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 Uttarādhayana 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, Uttarādhayana). However, Ut. is the only text to have an appreciable number of Āryā.s (see ALSDORF Ut: 5-6). Ut. has thirty-six chapters, and A. has published five contributions on Ut. 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 Etudes Jainas on pp. 41-42.
of the fourteen chapters he discussed, A. could detect āryā verses. If we add that the āryās 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 Uttarādhayana, with the āryā and with the ākhyāna problem, with the āryā and with Jaina dogmatics, and with Uttarādhayana in general. This state of affairs requires special bibliographical efforts. Generally speaking, we treat all Uttarādhayana 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 Uttarādhayana studies, but the names of E. LEUMANN, H. JACOBI, J. CHARPENTIER, and W. SCHÜRRING 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 Ut. (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 Ut. 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 Bl.) 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 if he might have added improvements, the Concordance has 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 (sāṃvāda.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 Uttarādhayana, which demonstrated the transformation 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 Uttarādhayana 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 philosophical 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 Ut. 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 PANNAVĀNA, PINDA.- and OHA-NIJUTTI, AURA-PACCAKKHĀNA, and MARANASAMĀHī" (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 Ut. 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, Nirukti.s, Bhāṣya.s et alia, Śvetāmbara and Digambara texts, a field which we would like to call "late canonically 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. Uttarādhayana 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 Uform (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/samvāda 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 (Cūḍāmaṇīs and Tīkās) 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 Bhāratakalpa-, Niśātha-, 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 (Niryyuktis and Bhāṣya-s in verse, Cūḍāmaṇīs and Tīkās in prose). Modern scholars therefore felt that all these classes had to be defined, 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 (Daśāvākālikasūtra 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 (SCHÜRING: DO: § 43, ALSDORF ET: 37-39, ALSDORF EX, BRUHN ÄV: § 4, TRIPATHI PA: 120, KHADABADI EX). Only a very recent study has avoided a discussion of the issue (BALKIR ÄV: 474-78). It can be claimed that the study of selected portions of the exegetical material (ViśāvBhāṣa and samavasarama 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 Niryyuktī (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 “Niruyuki.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. KHADABDI has demonstrated in detail that A.’s hypothesis cannot be reconciled with the facts (KHADABDI 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 “Niruyuki” 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 “Āvasyaka 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 Āvasyaka 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 Āvasyaka 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 conceptions for single texts, “narrow synopses” for two to three texts, or “short synopses” for limited pieces of text. In connection with LEUMANN’s Āvasyaka-Erzählungen, we can add that the entire material has now been studied by N. BALIBIR in her *Āvasyaka-Studien* (e.g. compare Āv: pp. 126 and 231-44 for “Viśeṣh. I, 863-862-861”). The same author has included a demonstration of Āvasyaka complexities in BALIBIR Sa. She has shown that, in the samavasana portion, the Āvasyaka Cūrṇi is not in conformity with the Āvasyaka Niruyuki. It omits six secondary verses of the ĀvNi ("post-cūrṇi insertion"), which are also missing in the Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya (BALIBIR Sa: 75-76). Moreover, in the implementation of the dvāra verse on the samavasana (Sa: 74), ĀvCū and Kṣemakīrti (= BṛKaBhā, Tīkā) go partially together versus (gehen teilweise zusammen gegen) the version recommended by Haribhadra (= ĀvNi, Tīkā).

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) BALIBIR Āv, (ii) _Kleine Schriften_ of ERNST LEUMANN, (iii) TH. OBERLIES’ study of the Brahmadatta tales (in the present volume), and (iv) PLUTAT Lī.

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, Tīkā.s), “Dṛṣṭivāda” (ALSDORF Dr: ĀvCū and ViĀvBhā), the “five negative bhāvanā.s” (p. 27 infra: prose from Aup. and Tīhāṇa), and the “time-table” (ALSDORF Ut: 40-41 — prose of Dronācayā). Instances of extensive parallelism of verse and prose are not rare in the narrative literature of L.V.L. One example is Kāśṭha ṛṣi (METTE Oh: 97-102: OghNī tradition et alia, verse and prose), and further examples can be found among the Āvasyaka stories, e.g. “Viśeṣh. 19271-3” (BALIBIR Āv: 253-69: Āvasyaka 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 Tīkā.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. BALIBIR 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 Āvasyaka _nikṣepa_ (ALSDORF Ni, HANAKI Å: 8-10, BALIBIR Āv: 231 f.), “Rṣabha’s prebirths” (LEUMANN Üb: 308-315), “fifth samītī” (p. 24-26 infra), the _five negative bhāvanā.s_ (p. 26-28), _jiva-and-gīva_ (p. 28 infra), _sāmāyāra_ (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 multilingual so that the status of the individual texts as ordering factors is reduced. The concept also implies that dogmatic concepts (e.g. vinaya or ahimsa) cannot be studied without reference to concrete tracts, wherever 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 nispea 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 Curni still is a Curni (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 skoka restoration, aryä detection, text correction, and 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 Utardhyayana, 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 SCHUHRING's Doctrine. In the case of ALSDORF Ut, the number of topics is limited, but A. was more concerned with the aspect of development and relative chronology than SCHUHRING (ALSDORF Et: 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 skoka.s and one in aryä.s. Of course, the pattern of the historical con-
clusion 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 Tikā.s (Śāntisūri, Dronācārya et al.). These Tikā.s must be consulted with caution (ALS DORF È: 39-44; ALS DORF 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 Śākyana's Rigveda commentary. A. could use a commentary published as "Cūrṇī" (Dasāvārtr: p. 46 infra), and in ALSDORF È (pp. 37-39) he stressed the general importance of the Cūrṇī.s for textual criticism. However, he never studied a Cūrṇī text very closely, and he had not seen the Uttarādhyayana Cūrṇī (ed. 1933). No doubt, the Cūrṇī.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 Tikāta) to the later strata, largely because he appreciated its quasi-classical simplicity. In his article on the Vidhurapandita Jātaka, he quoted H. LUDERS who called the Jātaka verses "literargeschichtlich unschätzbar[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-
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 pothi editions in the library of the Institute with new numbering.

