

MAHĀNISĪHA

STUDIES AND EDITION IN GERMANY

— *A REPORT* —

by Chandrabhal Tripathi

(Ahmedabad-Berlin)

MAY 1992

## Table of contents

<i>Preface</i>	3
<i>Abbreviations</i>	4
¶1. <i>Publications</i>	5-14
¶2. <i>Manuscripts</i>	15-19
¶3. <i>Contents</i>	20-36
¶4. <i>Language</i>	37-47
¶5. <i>Metres</i>	48-51
¶6. <i>Parallels</i>	52-60
¶7. <i>Date — Authorship</i>	61-63
¶8. <i>Conclusions</i>	64-72
¶9. <i>Passages</i>	72-78
¶10. <i>Reviews</i>	79-83
 <i>Epilogue</i>	 84

## PREFACE

*Padmabhūṣaṇa* śrī Dalsukhbhāi Mālvaṇiā asked me, during my stay in Ahmedabad in February 1992, to prepare a *Report* about the studies and the edition of the *Mahānisiha* by Professors Walther Schubring, Frank-Richard Hamm and Jozef Deleu, as he would like it to be attached to the *Mahānisiha* being published by the Prakrit Text Society. The valuable contributions of Walther Schubring and F.-R. Hamm are in German and the scholars not conversant with this language could till now not benefit from them. The work of Albrecht Weber is available in English, and the contribution of Jozef Deleu is written in English, important parts of which have been, with his kind permission, included in the present Report.

A direct and complete translation of the German contributions would be of little use as they are distributed over a long span of time (1918-1963) and in three volumes and are penned by two scholars. They contain some repetitions, and some of the views expressed by Schubring in 1918 were not maintained by him in 1963. Moreover, such a translation would become too lengthy to find a place here. It was, hence, decided that the contributions of Weber and others should be arranged anew and edited in an English garb. Thus, ¶3-8 are based on *their* writings. The contents of the *Mahānisiha* I-VI as described by them are given in ¶3. Their analysis of its language and metres follows in ¶4-5, the parallels detected by Schubring and others are discussed in ¶6. These lead in ¶7 to the results achieved by them about the date and the authorship of the MNA. ¶8 contains conclusions drawn by Schubring and Deleu. In ¶9 some important passages which are often discussed have been collected. In ¶10 we reprint some reviews of the *Studien zum Mahānisiha*.

On my part, I have given full details in ¶1 about the publications concerned and in ¶2 about the manuscripts utilized. The *Report* concludes with my *Epilogue*. The concordance in our Appendix reveals the arrangement of the MNA into chapters and paragraphs etc. in the German edition in juxtaposition to that of the present edition in the hope that it will serve not only practical purposes.

In my difficult task I have been helped by Professors Colette Caillat, Nalini Balbir, and Klaus Bruhn. R. Grünendahl and others have kindly introduced me to the subtle technicalities of a "computer". My sincere thanks are due to all of them, specially to śrī Dalsukhbhāi Mālvaṇiā.

This Report, wherein the main parts of his studies are incorporated, is dedicated respectfully to Prof. Dr. Jozef Deleu on the occasion of his 67th birthday.

*kṛtaṃ karaṇīyam.*

Berlin, in May 1992.

Chandrabhal Tripathi.

The Abbreviations frequent in our *Report* are (normal or *in italics*):

ABCIM	= An Annotated Bibliography of Catalogues of Indian Manuscripts by K.L.Janert, Pt.1. Wiesbaden 1965
ARK	= Abhidhāna-Rājendra-Kośa, 7 vol. Ratlam 1913-1925
BhORI	= Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona
Cat.	= Catalogue [of Manuscripts]
Cat.BhORI,17.2	= H.R.Kapadia, Cat. ... BhORI, Vol.XVII,Part ii
HTJ	= A.Weber, Über die Heiligen Texte der Jainas
Jn-Hss.	= W.Schubring, Jaina-Handschriften
MNA	= Mahānisiha-ajjhayaṇa, or -suyakkhandha
MNSt.A	= W. Schubring, Das Mahānisiha-sutta. 1918
MNSt.B	= Studien zum Mahānisiha, Chap.I-III, IV-V. 1963
MNSt.C	= Studien zum Mahānisiha, Chap.VI, VII-VIII. 1951
Ms(s).	= Manuscript(s)
OLZ	= Orientalische Literaturzeitung
PcchS.	= Pacchittasutta (= MNA,VII)
Rep.	= Bhandarkar or Peterson, Report ... Mss. ...
SLJ	= A.Weber, Sacred Literature of the Jainas (1892)
ZDMG	= Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft

\* \* \* \* \*

(The usual abbreviations of journals like BSOAS, JAOS, JAs, JRAS, WZKSOA are too well known to be included here.)

\* \* \* \* \*

While referring to the text of the MNA as edited in Germany, we use the Roman numerals I to VIII to denote the number of a chapter. An asterisk (\*) is added to the number of a verse if the verse is numbered in the edition, otherwise it precedes the number supplemented by us. § is prefixed to the number of a prose passage. Thus, e.g. I.§1.1 (*om namo titthassa...*) or I.1\* (*uvasante ...*) on p.18 of MNSt.B. V.§11 (p.190, line 39) (*se bhayavaṃ aṭṭhaṇhaṃ sāhūṇhaṃ asaiṃ ussaggaṇa vā ...*) refers to MNSt.B,p.190, line number is added here (in italics) because §11 though of considerable length is not further sub-divided.

Similarly we use an asterisk or § to characterize verses or prose passages respectively which are cited from other Prakrit or Sanskrit texts.

Printing mistakes in all publications are corrected silently.

## ¶1. PUBLICATIONS

¶1.0 The Mahānisiha-ajjhayaṇa or -suyakkhandha (MNA)<sup>1</sup>, surely the youngest amongst the texts of the group of the Cheya-suttas (or, Cheda-sūtras) of the Jaina Canon, has been, since 1883, subjected to many in depth studies and a critical edition in Germany. The scholars whose contributions have laid the foundations of our knowledge about the MNA are: Albrecht Weber, Ernst Leumann, Walther Schubring, Frank-Richard Hamm and Jozef Deleu<sup>2</sup>. We present, therefore, an annotated list of the publications concerned. Because all the most important books (MNSt.A.B.C; Jn-Hss., etc.) are not only out of print since long but also not easily available to scholars in India, it seems necessary to go into some details in these and other cases.

¶1.1 Albrecht Weber, HTJ = SLJ

1.1.1 Über die Heiligen Texte der Jainas (HTJ)

IN: *Indische Studien*. Leipzig: Brockhaus. Vol.16.1883, pp.211-479 and Vol.17.1885, pp.1-90.

See specially Vol.16, pp.455-465, where the MNA has been critically introduced, some of its passages (e.g. I.§28.2) are quoted and discussed. Also see 1.1.2.

1.1.2 Albrecht Weber, Sacred Literature of the Jainas (SLJ)

translated from the German by Dr. H. W. Smyth, Pennsylvania. IN: *The Indian Antiquary*, A Journal of Oriental Research ... edited by Richard Carnac Temple. Vol.XXI.1892 (Bombay), in instalments.

This is a translation of 1.1.1. For the MNA see pp.181-185 (June, 1892). We quote the English version and normalize the transliteration.

---

<sup>1</sup> This is the title occurring in the text itself (e.g. MNA.I.§1.2) and its colophons (I.§1.28; II.§37; III.§48; IV.§17:p.182,27; V.p.205,35; VI.§9\*.1:p.38; VIII.§\*46:p.104,35). The class designation -*sutta* used in MNSt.A (1918) has been corrected by Schubring himself, see, for instance, MNSt.B,p.171,fn.1.

<sup>2</sup> We may add here the names of Prof. W. Norman Brown, Vakil śrī Keshavlāl Premchand Mody and Muni śrī Puṇyavijayajī also, without whose active help the German studies and edition undertaken after 1948 would not have been possible.

## ¶1.2 Weber, Verz.(1853-1891)

Verzeichnis der Sanskrit- und Prakrit-Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin von Albrecht Weber. Vol.II,Part 2. 1888.

In this monumental catalogue of Indic Mss. in the collection of the State Library of Germany at Berlin (cf. K.L. Janert, *ABCIM*.I [see 1.15.2],p.30f.#20), Weber cites, under Ser.No.1876, profusely from the single Ms. of the MNA, Ms.or.fol.764. It was on the basis of this Ms. only, which is not of much value<sup>3</sup>, that Weber dealt with the MNA in his HTJ (= SLJ). A second Ms., acquired by the State Library in 1892, was then utilized and later described by W. Schubring (see ¶2.1.2 and 1.3).

## ¶1.3 Schubring, Jn-Hss.1944

*Die Jaina-Handschriften der Preussischen Staatsbibliothek Neuerwerbungen seit 1891 unter redaktioneller Mitarbeit von Günther Weibgen beschrieben von Walther Schubring.* Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz. 1944. XIII,647 pp.

This is, besides the Verz. of Weber (cf. ¶1.2), the most important catalogue of Jaina Mss. located in the State Library of Germany in Berlin. It describes, mostly with citations from the Mss., a total of 770 codices containing 1125 "texts". The Cat. begins with an Introduction and ends with five Appendices. Also see Janert, *ABCIM*,p.31,#24. Under Ser.No.92 (p.40), it deals briefly with Ms.or.fol.1887, which was used by Schubring in MNSt.A. In MNSt.B and C it was used but rarely as it is defective.

The following four items (1.4-7) are the main contributions as yet on the MNA.

## ¶1.4 Schubring, MNSt.A. 1918

*Das Mahānīsīha-sutta.* Berlin: Verlag ... Reimer. (Abhandlungen der Königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Jahrgang 1918, Phil.-hist.Klasse,No.5.) 1918. 102 pp. 1 plate.

In this monograph Schubring deals exhaustively with the MNA on the basis of two Mss. in Berlin and three from Poona. The Mss., however, did not then suffice for preparing

---

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. Weber, SLJ,p.181-2 ("The single copy which I have by me, and that a very incorrect one"); p.183,l.72 ("In this faulty condition of the Ms."); and also Schubring in MNSt.A,p.3 ("Die beiden in Berlin befindlichen Hss. ... sind freilich, ... kaum zu benutzen; um so mehr ist der Scharfblick Webers zu bewundern, mit dem er das für seine Zwecke Wichtige gesehen hat.").

an edition. This is the first and basic contribution of Schubring, and is often mentioned in the subsequent *Studies*. The sections are:

1. Introduction (pp.1ff.); 2. Contents (pp.10ff.); 3. Survey (pp.32ff.); 4. Parallels (pp.50ff.); 5. Teachings (pp.64ff.); 6. Monastic Rules (pp.78ff.); 7. Language (pp.84ff.); 8. Summary (pp.95ff.). (See also the overview in ¶1.8.)

¶1.5 Hamm / Schubring, 1951 = MNSt.C.

*Studien zum Mahānisīha*. Kapitel 6-8 von Frank-Richard Hamm und Walther Schubring. Hamburg, Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien, 6.1951. 116 pp.

This volume contains:

(I) by HAMM (a) pp.7ff.: Preliminary Report (about Mss. etc.); (b) pp.17ff.: Edition of Chap.VI (*Gīyattha-vihāra*); (c) pp.39-41: Variant Readings; (d) p.40: Abbreviations; (e) pp.41ff.: Notes; (f) pp.53ff.: Glossary; —

(II) by SCHUBRING, (a) pp.63ff.: "Introduction" (to the *Pacchittasutta* and *Susāḍhakahā*); (b) pp.75ff. edition of the *PcchS*, pp.94ff. of the *SusKahā*; (c) pp.105-7: Variant Readings; (d) pp.108-116: Glossary of more important words. (See 1.8.) —

Reviewed (1) by W. Kirfel in *Orientalische Literaturzeitung*. 1954, No.7/8, 361-363; (2) by Alfred Master in *JRAS*.1951, p.164; and (3) by Helen M. Johnson in *JAOS*.74. 1954, p.52. (Review 2 is reproduced below: ¶10; review 1 is in German.)

¶1.6 Deleu / Schubring, 1963 = MNSt.B.

*Studien zum Mahānisīha*. Kapitel 1-5 von Jozef Deleu und Walther Schubring. Hamburg, ANISH.10.1963. x, 240 pp.

