akkhamaṃ
PṇNi 665c.d (= OghNi <sup>S</sup> 583c.d = Obb. 2168c.d):	pacchā pacchima-kālammi kāuṃ appakkhamaṃ khamaṃ.

A. feels that not only the EIGHT PADILEHAṆĀ ĀRYĀ.S 26,24-31, but also the KĀRAṆA TOPIC 26,32c.d-35, which is much older, are an insertion in the time-table text (pp. 45-46). As a consequence, only three and a half śloka.s are left for the relevant section of this text:

Utt. 26,22 – 26,23 – half-śloka: 36a.b [end of *paḍilehaṇā*] – full śloka:  
32a.b plus 36c.d [end of *begging tour*].

See also p. 48, lines 4-5. A. observes on p. 46: "... I do think that there is at least a strong probability that the above speculations correspond to the actual history of the text." His thesis was later partially confirmed by the text of the OghNi (METTE Oh, pp. 136 and 222), where the complete kārāṇa śloka is found:

Utt. 26,32c.d (chaṇḥaṃ) = OghNi<sup>S</sup> 581a.b (chaṇḥaṃ)  
OghNi<sup>S</sup> 581c.d (āhārejja).

For a proper estimation of the time-table analysis one has to realize that we are confronted in the case of PṇNi/OghNi with no less than four parallel texts (PṇNi, OghNi, OghNi-Bhāṣya, and Obb.) and with numerous individual parallels (Utt., Ṭhāṇa etc.). Naturally, synoptic presentation and evaluation of such multiple texts is difficult, and we are greatly indebted to A. METTE for presenting the material in an exemplary matter.

As far as the transformation of old śloka texts into āryā dominated texts is concerned, the reader will notice the difference between the radical transformation, in the early days, of verse tracts, even of individual verses, and the conventional transmission with only minor changes in the later period. We do not know the workshops of the transformers, and we do not know how the process of transformation was eventually stopped.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. (i) Semantics. Refer to METTE Oh (p. 6, fn. 20) for extensions of the meaning of *sāmāyārī*. See also p. 37 on "alternative explanations" for *paḍilehaṇā* terms. – (ii) OghNi context. METTE Oh: 13 (*paḍilehaṇā* and time-table). – (iii) *paḍilehaṇā* in Ṭhāṇa. OghNi 265 (*ārabhaḍā*) and 266 (*aṇaccāviyaṃ*) appear in Ṭhāṇa under the captions "chavvidhā pamāya-paḍilehaṇā" and "chavvihā appamāda-paḍilehaṇā" (Ahmedabad ed. fol. 343a; see JĀS 3: § 503). Abhayadeva quotes ad OghNi 265 the verses OghNi-Bhāṣya 161 (*vatthe*) and "chap purimā" (supplementing "vatthe") on fol. 344a. Furthermore, he quotes ad OghNi 266 the verses OghNi-Bhāṣya 162 (*vitaha*) and 163 (fol. 343b, 344a). Here Abhayadeva gives a variant for 266b and quotes 163a in a form which differs from the Bhāṣya text but corresponds to his Nirukti variant (p. 35, fn. 7). – (iv) kārāṇa. See JAIN Pi: 56 for text and translation of Māc. VI 60-61 (26, 33 and 26, 35: *veyaṇa-* and *ādanke*). – (v) kārāṇa in Ṭhāṇa. Pṇ 662 (*veyaṇa-*) and 666 (*āyanke*) appear in Ṭhāṇa under the captions "... āhāraṃ āhāramāṇe ..." and "... āhāraṃ vocchinda-māṇe ..." (Ahmedabad ed. fol. 340b; see JĀS 3: § 500). PṇNi 663 and 664 ("bhāṣya-gāthe") are mentioned on fol. 341b. The *paḍilehaṇā* concept (number of faults to be avoided: p. 35) and the kārāṇa concept (*supra*) are both *six-fold*. – (vi) Parallels supplementing the material of ALSDORF Ut and METTE Oh for the KĀRAṆA TOPIC. Utt. 26,33 and 26,35: Ms. (JĀS) 36 and 39; PaKaBhā 892 and 893; JiKaBhā 1658 and 1665; Ga (JĀS) 59 (ad 26,33). – PṇNi 661 and 664: JiKaBhā 1657 and 1660 (1660a.c = PṇNi 664a.c).

\*\*\*\*\*

*Chapter 28,1-36: MOKKHAMAGGAGĀI. – A. pp. 48-57; → ALSDORF Ét: 77-78. –* This chapter deals with the tetrad of *jñāna* (28,4-13), *darśana* (28,14-31), *cāritra* (28,32-33), and *tapas* (28,34). The tetrad is midway between an old triad (members one to three only) and a pentad (*vīrya* added as the fifth member). The general term for the chain is *mokṣamārga* (see OHIRA Ta: 55-56, 104-05). Refer to SCHUBRING Do for *jñāna* (§ 73), *darśana/samyaktva* (§§ 82, 169, 176, 187), fivefold *cāritra* (§ 177), and *tapas* (§§ 178-179). The *mokṣamārga* is the sole subject of Māc. V (see OKUDA Di; table of contents on pp. 17-20). Part of the exposition of *darśana* (i.e. *darśana/samyaktva*) is the *samyaktvāticāra pentad* (five negativa: *sankhā*, *kankhā* ...), which occurs in *Uvās.* (HOERNLE Uv: § 44), *Bhag.* (OHIRA Bh: § 496), and *ĀvSū* (JĀS 15: § 65 on p. 350), and which was later transformed into a *positive octad* (Utt. 28,31). See also SCHUBRING Do: § 88 on *kankhā-mohaṇijja*. The object of *darśana* are the nine or seven *tattva*.s. See Utt. 28,14-15; SCHUBRING Do: § 169 and OHIRA Ta: 55. The *darśana* concept has also been included in the *twelfefold tapas* (e.g. Māc. V 168-69: sub-sub-division of *tapas*). A later element of the *darśana* exposition are the ten *rucci*.s. See Utt. 28, 16.18-27; LEUMANN Au: p. 43; DELEU Vi: 293; and SCHUBRING Do: §§ 169, 180 (the *rucci*.s are mostly a sub-sub-division of *tapas*). At some point in time, the *mokṣamārga* was equated with *ārādhanā* (Mār.2).

A. shows in his treatment of *darśana* (pp. 49-55) that the original *darśana* verses (two *śloka*.s: 28,14-15) have been enlarged, mainly by a verse sequence on the ten *rucci*.s (eleven *āryā*.s: 28,16.18-27; read “eleven” on pp. 49 and 54!). However, the *rucci* chain is part of a longer verse sequence (28,16-31: 16 *āryā*.s), and this is not restricted to Utt. We actually have “14 *Āryās* [28,16- 19. (20). 21-28. 31] common to Utt. 28 and Pann[av].” (p. 54; JĀS 9,1: § 110). A. pays special attention to 28,31, one of those verses in the sequence which is not concerned with the ten *rucci*.s but describes the “positive octad” (p. 53). In connection with 28,31, ALSDORF discusses also the *ācāra pentad* (= *mokṣamārga*). The verse 28,17 is “of dubious origin” (pp. 54, 50-51).

There are likewise secondary verses in the exposition of *jñāna* which precedes that of *darśana* (28,4-13). All these verses are *śloka*.s, but the majority of them are secondary (pp. 55-56). By contrast, there are *no* secondary verses for *cāritra* (28, 32-33; *āryā* and *śloka*) and *tapas* (28,34; *śloka*). When the insertions are eliminated, only eleven or thirteen original *śloka*.s remain (pp. 55-56). This is a number similar to that of other tracts in Utt. (p. 56).

Here as elsewhere A. derives more general observations from his findings (pp. 56-57). He calls the miniature tracts “memorial treatises” and the verses “versus memoriales.” In other words, the verses do not present a primitive form of the dogmatic discourse but a genre sui generis which must be supplemented by “oral expla-

nations of the guru” (see also ALSDORF Ét: 78-79 on Utt. 30). It seems that A. had in mind an analogy between the early form of dogmatic tracts and the skeleton components of the *ākhyāna* genre. He therefore feels (slight modification of Ét: 78), that, theoretically, the solitary verse on *tapas* would have been appropriate even without the following Chapter 30 on the same subject.