§ 2. Studies in the Prakrit Ārāyā II (Uttarādhyayana)

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 I (Sūtraśātānga, old ārāyā). Three of the fourteen relevant Utt. chapters have no ārāyās (12-15-25), and four chapters (10-12-13-15) have basically been compiled 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 ārāyā each, but have not been studied by A. in detail. The total of chapters containing ārāyās is thirteen. The ārāyās 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 Uttarādhyayana chapters in ALSDORF Ė) and to METTE Al: 91-92. ALSDORF Ut has been reviewed inter alia in CALLAT 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 sami, used by the Jaina authors instead of the correct Skt. form "smṛti".


A. demonstrates that the phrase "vāntam āpātam" (vantam ... āveṃ), which occurs in a crucial verse relating to the Rahānemi-Rāyamai 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 gandhā: "disgracing etc."). The three ārāyās of the chapter have been inserted between vss. 20 and 24 and contain secondary matter. They have no bearing on the subject of vāntam āpātam and are merely discussed in a footnote (fn. 6).

BIBLIOGRAPHY. K.R. NORMAN extends the comparison of Utt. 14,38 (vantāsi ...) with Jātaka 509,17-18 (pp.*183-84) to the verses Utt. 14,44-45 (bhoge bhocc ..., 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 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 (Cittasambhūjataka). The Utt. chapter is basically a composition in upejāti verses. LEUMANN already noticed that the ārāyās 1-3 and the ślokas 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 pūda 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 Cāndāla: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 hemistichs of one Śloka [in the kathānaka], not two full Triśūbbha and a third Triśūbbha [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 (vss. 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.


A. analyzes the Utt. version of the well-known story of Nāmi's pravrajyā and comes to the conclusion that the kernel of Chapter 9 is an "old samvāda, composed entirely in slokas" (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 samvāda (existing in the form of oral literature) "was replaced by fixed metrical additions" (p.*224; ALSDORF Ėt: p. 74, lines 4-10) in the āryā metre. "The redactor(s) of the Uttarādhayana 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 Sambhāta. Refer for the samvāda / ākhyāna issue furthermore to the following observations in ALSDORF Åk: "... 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 Jainas 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 Athavānagānā" (p.*45).

ALS DORF Åk was published in 1963/64, and his characterization was endorsed in 1965 by general observations on the narrative elements of the Uttarādhayananirukti (ALS DORF Ėt: 23-24). Refer for a narrative specimen of UjNī also to ALS DORF Vo: 18 and ALS DORF Ar: 21. ALS DORF 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).

UTTARĀJHĀYĀ STUDIES. Chapter 10: DUMAPATTAYAM; Chapter 15: SA BHIKKHO; Chapter 12: HARIJUJAM and Chapter 25: JANNAIJAM. – A. pp.*225-51; LAI no. 32 (1962). – There are no āryās 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. ALS DORF 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 ALS DORF Ėt: 7; → ALS DORF Ėt: 74. – Utt. 10, named after its incipit "Dumapattayaṃ," deals with the difficulties of reaching salvation (in technical language anityatva and bodhidurlabhata). 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" (ALS DORF Ut: 7) with a total of "eleven odd [āryā] pādas and three quarters of a [āryā] stanza" (ALS DORF Ut: 7). "When this interpolated passage is removed ... there remains a poem of 26 pure and nearly perfectly regular Vaitāliya stanzas"
Chapter 15.1-16: SA-BHIKKHO; 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 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 Trīṣṭubh/Jag[atī] pādān and stanzas are late intruders and accretions to the old sa-bhikkhū-stanzas in Aup[acchandasaka] metre: when these were collected and incorporated into Utt. and Dasav., they were supplemented at the beginning and end of the chapters with pādān and whole stanzas in the closely related and (by then) less unfamiliar and obsolete Trīṣṭ/Jag. metre" (p.*243). The situation is explained by the fact that "an Aup[acchandasaka] and Upajāti pādā 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 Vaitālīya chapters (Utt. 10 and Sūyagāda 1.2)" (p.*243). A. summarizes his metrical analysis by a short list of the non-aupucchandasaka pādās 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 Daśav. Vr and mentioned by him as "Cūrīs". He had no access to Daśav.Cū, but on a later occasion (Ēt: 38) he mentions the two "Cūrīs" 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 (ALSOROF VI: *178-79), but also in Dasav. X 1 and XI 6. See ALSOROF St: *239 and SCHUBRING Da: *233 and *236. Refer for Utt. 15,5 (no sakka) also to CIAALDA: 73-74.