This volume contains:

(I) by DELEU, in English (a) p.vii: Preface; pp.ix-x: Abbreviations; (b) pp.1ff.: Introduction (Preliminary Note, Description of Mss., Grammar, Metrics); (c) pp.18ff.: Edition of Chap.I-II-III; (d) pp.72ff.: Variant Readings; (e) pp.78ff.: English translation; (f) pp.149ff.: Notes; (g) pp.162ff.: Glossary; —

(II) by SCHUBRING, in German, (a) pp.171ff.: "Introduction"; (b) pp.175ff.: Edition of Chap.IV-V; (c) pp.206ff.: Variant Readings; (d) pp.209ff.: German translation; (e) pp.236-240: Glossary of selected words. (See 1.8.) —

Reviewed (1) by A.N.Upadhye in ZDMG.114.1964,pp.457-8; (2) by K. R. Norman in BSOAS.27.1964,pp.631-632; (3) by Ludo Rocher in JAOS.88,3.1968,pp.563-565; (4) by Erich Frauwallner in WZKSOA.8.1964,pp.265-6; (5) by C. Haebler in OLZ.1967. No.11/12, 593-596; (6) by Seiren Matsunami in *Indo-Iranian Journal*.11.1968-69,pp.149-150. (Reviews 1-3 are reproduced below: ¶10; reviews 4-6 are in German.)

¶1.7 Walther Schubring, *Zwei Reden Mahāvīras*.

IN: *Mélanges d'indianisme, à la mémoire de Louis Renou*. Paris 1968.

(Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne, No. 28), pp.657-669.

Introductory notes and translation, at places summarized, of two passages of the MNA, VI.1\*-47\*; 306\*-385\*. Reprinted in *Kleine Schriften* (see 1.10),pp.389-401.

¶1.8 Here follows a consolidated overview of MNSt.A, B and C <sup>4</sup>

Contents of	MNSt.A.	MNSt.B=	ANISH. 10	MNSt.C.=	ANISH.6
<i>by : Chap.</i>	<i>Sch.1918</i>	<i>Deleu:I-III</i>	<i>Sch:IVf.</i>	<i>Hamm:VI</i>	<i>Sch:VIIIf.</i>
Intr. Remarks	3-10	1-2	171-4	7	73-4
General Rem.	---	7-8	174	8-9	73-4
Descr. of Mss.	3	3-8	174	7-8;13	74
T e x t	---	18-72:I-III	175-205	17-38: VI	75-104
Variants	---	72-7	206-8	39-41	105-7
Translation	---	78-149	209-235	See ¶1.7	---
Contents: MNA	10-31	---	---	9-13	108-113
Notes	---	149-161	205-209	41-52	106

<sup>4</sup> For a similar chart of MNSt.B-C see C. Haebler (OLZ.62.1967,596). --- The Arabic figures in our chart refer to pages of volumes. *Sch* = Schubring.



Contents of	MNSt.A.	MNSt.B=	ANISH. 10	MNSt.C.=	ANISH.6
Language	84-95	9-14	---	13-14	---
Glossary	---	162-168	236-240	53-59	108-116
Metrics	96-97	15-17	---	14-18	---
Parallels	50-64	<i>discussed</i>	<i>in</i>	<i>notes</i>	---
Teachings	64-78	<i>discussed</i>	<i>in</i>	<i>notes</i>	
Monastic Rules	78-84	<i>discussed</i>	<i>in</i>	<i>notes</i>	
Facsimile	1 plate				

See the plate in MNSt.A for facsimile of one page of each of the three Poona Mss.

¶1.9 As the MNA is traditionally regarded as one of the Chedasūtras of the Jaina Canon, let us mention here the other texts of this group which have been critically edited and examined by Walther Schubring:

(1) *KalpaS.* *Das Kalpa-sūtra ...* Leipzig (*Indica...*ed. Ernst Leumann, Heft 2), 1905. 71 pp. Reprinted in *Kleine Schriften* (see 1.10), pp.1-69. The Introduction of the Kalpa-sūtra was translated into English by May S. Burgess, published in the *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XXXIX. 1910, pp.257-267 (also as an off-print), Bombay 1910.

(2) *VyNiSū.* *Vavahāra- und Nisīha-sutta.* Leipzig, *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Bd.15, Nr.1.1918. 72 pp. It contains an Introduction (pp.5-11), and an edition of the *Vyavahāra-* (pp.12ff.), and the *Niśītha-sūtra* (pp.37ff.) on the basis of Berlin and Poona Mss. (1.9.1-2 were published together by Muni śrī Jinavijaya, Jaina Sāhitya Saṃśodhaka Samiti, Poona, 1923. 67 pp. in Devanāgarī.)

(3) *3 ChSū.* *Drei Chedasūtras des Jaina-Kanons Āyāra-dasāo, Vavahāra, Nisīha* bearbeitet von W. Schubring Mit einem Beitrag von Colette Caillat. Hamburg, ANISH.11.1966. 106 pp. Professor C. Caillat (pp.48-69) gives a French translation of the Vyavahāra-sūtra, Chap.I-III, with her comments based on the Vyavahāra-bhāṣya and -ṭikā; she notes that in several cases the old canonical meaning had evidently been forgotten by the

traditional exegesis, probably because the praxis changed. She gives here a systematic analysis of the text and context of the Vyavahāra-sūtra. Schubring gives (1) an introduction to the Cheda-sūtras (pp.1-4), (2) an edition of the Āyāradasāo with his commentary (pp.5-28), (3) a preliminary remark on and the text of the Vyavahāra-sūtra (pp.29-47) and his German translation of VySū.IVff.(pp.70-91), (4) an introduction to and an analysis of the Nīśītha-sūtra (pp.92-103, on p.103 corrections of his edition of 1918) and (5) a Glossary of selected words in all three Sūtras (pp.104-106).

¶1.10 Walther Schubring, *Kleine Schriften*. 1977

herausgegeben von Klaus Bruhn. Wiesbaden: Steiner. Glasenapp-Stiftung, Bd.13.1977. xviii,497 pp.

This volume of "Collected Works" contains (1) Zwei Reden Mahāvīras, i.e. German translation of MNA.VI,1\*-47\* and 306\*-385\* (see 1.7); (2) *Das Kalpa-sūtra* (see 1.9.1); (3) review of H.R.Kapadia's Cat.BhORI.17.1-2 (p.454), and Schubring's other valuable contributions to Jainology. Very useful is the Bibliography by Klaus Bruhn on pp.ix-xvi.

¶1.11 Schubring, *Lehre* 1935 = *Doctrine* 1962

1.11.1 *Die Lehre der Jainas* nach den alten Quellen dargestellt von Walther Schubring. Berlin / Leipzig (*Grundriß der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde*, III.Bd., 7.Heft) 1935. 251 pp. For the MNA see pp.78-9, §52. This is the standard work on Jainism, its history, its literature, etc.

1.11.2 *The Doctrine of the Jainas* described after the old sources by Walther Schubring ... translated ... by Wolfgang Beurlen. Motilal Banarasidass. 1962. viii,335 pp. This is based on 1.11.1. §52 dealing with the MNA is on pp.112-4.

¶1.12 Related Jaina Texts

1.12.1 A passage from the Mahānisiha (III.§25: MNSt.B,pp.62-3) was discussed by Dharmasāgara-sūri in his *Kupakṣa-kauśikāditya*<sup>5</sup>. Schubring has, therefore, used, besides its Berlin Ms.(Verz.#1976), also Weber's essay<sup>6</sup> on and R.G. Bhandarkar's analysis<sup>7</sup> of

<sup>5</sup> This work, composed in samvat 1629, is also called: *Kupakṣa-kauśika-sahasrakiraṇa*, *Kuvakkha-kosika-sahasra-kiraṇa*, etc. See JRK,p.270 s.v. *Pravacana-parīkṣā*. Dharmasāgara cited and discussed other passages of the MNA, too.

<sup>6</sup> IN: *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* (SBAW), 1882, pp.793-814.

this work, see MNSt.A,p.6 with fn.1, etc. MNA III.§25 was also cited by Jñānasāgara in his *avacūri* on *Caityavandana-bhāṣya*, vs.30, by Devendra.

1.12.2 Dharmadāsa-gaṇi's *Upadeśa-mālā*<sup>8</sup> has many verses in common with the MNA, hence Schubring and others have used its edition by L.P. Tessitori, 1912; equally Haribhadra's *Upadeśa-pada* (see JRK,p.48; publ. Bhāvnagar, 1900) was utilized.

1.12.3 Ratnaśekhara cites in his *Ācāra-pradīpa* (composed in saṃvat 1516, see JRK,p.22(i)) long extracts from the MNA,Chap.III; its Ahmedabad (? Bombay saṃvat 1958f.) edition was used by both, Schubring (MNSt.A,p.50) and Deleu (MNSt.B,p.156).

1.12.4 An anonymous book in Gujarātī was used by W. Schubring in MNSt.A-B-C: *sumati nāgila caritra tathā saṃjātāsaṃjāt ane gaccha-kugaccha-no adhikār*, Ahmedabad, saṃvat 1933.

1.12.5 He similarly consulted the Mss. (and the appendix to the Ātmānanda-Grantha-ratnamālā,No.67.1918) of the *Susadha-caritra* by Devendra-sūri<sup>9</sup>, see MNSt.A.p.48 (with fn.1); *Lehre*,p.78; and MNSt.B,p.74.

1.12.6 The *Abhidhāna-Rājendra-Kośa* (ARK) quotes often from the MNA. These quotations have been taken into consideration by Schubring, Hamm and Deleu.

### ¶1.13 *Gacchâcāra, -prakīṇaka*

This text has many verses in common with the MNA as was noticed by A. Weber. We use the edition prepared by Muni Puṇyavijayaḥ and A.M.Bhojak, *Paiṇṇaya-suttāim*<sup>10</sup> (Jaina-Āgama-Granthamālā, 17,1.1.1984). 136,20,530 pp.

<sup>7</sup> *Report...*1883-84 by R.G. Bhandarkar, pp.144-155. See below ¶1.16.

<sup>8</sup> See JRK,pp.49-51. Of the *Upadeśa-mālā* we have at hand its edition by L.P.Tessitori (*Giornale della Societa Asiatica Italiana*, 25.1912,pp.167-249) and also its publication with the *Doghaṭṭi-vṛtti* of Ratnaprabha-sūri edited by ācārya Hemasāgara-sūri (śrī Ānanda-Hema-Jaina-Granthamālā, No.6,1958).

<sup>9</sup> Schubring opines that the *Susadha-caritra* of Devendra-sūri (Pkt, 519 āryās) is an adaptation of MNA,VIII. He gives, therefore, a synopsis of this work on the basis of four Mss. (2 in Berlin, 1 each from Vienna and Poona) and compares both texts critically. (JRK,pp.447-8: *Susadha[sic!]-kathā, -caritra* (I) + (II), *Suṣamā-kathā* refer most probably to this work of Devendra-sūri.)

<sup>10</sup> This edition contains 20 texts. *Gacchâyāra* (137 vss.) is the 17th, pp. 337-349.  
-- For other editions see e.g. *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus* Gedenkschrift für Ludwig Alsdorf (= StJB-LA = Alsdorf Mem.Vol.), ed. by Klaus Bruhn, Albrecht Wezler (ANISH.23.1981),p.311.

## ¶1.14 Muni Puṇyavijaya, Cat.ŚBh.Cby.

Catalogue of Palm-leaf Mss. in the Śāntinātha Jain[a] Bhaṇḍāra, Cambay by Muni Puṇyavijaya. Part 1,2. Baroda, Orient.Inst.1961,1966 (GOS.135, 149). 6,1-200; xii,201-497 pp.

Muniji describes 290 Mss. containing 804 Texts. On pp.442-497 there are as many as 17 useful indices. For the earliest list by Peterson see 1.15.1, for an earlier Cat. in Gujarātī by ācārya Vijayakumudasūri see ¶ 2.2.4. —

Reviewed (1) by W.Schubring in ZDMG.118.1968,pp.446-7; (2) by L. Alsdorf in OLZ.59.1964,No.9/10,494-5; (3) by R[ichard] W[illiams] in BSOAS.26.1963, pp.230-31.

¶1.15 Peterson, *Report / Rep.*

1.15.1 [*First*] Detailed *Report* of Operations in Search of Sanskrit Mss. in the Bombay Circle, August 1882 - March 1883 by Professor Peter Peterson.