Although A. has missed a few doctrinal details, his text on Chapter 28 contains several observations of considerable dogmatic interest and could form the basis for further studies in the relevant terms. It is especially *darśana* which calls for closer examination on account of its ambiguities. A. observes on p. 49: “We have thus two totally different treatments of *daṃsaṇa* side by side: two *Śloka*s defining its synonym *sammatta* as belief in the teaching of the nine “ethical fundamentals”, and thirteen [correct: eleven] *Āryās* propounding the doctrine of the ten *rucci*.” See in connection with *darśana* also JACOBI Ta: 301, GLASENAPP Jn (in the German edition p. 177, fn.), pp. 28-29 supra on the *darśanāvāraṇīya karman*, OHIRA Bh: § 261-63, and especially OETJENS Śi (pp. 194- 203). The term *darśana* (*samyaktva*, *śraddhā*) is an interesting instance of semantic disorder (no one-to-one relation). In such a case it is not sufficient to examine the individual terms under the aspect of historical semantic change. Rather it is necessary to study the entire configuration, and also the general impact of semantic irregularities on the dogmatic corpus. A comparison of the analyses of Utt. 26 and Utt. 28 (synopses vs. semantics) shows at any rate that the seemingly homogeneous material of the seven Utt. chapters actually presents problems of more than one type.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. (i) 10 *rucci*.s in *Ṭhāṇa*. *Ṭhāṇa* quotes 26,16 (“*dasavidhe sarāga-sammaddaṃsaṇe*”), and Abhayadeva adds the verses 26,18-27. See fol. 477a-478b and JĀS 3: § 751. – (ii) Parallels to the “positive octad”: *VyaBhā* 64, *NiBhā* 23, *JiKaBhā* 1037, and *CāPrā* 7 equal Utt. 28,31 (*nissankiya*); *ĀvNi* 1575a.b equals Utt. 28,31a.b. See for the other references ALSDORF Ut (and OKUDA Di, verse V 4). – (iii) The eight so-called *aticāra-gāthā*.s (pp. 53-54) describe the *ācāra pentad* and play an important part in ritual. The term “*aticāra-gāthā*.s” (“*aticāra*” instead of “*ācāra*”) is unexplained. See LEUMANN Ūb: 2b, lines 72-73, DCM 1948: nos.1185-90; TRIPATHI Ca: Ser.No.52, and OKUDA Di: 90. The *gāthā*.s 2-8 are found in *DaśavNi* and Utt. (see LEUMANN et al. for further details). – (iv) *Varia*. OKUDA Di: 150-51 (*ājñā*) and 110-11 (*uvavūhaṇa* [ALSDORF Ut: p. 54, fn. 1]); OETJENS Śi: 210-14 (*ājñā-rucci*) and 223-31 (*darśana*, *vicikitsā*); JOSHI Fa: 40-42 (*darśana* and *śraddhā*). – Utt. 28, 17: Māc. V 6 (*bhūd' aṭṭheṇa*) = *Samayasāra* 15. – (v) Fivefold *cāritra*: A. demonstrates on p. 55 (read after vs. 33 “five [!] kinds of *cāritra*”) that the couplet 28,32-33 was the product of partial transformation of *śloka*.s into *āryā*.s. Refer for 28,32 to *CāBha* 3 and see for *cāritra* scholasticism OHIRA Ta: 104-

12. – (vi) Complexities in the mokṣamārga concept: TATIA St: 71-72; CAILLAT At: p. 61-62; CAILLAT Ca: vss.73-80 (pp. 120-22; cāritra/karaṇa et alia); OHIRA Bh: §§ 261-62. – (vii) ārādhana concept, ārādhana literature: LEUMANN Ār, SCHUBRING Do: 185, OETJENS Śi: 27, 79-102, OHIRA Bh: §§ 383-385.

\*\*\*\*\*

*Chapter 30,1-37: TAVAMAGGAGAL. – A. pp. 57-62; → ALSDORF Ēt: 78-79. – SCHUBRING Do: §§ 178 (external asceticism) and 179 (internal asceticism).* – The subject of the chapter is indicated by its title. After the introductory śloka 30,1 we find three inserted verses, which A. eliminates (p. 57, elliptical style). Verses 30,1-4 are followed by a simile (30,5-6), by the tapas verse 30,7 (śloka, slightly changed version of 28,34: p. 56), and by the memorial verse for bāhira tapas (30,8 = āryā). The description of the first two positions of the sixfold bāhira tapas has been amplified to five verses in the case of anaśana or “fasting” (30,9-13: 1½ āryā.s) and to eleven verses in the case of omoyaraṇa or “reduction of food” (30,14-24: 9 āryā.s). The remaining ten positions (bāhira tapas III-VI, abhyantara tapas I-VI) occupy one śloka each (30, 25-28; 30,31-36) with 30,30 as the memorial verse (āryā) for abhyantara tapas. A. emphasizes that the amplification of the first two positions of bāhira tapas is reminiscent of the uneven treatment of the mokṣamārga in Utt. 28 (compare p. 60 top with pp. 48-49). After a terse discussion (the two groups of additional verses “represent several stages of insertion”: p. 61), ALSDORF again summarizes his findings by reconstructing the original text, using this time the expression “Urform” (p. 62). The two memorial āryā.s 30,8 and 30,30 are the only elements which A. compares systematically with the other versions of the tapas tract (pp. 58-59). He postulates two śloka.s as precursors of 30,8/30,30, not only for general reasons but also because 30,30d is a śloka pāda. He also states that the corresponding double āryā.s of the parallel tapas texts are not derived from Utt. Rather the two verses were current, and as such they were used inter alia as substitutes for two original śloka.s in Uttarādhyayana.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: (i) OKUDA Di: 135-54 (Māc. V 148-215 = tapa-ācāra). – (ii) Utt. 30,2a,b (five mahāvratas): Māc. V 91 [288; cf. Ut: 58], VII 160 [661], IX 14 [782], XI 9 [1026]; ĀcNi 331; ĀvNi-Bhāṣya 243 (after ĀvNi 1555). – Utt. 30,3a,b (five samiti.s etc.): The single pāda 30,3a recurs repeatedly, but 30,3a,b have no complete parallels. However, some verses are similar to 30,3a,b; we mention in descending order of similarity Pravacana-sāra 40, Ms. (JĀS) 326, and Mār. 1925. – Utt. 30,8/30,30: compare DaśavNi 47/48, Ms. (JĀS) 127/128, and Mār. 208 (Utt. 30,8).

\*\*\*\*\*

*Chapter 34,1-61: LES'AJHAYANAM. – A. pp. 62-68; → ALSDORF Ēt: 79-81. – SCHUBRING Do: §§ 97-98 (six lesā.s).* – The contents of the chapter are in conformity with its title. Ignoring the later additions, we can say that we have two old blocks: The introductory śloka (34,1) is followed by seven verses on the colours of the lesā.s (34,3-9; śloka.s), and by twelve verses (34,21-32; śloka.s), on the yoga.s which are at the root of the lesā.s (“lists of “yogas” due to which the jīva “develops” the six lesās”: reference on p. 67 [to p. 64]). The concluding verse (34,61) is likewise a śloka. There was possibly also an old statement in śloka.s about rebirth on the basis of bad or good lesā.s (prototype of verses 34,56-57, āryā/śloka, see pp. 66 and 67 [lines 13-14]). The common view, that lesā is “first and foremost, and in reality” (p. 62) soul-colour, is confirmed by this śloka tract. The tract contains everything that is old, while the āryā.s of the chapter – about forty and more than in any other chapter – present the lesā speculations of a later period (beginning with the taste, smell, and touch of the lesā.s: 34,10-19). A. emphasizes the historical relevance of his findings (p. 67), but he is not content with the isolation of the nucleus (“old memorial treatise”: compare pp. 47-48, 55-56, and 62). He also analyzes the accretions, more particularly the five āryā.s which describe the lesā.s under the aspects of “sthāna,” “gati,” and “āyus” (34,33.56-57.58-60: pp. 65-67).

The majority of the seven dogmatic chapters of Utt. reveal a difference between earlier and later dogmatic phases, normally concurrent with the śloka-āryā difference. The peculiarity of the present case is the convincing reduction to a plain nucleus of the extensive and intriguing lesā speculation of the later periods. It is also obvious that the “lesā doctrine” is to a large extent a classification of beings (A.L. BASHAM), although its peculiar form may also reflect certain views about the character of the soul.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: GLASENAPP Ka: p. 59, note 1 (leśyā, yoga, and pariṇāma); TATIA Pa: 293 (yoga and āsrava); BĀṬHIYA Le (*Leśyā-Kośa* in B.'s kośa series); TSUCHIHASHI Le (origins of the term lesā; bibliographical references); BASHAM Āj: 139-40, 244-45 (six abhijāti.s and six lesā.s); OHIRA Bh: §§ 298-313 (the lesā doctrine in Bhag. and Pannav.). Some lesā verses (in particular the metrical cluster 34,23.24: p. 64, fn. 1) contain terms of the kaṣāya type. Some recur in Pali texts and can be traced with the help of IBR (see asaṭho, āmāyāvī, sāṭheyya, māyā etc.).