Chapter 12,1-47 and Chapter 25,1-45: HARISHCHAND AND JANNAKHYAM. — A. pp. *243-51: — ALSOROF Ēt: 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. CIAALDA (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, ALSOROF changes “je ya veya-viś vippā, jannaṭha ya je diyā” into the metrically correct reading “... janna-jatthā ...” (p.*249). The word jatthā is not found in Prakrit, but yaṣṭ- 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 little 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-jatthā which he considers a paradigm of erroneous transmission, mentioning it also in ALSOROF Ēt: 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 In II (p. 50, fn. 1: Utt. 12), BROWN UT (pp. 16-17: Utt. 12), METTE En (pp. 131-33: Utt. 12), CHINACKI Vi (Vol. II, p. 36: Utt. 12), BROWN UT (p. 36: Utt. 25).

THE ĀRYĀ STANZAS OF THE UTARAJHĀYĀ. Chapter 24: PAVAYAMĀYĀ; Chapter 36: JVAJIVIBHATTI; Chapter 33: KAMMAPAYÀDI; Chapter 26: SAMA-YĀRĪ; Chapter 28: MOKHAMAGGAGI; Chapter 30: TAVAMAGGAGI; Chapter 34: LESAJHAYANAM. — 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 of A.'s readers in that A. often prints his Prakrit verses without metrical and textual adjustments (śek etc.), so that in metricus 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 Oghaniyukti, and this tempted him to reconstruct the development of two pieces (4 verses in Utt. and 3 plus 16 verses in the Oghaniyukti), or to account for the present state of affairs. The subject of the chapter are the eight pavayanā-māyā (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 (mahāvrat 1) into concrete instructions for the daily life of a monk. ALSDORF discusses the following verses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utt. 24</th>
<th>OghNi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 (uccāraṇa)</td>
<td>./ .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 (āryā : anāvāya-)</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>./ .</td>
<td>297-312; āryā.s derived from 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 (anāvāya-)</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 (vitthinge)</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 OghNi4), 296 instead of 296 (lines 4 and 11; 297 correct for OghNi5), 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 Čūrṇi or the Bṛha" (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.


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 contamina-
tion." 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 agree-
ments 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 Āryā 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 Ṭhāṇā
(with Abhayadeva). Refer for Ṭhāṇā ("cauvīhe [!] avadhanpe") to fol. 260b-26a
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 Isappabhā (description), rough earth (enu-
umeration), 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 trans-
formation 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.

Chapter 36,1-267: JIVĀLVAYIBHATTI. – A. pp. 11-26; → ALSDORF Ét.: 75-76. –
SCHUBRING Do: § 167 (bhāvanā topic). – A. begins his analysis with a short sum-
mmary of Utt. (p. 11). In Utt., the actual subject (jiva and ajiva: 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 bhāvanās or blameworthy forms of behaviour
which lead to durgati. or undesirable forms of rebirth (265,262-65); and (b) a
general soteriological tract (36,265-61). Tract (a) consists in principle of six versus
memoriales (Utt. 265,262, 264, 263, 265) including the "uññaggā-desa" 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.,
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 actu-
ally, 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
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 niddāpentad 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 dāranāvarāṇya only the tetrad (JAINI Pa: 132). Refer for thyāddhi alone to VIĀV Bhā 502 and JIKA Bhā 96 and 2539. See thāna-[m]-jīdha, paca-lāyanā etc. in IBR for the Buddhist usage (nīvaraṇa pentad et alia).

Chapter 26,1-53: SĀMAYĀLI. — A. pp. 27-48; → ALSDORF Ėī: 76-77. — SCHURRING Do: § 148 (description of the "routine duties" of a monk on the basis of Ch. 26); SCHURRING Do: § 136 (sāmāyāri). — 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 porisī each" (p. 27). After the introduction (pp. 27-28), ALSDORF discusses verses 26,8-23 (time-table up to vatthiṁ padāleha: pp. 28-29, 30-31; four āryās = 26,15.16.19.20, verses 26,24-31 (eight āryās on the vattha padālehaṁ: pp. 29, 31-41), verses 26,32.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 26,27-35 (time-table after vibhāṣa muñña: 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 PADILLEANĀ ĀRYĀS (technical details of the vattha padile-hanā) and the KĀRANA TOPIC (six reasons for eating and six reasons for fasting: part of the prescriptions for the begging tour).