(Extra Number of the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Soc., Bombay 1883.) See especially pp.56-69 (Cambay) and Appendix I: Cat. Palm-leaf Mss. in Śāntināths Bhaṇḍār, Cambay on pp.(1)-(103), this being the earliest list of this rather old collection. Compare ¶1.14.

1.15.2 *A Fourth Report* ... April 1886 - March 1892 by Professor Peter Peterson. (Extra Number of the JBBRAS. Bombay. 1894).

On pp.i-clxii: Index of [Jaina]-Authors; [A] pp.1-17: Report; [B] pp.1-177: Extracts from the Mss. purchased for Govt.; [C] pp.1-58: List of Mss. acquired for Govt. (pp.43-58, No.1167-1504: Jaina Lit.). — For Peterson's other Reports see K. L. Janert, ABCIM, Part I, pp.128-9: #274.

¶1.16 Bhandarkar, *Report / Rep.* 1883-84

*Report* on the Search for Skt. Mss. in the Bombay Presidency during the year 1883-84, by Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar. Bombay, 1887.

This very informative work contains: (1) Examination of Libraries at Pāṭaṇ (pp.1-15), (2) ... at Ahmedabad (pp.16-22); (3) ... of Mss. purchased for Govt.(pp.23ff.) *inter alia* Class xvii Jaina Lit.; Appx.I.A: List of Mss. in the Upāśraya Pophaliāno pāḍo, Pāṭaṇ (pp.161-205); Appx.I.B: ... of Ḍehlāno pāḍo, Ahmedabad (pp.205-255); then on pp.257ff.: Appx.II (Cat. collected during the year 1883-84); Appx.III (Extracts from Mss.). Appx.I.A-B

contain the earliest lists of Mss. at *Pāṭaṇ* and at *Ahmedabad* respectively. On the basis of Ms.No.278 (Dharmasāgara's *Kupakṣa-kauśika-sahasra-kiraṇa* with auto-commentary: see our fn.5 and 7), Bhandarkar analyses the contents of this work in details, see pp.144-155. This *Report*, as those of Peterson, was even otherwise much utilized by both Ernst Leumann and Walther Schubring. See also Janert, ABCIM.I,p.127 (#273: BP).

¶1.17 The *Jaina-Granthāvalī*, a forerunner to the JRK (1.18), was published by the Jaina Śvetāmbara Conference (Bombay), saṃvat 1965.1-367,1-112(Indices), 1-3(Errata) pp. It is the first consolidated register of Jaina Mss. (and texts and works) based on the lists of Pāṭaṇ (6 Bhaṇḍāras), Jesalmer (1), Limbaḍī (1), Cambay (1: jaina śālā), Bhavnagar (1), Ahmedabad (2 bh.), Koḍāy (1), Bombay (1 in Anantanāthajī Temple), and on the *Bṛhaṭṭipaniḥā* (dated sam. 1556). On p.16-17,No.29 it records 14 Mss. of the MNA adding two footnotes: 1. about its extent (3500, 4200, or 4548 granthāgra) and 2. Haribhadra's "editorship". This book was therefore used by W.Schubring, MNSt.A,pp.1-2.

¶1.18 Velankar, *JRK* 1944

*Jinaratnakośa* An Alphabetical Register of Jain Works and Authors. Vol.I

Works, by Hari Damodar Velankar. Poona, BhORI (Govt.Or.Ser.C, No.4) 1944. i-[xii], 1-466 pp. (Vol.II was prepared but has not yet been published.)

This is the most indispensable "consolidated register" of Jaina texts and works on the basis of printed catalogues and hand-written lists of Jaina Mss. and is thus a very useful research tool for Jainology (ABCIM.I,p.156.#330).

¶1.19 Kapadia, *Cat.BhORI.17.2* 1936

Descriptive *Cat.* of the Govt. Collections of Mss. deposited at the BhORI, Vol.XVII compiled by Hiralal Rasikdas Kapadia. Poona, BhORI. Pt.ii.1936 (with palaeographical appendices). XXII,363,24 pp.

Kapadia gives on pp.29-36 full details of the Poona Mss. of the MNA used by Schubring and others. It is, therefore, referred to by Deleu. For other parts of Vol.17 (and Vol.XVIII,Pt.1, Vol.XIX,Pt.1) by Kapadia see Janert, ABCIM.I, p.124,#264. For Vol.17. Pt. 1-2 see also Schubring, Kl.Schr.(¶1.10),p.454.

¶1.20 Leumann, *Übersicht* 1934 etc.

(1) *Übersicht über die Āvaśyaka-Literatur* von Ernst Leumann. Aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben von Walther Schubring. Hamburg, ANISH.4.1934. c.IV,56 pp., 2°.

The *Übersicht* [= A Survey of the Āvaśyaka-Literature] is a monumental work, prepared in the last century and is the proof of the genius of E. Leumann who could utilize only Mss. (in Berlin, Strasbourg, and from Poona) for his valuable studies. *Übersicht*, p.28b deals with Nāila (MNA, Chap.IV), cf. MNSt.B, p.174.

The two other important publications of Ernst Leumann are:

(2) *Das Aupapātika Sūtra*, erstes Upāṅga der Jainas. Leipzig (AKM.8.2) 1883. 166 pp.

(3) *Die Āvaśyaka-Erzählungen* (1. Heft). Leipzig (AKM.10.2) 1897. 48 (+1) pp. Both works of Leumann (reprinted 1966) are referred to in the German contributions on the Mahānisiha. (See also Nalini Balbir, *Récits jaina "Die Āvaśyaka-Erzählungen"*, forthcoming, dealing exhaustively with the Āvaśyaka narratives and Leumann's work thereon.)

¶2. MANUSCRIPTS<sup>11</sup>

¶2.0 Weber's study of the MNA in *Ind.Stud.*16.1883 was based on the single and defective Ms. in Berlin (see 1.1-2). For their studies and edition, distributed over three or two volumes respectively, Professors Schubring, Hamm and Deleu could luckily utilize some more Mss. from India; thus the material used by them consists of eight original, some of them very valuable, Mss. and one modern transcript. We present an inventory of the Mss. of the MNA which were available to them<sup>12</sup>.

## ¶2.1 Berlin, State Library (Staatsbibliothek)

1. Siglum: B. Ms.or.fol.764. Paper Ms., 96 Folia, dated<sup>13</sup>. See Weber, *Verz.*#1876, where lengthy citations are given. The Ms. is well written, but very incorrect, see above 1.3, fn.3.
2. Siglum: b. Ms.or.fol.1887. Paper Ms., 91 Folia, dated<sup>14</sup>, however, by a second scribe. See Schubring, *Jn-Hss.*#92.

## ¶2.2 Cambay, Śāntinātha Jaina Bhaṇḍār

1. Siglum: c. Palm-leaf Ms., 220 Folia. For description etc. see Peterson, 1st Report, p.(87),No.144; Hamm, *MNSt.C*,p.7; Deleu, *MNSt.B*,p.3; and Muni Puṇyavijaya, *Cat.ŚBh.Cby.*,p.62,No.36. It was accessible to scholars in Germany in the form of

<sup>11</sup> See also Velankar, *Jinaratnakośa*, p.304, which has been mentioned by Deleu (*MNSt.B*,p.4): "For other extant Mss (which to my regret it has proved impossible to secure) see H. D. Velankar ...".

<sup>12</sup> The Sigla of the Mss. utilized in Germany are: B, b (Berlin); c, C (Cambay); K (Baroda); M (Mody <Pāṭaṇ); P, p, π (Poona); and Pu (Puṇyavijaya <Pāṭaṇ). The Mss. c, C, and Pu are the most important palm-leaf ones from Indian collections in Cambay [= *Khambhāt*, *Stambhatīrtha*] and Pāṭaṇ [*Pattan(a)*].

<sup>13</sup> *saṃvat 1569 varṣe pāṭasāha Mahamūṇḍa-vijaya-rājye Devāsa-śubhasthāne Sāha-Rāmasi-putra-Bhādā-bhāryā-Lakṣmī-putra-Jājā pustikā liṣāpitā, paṃ. Mahisāgara.*

<sup>14</sup> The scribal remark reads: śrī-Junāgaḍha-vāstavya-Prāgvāṭa-vaṃśe Vṛddha-śākhāyāṃ Sonī śrī pa su-Śimajī, su-Rāmajī, su-Manajī, su-Sonī-Pāsavīra: e pitā-pakṣa; atha mātā-pakṣe: Stambhatīrthe vāstavya Tapā-pakṣe śrī-Hiravijayasūri-rājy(e) So[nī]-Somasī-bhā[ryā]-bāi-Karamāi-putrī-bāi-Vabāi-putra-Sonī-Pāsavīrai 45 āgama-no bhaṇḍāra puṇya-hetu Sā<sup>o</sup>-Rāghavajī-Dhanuā-nī sākhi sānidhyaīm karī karyo chai, karma-kṣaya-mokṣārtham cēti bhadraṃ. *saṃvat 1721 varṣe poṣa vadi 10 dine.*

microfilms which were prepared by Professor W. Norman Brown and then supplied by Keshavlāl Premchand Mody of Ahmedabad to Hamburg. The Ms. is characterized by Deleu (p.5): "the superiority of c as to general trustworthiness" and "the Ms that bears the best character of accuracy". It ends on Fol. 220b with the beginning of a donor's *praśasti* (*secunda manu*); its text supplied by Hamm and Puṇyavijayaḥ is reproduced here: *arhaṃ*.

*dharmmārtho 'pi na dharmmārthaḥ, kusthito 'pi na kusthitaḥ /*  
*ṣaḍḍhāyatāhva-vaṃśo*<sup>15</sup> *'sti mahāścarya-nidhāna-bhūḥ // [1A]*  
*tatrābhūn Nītidhāḥ śreṣṭhī muktā-maṇir ivôjjvalaḥ /*  
*babhūva [gr]hiṇī tasya Lakṣmīr guṇa-gaṇānvitā // 1*  
*Va[r]ddhamāna-padāmbhoje varddhamāna-ratiḥ sadā /*  
*Ānandākhyah .. .. .*<sup>16</sup> *saṃjāto nandanas tayoh // 2 [///].*

2. Siglum: C. Palm-leaf Ms., 238 Folia (or 239 Foll. in Cat.ŚBh.Cby). For description etc. see Peterson, 1st Rep.,p.(87),No.143; Hamm, MNSt.C,p.8; Deleu, MNSt.B,p.3; and Muni Puṇyavijaya, Cat.ŚBh.Cby,p.60,No.34.

3. Muni Puṇyavijaya records on pp.60-62, as No.35, a third palm-leaf Ms., dated saṃvat 1317, of the Cambay collection. It consists of 243 Folia and ends with a donor's verse in Prakrit followed by a remark in Sanskrit<sup>17</sup>. This Ms. remained unused by Schubring, and others in Germany, although it was listed by Peterson, 1st Report,p.(87),No.142, and as such was surely known to them.

4. For these Cambay Mss. see also āc° Vijayakumudasūri's Gujarātī Cat. *śrī Khambhāt, Śāntinātha prācīna tādapatrīya jaina jñānabhaṇḍāraṇī sūcipatra* (with Muni

<sup>15</sup> Compare the modern surname *Khaḍḍāyatā* which is frequent in Gujarat.

<sup>16</sup> In this lacuna in Hamm's text, Muni Puṇyavijayaḥ reads: *śreṣṭhaḥ*.

<sup>17</sup> This interesting verse, already cited by Peterson (1st Report,p.(57), No.142), but not by Hamm, is followed by a remark in Sanskrit (missing in both, Peterson and Hamm); these are quoted by Muni śrī Puṇyavijayaḥ (Cat.ŚBh.Cby):-

*ālhi-āminiseyattha putthiyā siri-Mahānisiḥassa /*  
*Rūpala-susāviyāe lihāviyā tera-sattarase 1317 // CHA //*

(Skt.):

*śrī-Rūpala-pustikā Mahānisiṭha-graṇthaḥ // atra saṃcaye yathā Mahānisiṭho likhyate tathā vidhyeyam / yataḥ sā°-Sādhāraṇa etad-viṣaye bṛhad-bhaṭṭarakair ādiṣṭo 'sti. ata etal-likhāpana-viṣaye 'sau protsāhanīyah //*



śrī Puṇyavijayajī's introduction) [Cambay, saṃvat 1997], p.30-1, No.126.1, and p.40-1, No.145.1, which is mentioned by Deleu, MNSt.B,p.3.