Recently, B. BHATT has noticed that the so-called Bhagavatī-Avacūri (see BhagVyā in § 5) includes an anonymous series of 271 āryā.s which are more or less closely connected to the Bhagavatī. The question of the exact position of these verses vis-à-vis the transmitted text of the Bhagavatī deserves systematic study. Besides nine āryā.s recurring in UtNi, we find in this series the three Utt. āryā.s on āyus (34,58-60) discussed by A. on pp. 66-67 and de-



scribed by him as “difficult to understand” (p. 66). They belong to Bhag. 3.4.159 (see BhagVyā: p. 14, lines 2-4). The BhagVyā text of 34,58/59 has the reading *uvavāo* as mentioned by A. on p. 66 in fn. 2.

**ITTHĪPARINNĀ.** Sūyagaḍa I 4. – A. pp.\*193-214. LAI no. 30 (1958).

Itthīparinnā is composed in the old āryā which had been discovered by H. JACOBI (p.\*194). A. gives a fresh description of the metre on pp.\*196-97 (see also ALSDORF Pa, pp. 20-22) and analyzes Itthīparinnā on pp.\*197-214 (critical edition, translation, and extensive notes). There are two more texts with old āryā.s in the Śvetāmbara canon, viz. Āyāra 1,9 and Utt. 8. ALSDORF It supplements earlier studies in Āyāra 1,9 and Sūyagaḍa I 4, and is followed by NORMAN Kā on Utt. 8 (1977). The term “parinnā” which appears in the title of the chapter has more than one meaning: See TATIA Pa.

Besides Utt.15/Dasav.X (supra), Itthīparinnā is the only canonical text portion which has been translated by A. As a connected section it demonstrates the *style* of A.'s translations better than the individual verses translated by him in his other āryā studies. Quoting an observation by H. JACOBI, A. claims that “the [ancient] author allows us an unexpected, and sometimes not unamusing, “glimpse of a Hindu household some 2000 years ago”.”

### § 3. *Les Études Jaina*

**LES ÉTUDES JAINA. ÉTAT PRESENT ET TACHES FUTURES.** A. pp. 1-97. LAI no. 13 (1965). – Four lectures (pp. 1-25, 25-50, 51-72, 72-97).

ALSDORF Ét is almost a compendium of A.'s views on Prakrit and Pali philology with no less than thirty pages (pp. 51-81) devoted to the āryā subject. The close connection between ALSDORF Ét and A.'s two āryā monographs is also reflected in two reviews. In 1968, C. CAILLAT reviewed Ét along with *ALSDORF Ut* (LAI: pp. 46-51), and, in 1971, J.W. DE JONG reviewed Ét along with *ALSDORF Pa* (LAI: pp. 61-68). The reader of the present paper will remember that ALSDORF Ét was published *after* the Uttarādhyayana articles and shortly *before* the Uttarādhyayana monograph. Strictly speaking, the *Études Jaina* must be read as a whole, but here we concentrate on those pages which are relevant to the āryā subject. At the end we will return to the issue of A.'s general approach, which has already been touched upon on pp. 15-17 supra.

On pp. 54-57, A. gives a description of the three relevant metres (new āryā, old āryā, veḍha), which is followed on pp. 58-72 by a report on his studies in the Pali āryā (then in preparation), and on pp. 72-81 by an analogous report on his studies in the Prakrit āryā. For the veḍha, we refer the reader also to pp. 60-61. A. calls the

veḍha a semi-metrical variety (“variante semiprosaique”: p. 57) of the āryā, but mentions it in his Paris lectures only in passing. He surveys six Jātaka.s discussed in ALSDORF Pa (nos. 542, 525, 485, 479, 358, 301) on pp. 61-63, the beginning of Mahāvagga (also ALSDORF Pa) on pp. 66-68, and numerous Uttarādhyayana chapters ([9, 13, 22, 20]; 10; 36, 26, 28, 30, 34) on pp. 72-81. A.'s studies in the āryā were in an advanced stage when he gave his Paris lectures, and the abstracts contained in ALSDORF Ét can be read as an introduction to the three studies which followed at short intervals in 1966 (Th, Ut) and 1968 (Pa). Sometimes A. refers in these studies to the *Études* and sometimes not. Considering the difficult subject matter and the elaborate treatment, ALSDORF's three āryā publications are a demonstration of the alacrity with which he used to work. All studies are closely related, but ALSDORF Ut occupies a special position: It does not stand for a monograph but for a method.

A few topics of the *Études* require special mention. On p. 54, A. makes two significant observations on the āryā. He says that it is difficult for Western Indologists “to hear” this metre: “L'āryā cause d'ordinaire aux indologues occidentaux modernes quelques difficultés. Même qui d'habitude a le sens des mètres indiens se plaint de ne pas l'*entendre*, de ne pas en percevoir le rythme a l'oreille.” On p. 55 he says that the āryā, although open to considerable variation, follows well-defined rules: “En fait, malgré des possibilités de variation qui semblent déroutantes, elle suit des règles subtiles et très strictes, beaucoup plus strictes que le śloka, de sorte que précisément pour elle le mètre se révèle un inappréciable et presque infaillible moyen de détermination du texte.” These passages may appear outdated today, but apart from their importance for earlier phases of studies in MIA verse texts they have indisputable didactic relevance.

A. has devoted several pages (68-72) to the controversial subject of the history and chronology of the āryā (see also ALSDORF Th: 233). For the present state of our knowledge the reader is referred to NORMAN Pa (p. 110) and NORMAN Ār (especially 5.1-6), and to the relevant observations in the reviews (CAILLAT Re 1968 [LAI: 48] and DE JONG Re 1971 [LAI: 65-66]). The chronology of the āryā is not without effect on the chronology of the canonical texts (pp. 69-70). For much later datings of canonical Jaina texts on the basis of other testimonia we refer the reader to M.A. DHAKY's recent studies, especially to DHAKY Nā (passim) and DHAKY Bo (p. 135, fn. 1-2).

ALSDORF Ét also explains details such as A.'s knowledge of some (at least in his day) little known early Jaina texts. A. had always taken interest in the question of the position of early Digambara literature vis-à-vis early Śvetāmbara literature. Following LEUMANN, he therefore studied Mūlācāra and Mūlārādhana in combination with related Śvetāmbara works (pp. 94-97). These studies stood him in good stead when he had to analyze the dogmatic chapters of the Uttarādhyayana.

As far as future work is concerned (“tâches futures”), A.’s approach, as described in *Ét.*, must be called conservative. He seems greatly interested in *critical editions* (pp. 25-30). He even calls the small number of modern editions of ancient Jaina texts a blessing in disguise (our expression), since the haste of the Buddhologists produced, so he feels, too many insufficient editions of Pali texts (p. 26). Here he views Jainology from the angle of Pali studies, quite understandably in so far as his studies in the Pali *āryā* are primarily a great step forward in the field of textual criticism. At the same time, he does not realize that the projects which he has advocated or initiated himself in the field of Jaina studies point in a different direction. We mention the continuation of LEUMANN’s *Āvaśyaka* studies (pp. 81-84), the exploration of the *karman* literature of the *Digambara.s* (pp. 88-94), and finally the study of dogmatic topics as demonstrated in ALSDORF *Ut.* All these projects show that a philosophy which views critical editions as the first and foremost task is too narrow in the case of the literature of early Jainism. Moreover, nothing could better demonstrate the limits of normal textual criticism than the corrupted (*gestörten*) text portions which ALSDORF studies in *Uttarādhyayana* and SCHUBRING in the *Ācārāṅgasūtra* (see also p. 27 etc. *supra*).

The example of the “critical editions” already shows that the interpretation of an author must always consider the context of his complete oeuvre, which may contain conflicting elements. A few observations on this point may be added. ALSDORF was an admirer of E. LÜDERS, but he also had great respect for P. HACKER’s approach; he was a staunch philologist, but in his day he was also one of the few German scholars who took a vivid interest in modern India; he was a true Sanskritist, but he started his career with *Apabhraṃśa* studies. A. repeatedly criticized Jaina *scholasticism*, but he often mentioned the *Mudbidri* manuscripts with great enthusiasm – he almost seemed proud that he was the first Western Jainologist who had realized their importance (*Ét.*: 88-94). Moreover, he studied all the *āryā.s* of the Jaina canon, some of which presented extreme forms of scholasticism, while he devoted only one single article (*Ithīparinnā*) to the *early* Jaina tradition. No doubt, ALSDORF wrote (transl. from the original French): “The more we realize with Schubring that Mahāvīra was one of the greatest and most original thinkers (SCHUBRING: “*Denker*”) of ancient India, the more we are under an obligation to separate his person and his spiritual work from later falsifications” (*Ét.*: 81; SCHUBRING *Do.*: § 21). However, this is not a demonstration of ALSDORF’s false outlook, but rather a demonstration of the limited use of quotations (assuming that this passage *is* quoted). ALSDORF hardly intended to derogate all Jaina authorities after Mahāvīra. Without analyzing ALSDORF’s text in great detail, we can say that, in the passage just quoted, he wanted primarily to pay

his respect to his guru SCHUBRING, and to Mahāvīra as one of the spiritual heroes of ancient India. Moreover, A. preferred an early dating for the canonical texts, but would hardly have connected substantial parts of the canon with Mahāvīra.