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

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 mantābbhīga 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-duggāj: vss. 1951-55. The vss. 1953, 1954, and 1955ab correspond respectively to Utt. 36,262/264; 263/265; and to ummagga-desao. 1955: "sammoihanā kālam karittu Dodundugā (probably Dogundugā, cf. Utt. 19,3) surā hanti, annañ pi deva-duggat uvayanti virādhaya marane." — BhāPrā 13ab [āryā, first line]: five bhāvanā.s mentioned. — (ii) ummagga-desao as a single verse: BrKaBhā 6424, JIKA Bhā 2047, PaKaBhā 1360. — (iii) Refer for āsurīya to Sūyāgada II: JĀS 2,2: § 706 (... āsuriṃ kibbisieṣa śāṅcesu ...), to Sūyāgada I: JĀS 2,2: § 151 (... āsurīyaṃ disam; CAILLET Ėy: pp. 28, 39-40), and to Sūyāgada I: JĀS 2,2: § 310 (... āsurīyaṃ ... abhihitām). [References from B. BHATT.] The sequence kandappa, kukkuiya, mohariya (ALSORF Ut: 15 ("gāhā 2")) is also used for the anathadhāna transgressions 1-3 out of 1-5 (HORNLE 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). ALSORF 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-jiva 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.]
It follows from A.'s text that the eight Āryās were not an ad hoc text but an element of the dogmatic discourse. The wording shows "that our set of eight Āryās 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 padilehanā 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-jiva" ahimsā; compare BHATT Se: 135-41.

The begging tour takes place in the third poriś of the day. We now supply the synopsis for the KĀRANA 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 PnNi 667-68) will facilitate the understanding of A.'s analyses (pp. 42-47):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utt.</th>
<th>PnNi</th>
<th>Māc.</th>
<th>Ms.</th>
<th>Ṭhāna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26,33</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>VI 59</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43 (JĀŚ 3: § 500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,34</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>VI 60</td>
<td>PnNi 663 quoted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,35</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>VI 61</td>
<td>PnNi 664 quoted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The core of the EIGHT PADILEHANĀ ĀRYĀS 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 paṭilehā 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 padilehanā 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 Yaśovijaya Sa (citra 10-22) for the present form of the padilehanā ritual.
For the comparative analysis of the KĀRANA TOPIC in Utt. on the one hand and in PnNi on the other, ALSDORF gives a résumé on p. 45, which corresponds to the first two columns of the above synopsis for kāraṇa. Below, we supply the verse figures (not given by A.) along with the pratīka.s:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Utt. 26,32c.d (chānham) } & \text{ PnNi 661 (chāhī)} \\
\text{Utt. 26,33 (veyanā-)} & = \text{ PnNi 662 (veyanā-)} \\
& \text{ PnNi 663 (n’ātthi): Bāhāya} \\
& \text{ PnNi 664 (iriyaṃ): Bāhāya} \\
\text{Utt. 26,34 (nīggaṇṭho) } & \text{ PnNi 665a.b (ahava na)} \\
& \text{ PnNi 665c.d (paccāhā)} \\
\text{Utt. 26,35 (āyanke) } & = \text{ PnNi 666 (āyanke)}
\end{align*}
\]

A. argues that an old śloka version of the KĀRANA TOPIC was the precursor of a later ārāyā version (each version — Utt. and PnNi — showing traces of the old śloka version). A. METTE has afterwards shown that the two half-śloka.s PnNi 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 KĀRANA TOPIC:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Obb. 2164a.b: } & \text{ chāhī kāraṇeh cehiṃ āhāreja su-samjae} \\
\text{PnNi 665a.b = OghNi5 583a.b; Obb. om.):} \\
& \text{ ahava na kujia āhāraṃ chahīn thānēchī samjae} \\
[\text{Obb. 2164c.d: } & \text{ chahī civa karaṇeheheh n’āhārejī imehinh tu]} \\
\text{Obb. 2168a.b: } & \text{ deham caitu-kāma vahā samjama-akkhamān} \\
\text{PnNi 665c.d = OghNi5 583c.d = Obb. 2168c.d:} \\
& \text{ paccāhā pacchima-kālamiṃ kāṃ appakkhamān khamān.}
\end{align*}
\]

A. feels that not only the EIGHT PADILEHANĀ ĀRYA.S 26,24-31, but also the KĀRANA 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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Utt. 26,22 – 26,23 – half-śloka: 36a.b [end of padilehant] – full śloka:} \\
32a.b plus 36c.d [end of begging tour].
\end{align*}
\]

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 kāraṇa śloka is found:

BIBLIOGRAPHY. (i) Semantics. Refer to METTE Oh (p. 6, fn. 20) for extensions of the meaning of sāmyārti. See also p. 37 on “alternative explanations” for padilehanā terms. — (ii) OghNi context. METTE Oh: 13 (padilehanā and time-table). — (iii) padilehanā in Thānā, OghNi 265 (ārāḥḍaḥ) and 266 (anaccaīyāṃ) appear in Thānā under the captions “chavvihā padilehanā” and “chavvihā appamāda-padilehanā” (Ahmedabad ed. fol. 343a; see JAS 3: § 503). Abyayadeva quotes ad OghNi 265 the verses OghNi-Bāhāya 161 (vatthe) and “chāp purimā” ( supplementing “vatthe”) on fol. 344a. Furthermore, he quotes ad OghNi 266 the verses OghNi-Bāhāya 162 (vītāha) and 163 (fol. 343b, 344a). Here Abyayadeva gives a variant for 266b and quote 163a in a form which differs from the Bāhāya text but corresponds to his Niryutki variant (p. 35, fn. 7). — (iv) kāraṇa. See Jain Pi: 56 for text and translation of Māc. VI 60-61 (26, 33 and 26, 35: veyanā- and ādāne). — (v) kāraṇa in Thānā. Pn 662 (veyanā) and 666 (āyanke) appear in Thānā under the captions “... āhāram āhāramāṃe ...” and “... āhāram vocchinda-māne ...” (Ahmedabad ed. fol. 340b; see JAS 3: § 500). PnNi 663 and 664 (“bāhāya-gāthe”) are mentioned on fol. 341b. The padilehanā concept (number of faults to be avoided: p. 35) and the kāraṇa concept (supra) are both six-fold. — (vi) Parallels supplementing the material of ALSDORF Ut and METTE Oh for the KĀRANA TOPIC. Utt. 26,33 and 26,35: Ms. (JAS) 36 and 39; PaKaBha 892 and 893; JiKaBha 1658 and 1665; Ga (JAS) 39 (ad 26,33). — PnNi 661 and 664: JiKaBha 1657 and 1660 (1660a.c = PnNi 664a.c).
Chapter 28,1-36: MOKKHAMAGGALI. — A. pp. 48-57; → ALSDORF Ėt: 77-78. — This chapter deals with the tetrad of jīna (28,4-13), darśana (28,14-31), cărina (28,32-33), and tapas (28,34). The tetrad is midway between an old triad (members one to three only) and a pentad (vṛya added as the fifth member). The general term for the chain is mokṣamārga (see OHIRA Ta: 55-56, 104-05). Refer to SCHURING Do for jīna (§ 73), darśana/samyakta (§§ 82, 169, 176, 187), fivefold cărina (§ 177), and tapas (§§ 178-179). The mokṣamārga is the sole subject of Māc. V (see OKUDA Dī; table of contents on pp. 17-20). Part of the exposition of darśana (i.e. darśana/ samyakta) is the samyakvyāticāra pentad (five negativa: sankhā, kankhā ...), which occurs in Uvās. (HOERNLE Uv: § 44), Bhag. (OHIRA Bh: § 496), and ĀvŚū (JĀS 15: § 65 on p. 350), and which was later transformed into a positive octad (Utt. 28,31). See also SCHURING Do: § 88 on kankhā-mohanīya. The object of darśana are the nine or seven tattva.s. See Utt. 28,14-15; SCHURING Do: § 169 and OHIRA Ta: 55. The darśana concept has also been included in the twelvefold tapas (e.g. Māc. V 168-69: sub-sub-division of tapas). A later element of the darśana exposition are the ten ruci.s. See Utt. 28, 16.18-27; LEUMANN Au: p. 43; DELEU Vi: 293; and SCHURING Do: §§ 169, 180 (the ruci.s are mostly a sub-sub-division of tapas). At some point in time, the mokṣamārga was equated with ārādhana (Māc.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 ruci.s (eleven āryā.s: 28,16.18-27; read “eleven” on pp. 49 and 54!). However, the ruci 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 ruci.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 jīna 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 cărina (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 Ėt: 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 ākyāna genre. He therefore feels (slight modification of Ėt: 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 dhamma side by side: two Ślokas 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 ruci.s.” See in connection with darśana also JACOBI Ta: 301, GLASENAPE In (in the German edition p. 177, fn.), pp. 28-29 supra on the darśanāvanāpya karman, OHIRA Bh: § 261-63, and especially OETJENS Ši (pp. 194-203). The term darśana (samyakta, 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 ruci.s in Ṭhāna. Ṭhāna quotes 26,16 (“dasavidhe sarīga-sammaddhamse”), and Abhayadeva adds the verses 26,18-27. See fol. 477a-478b and JĀS 3: § 751. — (ii) Parallels to the “positive octad”: VyaBhā 64, Nībha 23, KkāBhā 1037, and Čāpa 7 equal Utt. 28,31 (nissankiya); Āvni 1575a.b equals Utt. 28,31a.b. See for the other references ALSDORF Ut (and OKUDA Dī, 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.” (“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 Daśāvīti and Utt. (see LEUMANN et al. for further details). — (iv) Varia. OKUDA Di: 150-51 (ājū) and 110-11 (uvaṭṭhāna [ALSDORF Ut: p. 54, fn. 1]; OETJENS Ši: 210-14 (ājū-ruci) and 223-31 (darśana, vicikitsā); JosHI Fa: 40-42 (darśana and śraddhā). — Utt. 28, 17: Māc. V 6 (bhūd aṭṭha) = Samayasāra 15. — (v) Fivefold cărina: A. demonstrates on p. 55 (read after vs. 33 “five [1] kinds of cărina”) that the couplet 28,32-33 was the product of partial transformation of śloka.s into āryā.s. Refer for 28,32 to ČāBhā 3 and see for cărina scholasticism OHIRA Ta: 104-