### ¶2.3 Poona (= Puṇe), Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute<sup>18</sup>

1. Siglum: P. Paper Ms., 56 Folia. For description etc. see Schubring, MNSt.A, p.3 (and plate: fasc. of one side each of three Poona Mss.); Hamm, MNSt.C,p.8; Deleu, MNSt.B,pp.3-4; and H.R.Kapadia, Cat.BhORI.17.2,pp.29-31, No.457 with copious citations<sup>19</sup>.
2. Siglum: p. Paper Ms., 74 Folia. dated<sup>20</sup> (saṃvat 1566). For description etc. see Schubring, MNSt.A,p.3; Hamm, MNSt.C,p.8; Deleu, MNSt.B,pp.3-4; and Kapadia, Cat. BhORI.17.2,p.35,No.460.
3. Siglum: π. Paper Ms., 129 Folia, dated<sup>21</sup> (saṃvat 1594). For description etc. see Schubring, MNSt.A,p.3; Hamm, MNSt.C,p.8; Deleu, MNSt.B,pp.3-4; and Kapadia, Cat. BhORI.17.2,pp.34-35,No.459.
4. The Ms. registered by Peterson in his *4th Report*,p.49,No.1308 [of 1886-92], is now located in the BhORI (see our fn.18), see Kapadia, Cat.17.2, No.461. It was not available to scholars in Germany<sup>22</sup>.

<sup>18</sup> There are now f i v e Mss. of the MNA in the BhORI collection, as registered by H. R. Kapadia in his Cat.BhORI.17.2,pp.29-36,No.457-461; they are: (1) 165 of 1881-82, (2) 792 of 1892-95, (3) 178 of 1873-74, (4) 228 of 1871-72, (5) 1308 of 1886-92 respectively.

<sup>19</sup> For the post-colophon remark in this Ms. see also Chandrabhāl Tripāṭhī, *Cat. Jaina Mss. Strasbourg* (Leiden: Brill. Ind.Ber.5.1975), pp.191-192,#133.

<sup>20</sup> The scribal remark runs : *saṃvat 1566 varṣe caitra sudi 2 dine śrī-Aṇahillapura-pattane* [illegible letters] *di-parivāra-yutena śrī-Mahāniśītha-sūtram lekhayāṃcakre CHA CHA //* [different hand:] *pam. Bhupativijaya-nī parata chail*

<sup>21</sup> The remark about the date is: *saṃvat 1594 varṣe mārṅgaśīrṣa-māse prathama-pakṣe 10, śrīmat-Kharatara-ga(c)che śrī* ["letters are gone, since a strip of paper is pasted here": Kapadia] [///].

<sup>22</sup> It was, however, noticed by Professor Ernst Leumann (in his private copy of Peterson's *4th Report*, which is now with me: CBT), and by Hamm,MNSt.C,p.8.

## ¶2.4 Pāṭaṇ, Saṅghavinā pādāno bhaṇḍār

- (1) Siglum: Pu. Palm-leaf Ms. 111 Folia, dated<sup>23</sup>. For description see *Descr.Cat.Mss.* ... *Pattan*, compiled from the notes of ... C. D. Dalāl ... by L.Bh.Gāndhī. Baroda, Orient. Inst. 1937 (Gaek.Or.Ser.76), p.209, No.344.1 (i.e. Foll.1-111; on Foll.112ff. other texts follow). Muni Puṇyavijayajī (hence Siglum Pu) got the films of this Ms. prepared and then forwarded them to Hamburg; photographs of these films were used by Deleu and Schubring for MNSt.B (see MNSt.B, p.4).
- (2) Siglum: M. A modern transcript on paper, 233 Foll. written on one side only. For its description etc. see Hamm, p.8 and Deleu, p.3. It was got prepared by śrī Keshavlāl P. Mody (hence Siglum M) and sent to Prof. Schubring<sup>24</sup>. This could be used for MNSt.B. (Its present whereabouts are unknown.)

## ¶2.5 Baroda, Muni Kāntivijayajī Bhaṇḍār

Siglum: K. Paper Ms., 164 Folia (Size: 11 by 5 inches, 5 lines to a page, ṭabo occupies 2 to 3 lines of unequal length; 43-52 akṣaras in a line; fair writing). Not dated<sup>25</sup>. The original Ms. was lent, with the consent of the authorities, by Muni Puṇyavijayajī to Prof. Schubring. Deleu describes it to be in "excellent condition". It contains, with a ṭabo, Chap.I-V only; "... it appears that a continuation was never intended" (Deleu, p.4)<sup>26</sup>.

<sup>23</sup> The correct date is given by Deleu: *saṃvat 1454 varṣe āṣāḍha vadi 10 śanau Mahāniśītha-pustakaṃ likhitam //*. The date given by Hamm (*saṃvat 1954!*) is a misreading. It was Deleu who identified the original Ms. (Pu) with the modern transcript (M), which adds to the above-mentioned colophon of the original: *patrāṅka 111 tādapatrīya//*, thus indicating that folia 1-111 of the palm-leaf Ms.(Pu) contain the MNA.

<sup>24</sup> Deleu, MNSt.B, p.3 notices a "curious colophon" on p.64 of this "Ms.": *saṃvat 1456 varṣe kārttika vadi 12 soma-vāre śrī-Stambhatīrthe* [i.e in Cambay] *Pañcakalpa-pustakaṃ likhāpitam asti*.

<sup>25</sup> See, however, the remark of Deleu: "No date, but the outward appearance being almost identical with that of Ms. β in Schubring's Kalpasūtra p.16 (Berlin Ms.or.fol.2108, dated saṃvat 1812) makes it likely that K was written at about the same time" (MNSt.B, p.4).

<sup>26</sup> JRK p.304 registers two manuscripts in Baroda, in Muni Haṃsavijayajī's Collection, No.781 and No.1575, but not a single manuscript from Ācārya Kāntivijayajī's Collection. Both, Haṃsavijayajī's and Kāntivijayajī's, collections were housed in the same building (Śrī Ātmārāmaji Jaina Jñāna Mandira) in Narasiṃhaji-nī pol, Baroda, vide JRK, p.iv, No.17:BK, and p.v, No.41:Hamsa.

---

¶2.6 Prof. Schubring, while he was in Ahmedabad, was shown by K. P. Mody (cf. 2.4.2) more than eight [paper] Mss. of the MNA which were partly utilized by him, see MNSt.B,p.106.

¶2.7 NOTE: Prof. Schubring and his colleagues have expressed in warm words their gratitude to Prof. W. Norman Brown, śrī Keshavlāl P. Mody and specially to Muni śrī Puṇyavijayajī for their kindness in making them the microfilms, transcript or the original of important Mss. from Indian collections available in Germany, see e.g. MNSt.B,p.7, p.106; MNSt.C,p.4, p.63. (Their Sigla M and Pu are further indications.)

### ¶3. CONTENTS

¶3.0 The contents of the MNA has been described in differing ways by A. Weber, W. Schubring, F.-R. Hamm. Deleu could abstain from similar details because he presents a translation of Chap.I-III. We give below the descriptions by Schubring (*Lehre*), the shortest one; Weber (SLJ), the oldest and the most general introduction; Schubring (MNSt.A), Chap. I-V, and Hamm (MNSt.C), Chap. VI, the most systematic one. Chap. VII-VIII are called "Appendices" and introduced very briefly by Weber. Schubring dealt with them very exhaustively in MNSt.A (pp.26-32) and in MNST.C (pp.63-74).

\* \* \* \* \*

¶3.1 Schubring, *Lehre*, p.78 (= *Doctrine*, p.113)

Chap.I. Salluddharaṇa. Confession and contrition. Chap.II. Kamma-vivāga-vivaraṇa. The consequences of evil deeds; chastity, sexuality, and moral reflections. Chap.III. 200 species of a *kusīla*, ritual and importance of the *panca-mangala* and other formulae; the cult of the Arhats. Chap.IV. The story of Sumai and Nāila and the way they behaved towards some *kusīla*, with characteristic details. Chap.V. Navaṇīyasāra. Concerns the gaccha and the teacher, with kathās of Vaira and Kuvalayappabha. Chap.VI. Giyatthavihāra. The arbitrary dealings of Nandiseṇa, the same of Āsaḍa; confession and atonement; the inaccurate confession of Meghamālā; the intercourse with trained and untrained monks (*gīy'attha* and *agīy.*). The stories of Īsara, Rajjā, Lakkhaṇadevī-Khaṇḍoṭṭhā. The devotion of the life of a monk or a nun must be unconditional. There follow two alleged appendices (*cūliya*): Chap.VII. About atonement; the *Pacchitta-sutta*; sundry matters. Chap.VIII. The story of Sujjhasirī and Susaḍha. The advantages of full confession.

\* \* \* \* \*

¶3.2 Weber, SLJ, pp.184-185

The first book [=chapter] is entitled *Sall'uddharaṇam* and treats of the most various kinds of *salla*, *śalya*. The repeated references to the *savvaṃgôvaṃga* are worth our notice; whence the existence of the *uvaṃga* at the time of its composition (see

Ind.Stud.16,p.373) is *eo ipso* clear. Then follows the figure of the useful copartnership of the lame with the blind man which is specially emphasized:

*hayam nāṇaṃ kiyāhīṇaṃ, hayā annāṇao kiyā /*

*pāsanto paṃgulo daḍḍho dhāvamāṇo a aṃdhao // ...*

*aṃdho ya paṃgū ya vaṇe samecchā, te saṃpauttā nagaraṃ pavittṭhā ||<sup>27</sup>*

Furthermore, emphasis is laid upon reverence (*vaṇde, vaṇdiyyā*) for pictures (*paḍimā*) and temples (*ceia, ceiyālaya*). A special formula seems to have been made use of in this connection, an enigmatical treatment of the letters which occurs after the fashion of the treatment of *a u m* (*om*) in the Upanishads and in similar formulas in the tantra ritual. This entire subject was a riddle to the copyist [see I.§28.2], and so it remains for us. After the real conclusion of the work, in an addition, a similar subject is treated of in like manner merely by means of single letters [VIII.§46, see MNSt.C, pp.106-7].

Book II is entitled *kammavivāyaṇaṃ* [rec.: -vivāga-vāgarāṇa], ... At the end is found an obscure statement which perhaps has reference to Ajjh.I.II and which reads: *eesiṃ tu ...* [see II.§37.2; ¶9.2].

Books III and IV, without specific titles, are composed almost entirely in prose, and treat specially of the *kusīla*. It is noticeable that in Book III frequent reference [or, reverence?] is paid to the *duvālasaṃgaṃ suya-nāṇaṃ* and the *saṃgōvaṃga-duvālas'-aṃga-samudda*. The commencement with *sāmāiya* is retained, and the *suya-nāṇaṃ* is then characterized as *sāmāiya-m-āi logabindu-sā <ga> ra-payyavasānam*. We find in the text the following statements which are very characteristic as regards the origin and history of Book III: *tattha tattha ...* [cf. III,§46]. This is an example of the saying *qui s'excuse s'accuse*. It is more probable that the above is a production of the author himself than it emanates from the hand of the copyist who is inclined to doubt.

Book IV contains a legend of two brothers, Sumati and Nāila<sup>28</sup>, in which we may observe an occasional reference (in Sanskrit!) to an old elucidation (!) of Anga 10:

<sup>27</sup> [These vss. are MNA.I.35\*-37\* (Deleu,p.20), most probably borrowed from the *Āvaśyaka-niryukti* (see the *Viśeṣāvaśyaka-bhāṣya* of Jinabhadra-gaṇi, ed. by Pt. D.Mālvaṇiā, LDS.10.1966, pp.220-222, vs.1156, 1162, 1166 = Niry.101-102-103). Cf. also Leumann, *Av.Erzählungen*, p.19: II.22.]

<sup>28</sup> Weber, fn.93: In the Therāvali of the Kalpas[ūtra], one of the four scholars of Vajra(svāmin), or of Vajrasena, is called by this name. He was the founder of a school which bore his name. Bhūadinnā, the scholar of Nāgajjuna, was from the Nāilakula: see vs.41 of the Therāvali in the Nandis[ūtra].