It is true, ALSDORF reflects an epoch and a school. He had, for example, never heard, so it seems at least, of S. LÉVI’s criticism of V.S. SUKTHANKAR’s critical edition of the *Ādiparvan* (LÉVI *Re* 1929). By contrast, A. could not imagine that his teacher LÜDERS had not said the last word on many important issues. However, a study of A.’s limitations – like others he was influenced by the academic *Zeitgeist* – must be undertaken with great caution and sensitivity, and observations on his outlook must be accompanied by painstaking analyses of his actual findings.

Our “ALSDORF criticism” represents our own views. (We had known ALSDORF from 1950 to his death.) However, they have resulted from discussions which we have had with Prof. C. CAILLAT, who suggested that we should include in the present paper some remarks on the historical conditions which determined ALSDORF’s studies. Prof. CAILLAT also agreed to draft a few additional observations which will conclude the present section:

Ce qui frappait chez LUDWIG ALSDORF, ce n’était pas seulement l’érudition du savant, la clarté, la fermeté de ses connaissances et de son esprit, c’était aussi sa vaste culture générale, que vivifiaient une curiosité, une énergie sans borne.

L’intérêt qu’il avait toujours porté aux textes, quels qu’ils fussent, faisait de lui un philologue convaincu, soucieux de précision et de critique textuelle aussi bien que de cette “höhere Kritik” à laquelle il convoitait d’autant plus résolument qu’il souhaitait tout faire connaître de l’Inde, lui qui avait très tôt vécu au contact direct des réalités indiennes, dans ce pays où il avait des amitiés nombreuses et précieuses, où il avait beaucoup observé.

Ardent au travail, l’homme allait de l’avant, poussant à la perfection les études auxquelles l’avaient magistralement préparé l’époque, le milieu intellectuel exceptionnellement brillant où son œuvre s’est déployée, si bien qu’il ne semble pas avoir pris le temps – ni avoir eu l’envie – de s’interroger sur l’impact que le développement des sciences sociales, en cette seconde moitié du XXe siècle, pourrait avoir sur les recherches relatives à l’Asie du sud et du sud-est.

Même dans les domaines où il était totalement à l’aise, celui de la linguistique, L. ALSDORF paraît être resté un tenant des traditions établies, celle de la linguistique historique, de la grammaire normative, sans concessions à la linguistique synchronique, aux observations de ceux qui, ailleurs, attiraient l’attention sur le renouvellement, la transformation des systèmes grammati-

caux (en dépit des contraintes que peut exercer un modèle reconnu, une langue de prestige).

C'est sur du concret, du tangible, qu'il paraît avoir aimé s'appuyer, qu'il a raisonné, avec une rigueur qui ne laissait guère s'insinuer le doute, avec une célérité qui, pratiquement, excluait la mise en cause des méthodes qui avaient fait leurs preuves, et qui, avec lui, ont en effet continué à prouver leur excellence.

#### § 4. Studies in the Pali Āryā

ĀRYĀ STANZAS IN THERA-THERĪ-GĀTHĀ. "Appendix II" to the PTS edition of Th/Thī. – A. pp. 233-50. LAI no. 39 (1966). Refer for LAI no. 39 (and no. 14 infra) to → ALSDORF Ēt: 58-72.

A. describes the origin of the appendix in the following terms: "Practical requirements of work for the Critical Pali Dictionary have led the present writer to undertake a re-edition of all Āryās (about 450) occurring in the Pali canon. Coming to know of this project when the reprinting of the present volume was nearly finished, Miss Homer very kindly offered to include in it the new text of the Āryās (27 in Th, 130 in Thī); owing to the advanced state of the printing, this was only feasible in the form of an appendix. It will be seen that the metrical restitution involves numerous and considerable changes, some of which even affect Dictionary and Grammar ..." (pp. 233-34).

In Pali literature, the relationship between āryā and śloka is not the same as in the Jaina texts. The āryā "which had fallen into disuse in Pali after the "emigration" of that language from India to Ceylon, has been quite unfamiliar or even unknown to countless generations of Pali scribes and editors, with the result that most stanzas in this metre have severely suffered in tradition" (p. 233). Moreover: "There is a distinct tendency, most noticeable in S [Bangkok], to transform the obsolete Āryā into the familiar Śloka" (p. 233 fn.). As in the case of the Jaina texts, A. demonstrates in Th and in Pa repeatedly the transition from śloka (and early metres generally speaking) to āryā. This seems to imply that texts with āryā portions are invariably late. However, H. BECHERT states that, in principle, the āryā occurs already in the earliest strata of Buddhist traditions so that the presence of the āryā metre in a text would not automatically imply a late date (BECHERT Ve: 13).

A.'s edition of the āryā.s in Th is restricted to the presentation of variants along with a number of very brief notes. The reader finds a correct or corrected āryā text along with the necessary typographical adjustments (ē etc.).

DIE ĀRYĀ-STROPHEN DES PALI-KANONS. A. pp. 1-89. LAI no. 14 (1968).

This publication continues ALSDORF Th as well as ALSDORF Ēt (ALSDORF Pa: 5-6). A. deals with *new* āryā.s (pp. 23-89) and with *old* āryā.s (pp. 15-22: 43 āryā verses, analysis on pp. 20-22) as contained in various Tipiṭaka texts. A general discussion of āryā problems appears at the beginning of the study (pp. 5-7 and 9-12) and can be read together with ALSDORF Ēt: 51-61. Learned as the study is, it has yet a certain didactic bias, supplying information on rules and licenses for the metres under discussion (e.g. compare pp. 7 and 10 on the license to replace odd āryā pāda.s by odd śloka pāda.s). The greater part of ALSDORF Pa was a critical edition and restoration of the relevant āryā verses, but there was also scope for the discussion of other philological problems. A. edited in Th and Pa *all* āryā.s of the Tipiṭaka (about 450: supra), just as he edited *all* āryā.s of Uttarādhyaṇa. This may be considered a matter of course, but it is to some extent typical of A., who felt it always necessary to study texts or corpora of texts in their entirety (e.g. in connection with comparisons: p. 77).

Pp. 23-50 are devoted to the eight Jātaka.s which contain new āryā.s (Jātaka.s 301, 358, 479, 485, 525, 536, 542: p. 39 supra). A.'s commentary includes references to the literary sources: The Culladhammapālaṅkāra (358) is an imitation of the Kṣāntivādiṅkāra (313), and the Cullasutasomajātaka (525) is probably an imitation of the Mahājanakajātaka (539); the Khaṇḍāhālaṅkāra (542) borrowed verses 86-93 from the Cullasutasomajātaka and verses 105-12 from the Candakinnarajātaka (485). A.'s treatment of Jātaka.s 479 (Kālingabodhiṅkāra) and 525 follows earlier studies by H. BECHERT (1966, 1954/61). As pointed out by Th. OBERLIES in his Jātaka studies, many of ALSDORF's emendations and his text in general can be accepted (Jā II; further details ibid.). Refer to OBERLIES also for *osaṭhi* in Jāt. 485,2 (p. 29; OBERLIES Mi: 174-79).

On pp. 51-77, A. discusses the "beginning of Mahāvagga" (Vinaya I, pp. 1-44 [sic]), i.e. the account of the enlightenment of the Buddha and of eleven ordinations (p. 71). A.'s analysis makes ample use of Pali and Sanskrit parallels, the latter mainly taken from Catuspariṣatsūtra (CPS), Mahāvastu, and Lalitavistara. J.W. DE JONG observes in this connection in Re 1971 (LAI: p. 67) that A. only considered the Mūlasarvāstivādin version (CPS), a late text, but not the Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka versions as known from Chinese sources (transl. A. BAREAU).

In his introductory section on p. 51, A. mentions inter alia that the Mahāvagga portion contains at least nineteen āryā.s, besides twenty-eight verses in the current old metres.

(i) In the first of his five Mahāvagga sections, A. restores the two variants of the solicitation āryā ("uṭṭhehi"; pratika.s of the *second* lines: "desassu" and "cittam hi").