* * * * * * *

Chapter 30,1-37: TAVAMAGGAL. — A. pp. 57-62; → ALSDORF Et: 78-79. — SCHUBRING Do: §§ 178 (external asceticism) and 179 (internal asceticism). — The subject of the chapter is indicated by its title. After the introductory sūkha 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 (sūkha, slightly changed version of 28,34: p. 56), and by the memorial verse for bāhīra tapas (30,8 = āryā). The description of the first two positions of the sixfold bāhīra tapas has been amplified to five verses in the case of anāsana or “fasting” (30,9-13: 1½ āryā.s) and to eleven verses in the case of omayyaraṇa or “reduction of food” (30,14-24: 9 āryā.s). The remaining ten positions (bāhīra tapas III-VI, abhyantara tapas I-IV) occupy one sūkha each (30, 25-28; 30,31-36) with 30,30 as the memorial verse (āryā) for abhyantarata tapas. A. emphasizes that the amplification of the first two positions of bāhīra 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 “Uform” (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 sūkha.s as precursors of 30,8/30,30, not only for general reasons but also because 30,30 is a sūkha 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 common, and as such they were used inter alia as substitutes for two original sūkha.s in Uttarādhyayana.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: (i) OKUDA Di: 135-54 (Māc. V 148-215 = tapa-ācāra). — (ii) Utt. 30,2a,b (five mahāvarta.s): Māc. V 91 [288; cf. Ut. 58], VII 160 [661], IX 14 [782], XI 9 [1026]; ĀvN 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 DaśavN 47/48, Ms. (JĀS) 127/128, and Mār. 208 (Ut. 30,8).

* * * * * * *
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 uttavān as mentioned by A. on p. 66 in fn. 2.


Itthīparinnā is composed in the old ārya 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 ārya’s in the Śvetāmbara
canon, viz. Āyāra I,9 and Utt. 8. ALSDORF It supplements earlier studies in Āyāra I,9
and Sūyāgaṇa 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 ārya
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

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 ārya subject. The close connection
between ALSDORF Ét and A.’s two ārya monographs is also reflected in two reviews.
In 1968, C. Caillat reviewed Ét along with ALSDORF Uč (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 ārya 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 ārya, old
ārya, veḍha), which is followed on pp. 58-72 by a report on his studies in the Pali
ārya (then in preparation), and on pp. 72-81 by an analogous report on his studies in
the Prakrit ārya. For the veḍha, we refer the reader also to pp. 60-61. A. calls the
vedha a semi-metrical variety (“variente semiprosaïque”: p. 57) of the ārya, but men-
tions 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 ārya were in
an advanced stage when he gave his Paris lectures, and the abstractions 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 ārya 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 sig-
nificant observations on the ārya. He says that it is difficult for Western Indologists
“to hear” this metre: “L’ārya cause d’ordinaire aux indologues occidentaux modernes
quelques difficultés. Même qui l’habitue a le sens des mètres indiens se plaint de ne
dans entendre, de ne pas en percevoir le rythme a l’oreille.” On p. 55 he says that the
ārya, 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 sōka, de sorte que précisément
pour elle le mètre se révèle un inappréciable et presque infaillible moyen de déni-
tération 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 ārya (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 ārya is not without effect
on the chronology of the canonical texts (pp. 69-70). For much later datings of cano-
nical 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. Follow-
ing Leumann, he therefore studied Mūlācāra and Mūlārādhānā 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 Ėt, 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 ārya 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 U.t. 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 (gestört/en) text portions which Alsdorf studies in Utarādityayana and Schubring in the Ācārāgasūtra (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. Loders, 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 Abhinavagupta 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 (Ēt: 88-94). Moreover, he studied all the ārya.s of the Jaina canon, some of which presented extreme forms of scholasticism, while he devoted only one single article (Ithipārinā) 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" (Ēt: 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. Levi's criticism of V.S. Sukthankar's critical edition of the Ādiparvan (Lévi Re 1929). By contrast, A. could not imagine that his teacher Loders 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. Callat, who suggested that we should include in the present paper some remarks on the historical conditions which determined Alsdorf's studies. Prof. Callat 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 vigifiaient 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 conviait d'autant plus ré-solument 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 ils avaient magistrallement 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 XIXe 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, attirtaient l'attention sur le renouvellement, la transformation des systèmes grammati-
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


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 Horner 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 rettusion 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 Āryās 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 (१ etc.).


This publication continues ALSDORF Th as well as ALSDORF Ėt (ALSDORF Pa: 5-6).