*śeṣaṃ tu ...* [see ¶9.6]. -- Whoever, bhikṣu or bhikṣuṇī, should praise the adherents of hostile systems or schismatics (*parapāsaṃdīnaṃ pasasaṃ kareyya, je yā vi naṃ niṇhagāṇaṃ p. k.*), whoever speaks in favour of the schismatics (*niṇhagāṇaṃ anukulaṃ bhāseyyā*), visits their temples (*niṇh. āyatanam pavisiyya*), studies their texts (*gantha-sattha-pay'akkharaṃ vā parūveyyā*), or follows their ordinances (*niṇh. saṃkalie kiles'āie tavei vā saṃjamei vā jāṇei vā vinnāvei vā suei vā paḍivvei vā avimuha-suddha-parisā-mayaggāe salāheyyā*), his fate will be as disastrous as that of Sumati, *sa vi naṃ paramā-hammiesuṃ uvavayyeyya jahā Sumati*. The hate against the heterodox and schismatics is here so bitter, that the conjecture is not too bold if we assume that the heterodox and schismatics had at that time got possession of the text of this book.

Book V, *duvālasaṃga-suya-nāṇassa ṇavanīya-sāra*, mentions the *duvālasaṃga*, but merely in a general way. It treats especially of the relation between the teacher (*guru*) and student (*sīsa*), of the *āyāra* (*gacchāyāra*), and *aṇāyāra*.

Book VI, *giyattha-vihāra*, treats of the *pacchitta prāyaścitta*, and contains a legend of a teacher Bhadda and the *ayyiā* (*āryikā*) Rajjā. The mention of the *dasapuvvī* in the introduction brings *eo ipso* the date of its composition down to a period subsequent to that of Bhadrabāhu, the last *caturdaśapūrvīn*, and to that of Vajra, the last *daśapūrvīn*.

Books VII-VIII, which are characterized as two *cūliyās*, a name which *per se* marks them as a secondary addition, treat likewise of the *pacchitta*, and, in fact, in such great detail, that the words *kiṃ bahunā*, together with the formal frame-work enclosing them, are occasionally repeated several times in immediate succession. Shortly before the close these words occur again. A legend of the daughter of Suyyasivi in Avanti plays a very prominent part in these books. The solemn adjuration (found also in another passage) to save this *sūtram* from any damage, is another indication of its secondary origin: *jahā naṃ Goyamā! inam-o ...* [see VII, §37: C, p.86.24-26].

To the conclusion (*samattaṃ mahānisīhasuyakkhandham*) are joined the reverential invocations to the 24 *titthaṃkaras*, the *tittha*, the *suyadevayā*, the *suyakevalī*, all the *sāhu*, *siddh'āi* to the *bhagavaṃt arahamṃ* [sic]. Then follow the incomprehensible separate *akṣaras* etc., mentioned [above]. The actual conclusion is formed by the statement concerning the extent of the whole book (4504 *ślokas*):

*cattāri saḥassāṃ ...* [see below ¶9.8].

¶3.3 Schubring, MNSt.A, pp.10-31

**Chap.I:** *Sall'uddharāṇa* (for this title see vss.50 and 62). A prose introduction and 222 verses, mainly ślokaś.

1-6. vss.1-39. Despite firm conviction that all acts (karman) find their result after death, many persons do not work for their salvation. For this one should be clear about one's own human soul; it is difficult to attain human birth in which the dharma is to be performed. He, who is concentrated in his self and wants to achieve the highest aim, will surely be successful. There are many who follow dharma with a secret dart (*salla*, i.e. not confessed sin) in their heart. All their efforts are, hence, in vain. Keeping silence about committed sins results in worse forms. The unconfessed sin has many forms and stages. Even though it may be very difficult, a monk must refrain from sins. Only after a full confession of sins, all acts of dharma will lead to full success.

7. vss.40-47; 8. prose, 9. vss.48-53, 10. vss.54-64. Activities preparatory to confession. The prayer before the idols (*paḍimāo*) of the Jinas in a place of worship (*ceiya, ceiy'ālaya*). An incantation (*vijjā*) addressed to the Goddess of the Holy Doctrine in a special script. The confession itself and the concluding activities.

11. vss.62-90. The result of a true confession is pure knowledge (*kevala-jñāna*). The monks who possess it are the kevalin with an appellation from amongst forty adjectives which depict the mental attitude and constitution.

12. vss.91-111. Confession, if it is insufficient because of silence, or performed with special intention or with joylessness, causes further stay in the saṃsāra. Here special names are attached to the *āloyaga* for individual cases.

14. vss.112-144. Numerous nuns (*samaṇī*) attain freedom from saṃsāra through confession and repentance. As samaṇī-kevali they are given appellations like those of the monks (in 11) and their good intentions described.

15-17. vss.145-160. Confessions not enough in the case of nuns. Hence the results as above (12).

18-19. vss.161-173. Bodily pains coming from outside seem to be more bearable than asceticism and self-control to some persons. They are, therefore, not capable to confess a sin. Also a wrong-doer keeps hard silence even if the king would reward his confession.

20-27. vss.174-222. Praise of the sincere confession and of all virtues of monks. After the colophon follows the excuse.

**Chap.II. *Kamma-vivāga-vāgarāṇa*.** 209 ślokas with a long prose passage inserted.

1-2. vss.1-28. Description of the suffering of all living beings in the world. Even the gods suffer because they know that their majesty does not last for ever. The types of suffering, their duration and their strength.

3-6. vss.29-99. The killing of a lice as an example of a bad deed, and its results. Murder in general, lying, stealing, unchastity, and joy of possession. Different lower and higher forms of existence as result of bad deeds.

7. vss.100-109. About karman, its binding force for all beings, except for *siddha*, *jogi* and *selesi*. Its culmination as a sum total of all bad deeds.

8. vss.110-120. The obstruction of the influx of karman, the asceticism, "Leidenschaftslosigkeit" and ultimately mokṣa.

9. vss.121-146. Some do not believe in the wholesomeness of the obstruction of the influx of karman. No being enjoys peace even in sleep as long as all karman is not destroyed through asceticism and self-control. All beings suffer continuously pain and have at no moment peace. To have a lice in hair is a small evil; it does not mean harm. One should, therefore, allow it to move at will, and not incur pains in hell and permanent insteadness.

10-24. vss.147-155 as change-over to prose passages. Avoiding of the female, and that too of every woman irrespective of the fact whether she belongs to the order or not, even of female animals. - Prose: Questions of Goyama, answers of the Bhagavat. One should neither think of nor speak, stay or walk with a woman, because a man will be infatuated by a woman, even if she be a nun, by her nature; her mind will be confused by her desire for sexual intercourse, she does not think about the results, her body totters and falls down. This situation is misused by a man. The sexual constitution of a man has six stages. There are also women, who are at the highest stage. In case an average woman does not satisfy her sexual aim, the fire of her desire burns like that of a village, but cools down afterwards like the fire of a torch. If she controls herself, she is praiseworthy and reaches mokṣa, otherwise she commits a grave sin and destroys



heavy repentance. The bad influence of women on men. It is compared with night, lightning, waves of the ocean, wind, fire, a dog, a fish, etc. Sexual intercourse as a sin against the first vow.

25-27. vss.157-208. He who avoids intercourse should also avoid possession and damage of living beings. Prose passage: The period of resulting suffering. Caution against harm to others.

28-36. vss.167-208. Brief ethical discourses in the form of questions and answers. There should be no communion with bad monks. Repentance can not shorten future existence in hell. If missed, the opportunity to awakening does not recur. It is prohibited to deal with women, water and fire. Taking out the dart (*salla*), i.e. performing confession, causes pain, is however wholesome. The repentance is like medicine (*vaṇa-piṇḍī*) or bandage (*paṭṭa-bandha*). He who knows the necessary repentance but does not perform it, is like a man who knows about cold water in hot weather but does not drink it. Even acts done in negligence have grave results; the poison of a snake produces harm even if the person becomes careful later on. Those who know about the repentance should inform others about their duties.

The colophon is followed by the sentence: *eesiṃ tu doṇhaṃ pi ajjhayaṇāṇaṃ vihi-puvvagaṇaṃ savva-sāmaṇṇaṃ vāyaṇaṃ ti* (¶9.2).

### Chap.III. No title.

1. vss.1-10. The cultivation and teaching system of the MNA.

2. The śloka 11-14 introduce the prose.

3-38. Detailed description of the first type of bad monks (*kusīla*), wherein the āryā vss.119-131. 39-47. At the end of the chapter (see ¶9.5) a brief mention of the other types: *osanna*, *pasattha*, *sacchanda*, and *sabala*. The conclusion consists of vss.138-141, a summary warning, and as change-over to the next chapter, a reference to the fate of Sumai. A very long discussion (3-), starting with "attentive fasting" (*uvahāṇa*), is necessitated by the enumeration of those persons who deviate from the doctrinal knowledge (viz. the *supasattha-nāṇa-kusīla*), among whom are those who acquire this knowledge without the required respectful fasting and are called highly guilty (*je kei anuvahāṇeṇaṃ supasatthaṃ nāṇaṃ ahiyanti*).

4-7. Initiating the true knowledge can be undertaken only by invoking the Holy. And this invocation is the fivefold formula of auspiciousness (*panca-mangala*) consisting of *namo arihantāṇaṃ, namo siddhāṇaṃ, namo āyariyāṇaṃ, namo uvajjhāyāṇaṃ, namo loe savva-sāhūṇaṃ*. These five formulas are called the five ajjhayaṇas, the appended verse the *cūlā*; both together are then called *pancamangala-mahāsuyakkhandha*. A faithful person, who has prepared himself by fasting, appears on an astronomically auspicious day in the sacred place of worship and pays his respects to the idol (*paḍimā-bimba*) of the Holy by kneeling and repeats the first namaskāra formula, on the subsequent days the second upto fifth formula. He then concentrates on the attached verse from the sixth to the eighth day. The daily study is accompanied by *āyambila* fasting. One practises the correct pronunciation, in order, out of order or in reverse order.

8-10. The inner meaning (*sutt'attha*) of the *panca-mangala* explained in brief (*samās'attho*), mainly by the derivation of the words *arihanta ... siddha*.

11-13. The detailed exposition (*vitthar'attham*) follows now; however, it discontinues while describing the majesty of the arhat and changes over to *āryā* metre to be precise in expression (*aha vā, Goyamā! kim ettha pabhūya-vāgaraṇeṇaṃ, sār'attham bhaṇṇae*), vss.16-22. He who worships the Arhat with veneration will, as consequence, attain mokṣa.

14-15. With the remark *aha vā ciṭṭhau tāva sesa-vāgaraṇaṃ* the prose passage then continues the discussion of the 11th section, and vss.23-33 resuming the thread of vss.16-22 depict the Tirthankaras as the most praiseworthy in the world.

16-21. vss.34-5 followed by exegetical prose with sandwiched vss.36-38. The worship (*accāṇa, thava*) has two forms: the ascetic life of a monk, and the pious life of the laity. The asceticism of monks is indeed higher than the life of laity. Donations (*dāṇa*) are prohibited for monks, hence the laity should perform them. The śloka 39-45 contain a question by Goyama about the deep respect paid to Jina by gods and prominent lay-persons and its answer. *Āryā* vss.46-68. Under whatever reason one might decorate the idols of Jinās and celebrate them in festivities, asceticism and self-control are far more important, as they lead to mokṣa; a lay-person can at the most reach the

Accuya heaven. The life as a monk offers the singular opportunity to attain the highest goal; one should not miss it.

22-24. vss.69-106. Episodes from Mahāvīra's life, when he was venerated by Gods. At the end their source is mentioned. Vss.107-110 justify prolixity by referring to the good impression they create on the laity.

25. The conclusion consists of important remarks from the view-point of textual history (see ¶9.4).

26-30. Resumes the theme of Sec.11. After the *panca-mangala*, the *iriyā-vahiyā* is the object of study. Most probably the formula *iriyāvahiyāe paḍikkamaṇaṃ* is implied, as it is a part of the Pratikramaṇa-sūtra and refers to the confession of all faults (*aticāras*) which are possible while performing the daily duties. It is studied like the *Panca-mangala*. Thereafter follow the *Sakka-tthava*, the *Arahanta-*, *Cauvīsa-* and *Nāṇa-tthaya* with various rules about fasting. All this happens in the sacred place. When the monk has a clear mind about these texts, he recites them for the first time, on an auspicious day, in the presence of his teacher, brother monks and the laity; thereafter the teacher delivers a sermon. Now onwards the monk repeats the formulae thrice a day. Only after his prayers in the morning, he can drink water; after those at noon, he can have his meals. In the evening, the prayer should be completed before the sun sets. In continuation of the ceremony, the teacher recites an utterance and puts seven handfuls of perfumed powders (*vāsa-kṣepa*) on the head of the novice saying *niṭṭhāraga-pārāgo bhavejjāsi*. The community does the same with the addition *dhanno sampuṇṇa-lakkhaṇa si tumāṃ*. Thereafter the teacher blesses him with a garland offered previously to the Jina and delivers a short address. Thanks to his good deeds in previous existences he has now attained human birth; the doors to hell and lower animal forms are closed for him; all lower karman is destroyed. The *panca-namokkāra* will create a new one in the next life; and this is the last life in which he will be neither a slave nor poor nor mentally imperfect.