– (ii) In the next section, A. restores the nine verses of the aggisāla episode (defeat of the nāga in Uruvela-Kassapa's fire-temple). He demonstrates that the preceding prose is secondary (more general observations on this point are given in fn. 2 on p. 60), but that there are later repercussions of the prose version on the verse version. The verses are missing in the Catuspariṣatsūtra, which shows that its redactor did not yet know the new āryā metre. – (iii) In section three, A. points out that the first of five āryā.s sung by Śakra (on the Buddha's entering of Rājagṛha) must be read in the more correct version of the verse as found in the Nidānakathā. A. gives also a short reference to the versions of the Mahīśāsaka.s and Dharmagupta.s (p. 63, fn. 4). – (iv) The subject of section four is the conversion of Sāriputta and Mogallāna. After a detailed analysis of the three verses of the preceding Assaji-Sāriputta dialogue (appaṃ vā ..., ye dhammā ..., es'eva dhammō ...), A. restores the two āryā.s of the Buddha's prophecy concerning his two main disciples S. and M. (there is again a preceding prose version: p. 68). – (v) Section five is a study of the *etha-bhikkhavo formula* (ordination formula). Part of the formula (p. 71) shows the āryā metre (˘ ˘ caratha ... antakiriyāya = āryā pāda.s a.b), is formed on the basis of the old ehi-bhikkhu phrase ("ehi tvam, bhikkhu" plus imperative), and forms an integral part of the Mahāvagga which was not incorporated in CPS. On account of its āryā.s, the Mahāvagga is a comparatively late text, and the use of the (famous) etha-bhikkhavo formula in it, and only in it, is a departure from earlier usage (*labheyyāhaṃ formula*). A. concludes section five with the observation that the CPS version of the beginning of Mahāvagga is obviously later than the corresponding Pali text, and that the Pali version is possibly the earliest extant version (but see DE JONG Re supra). Furthermore, A. had already stated on p. 66 of ALSDORF Ét that the Mahāvagga text with its āryā.s must be dated much later than the Mahāparinibbānasutta, which does not contain a single āryā.

The remaining part of ALSDORF Pa (pp. 319-31) is devoted to the āryā.s (and verses with āryā elements) in Saṃyutta-Nikāya, Vimānavatthu, and Apadāna.

In Th and Pa, ALSDORF makes ample use of the "oriental editions" which had previously hardly been available (Pa: 13-14). C. CAILLAT (Re 1969) summarizes ALSDORF Pa with the following words: "S'aidant systématiquement des éditions orientales dont il confronte les traditions et lectures avec celles qu'ont diffusées les éditions européennes, L.A. met en évidence et regroupe quelque trois cents āryā pā., dont plusieurs n'avaient pas été jusqu'ici reconnues" (p. 22). Refer for the oriental editions also to OBERLIES Jā II. K.R. NORMAN feels that "The aspect of Alsdorf's work which is likely to have the greatest impact upon Pāli studies in the long run is the writing about metre, especially his study of the āryā metre, published in 1968, which deals with all the examples of the āryā metre, old and classical alike, in the Canon, except for those in the Thera- and Therī-gāthā. ... He stated there [1966, p.

233] his belief that prosody can, and ought to be, used as the surest guide to the restoration of a corrupt text. With this as his basis, and with a fine feeling for the correct reading, he succeeded in producing emendations for almost every corrupt passage in texts composed in the āryā metre in Pāli" (NORMAN Al: 102; see also NORMAN La: 177). It should be added that A. also paid due attention to the various forms of repetition, a structural rather than a historical subject (p. 34-36: Cullasutasomajātaka; pp. 38-50: Khaṇḍāhārajātaka; pp. 81-86: Guttīla-Vimāna). That A.'s views on the oriental editions may occasionally require modification (FALK Te: 70-71) does not affect his studies in the Pali āryā.s.

**BEMERKUNGEN ZU EINEM METRISCHEN FRAGMENT DES MAHĀPARINIRVĀNA-SŪTRA.** A. pp.\*266-69. LAI no. 35 (1955).

The subject of this paper is a sequence of twelve āryā.s which occur both in the MPS and in the Saṃyuktāgama and which are concerned with the seven bodhyaṅga.s. The verses had already been studied by E. WALDSCHMIDT. A. now shows that the careful analysis of the metre leads to a few improvements in our understanding of the text.

**VERKANNTTE MAHĀVASTU-STROPHEN.** A. pp.\*370-79. LAI no. 41 (1968/69).

A. restores the twenty-one āryā.s of the upasampadā section at the beginning of the Mahāvastu which had already been recognized by LEUMANN (see *Ernst Leumann. Kleine Schriften*). Afterwards he analyzes the verses (two āryā.s et aliud) in the story of the conversion of Sāriputra and Maudgalyāyana. At the beginning of the paper, A. stresses the need for a critical edition of the Mahāvastu. He seems to feel that the Mahāvastu offers considerable scope not only for the metrical restoration of known verses, but also for the detection of new verses.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Acknowledgement

The very nature of the present essay necessitated frequent contacts with colleagues who are working in the same field. In most cases, an acknowledgement has already been made in the text, but I would like to express my indebtedness also in a comprehensive manner.

As on previous occasions I am grateful to R. RADZINSKI for improving with great care the language of my paper.

### § 5. Abbreviations and Bibliography I (Jaina Texts)

In our verse quotations, we always follow the modern authors to whom we are referring. See *ALSDORF Ut: 4* for *ALSDORF Ut*, and see the references given in *this section* for the other authors. When we quote directly, we follow the editions mentioned in *TRIPATHI Bi*, the *JĀS* editions if available, and further editions if specified in this section. For the titles of works we use our own abbreviations, but we have adopted in some cases the abbreviations used by L. *ALSDORF* and A. *METTE*. In references to Prakrit works (*JĀS*, *HOERNLE Uv*, *LEUMANN Au*), the section symbol (“§”) refers to prose sections, old (*sūtra.s*) or modern. The present list supplements to some extent *TRIPATHI's Bibliographical Report* (1981).

Abhayadeva	See <i>Ṭhāṇa</i>
ĀcNi	Ācārāṅganiryukti
Āyāraṅga	Ācārāṅgasūtra ( <i>JĀS</i> 2,1)
Āp.	Āturapratyākhyāna ( <i>JĀS</i> 17,1 [16])
Aup.	Aupapātikasūtra (see <i>LEUMANN Au</i> )
ĀvCū	Jinadāsa's Āvaśyakacūrṇi. Ratlām/Indaur 1928-29.
ĀvHa	Haribhadra's Āvaśyakaṭikā (see <i>ĀvNi</i> )
ĀvNi	Āvaśyakaniryukti. – Refer for vss. 4-56 of the <i>Pāriṣthāpanikī-Niryukti</i> (p. 26 <i>supra</i> ) to pp. 619b-637a of the <i>ĀvNi</i> ed. of 1916-17, or to Pt. II, pp. 86-98 of the <i>saṃ</i> . 2038 reprint.
ĀvNi-Bhāṣya	Bhāṣya verses in the <i>Āvaśyakaniryukti</i>
ĀvSū	Āvaśyakasūtra ( <i>JĀS</i> 15: 333-58)
Bhag.	Bhagavatisūtra (Bombay 1918-21: text counting of the <i>Āgamodaya Samiti</i> ; <i>JĀS</i> 4,1-3: text counting of the <i>JĀS</i> ).
BhagVyā	Bhagavati-Vyākhyāna. Anonymous. Published as <i>Śrī Bhagavatisūtrāvācūrī</i> . Surat 1974 (DLJP 114). Pp. 1-202. – See pp. 37-38 above.
BhāPrā	Kundakunda's Bhāvaprābhṛta
BṛKaBhā	Saṅghadāsa's Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya
CāBha	Kundakunda's Cāritrabhakti
CāPrā	Kundakunda's Cāritraprābhṛta
Dasav.	Daśavaikālikasūtra (see <i>SCHUBRING Da</i> and <i>JĀS</i> 15: 1-81)
DaśavCū	Agastyaśiṃha's Daśavaikālikacūrṇi. Prakrit Text Society 1973.
DaśavNi	Daśavaikālikaniryukti
DaśavVṛ	Anonymous Daśavaikālika commentary formerly known as “ <i>Cūrṇi</i> ” (Ratlām/Indaur edition of 1933). The correct title is “ <i>Vṛddhavarāṇa</i> ”. See <i>CAILLAT Va</i> : 69 and 82 (fn. 5) and <i>BOLLÉE Ni</i> : 31.
Ga	Gacchācāra ( <i>JĀS</i> 17,1 [17])
JĀS	Jaina-Āgama-Series
JīKaBhā	Jinabhadra's Jītakalpabhāṣya