A. deals with new Āryās (pp. 23-89) and with old Āryās (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 Ėt: 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 Āryās of the Tipiṭaka (about 450: supra), just as he edited all Āryās of Uttarādhyāyana. 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 corpuses 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 Āryās (Jātaka.s 301, 358, 479, 485, 525, 536, 542: p. 39 supra). A.'s commentary includes references to the literary sources: The Culladhammapālājātaka (358) is an imitation of the Kṣantivādījātaka (313), and the Cullasutamajātaka (525) is probably an imitation of the Mahājānakaːjātaka (539); the Khanyādhālajātaka (542) borrowed verses 86-93 from the Cullasutamajātaka and verses 105-12 from the Candikinnarajātaka (485). A.'s treatment of Jātaka.s 479 (Kālingabodhijātaka) 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 oṣṭha 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 Catuspārīṣṭāsūtra (CPS), Mahāvastu, and Lalitavistara. J.W. DE JONG observes in this connection in Rev 1971 (LAI: p. 67) that A. only considered the Mūlasarvāstivādin version (CPS), a late text, but not the Mahāśāsaka and Dharma-gupta 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 Āryās, 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 ("ūṭṭhehi", prati.kas of the second lines: "desassau" and "cittām hi").
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 Catuspariṣatīsūtra, 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 āryās sung by Śākra (on the Buddha's entering of Rājaogrha) 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 Mahāsākāsa and Dharmagupta (p. 63, fn. 4). — (iv) The subject of section four is the conversion of Śāriputta and Mogallāna. After a detailed analysis of the three verses of the preceding Assaji-Śāriputta dialogue (appamāṇa ..., ye ṭhamma ..., es'eva dharmo ...), A. restores the two āryās 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 etha-bhikkhu phrase ("etha tvaṃ, bhikkhu!" plus imperative), and forms an integral part of the Mahāvagga which was not incorporated in CPS. On account of its āryās, 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 (labhayaḥam 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 that the Mahāvagga text with its āryās 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 āryās (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 reconnaiss.” (p. 22). Refer for the oriental editions also to OBERLIES Jä 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 Therā- 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: Cullasutassomajātaka; pp. 38-50; Khaṇḍhālajātaka; pp. 81-86: Guttla-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 āryās which occur both in the MPS and in the Saṃyuktāgama and which are concerned with the seven bodhīyās. 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.

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

A. restores the twenty-one āryās 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 āryās et alii) in the story of the conversion of Śāriputra 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.

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

In our verse quotations, we always follow the modern authors to whom we are referring. See ALSDORF U, 4 for ALSDORF U, 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 JAS 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 (JAS, 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 Śhāna
Ācānī  Ācārāṇāṇiṣṭhūkī
Āyāranga  Ācārāṇāṇiṣṭhūkī (JAS 2,1)
Āp.  Āturāpratāpyākhyāna (JAS 17,1 [16])
Aup.  Aupāpatikāsūtra (see LEUMANN Au)
ĀvHa  Haribhadra's Āvāsyakācārī (see ĀvNi)
ĀvNi  Āvāsyakācārī. — Refer for vss. 4-56 of the Pārīśthāpānāśīrṣṭi-Niyukti (p. 26 supra) to pp. 619b-637a of the ĀvNi ed. of 1916-17, or to Pt. II, pp. 86-98 of the same. 2038 reprint.
ĀvNi-Bhāṣya  Bhāṣya verses in the Āvāsyakācārīyukti
ĀvSū  Āvāsyakācārī (JAS 15: 333-58)
BhāPrā  Kundakunda's Bhāvaprabhāpta
BrKaBhā  Sutghadāsa's Bhṛhatkālābhāṣya
CāBhā  Kundakunda's Cārītrabhāṣya
CāPrā  Kundakunda's Cārītraperbāhtra
Daśav.  Daśavaikālikasūtra (see SCHUBRING Da and JAS 15: 1-81)
DaśavNi  Daśavaikālikānīṣṭhūkī
DaśavVṛ  Anonymous Daśavaikālikā commentary formerly known as "Cūrṇī" (Ratāṃ/Indaur edition of 1933). The correct title is "Śṛddhavivarana". See CAILLAT Va: 69 and 82 (fn. 5) and BOLLÉE NI: 31.
Ga  Gacchācāra (JAS 17,1 [17])
JĀS  Jaina-Āgama-Series
JīKaBhā  Jinabhadrā's Jītakālābhāṣya
§ 6. Abbreviations and Bibliography II (modern works)

In the case of W. SCHUBRING and L. ALSDFOR, 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 ALSDFOR, we always give the LAI number in addition to an abbreviated bibliographical reference. When mentioning Akademie-Abhandlungen (ALSDFOR Pa and ALSDFOR 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 JÄ. OBERLIES' paper (part II forthcoming) can be used as an introduction to the various metres found in A.'s sources (mātrāchandas, ganacchandas, trīśūbhi/jagati, and sūkta). 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 Uttarādhyayanasastra will be found under the names BOLLÉE and NORMAN.

ALSDFOR Åk
- LAI no. 18.

ALSDFOR År

ALSDFOR Cī

ALSDFOR Dr
- "What were the Contents of the Drṣṭivāda?," in: German Scholars on India. Vol. I. Benares 1973. - LAI no. 33.

ALSDFOR Ét

ALSDFOR Ex

ALSDFOR Fr

ALSDFOR It

ALSDFOR Ku

ALSDFOR Ma

ALSDFOR Na

ALSDFOR Pa

ALSDFOR St
CAILLAT Al
C. CAILLAT Atonements in the Ancient Rituals of the Jaina Monks.
Ahmedabad 1975.

CAILLAT Áy
— "Arddhamagadhī ñovāṇa," in: Bull. d’Études Indiennes 7-8, 1989-90,
pp. 17-45.

CAILLAT Br
— "The Beating of the Brahmins (Utarrādhāvyāna 12)," in: Festschrift

CAILLAT Cèr
— "The Recent Critical Editions of the Jain Āgama," in: ZDMG.