31. Like the *panca-mangala* the other sacred texts beginning with the *Sāmāyika* are to be studied, only small differences exist. For monks in tender age, fasting is obligatory, in rules for study, however, some concessions are allowed. Fasting and study should correspond to each other so that some benefit towards new existence might be

produced in case of an early death. One who hears others studying the panca-mangala should also fast, otherwise he would maltreat the holy knowledge (*nāṇa-kusīla*), a backflash to I. At the end āryā vss.111-122 about the value of study at prescribed periods.

39-47 have been described above along with I.

**Chap.IV.** No title. Prose, in the narrative, however, there are 14 āryā vss.

1. Sumai and Nāila, two rich brothers and lay worshippers in the city of Kusatthala, are compelled to emigrate because of the loss of their property. On their way they meet five monks and a layman, whom they join. However, Nāila (a follower of Ariṭṭhanemi, the 22nd Tirthankara, in whose times the story happens) soon realizes that they are in a bad company and he tries to convince Sumai to get themselves separated from them. In the course of a dialogue he depicts with emphasis the blemishable behaviour of their companions. Sumai, on the other hand, is decided to accompany them even if their conduct were punishable. The limitations demanded by Nāila can hardly be fulfilled; he (Sumai) would remain with them provided they would not wander too far off. Hence Nāila wanders alone on his way. Already after five months a draught causes the death of those seven persons. Among them, Sumai will have to lead the largest number of existences. His first rebirth, in a series of many more, is that among the gods (*paramāhamiṇiya deva*) who are most remote from the True Doctrine. Every one who keeps company with the unbelieving has to suffer like Sumai. That he was earlier a believer weighs even more in his case. On the other hand, Nāila, after departing from Sumai, decides a fast-unto-death. Ariṭṭhanemi visits him and initiates him as a monk, Nāila becomes a kevalin and will attain mokṣa.

10- . The later existences of Nāila mentioned above are simply enumerated; only one of them attracts special attention. This is the description of the inhabitants of Paḍisantāvadāyaga, a region south to the delta of the river Sindhu. The beings, who live in 47 caves of the area, are very big, have the best of joints and utterly hard bones. Their appearance is ugly and causing fear, they are cruel and lustful, especially of honey and meat. They, a maritime folk, know how to sail on the waters using special types of vessels. They are envied by the people of Rayaṇadīva, an intermediate continent lying

at the distance of 3100 yojanas. There exist rotating revolving craters of immense diameter; in one of them the people of the island preserve much meat and honey, fill in also many pots with them and sail to the mainland in rafts. The cave dwellers rush thereto to kill them, but the islanders hurry back to their island leaving back one pot after the other which the cave dwellers take possession of and thus the islanders win time. Thus they enchant them to the Rayaṇadīva where the crater full of tasty eatables awaits them. When the cave dwellers jump into the crater and enjoy in crowds the food, the islanders start moving the crater. The cave dwellers must then suffer painful shaking, which because of their strong physical structure does not kill them. The islanders watch their success with pleasure, take away the rafts of the cave dwellers with which they had reached the island.

After the colophon appears the remark (IV.§18<sup>Skt</sup>: below ¶9.7).

**Chap.V.** *duvālas'anga-suyanāṇassa Navaṇīya-sāra*. This is the title used by the text in a cross reference.

1-6. Introductory vss.1-8. After the description of a bad monk follows that of a bad gaccha. One should belong only to a good gaccha. A good gaccha is that which is led by a good gaṇin. The gaccha which has good relation with the rules (*āṇā*) is called *āṇā-ṭhiya* or *ārāhaga*, the gaccha which has bad relation *āṇā-virāhaga*. The constitution of the sangha will be valid till the time of Duppasaha. The signs of a gaccha which breaks the constitution. Decisive for the gaccha is the Teacher.

7-10. Verses 9-114. Description of teacher and gaccha of both good and bad qualities. Verses 115-121. Description of the saṃsāra and caution against violating rules (*āṇā*).

11-12. Prose: If the monks and the nuns have to be together under certain circumstances, how can this rule be maintained in the time of Duppasaha and Viṇḥusiri? These two, a monk and a nun, and the pair of laity Jiṇadatta and Phaggusiri will be the last believers at the end of the Dussamā-period, rather the whole sangha will consist of these four only. Though the required number of co-religionists will not be there, yet their excellence would compensate for it. From the Canon, only the Dasaveyāliya-

suyakkhandha will be left over, and Duppasaha would follow it. The genesis of the Dasaveyāliya.

13-17. The order (*āṇā*) of a teacher should not be disregarded. As an illustration serves the story of five hundred disobedient monks of Vaira (who was followed by excellent fifteen hundred nuns). Without his permission they undertake a pilgrimage to honour Candraprabha, the 8th Tīrthankara, during which they commit many offences. Hence Vaira, who at first was not with them, feels responsible for them and follows them. Without success he reminds them of the results of such behaviour, till at last he feels freed from all responsibility. Only one of the five hundred monks returns to him and stays with him. Both meet with death by a lion as they despise an escape: they will be reborn to attain Kevalin-hood. Those 499 monks must remain in the saṃsāra without end.

18-20. A teacher can be of fourfold type. Among them the *bhāvāyariya* has to be regarded equal to a Tīrthankara, and his orders are to be followed as those of a Tīrthankara. The penalty which a teacher deserves is much more heavy than that of an ordinary monk. How should a monk be, who can be entrusted with the leadership of a gaccha or gaṇa? The prestige of a teacher will remain undisturbed till the days of Sirippabha, who will live during the rule of the despotic king Kakki, who will prosecute the sangha while Sirippabha will shine because of his virtues.

21-28. Description of persons who are not fit to join the sangha. A teacher who allows such a dīkṣā would incur a heavy debt. The Canon is to be transmitted in its right form by the teacher. In the course of time, there have been many who have transgressed and hurt the Holy Teachings. He who out of negligence causes harm to the teaching is unfit to be a teacher. A teacher with wrong views is not worthy of liberation. How a teacher suffers if he explains the Holy Word in a wrong way to serve his purpose is illustrated by the story of *sāvajj'āyariya*.

29-35. The last Tīrthankara (here *titthaṃkara* instead of *titthagara* till now) of the series preceding the present one was Dhammasiri. During his life-time there occurred seven remarkable incidents, and the eighth after his demise. In his honour was erected a splendid shrine by the monks and the laity; the upkeep of the shrine keeps the inhabitants so busy that the teaching suffers. These servants of the service are once

visited by the active teacher Kuvalayappaha. They receive him with respect and request him to stay in the shrine, he rejects this as unworthy (*sāvajja*), hence he gets the nickname *sāvajj'āyariya* which does not disturb him. Soon thereafter some doubts arise in the mind of monks who now devote themselves more to the teaching. They call Kuvalayappaha back, he clears their doubts and explains them the Canon. But in the presence of the monks a woman bowed down in respect at his feet and touched them. Now, while explaining the 5th Chapter of the Mahānisiha (!), the verse 127, where it is told that an Arhat should not tolerate the touch of a woman, he overcomes his fear that he might be given another nickname (*mudd'aṅka*), and the temptation either to pass over or to explain in a different way the verse. Hence he becomes an object of reproach. In spite of arduous thinking, disturbed by crude urging of the listeners, he is unable to find a suitable argument (*parihāraga*) which would save him. At the end he knows nothing more than to declare that the Canon knows both rules and exceptions and that its teachings are without exclusiveness. Because of this declaration, which was to the taste of the monks, he will have to atone for it during a long wandering in the *samsāra*.

36-39. Some of his after-births are dealt with. The daughter of a purohita, in the service of a trader in spices, has the *dohada* to eat meat and *saktu*, which she acquires by selling away precious items belonging to her master. For this offence, she is, as the custom demands, kept in custody in her house during the time of her pregnancy. When she has delivered a son, the soul of Kuvalayappaha reincarnate, she runs away. At the orders of the king the child is reared well and later on appointed as the superintendant of the slaughter-house (*sūṇāhivai*). This job leads him to the worst of hells. As the son of a brahmin woman, widowed in young age, he is born with severe diseases and lives a life of seven hundred years in which he experiences only atrocious treatment and hardships. As a bullock working in an oil-press he suffers for 19 long years from worms which clung in its wounded shoulders. In the time of Pārśva, he reaches emancipation. At the end of the chapter it is explained how the answer of Kuvalayappaha was sinful.

**Chap.VI:** Giyattha-vihāra (Hamm,pp.9-13; Cf. MNSt.A,pp.21-26)

The term giyattha has been explained in the commentary on the Gacchācāra, vs.41 (*gītaṃ sūtram, arthas tasya vyākhyānam, tad-dvayena yukto gītārthah*) and in the

ARK.III.902a (*gīto vijñāta-kṛtyâkṛtya-lakṣaṇo 'rtho yena sa g.*), both of these denoting "a learned, an experienced monk".

Sec.1, vss.1\*-47\*. Legend of N a n d i s e ṇ a.

The monk Nandiseṇa wants to commit suicide but is prevented therefrom twice by a *cāraṇa*-muni who appears before him in the sky. He gives away his paraphernalia of a monk to his teacher and proceeds to a foreign place. Here, while entering the house of a harlot, he bids the usual greeting *dharma-lābha*, responded by the lady with *artha-lābha*. Hence he produces much money which he presents her. Having taken the vow not to partake of any food or drink each day before he has converted ten persons to Jainism, he starts living with the harlot. After a while he gets fed up with his way of life and returns to his teacher Dummuha, who blames him for having sold the teachings for the sake of food etc. Nandiseṇa is convinced of his fault, repents (vss.34-5) and begins a hard penance, at the end of which he is to attain *mokṣa*.

Finally (vss.41ff.), the rule is again emphasised that a monk should give back all his paraphernalia to the teacher if he wants to leave the area of Guru's Rule.

Sec.2, vss.48\*-73\*. Legend of Ā s a ḍ a.

The monk Āsaḍa, a pupil of Bhūikkha, thinks that through *tapas* the teacher can be pleased - and suicide is apparently a hard *tapas* - and intends to commit suicide, like Nandiseṇa. But he is not prepared for such a heavy *tapas*. He thinks of reporting to his teacher that a *devatā* had advised him not to commit suicide but to hand over his paraphernalia to the teacher, lead a pleasant life and only afterwards to practice hard asceticism. He however recognises that even such thoughts are sinful and - without *ālocanā* - decides himself for a heavy penance which he then undergoes. Yet through this self-decision he commits a grave sin which keeps him bound to the *saṃsāra*.

Sec.3a, vss.74\*-77\*. Does one feel better when no sin is committed or when, after committing a sin, it has been repented? Answer: Even the mere consideration of the second possibility is not allowed.

Sec.3b, vss.78\*-81\*. One should apply all his energy to perform the repentance, otherwise one would fall into lower existences and would be reborn as an animal or in the hell.



Sec.3c, vss.82\*-86\*. A properly performed repentance destroys the sinful act, as the sun causes the snow ("Schnee") to melt.

Sec.3d, vss.87\*-92\*. Before whom one should perform *ālocanā*, the first act of repentance? Answer: Firstly the Kevalin-s are the most suited ones; in their absence, the following can serially be regarded as proper: those who have attained the fourfold knowledge, then the monks on lower levels of knowledge.

Sec.3e, vss.93\*-106\*. The increase of penance in cases of different sins, mainly sexual acts. A nun loses her capacity for true knowledge (*bodhi*) completely after third intercourse.

Sec.3f-g, vss.107\*-114\*. Even a layman, who is faithful to his wife, does not go beyond the existence of a god of middle range in his next birth. (Sec.3g) The reason for this, says Mahāvīra, is that all sexual activity, with one's own wife or with any other woman, means *pāpa*.