Māc.	Mūlācāra (Vaṭṭakera/Kundakunda). See <i>LEUMANN Üb</i> (pp. 16-19: Māc. VII), <i>OKUDA Di</i> (Māc. V), <i>JAIN Pi</i> (Māc. VI). The Māc. numbering seems to be basically the same in all Vaṭṭakera editions, and this numbering is common to <i>ALSDORF Ut</i> , <i>OKUDA Di</i> , and <i>JAIN Pi</i> . For details of the respective texts refer to <i>ALSDORF Ut passim</i> , <i>OKUDA Di</i> (pp. 6-7, 34-35) and <i>JAIN Pi</i> (pp. 24-25). However, the numbering of the Vaṭṭakera editions may continue throughout the work or be separated by chapter. It is <i>chapterwise</i> in <i>ALSDORF Ut</i> : 43, <i>OKUDA Di</i> , and <i>JAIN Pi</i> . It is <i>continuous</i> in <i>ALSDORF Ut</i> : 12 and in the 1944 edition of the Murtidevi Jaina Granthamala, which was not known to A. (see fn. 4 of p. 11 of <i>ALSDORF Ut</i> ). In the few cases where we quote directly we mention the number in the chapter <i>and</i> the continuous number. – Our paper contains no references to verses found only in the Kundakunda version.
Mār.	Śivārya's Mūlārādhana. We quote from <i>ALSDORF Ut</i> : p. 11, fn. 3), when referring to A., from <i>OETJENS Śi</i> (pp. 27, 30-33: Sholapur 1935) when referring to <i>OETJENS</i> , and from Sholapur 1978 when quoting directly.
Ms.	Marāṇasamādhī ( <i>JĀS</i> 17,1 [5])
NiBhā	Niśīthabhāṣya
Obb.	Oghabṛhadbhāṣya. See <i>METTE Oh</i> : 150-51.
OghNi (OghNi <sup>S</sup> )	Oghaniryukti. <i>ALSDORF</i> uses the verse numbering of the 1919 edition (Bombay 1919: 1-811), while <i>METTE</i> follows the 1957 edition (Surat 1957: 1-812). We refer always to Bombay, and to Surat (OghNi <sup>S</sup> ) only when quoting from <i>METTE</i> . Refer for editions etc. to <i>METTE Oh</i> : 150-51.
OghNi-Bhāṣya	Bhāṣya verses in the Oghaniryukti
PaKaBhā	Pañcakalpabhāṣya. An edition prepared by the late C. <i>TRIPATHI</i> will be published posthumously.
Pannav.	Prajñāpanāsūtra ( <i>JĀS</i> 9,1-2)
PṇNi	Piṇḍaniryukti (see <i>JAIN Pi</i> )
Pravacanasāra	Kundakunda's Pravacanasāra
Samayasāra	Kundakunda's Samayasāra
Sūyagaḍa	Sūtrakṛtāṅgasūtra ( <i>JĀS</i> 2,2)
Ṭhāṇa	Ṭhānāṅgasūtra ( <i>JĀS</i> 3: 1-322). Refer for Abhayadeva's commentary to the Bombay edition of 1918-20.
TS	Umāsvāti's Tattvārthādhigamasūtra
UtCū	Govāliya-Mahattara-Śiṣya's Uttarādhyayanacūrṇi. Ratlām/Indaur 1933. Pp. 1-284.
UtNi	Uttarādhyayaniryukti
Utt.	Uttarādhyayasūtra (see <i>CHARPENTIER Ut</i> and <i>JĀS</i> 15: 85-329)
Uvās.	Upāsakadaśāsūtra (see <i>HOERNLE Uv</i> )
ViĀvBhā	Jinabhadra's Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya
VyaBhā	Vyavahārabhāṣya. C. <i>TRIPATHI</i> has corrected the numbering of the edition in the copy of the Institute. Thus verse number 64 <i>uncorrected</i> (see our p. 35) is number 72 <i>corrected</i> .

### § 6. Abbreviations and Bibliography II (modern works)

In the case of W. SCHUBRING and L. ALSDORF, we quote reprinted articles according to the pagination of the *Kleine Schriften* (with asterisk), but the abbreviations and bibliographical data are always based on the original publications. When quoting ALSDORF, we always give the LAI number in addition to an abbreviated bibliographical reference. When mentioning *Akademie-Abhandlungen* (ALSDORF Pa and ALSDORF Ut; Mainz; BECHERT Ve; Göttingen) we follow the internal pagination of the *Abhandlung*. Below we include only those *studies in metre* which have a direct bearing on A.'s āryā publications. However, in addition to the publications mentioned in our text (H. BECHERT and K.R. NORMAN), we have included in our Bibliography OBERLIES Jā. OBERLIES' paper (part II forthcoming) can be used as an introduction to the various metres found in A.'s sources (mātrāchandas, gaṇacchandas, triṣṭubh/jagatī, and śloka). It also supplies the bibliographical references to the studies in these metres (including a reference to J. SAKAMOTO-GOTO's unpublished thesis on mātrāchandas). The latest studies in the *Uttarādhyayana* will be found under the names BOLLÉE and NORMAN.

- ALSDORF Āk L. ALSDORF "The Ākhyāna Theory Reconsidered," in: JOI 13.1963/64. – LAI no. 18.
- ALSDORF Ar — "Ardha-Māgadhī," in: *The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition*. Göttingen 1980. – LAI no. 161.
- ALSDORF Ci — "The Story of Citta and Sambhūta," in: S.K. BELVALKAR Fel.Vol. Benares 1957. – LAI no. 29.
- ALSDORF Dṛ — "What were the Contents of the Dṛṣṭivāda?," in: *German Scholars on India*. Vol. I. Benares 1973. – LAI no. 33.
- ALSDORF Ét — *Les Études Jaina*. Paris 1965 (1966). – LAI no. 13. – Four lectures delivered at the Collège de France in 1965. An English translation is a desideratum.
- ALSDORF Ex — "Jaina Exegetical Literature and the History of the Jaina Canon," in: *Mahāvīra and His Teachings*. Bombay 1977. – LAI no. 160.
- ALSDORF Fr — "Bemerkungen zu einem metrischen Fragment des Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra," in: ZDMG 105.1955. – LAI no. 35.
- ALSDORF It — "Itthiparinā," in: IJ 2.1958. – LAI no. 30.
- ALSDORF Ku — *Der Kumārapālāpratibodha*. Hamburg 1928. – LAI no. 1.
- ALSDORF Ma — "Verkannte Mahāvastu-Strophen," in: WZKS 12-13. 1968/69. – LAI no. 41.
- ALSDORF Na — "Namipavajjā," in: W.N. BROWN Comm.Vol. New Haven 1962. – LAI no. 31.
- ALSDORF Pa — *Die Āryā-Strophen des Pāli-Kanons*. Wiesbaden 1968. – LAI no. 14.
- ALSDORF St — "Uttarajjhāyā Studies," in: IJ 6.1962. – LAI no. 32.

- ALSDORF Th — "Āryā Stanzas in Thera-Therī-Gāthā," in: *The Thera- and Therī-Gāthā*. Second edition. London 1966. – LAI no. 39.
- ALSDORF Ut — *The Āryā Stanzas of the Uttarajjhāyā*. Wiesbaden 1966. – LAI no. 12.
- ALSDORF Vā — "vāntam āpātum," in: S.K. CHATTERJI Jubilee Vol. Poona 1955. – LAI no. 28.
- ALSDORF Vi — "Das Jātaka vom weisen Vidhura," in: WZKS 15.1971. – LAI no. 42.
- ALSDORF Vo — "Zwei Proben der Volksdichtung aus dem alten Magadha," in: *Beiträge zur Indienforschung*. Berlin 1977. – LAI no. 158.
- BALBIR Āv N. BALBIR *Āvaśyaka-Studien. Introduction générale et Traductions*. Stuttgart 1993.
- BALBIR Sa — "An Investigation of Textual Sources on the *samavasaraṇa*," in: N. BALBIR and J.K. BAUTZE (eds.) *Festschrift Klaus Bruhn*. Reinbek 1994. Pp. 67-104.
- BASHAM Āj A.L. BASHAM *History and Doctrines of the Ājīvikas*. London 1951.
- BĀṬHIYĀ Le M. BĀṬHIYĀ, S. CORADIYĀ *Leśyā-Kośa*. Kalkattā 1966.
- BECHERT Cu H. BECHERT "Das Cullasutasomajātakam," in: *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*. Heft 4 (1954). Revidierter Nachdruck (1961), pp. 13-28.
- BECHERT Kā — "Über einen Verstyp im Jātaka-Buch," in: *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*. Heft 19 (1966), pp. 77-86. – Kālingabodhijātaka.
- BECHERT Ve — "Alte Vedhas" im Pāli-Kanon. Göttingen 1988.
- BHATT An B. BHATT "Twelve aṇuvekkhās in Early Jainism," in: *Festschrift Klaus Bruhn*. Reinbek 1994. Pp. 171-93.
- BHATT Se — "The concept of the Self and Liberation in Early Jaina Agamas," in: *Self and Consciousness. Indian Interpretation*. Centre for Indian and Inter-religious Studies. Rome 1989. Pp. 132-72.
- BOLLÉE Ma W.B. BOLLÉE *Materials for an Edition and Study of the Piṇḍa- and Oha-Nijjuttis*. Stuttgart 1991.
- BOLLÉE Ni — *The Nijjuttis on the Seniors of the Śvetāmbara Siddhānta*. Stuttgart 1995.
- BOLLÉE Ut — "Pourquoi il faut respecter un savant. Uttarajjhāyā XI," in: *Indol. Taur.* 14.1987-88, pp. 145-62.
- BROWN Ut W.N. BROWN *Manuscript Illustrations of the Uttarādhyayana Sūtra*. New Haven, Connecticut. 1941.
- BRUHN Āv K. BRUHN "Āvaśyaka Studies I," in: K. BRUHN und A. WEZLER (eds.) *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus* (L. ALSDORF Comm.Vol.). Wiesbaden 1981. Pp. 11-49.
- BRUHN Co K. BRUHN and C.B. TRIPATHI "Jaina Concordance and Bhāṣya Concordance," in: H. HÄRTEL (ed.) *Beiträge zur Indienforschung* (E. WALDSCHMIDT Fel.Vol.). Berlin 1977. Pp. 67-80.
- BRUHN Rv 1972 K. BRUHN: review of ALSDORF Ut in: ZDMG 122.1972, pp. 431-33.
- BRUHN Se II — "Sectional Studies in Jainology II," in: *Berliner Indologische Studien* 7.1993, pp. 9-58.