CAILLAT Da
— "Notes sur les variantes dans la tradition du Dasaveyālīya-sutta," in:

CAILLAT Mū
— "Quelques observations a propos d’une publication nouvelle sur le

CAILLAT Ph
— "Deux études de moyen-indien," in: Journal Asiaticque 248. 1960,
pp. 41-64. [Pt. I continued: "Nouvelles remarques sur les adjectifs

CAILLAT Re 1968
— review of ALSORDF Ét and ALSORDF Ut in: Journal Asiaticque 256.

CAILLAT Re 1969
— review of ALSORDF Pa in: Bull. de la Société de Linguistique de
Paris 64.1969, pp. 22-23.

CAILLAT Vā
— "Notes sur les variantes grammaticales dans la tradition du Dasa-
veyālīya-Sutta," in: L.A. HERCUS et al. (eds.) Indological and Buddhist

CHARPENTIER Ja
62-69. — Ch. 25 = Jannaijām.

CHARPENTIER Mā
— "Studien über die indische Erzählungsliteratur. 2. Das Māṭāṅga-

CHARPENTIER Ut
— The Utarrādhāvyānasūtra. Uppslaa 1922.

CHOJNACKI Vi

DCM

DELEU Vī

DhAKY Bo
M.A. DHAKY and SAGARMA JAIN "A Propos of the Boṭika Sect," same

DhAKY Nā
M.A. DHAKY "Nāṭaputta" in Early Nirgrantha Literature," in: M.A.
DHAKY and SAGARMA JAIN (eds.) Pt. Daluṣkhaī Bhai Malvania Felicit-

FALK Te
H. FALK "Zur Textgeschichte der Jātakas," in: Berliner Indologische

GLASENAPP Ja
from the original German by SHRINHAB SHROTRI. Motilal Banarsi-
dass. Forthcoming.

GLASENAPP Ka

HANAKI Ån

HOERNLE Ut
— Unfortunately, this book has not yet been reprinted.

IBR
Sri Lanka Buddha Jāvanta Tripitika Series. The International Buddhist
Research and Information Center. Colombo 1995. — Computerized
version.

JACOBI Er
H. JACOBI Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāṣṭrī. Leipzig 1886.

JACOBI Jn I
— Jainā Sātras. Pt. II. The Utarrādhāvyāna Sūtra. The Sātrākārīdāgha
Sūtra. SBE 45. Oxford University Press 1895.

JACOBI Ta

JAIN Pi
R.P. JAIN Pīṇḍasuddhi: Das sechste Kapitel von Vātakaranas Māṭāṅga-
und der dākṣāyana-Abschnitt der Pīṇḍa-nipātī. New Delhi 1983 (by
R.P. JAIN). — Refer to § 5 for quotations from Mīc.

Jaina Concordance
Punch cards kept in the Institut für Indische Philosophie und Kun
geschichte 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. BHOJAR (eds.) Dasaveyālīya-
suttam, Utarrādhāvyānāṁ, and Āvavayasaṁtaṁ. Jaina-Āgama-Series

DE JONG Re 1971
J.W. DE JONG: review of ALSORDF Ét and ALSORDF Pa in: IJ 13.1971,

JOSHI Fa
L.M. JOSHI Facets of Jaina Religiousness in Comparative Light.
Ahmedabad 1981.

KHADABADI Ex
B.K. KHADABADI "Reflections on the Jaina Exegetical Literature," in:
M.A. DHAKY and SAGARMA JAIN (eds.) Pt. Daluṣkhaī Bhai Malvania

Kleine Schriften

LAI
K. BRUHN, M. DUCKWITZ, A. WEZLER (eds.) Ludwig Alsdorf and

LEUMANN År
E. LEUMANN "Die Arādhānā-Literatur." Unpublished manuscript. See
OETJENS Ši: 80-81 and PLUTAT Li.

LEUMANN Åu
— Das Aupāḍākkī Sūtra. Leipzig 1883.

LEUMANN Da
— "Dasavatākkā-liṅga- and -niryutki 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

LÉVI Re 1929
S. LÉVI, review of the Ādīparvan in: Journal Asiatique 299 (pp. 345-
48) and 1934 (pp. 281-83).

L.V.L.
— "Late canonical and post-canonical verse literature" (see p. 9).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mette Gi</td>
<td>— &quot;Giftmüllentsorgung&quot; im alten Indien.&quot; Fostoming.</td>
<td>Fostoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohira Ta</td>
<td>— A Study of Tattvārthasūtra with Bhāṣya. Ahmedabad 1982.</td>
<td>Fostoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okuda Di</td>
<td>K. Okuda Eine Digambara-Dogmatik. Das fünfte Kapitel von Vattuškeraśa Madhācāra. Wiesbaden 1975. — Refer to § 5 for quotations from Māc. — See also CAILLAT M.</td>
<td>Fostoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plutat Li</td>
<td>B. Plutat The Literary Remains of Ernst Leumann. Fostoming.</td>
<td>Fostoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSM</td>
<td>H.D.T. Sheth Pālō-Ṣadda-Māhaṃno.</td>
<td>Fostoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schubring Āc</td>
<td>W. Schubring Ācārānga-Sūtra. Leipzig 1910.</td>
<td>Fostoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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