Sec.3h, vss.115\*-119\*. Legend of the nun Meghamālā, who, during the time of the Tirthankara Vāsupūjya, did not declare a small sin: she had namely passed over a house during her begging tour on account of considerations of food. Hence she falls down in the first hell. In vss.120\*-126\* general advice not to break vows.

Sec.4, vss.127\*-151\*. One should live only in the *Gīyattha-vihāra*, i.e. the company of learned and experienced monks, at the most in *Gīyattha-mīṣaya*. The term *gīyattha-vihāra* denotes the group of monks representing the ideal. A description of the *gīyattha-vihāra* which is full of general teachings of Mahāvīra, perhaps to designate the programme which can serve to recognize the g.-v. At the injunction of a *gīyattha* one can confidently eat poison, it will lead to salvation. Contrarywise, one should not at the behest of an *a-gīyattha* eat even *amṛta*, it will immediately turn into poison. One should under all circumstances leave the company of such an *a-gīyattha*. In the concluding verse (*vaṁśastha*) the faithful performance of even the smallest vow is praised.

It is this section which has supplied the title for the VIth chapter.

Sec.5, vss.152\*-199\*. Legend of Ī ś v a r a.

After the nirvāṇa of the First Tirthankara of an earlier series, a goddess appears to honour him, and there is a pratyeka-buddha (pr-b.) who is asked by a great congregation about his teacher and his ordination. Īśvara takes the answer of the pr-b. as a lie and

thinks in a rationalistic way over some points of the doctrine of the gaṇadhara, e.g. he is a bad monk if he destroys earth-beings (*paḍhavi-kāiṇa*) etc. Īśvara opines that the earth-beings are always exposed to such injuries and feels that as this teacher is unbelievable he would rather leave him and preach a simpler dharma. When Īśvara recognises these thoughts as sinful, he reproaches himself strongly and accepts a heavy penance, apparently without confession. Īśvara returns to the pr-b. and when he hears his teachings that no harm should be done to earth-beings, he again opines that it is quite impossible to protect earth-, fire- and water-beings, he (pr-b.) preaches just like that. As a punishment of these wrong thinking, Īśvara is born in the (lowest) seventh hell and undergoes many painful existences. At present, says Mahāvīra, he is born as Gosālaya.

Sec.6, §1-37 including vss.200\*-201\*-202\*(a quotation). Legend of R a j j ā.

The nun Rajjā lived in the gaccha of Bhadda, who had the rule not to partake of anything else but pure water (*kaḍhinōdaya*) at every fourth meal-time (*cauttha*). Rajjā gets leprosy as her bad karman-s ripen and, asked by sister nuns, declares the pure water (*phāsuga-pāṇa*) as the cause of "the destruction of her body". Therefore, a decision to avoid such water is taken by the sister nuns, except one who sees through the matter and decides to keep her vow till her death. This nun attains the pure knowledge (*kevala-jñāna*) and as *kevalin* she is praised by gods. Rajjā approaches the Kevalin and asks about the cause of her illness, which is revealed to her. Rajjā desires a penance corresponding to her fault; she is however taught that there is no adequate repentance for her sin as she had misled other nuns.

Sec.7, vss.203-305. The legend of Lakkhaṇadevī - Khaṇḍoṭṭhā.

King Jambūdiṇṇa and his queen Siriyā have many sons, yet they desire the birth of a daughter; one is indeed born to them after they have performed special worship of different divinities and she is named Lakkhaṇadevī. She performs a *svayamvara* but the young husband dies shortly after the marriage. Hence, when a Tirthankara preaches the doctrine, she is mentally ready to enter the order along with her whole family: father, mother and brothers. Once she observes the love-play of *cidaga* birds and asks herself why the Tirthankara has prohibited his followers to look at man and woman making love. However, she realises her sin, which she has committed thereby. Doubtful whether

she should confess and thus cause blame to her family, she decides to ask about the penalty for her sin under the excuse that this is meant for somebody else, and then to perform the repentance herself. She dies and is reborn as a maid-servant, now called Khaṇḍoṭṭhā, in the services of a harlot, who pains her as she is more beautiful than the harlot (who is called *therī* and *ves'ajjā*) herself. A dream warns Khaṇḍoṭṭhā of the intention of the harlot to maim her limbs, hence she runs away and in a foreign place gets married to the son of a rich widow. The first wife of her husband deforms Khaṇḍoṭṭhā because of envy and thus kills her. The husband becomes a monk out of grief. However, Khaṇḍoṭṭhā, rather her soul (sometimes masc., sometimes fem. pronoun), has to undergo many tragic rebirths till she will in future - driven out of the village as a *dākinī* - see the Tirthankara Padma and simply because of this *darśana* attain mokṣa.

Sec.8, §§1-11, vss.306-385.

After a series of vocatives to Mahāvīra (§§1-11), follows the question (vss.306-11): Why is the dharma not preached in such a way that to attain monkhood the devotee would need a chain of eleven existences, while according to the prevailing doctrine he has to undertake unbelievable austerity to reach salvation within one birth. In the case of the first alternative even tender persons could be won over for the teachings. Before an answer to this query is given through a parable (vss.374-85), the immediately following sub-section deals with the "tender" (*dullaliya* and *sukumāliya*); it is metrically even more irregular than the preceding ones and it remains unclear at many places. A tender person in the real sense of the term is only the Tirthankara. When he is in the womb of his mother, Indra serves him with *amṛta*; at the time of his birth, his country is free from pains and diseases; the gods initiate him and all, gods and human beings, praise him (vss.312-20). After a short enjoyment of worldly pleasures he recognizes their unsteadiness and leaves them in order to practice *tapas* (vss. 321-25). How different is in contrast the tenderness of those who wish to attain that what they feel as luck within one life-time (vss.326-28). They undertake various arduous tasks and have to be satisfied if at least they attain something, may be a rag! (vss.329-32). They leave their friends and pleasures to collect under troubles some small copper coins (vss.333-36). Their tenderness is such that they do agree with the dharma but do not work for it (vs.337).

Verses 338-47 seem to deal with the troubles and dangers one undergoes to attain a woman. If he is told to remain firm in the dharma, he answers that he is unable to do so. These "tender persons" do not realize that through exertion, and only through exertion, one can attain all, i.e. salvation (vss.348-52). A sub-section about the pre-eminence of the Tirthankaras follows (vss.353-60). The question of Goyama in vs.361 is: can each and everyone attain salvation through exertion? The answer of Mahāvīra is something like this (some points remain unclear): Even in the worldly affairs everyone can not perform the same task and in same proportions as somebody else would. He who does not perform austerities in a single existence falls down in bad existences (vss.362-73). Now follows the parable mentioned above: A tortoise pursued by various aquatic animals escapes them narrowly, leaves the ocean somehow and reaches a wonderful lotus pond; it decides to fetch also its relatives which are found with difficulty; but they do not find the nice pond again (vss.374-85).

Sec.9, vss.386-411. Sayings.

Verses in the āryā metre containing general teachings. They deal with insecurity of life, the infinity of existences (*culasū-jōṇi-lakkha-*) till now lived, and the pains and sorrows experienced in them, exemplified through similes, etc. [Many vss. have their parallels in Dharmadāsa-gaṇi's *Upadeśa-mālā*.]

## ¶4. LANGUAGE

¶4.0 Schubring characterizes the language of the MNA (MNSt.A,p.84) as Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī with at places weaker, at other places stronger infusion ("mit einem bald schwächeren, bald stärkeren Einschlag") of Ardhamāgadhi, and Hamm (MNSt.C,p.13) agrees with him quoting this very phrase. Deleu calls it "Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī in essence but blended with Ardhamāgadhi" (MNSt.B,p.1.10-11). It has been examined in detail by Schubring (MNSt.A,pp.84-95) and by Deleu (MNSt.B,pp.9-14), also by Hamm (MNSt.C,pp.13-14). With additions of some remarks by Schubring and Hamm, we reproduce the treatment of Deleu here as it is very systematic:

## ¶4.A, Deleu, paragraph 1-24

- Par. 1-14 PHONETICS (... 9.Anaptyxis, 10.Analogical Doubling, 11.Assimilation, 12.Haplology, 13.Skt., 14.Sandhi)
- Par.15-21 MORPHOLOGY
- (I) Noun 15. Change of gender  
16. Case-forms (A. Nom., B. Acc., C. Instr., D. Dat., E. Gen.)
- (II) 17. Adjective
- (III) 18. Numeral
- (IV) 19. Pronoun
- (V) 20. Verb (A. Pr.Ind., B. Opt., C. Fut., D. Part., E. Abs.)
- (VI) 21. Word-formation a. Suffixes, b. Intensive formations,  
c. Inversion of cpds. d. Loose constructions, e. *ca* / *vā*
- Par.22-24 SYNTAX  
22. Use of cases, 23. Use of verb forms, 24. False concord.

1-14

## PHONETICS

1 On *atthī* ( *strī* ) in *atthi-bandho* (II.§13.7) with shortening of *-ī* in the compound see MNSt.A,p.87-8 [with more than five instances and reference to R.Pischel, Gramm.d.PktSpr.<sup>29</sup> §147,fn.1].

2. For *o* instead of *u*, Pischel,§77, has given a shrewd explanation: (*aṇa-* = *a-*). This holds good for *aṇovautta* (III.§26.4), *aṇovalakkha* (III.§11.13), *aṇovavūhā* (III.§3.9.5), *aṇovasagga* (II.§20.2) and *aṇovahāṇa* (III.§3.14.4 & 15); cf. MNSt.C,p.108 under *aṇovautta*

<sup>29</sup> [Richard Pischel, Grammatik der Prākṛit-Sprachen (*Grundriß der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde*, I.8) Straßburg 1900. Abbr.: "Pischel". References are to the paragraphs. -- Also compare R. Pischel, Hemacandra's Grammatik der Prākṛitsprachen ... Pt.1,2. Halle 1877,1880. Abbr.: "Hc". -CBT]

VII.§9,11f.), but not for *ovautta* (III.§9.17), *niravaddava*, and *samovalabhittāṇaṃ* (MNSt.C,p.112: VII.§41,p.87.30), which may be explained by analogy.

3. -iya has become -ī in *eg'indī* (*ekendriya* II.7\*), *ji'indī* (*jītēndriya* I.87\*) and *viya'indī* (*vikalendriya* II.3\*, 5\*, 131\*). -ita has become -ī in *gāratthī* (see II.180\*, 183\* (and VI.107\*, 124\*?).

4. There are a few instances of the interchange *ut-* / *ava-*. For *vyutsrjanti*, *vyutsrṣṭa*, *vyutsarjana* we have *vosiranti* (II.184\*), *vosatṭha* (I.§1.9), *vosiraṇa* (III.§4.11). For usual *viussagga*, i.e. *viosagga* (Leumann, *Aupapātikasūtra*, Glossary<sup>30</sup>), we once find *ūsagga* (III.§44.19); cf. *ussagga* in VI.40\*. On the other hand *ugghasaṇa* (III.§43.3) is *ava-gharṣaṇa* and *uttārittu* (I.165\*) probably is *avatārya* (see below par.20Ed: under Absolute).

5. *v* has entered for secondary *y* < *d* in *uvara* (II.§15.10) < *udara* and in *ūṇōvariya* (III.§44.18) < *ūṇōdaritā*.

6. *khavaliya* (I.§1.11 & 146\*) < *kaśmalita* is to be explained by Pischel,§312, 212 & 251: *kaśmalita* > *\*kamhaliya* > *\*khamaliya* > *\*khāṇaliya* > *khavaliya*.

7. *alīha* (I.166\*) < *alīka*, with the change *h* < *\*kh* < *k*, is to be added to Pischel,§206.

8. *h* seems to go back to *kh* < *kkh* < *kṣṇ* in *tīha* (I.193\*).

9. The ANAPTYXIS in *khudūlaga* (I.28\*) < *kṣudraka* has already been mentioned in MNSt.A,p.87 [where further examples have been recorded: *ṇhāṇu-maddaṇa*, *teṇu mahā°*, *Maṇuga* (= *Manaka*), *maṇu-pajjavī* (= *mana-*), *māṇu-saṃjuya*, *māṇusa* (= *mānasa*), *vāṇura*, *vimaṇu-dummaṇa*, *samaṇu-dhamma* (= *śramaṇa-*), *sāṇu-jāi*.]