- CAILLAT At C. CAILLAT *Atonements in the Ancient Rituals of the Jaina Monks*. Ahmedabad 1975.
- CAILLAT Äy — “Ardhamagadhi *āyadaṇḍa*,” in: *Bull. d' Études Indiennes* 7-8.1989-90, pp. 17-45.
- CAILLAT Br — “The Beating of the Brahmins (*Uttarādhyayana* 12),” in: *Festschrift Klaus Bruhn*. Reinbek 1994. Pp. 255-66.
- CAILLAT Cr — “The Recent Critical Editions of the Jain Āgama,” in: *ZDMG. Supplement V*. (21. Deutscher Orientalistentag, Berlin 1980). Wiesbaden 1983. Pp. 234-40.
- CAILLAT Da — “Notes sur les variantes dans la tradition du Dasaveyāliya-sutta,” in: *Indol. Taur.* 8-9 (1980-81), pp. 71-83.
- CAILLAT Mū — “Quelques observations a propos d' une publication nouvelle sur le Mūlācāra,” in: *WZKS* 23.1979, pp. 155-62.
- CAILLAT Ph — “Deux études de moyen-indien,” in: *Journal Asiatique* 248. 1960, pp. 41-64. [Pt. I continued: “Nouvelles remarques sur les adjectifs moyen-indien *phāsu*, *phāsuya*,” in: *J.A.* 249. 1961, pp. 497-502.]
- CAILLAT Re 1968 — : review of ALSDORF Ét and ALSDORF Ut in: *Journal Asiatique* 256. 1968, pp. 145-49. Reprint in LAI: pp. 46-51.
- CAILLAT Re 1969 — : review of ALSDORF Pa in: *Bull. de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 64.1969, pp. 22-23.
- CAILLAT Va — “Notes sur les variantes grammaticales dans la tradition du Dasaveyāliya-Sutta,” in: L.A. HERCUS et al. (eds.) *Indological and Buddhist Studies* (J.W. DE JONG Fel. Vol.). Canberra 1982. Pp. 69-94.
- CHARPENTIER Ja J. CHARPENTIER “Zu Uttarajjhayaṇa XXV,” in: *WZKM* 24.1910, pp. 62-69. — Ch. 25 = Jannaijjaṃ.
- CHARPENTIER Mā — “Studien über die indische Erzählungsliteratur. 2. Das Mātaṅga-jātaka,” in: *ZDMG* 63. 1909, pp. 171-88.
- CHARPENTIER Ut — *The Uttarādhyayanasūtra*. Uppsala 1922.
- CHOJNACKI Vi C. CHOJNACKI *Vividhatirṭhakaḥ*. Vols. I-II. Pondichery 1995.
- DCM H.R. KAPADIA: *Cat. BHORI* 17,4. Poona 1948.
- DELEU Vi J. DELEU *Viyāhapannatti*. Brugge 1970.
- DHAKY Bo M.A. DHAKY and SAGARMAL JAIN “A Propos of the Boṭṭika Sect”, same volume as DHAKY Nā. Pp. 131-39.
- DHAKY Nā M.A. DHAKY “‘Nātaputta’ in Early Nirgrantha Literature,” in: M.A. DHAKY and SAGARMAL JAIN (eds.) *Pt. Dalsukh Bhai Malvania Felicitation Volume I*, Varanasi 1991. Pp. 120-24.
- FALK Te H. FALK “Zur Textgeschichte der Jātakas,” in: *Berliner Indologische Studien* 8.1995, pp. 63-80.
- GLASENAPP Jn H. VON GLASENAPP *Jainism: An Indian Religion of Salvation*. Transl. from the original German by SHRIDHAR B. SHROTRI. Motilal Banarsidass. Forthcoming.
- GLASENAPP Ka — *Die Lehre vom Karman in der Philosophie der Jainas*. Leipzig 1915.
- HANAKI Aṇ T. HANAKI *Aṇuogaddārāim*. Vaishali 1970.

- HOERNLE Uv A.F.R. HOERNLE *The Uvāsogadasāo*. Vols. I-II. Calcutta 1890, 1888. — Unfortunately, this book has not yet been reprinted.
- IBR *Sri Lanka Buddha Jayanti Tripitaka Series*. The International Buddhist Research and Information Center. Colombo 1995. — Computerized version.
- JACOBI Er H. JACOBI *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāshṭrī*. Leipzig 1886.
- JACOBI Jn II — *Jaina Sūtras*. Pt. II. *The Uttarādhyayana Sūtra. The Sūtrakritāṅga Sūtra*. SBE 45. Oxford University Press 1895.
- JACOBI Ta — “Eine Jaina-Dogmatik,” in: *ZDMG* 60 (1906), pp. 287-325, 512-551.
- JAIN Pi R.P. JAIN *Piṇḍasuddhi: Das sechste Kapitel von Vaṭṭakeras Mūlācāra und der āhākamma-Abschnitt der Piṇḍa-nijjuttī*. New Delhi 1983 (© by R.P. JAIN). — Refer to § 5 for quotations from Māc.
- Jaina Concordance Punch cards kept in the Institut für Indische Philologie und Kunstgeschichte of the Freie Universität Berlin. The concordance includes all the earlier texts but contains mainly L.V.L. material. See pp. 8 and 17-18.
- JAINI Pa P.S. JAINI *The Jaina Path of Purification*. University of California 1979.
- JĀS 15 MUNI PUNYAVIJAYAJI and Pt. A.M. BHOJAK (eds.) *Dasaveyāliya-suttam, Uttarajjhayaṇāim, and Āvassayasuttam*. Jaina-Āgama-Series No. 15. Bombay 1977.
- DE JONG Re 1971 J.W. DE JONG: review of ALSDORF Ét and ALSDORF Pa in: *IJJ* 13.1971, pp. 207-12. Reprint in LAI: pp.61-68.
- JOSHI Fa L.M. JOSHI *Facets of Jaina Religiousness in Comparative Light*. Ahmedabad 1981.
- KHADABADI Ex B.K. KHADABADI “Reflexions on the Jaina Exegetical Literature,” in: M.A. DHAKY and SAGARMAL JAIN (eds.) *Pt. Dalsukhbhai Malvania Felicitation Volume I*. Varanasi 1991. Pp. 27-33.
- Kleine Schriften* A. WEZLER (ed.) *Ludwig Alsdorf. Kleine Schriften*. Wiesbaden 1974.  
K. BRUHN (ed.) *Walther Schubring. Kleine Schriften*. Wiesbaden 1977.  
A. WEZLER (ed.) *Ludwig Alsdorf. Kleine Schriften*. Vol. II. Stuttgart 1996.  
N. BALBIR (ed.) *Ernst Leumann. Kleine Schriften*. Forthcoming.
- LAI K. BRUHN, M. DUCKWITZ, A. WEZLER (eds.) *Ludwig Alsdorf and Indian Studies*. Motilal Banarsidass 1990.
- LEUMANN Ār E. LEUMANN “Die Ārāḍhanā-Literatur”. Unpublished manuscript. See OETJENS Śi: 80-81 and PLUTAT Li.
- LEUMANN Au — *Das Aupapātika Sūtra*. Leipzig 1883.
- LEUMANN Da — “Daśavaikālika-sūtra und -niryukti nach dem Erzählungsgehalt untersucht und herausgegeben,” in: *ZDMG* 46.1892, pp. 581-663. To be published in the *Kleine Schriften* of ERNST LEUMANN.
- LEUMANN ÜB — *Übersicht über die Āvaśyaka-Literatur*. Hamburg 1934.
- LÉVI Re 1929 S. LÉVI, review of the Ādiparvan in: *Journal Asiatique* 1929 (pp. 345-48) and 1934 (pp. 281-83).
- L.V.L. “Late canonical and post-canonical verse literature” (see p. 9).

- METTE Al A. METTE "L. Alsdorf and Jainological Studies," in: LAI: pp. 85-94.  
 METTE En — *Durch Entsagung zum Heil*. Zürich 1991.  
 METTE Gi — "'Giftmüllentsorgung' im alten Indien." Forthcoming.  
 METTE Oh — *Pinḍesaṇā. Das Kapitel der Oha-nijjuttī über den Bettelgang*. Wiesbaden 1974. — Refer to § 5 for quotations from OghNi.  
 NORMAN Al K.R. NORMAN "L. Alsdorf and Pāli Studies," in: LAI: pp. 99-102.  
 NORMAN Ār — "The Origins of the āryā Metre," in: D.J. KALUPAHANA, W.G. VEERARATNE (eds.) *Buddhist Philosophy and Culture* (N.A. JAYA-VICKRAMA Fel.Vol.). Colombo 1987. Pp. 203-14.  
 NORMAN As — "Uttarajjhayaṇa Studies. An edition and translation of the fourth ajjjhayaṇa ...," in: *Siddhantacharya: Pandit Kailashchandra Shastri Felicitation Volume*. Rewa 1980. Pp. 564-72. — Utt. 4 = Asaṃkhaṃ.  
 NORMAN Kā — "Kāviliyaṃ," in: A.N. UPADHYE et al. (eds.) *Mahāvira and His Teachings*. Ahmedabad 1977. Pp. 9-19. — Utt. 8 = Kāviliyaṃ.  
 NORMAN La — "The Metres of the Lakkhaṇa-suttanta (I)," in: *Buddhist Studies in Honour of Hammalava Saddhatissa*. Nugegoda 1984. Pp. 176-88.  
 NORMAN Pā — *Pāli Literature*, in: *A History of Indian Literature VII 2*. Wiesbaden 1983.  
 NORMAN Us — "Uttarajjhayaṇa-Sutta XIV: Usuyārijaṃ," in: *Pt. Dalsukhbhai Malvania Felicitation Volume I*. Varanasi 1991. Pp. 16-26. — Utt. 14 = Usuyārijaṃ.  
 NORMAN Vi — "Uttarajjhayaṇa-sutta I," in: *Jain Studies in Honour of Jozef Deleu*. Tokyo 1993. Pp. 375-94. — The reader will find a short survey of Uttarādhyaṇa studies on pp. 375-76. — Ch. 1 = Viṇayasuyaṃ.  
 OBERLIES Jā Th. OBERLIES "Der Text der Jātaka-Gāthās in FAUSBÖLLS Ausgabe [I]," in: *Bull. d'Études Indiennes* 11-12.1993-94, pp. 147-170. Part II forthcoming.  
 OBERLIES Mi — "Miscellanea Palica," in: *Bull. d'Études Indiennes* 7-8.1989-1990, pp. 157-84.  
 OETJENS Śi K. OETJENS *Śivāryas Mūlārādhana. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Sterbefasten-Literatur der Jainas*. Hamburg 1976. — Refer to § 5 for quotations from Mār.  
 OHIRA Bh S. OHIRA *A Study of the Bhagavatīsūtra*. Ahmedabad 1994.  
 OHIRA Ta — *A Study of Tattvārthasūtra with Bhāṣya*. Ahmedabad 1982.  
 OKUDA Di K. OKUDA *Eine Digambara-Dogmatik. Das fünfte Kapitel von Vatṭakeras Mūlācāra*. Wiesbaden 1975. — Refer to § 5 for quotations from Māc. — See also CAILLAT Mū.  
 PLUTAT Li B. PLUTAT *The Literary Remains of Ernst Leumann*. Forthcoming.  
 PSM H.D.T. SHETH *Pāia-Sadda-Mahaṇṇavo*.  
 SCHUBRING Āc W. SCHUBRING *Ācārāṅga-Sūtra*. Leipzig 1910.  
 SCHUBRING Da — *The Dasaveyāliya Sutta*. Ahmedabad 1932. *Kleine Schriften*: pp. \*109-248.  
 SCHUBRING Do — *The Doctrine of the Jainas*. Motilal Banarsidass 1962.

- SCHUBRING Wo — *Worte Mahāvīras*. Göttingen 1926.  
 TATIA Pa N. TATIA "Parallel Developments in the Meaning of *Parijñā*," in: *Indol. Taur.* 11.1983, pp. 293-302.  
 TATIA St — *Studies in Jaina Philosophy*. Benares 1951.  
 TRIPATHI Bi C. TRIPĀṬHI "The Jaina Concordance in Berlin. A Bibliographical Report," in: *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus* (L. ALSDORF Comm.Vol.). Wiesbaden 1981. Pp. 301-29.  
 TRIPATHI Ca — *Catalogue of the Jaina Manuscripts at Strasbourg*. Leiden 1975.  
 TRIPATHI Pa — "Narratives in the *Pañcakalabhāṣya* and Cognate Texts," in: *Indol. Taur.* 11.1983, pp. 119-28.  
 TSUCHIHASHI Le K. TSUCHIHASHI "On the Literal Meaning of *leśyā*," in: *Indol. Taur.* 11.1983, pp. 195-202.  
 YAŠOVUJAYA Sa MUNIŚRI YAŠOVUJAYĀJĪ *Samvachcharī pratikramaṇ kī saral vidhi*. Baroḍā 1976. — The booklet is on ritual, and there are several publications of the same type.



## Mitarbeiter dieses Bandes / Contributors to this Volume

Dr. Harivallabh C. BHAYANI	25/2 Vimanagar Satellite Road Ahmedabad – 380 015 India	Prof. Dr. Adelheid METTE	Indologisches Seminar Universität Münster Salzstraße 53 D – 48143 Münster Germany
Dr. Gouriswar BHATTACHARYA	Institut für Indische Philologie und Kunstgeschichte Freie Universität Berlin Königin-Luise-Straße 34a D – 14195 Berlin Germany	Dipl.-Ing. Gerd J.R. MEVISSSEN, M.A.	Institut für Indische Philologie und Kunstgeschichte Freie Universität Berlin
Prof. Dr. Klaus BRUHN	Institut für Indische Philologie und Kunstgeschichte Freie Universität Berlin	Dr. Christopher MINKOWSKI	Department of Asian Studies Cornell University – Rockefeller Hall Ithaca, NY 14853– 2502 U.S.A.
Priv.-Doz. Dr. Klaus BUTZENBERGER	Institut für Indische Philologie und Kunstgeschichte Freie Universität Berlin	Dr. R. NAGASWAMY	No. 22, 22nd Cross Street Besant Nagar Madras – 600 090 India
Dr. Theo DAMSTEEGT	Faculteit der Letteren Rijks Universiteit Leiden Postbus 9515 NL – 2300 RA Leiden The Netherlands	Prof. Dr. Helmut NESPITAL	Institut für Indische Philologie und Kunstgeschichte Freie Universität Berlin
Christoph EMMRICH, M.A.	Institut für Indische Philologie und Kunstgeschichte Freie Universität Berlin	Priv.-Doz. Dr. Thomas OBERLIES	Orientalisches Seminar – Indologie Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg Humboldtstraße 5 D – 79085 Freiburg i. Br. Germany
Prof. Dr. Harry FALK	Institut für Indische Philologie und Kunstgeschichte Freie Universität Berlin	Falk REITZ, M.A.	Institut für Indische Philologie und Kunstgeschichte Freie Universität Berlin
Prof. Dr. Adalbert J. GAIL	Institut für Indische Philologie und Kunstgeschichte Freie Universität Berlin	Dr. Maruti Nandan TIWARI	Department of History of Art Banaras Hindu University Varanasi – 221 005 India
Prof. Dr. Michael HAHN	Fachgebiet Indologie Philipps-Universität Marburg Wilhelm-Röpke-Straße 6 D – 35032 Marburg Germany	Prof. Dr. R. VASANTHA	Department of History Sri Krishnadevaraya University Anantapur (Andhra Pradesh) India
Prof. Dr. Jens-Uwe HARTMANN	Institut für Asien- und Afrikawissenschaften Abteilung Zentralasien – Tibetologie Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin Luisenstraße 54/55 D – 10099 Berlin Germany	Dr. Klaus WILLE	Katalogisierung der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Akademie der Wissenschaften – Arbeitsstelle Göttingen – Hainbündstraße 21 D – 37085 Göttingen Germany
		Prof. Dr. Peter ZIEME	Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissen- schaften, Akademievorhaben Turfanforschung Unter den Linden 8 D – 10117 Berlin Germany