10a. The text offers a few instances of ANALOGICAL DOUBLING of a single initial consonant in the second member of a compound (Pischel,§196). They have been listed in the Glossary under *akkahaṇīyaya* (*akkhaṇḍiya*, *ajjhosiya*, *aṇiggihiya*, *addaṃsaṇa*, *uvassame*, *dussayahā*, *dhāuvvāya*, *nikkhila*, *viggovaṇayā*, *sakka*, *saccitta*<sup>31</sup>). This doubling is often a question of metrics, cf. e.g. *pphalaṃ* in III.114\*.

<sup>30</sup> [Ernst Leumann, *Das Aupapātika Sūtra*, erstes Upāṅga der Jaina: see ¶1.20.2. -CBT]

<sup>31</sup> [Their occurrences are: I.69\*, III.20\*(*akkh.*); II.105\*(*ajjh.*); I.195\*(*aṇ.*); I.33\*(*add.*); II.37\*(*uv.*); III.13\*f.(*duss.*); III.§3.10 (*dhā.*); I.201\*(*nikk.*); I.19\*(*vigg.*); I.165\*(*sakka* = *svaka*); II.§23.3 (*saccitta*). -CBT]

- 10b. *sukkara* (I.162\* ff.) < *sukara* is influenced by *dukkara* (*duṣkara*); cf. *dhāuvvāya* [III.§3.10.19 *dhātuvāda* (influenced by *dhanur*°)].
11. *a* has become *i* by ASSIMILATION (Pischel, §177) in *ihijje* (III.§27.3) = *ahijje* (III.§26.1) < *adhīyeta*. Cf. also *ihijjā* (sic! III.§26.1 in [Mss.] Pu.K)<sup>32</sup>.  
*a* has become *u* after a labial (Pischel, §104) in *kuhuga* (III. §3.10.14) < *kuhaka* and *nimugga saṃmugga* (III.§39.12) < *nimagna, saṃmagna*.
12. HAPLOLOGY is found in *aṇihaṇorapāra* III.§5.4) < *aṇihaṇa* and *aṇorapāra* (= *avā*°) and *antarāla*.
13. Sanskrit: the ritual terms *svāhā upacāro* (III.§29.13 seq.) and the caus. imper. *avadhāraya* (II.29\*) and *nibodhaya* (see Glossary); Skt. *k* is retained in *sakaṃ* (I.12\*), Skt. *t* in *atisaya* (I.§1.4) and a great many other cases.
14. SANDHI:
- (a.) *-i* dropped: e.g. *jāt'ādi* (I.§1.10), *labhant' ee* (II.9\*), *kis'ādiyaṃ* (II.63\*). For cases such as *p' imaṃ* (I.27\*) and *bhavant' ihaṃ* (II.71\*) see Jacobi, Indogermanische Forschungen 31, pp.211ff. In "*na kāy' āloyaṇ' "* *uccare* (I.98\*) = "*na kācid ālocanā*" [*iti*] *uccaret* both *-i* (of *kāi* = *kācid*) and *-ā* are dropped. Note *kāy' ālo*° instead of *kā' ālo*°.
  - (b.) *-e* dropped: *ghattāv' eyaṃ* (I.164\*), *ga' eg'indī* (II.7\*), *saṃkaḍa-tṭh' etthaṃ* (II.144\*), *ubbham' ega-disaṃ* (III.26\*), *savva-tṭhāṇ' esiyavvaṃ* (III.48\*).
  - (c.) *-aṃ* dropped: *kāyavv' āyaṃbila-kkhamanaṃ* (I.41\*), *parijaviyyav' atthasayaṃ* (I.41\*), *dhamma-saddh' ullasāvituraṃ* (I.151\*), *aṇudiyah' eyaṃ* (I.163\*), *jamm' egaṃ* (I.182\*), *samm' eyaṃ* (II.1\*), *bhāva-sall' uddharintāṇaṃ* (II. 195\*).
  - (d.) Note *-m-* in the following instances: *kunthū-m-uvalakkhaṇaṃ* (II.52\*), *nirāhāre-m-apāṇīe* (II.81\*), *laddhā-m-avi* (II.103\* = *labdhvā 'pi*), *agilāe-m-ahaṇṇisā*° (III.§9.11).
  - (e.) *khut-taṇha-* (II.89\*) < *kṣut-trṣṇā*.

<sup>32</sup> [On this point see the review by L. Rocher (JAOS.88,3.1968), which is reprinted in ¶10. -CBT]

15-21

## MORPHOLOGY

15-16

## N O U N

15. Change of gender (MNSt.A,p.94; B,p.14)

15.a. neut. instead of masc.:

*aikamma* (III.§18.3; §34.1), *aivāya* (III.§44.3.1), *abhioga* (III.§42.1), *ārambha* (I.212\*), *ālāvaga* (III.§25.7; §33.2), *āsava* (III.§18.2), *kesa* (I.20\*, II.28\*), *khaṇa* "festival" (III.89\*), *khaya* (III.§4.6 & 14), *thava* (III.37?), *dhamma* (I.13\*, 134\*, 220\*; III.71\*), *payattha* (III.§4.13), *pariggaha* (III.§44.3.5), although beside *samattho*, *pariccāga* (III.§4.9.4; masc.III.§4.7), *pariṇāma* (I.212\*), *musāvāya* (III.§44.3.2), yet with *bādarō*, *rāga* (II.§15.10), *rāsi* (II.108\*), *viṇioga* (III.40\* & 45\*), *vimokkha* (III.§4.14), *saṃjama* (I.84\*), *saṃdeha* (III.§27.6), *saṃdoha* (III.§11.9). [MNSt.A,p.94 lists the following instances: *aikkamaṃ*, *antaṃ*, *abhāvaṃ*, *abhiggahaṃ*, *asaṃjamaṃ*, *ahammaṃ*, *āsavaṃ*, *āhāraṃ*, *udayaṃ* (*udayaḥ*), *uvaesaṃ*, *uvaramaṃ*, *kālaṃ*, *kiriyaṃ*, (*suya-*)*kkhandhaṃ*, *gandhaṃ*, *candaṃ*, *ḍambhaṃ*, *tanuṃ*, *tuṭṭhiṃ*, *thavaṃ*, *diyahāṇi* und *°hāiṃ*, *dīvaṃ* (*dvīpaḥ*), *desaṃ*, *dehāṇi*, *dhammaṃ*, *namokkāraṃ*, *nikkhevaṃ*, *paesaṃ*, *paccayaṃ*, *pamodaṃ*, *pariosaṃ*, *paribhogaṃ*, *bandhaṃ*, *mokkhaṃ*, *lābhaṃ*, *viṇiogaṃ*, *vivegaṃ*, *visesaṃ*, *voccheyaṃ*, *saṃsayamaṃ*, *saggaṃ*, *sajjhāyaṃ*, *saṃjamaṃ*, *saṃdehaṃ*, *saṃbhavaṃ*, *sūriyaṃ*, *sesaṃ*. Hamm (MNSt.C,p.14) gives following instances from Chap.VI: *ukkurudaṃ* 397\*, *kaṇṭagaṃ* 238-9\*, 242\*, *kālaṃ* 186\*, 398\*?, *cuṇṇajogaṃ* 6\*, 24\*, *tosamaṃ* 141\*, *dehaṃ* 343\*, *dhammaṃ* 184\*, *pariṇāmaṃ* 323\*, *paribhogaṃ* 6\*, 22\*, *palayaṃ* 358\*, *bandhaṃ* 113\*, *bhangaṃ* 119\*, *musāvāyaṃ* 352\*, *mohaṃ* 353\*, *rāgaṃ* 353\*, *rāsi* 6\*, 36\*, *lābhaṃ* 124\*, *saṃjamaṃ* 121\*.]

15.b. neut. instead of fem.: *kiriya* (III.§29.8 = *kriyā*), *cūla* (III.§7.6; but *cūlā* III.§6.13, §9.21), *ṭhi* (II. §12.2 & 9), *taṇu* (II.78\*); *itthiya* (neut. II.§11.2f.; §17.1 & 4; §18.2, §20.4) = *strīka* "a female".

15.c. masc. instead of neut.:

*angōvanga* (II.§11.24f.), *abbhakkhāṇa* (II.61\*), (*āy*)*ambila* (I.42\*, III.5\*f.), *uttamatta* (II.§15.6), *uvahāṇa* (III.§7.10), *karavatta* (II.138\*), *khaṇḍaṇa* (II.§11.22), *citta* (II.§11.8f.), *tava* (I.3\* & 37\*), *dāṇa* (I.3\*), *dukkha* (II.53\* & 140\*), *duha* (II.26\* & 138\*), *dhāraṇa* (III.§44.3.5), *nagara* (II.§16.3), *nāma* (I.23\*, 65\*, 112\*, 145\*), *pāyacchitta* (II.174\*, 200\*f.), *pāva* (I.218\*), *phala* (II.133\*), *maṇuyatta* (I.75\*), *raṇa* (II.§16.3), *vaya* (II.187\*



= *vrata*). [MNSt.A,p.94 lists the following instances: *dāṇo*, *duho*, *pacchitto*, *rayaṇe*, *vigghe*, *sāmaṇṇe*.]

15.d. masc. instead of fem.:

*taṇu* (II.§11.25), *bondi* (II.§11.26), *thui* (III.§8.4f.) with *pasāhage* and *ese*, but also with *kāyavvā*. See also below paragraph 19: quite a number of pronouns in I.147\*-150\*.

[15.e. MNSt.A,p.94 mentions some words used in two genders: *-attho* / *-atthaṃ*, *āgamaṃ* / *āgamo*, *-jaṇaṃ* / *-jaṇo*, *gacchaṃ* / *gaccho*.]

16

Case-forms

16[A] Nominative

a. For the distribution of the nom.sg.masc. in *-e/-o* and the nom.pl.masc. in *-e/-ā* see MNSt.A,pp.84ff. and pp.88ff., but also MNSt.C,pp.13f.

b. Sometimes the stem is used for the nom.sg.: *metta* (I.101\*), *pasu* (II.4\*), *miya* (II.9\*), *guru* (II.31\*), *bandhi* (II.110\*), *hiṇḍi* (II.128\*), *gihi* (II.189\*), *accana* (III.35\*,twice), *pakkheva* (III.85\*).

c. *pasave* (II.68\*) is formed like *bahave* (Sanskritism).

d. Sometimes the acc. seems to be used along with or instead of the nom., see II.138\*, §20.1f., §20.4ff., 200\*.

16[B] Accusative

a. The stem is used for the acc.sg. in *khana* (II.6\*).

b. The acc.sg. of masc. and fem. stems in *-i/-ī* often ends in *-ī* instead of *-iṃ*: *rāi* (II.49\* & 89\*), *joṇī* (II.64\*), *vāsiṇī* (II.151\*a), *sāhuṇī* (II.151\*c), *āivamāṇī* (II.§18.3), *mahaī* (II.§24.5), *samsaggī* (III.12\*); *vuddhi* (I.101\*) with metrically short *-i*; *aggī* (II.131\*), *āyaī* (II.§11.20). Cf. also the adv.acc. *sunṇāsunnī* (I.100\*) below paragraph 21b. [The examples from Chap.VI given by Hamm (MNSt.C,p.14) are: *itthī* 111\*, *kāgiṇī* 335\*, *giṇī* 341\*, *jāi* 162\*, *dikkhā* 162\*, *dhūli* 235\*, *sarī* 341\*.]

The Mss., especially Ms. c, sometimes use the spelling short vowel + double consonant instead of short vowel + *-ṃ* + single consonant, e.g. *maha-nihi vva* (III.9\*), *taṇu cchive* (I.119\*).

c. *pure* (I.28\*) = *purās* (acc.pl.).

## 16[C] Instrumental

- a. There are two instances of the instr.sg. in *-īya* (Pischel, §385; Alsdorf<sup>33</sup>, BSOAS.8.1935-37, p.328): *vihiya* (I.61\*) and *parisamattīya* (I.78\*).
- b. *icchayā* (II.42\*), *saṃkhayā* (II.50\*) and *pavattaṇayā* (II.74\*) are Sanskritisms.

## 16[D] Dative

- [a] Another Sanskritism is *varāya* (II.133\*), if it does not stand for *varākaḥ*.

## 16[E] Genitive

- [a] *majjhomajjhīya* (I.128\*) is an adv.gen., see below par. 21b(2); Pischel, §385.

## ADJECTIVE

17. A few words generally considered to be substantives are used as adjectives in our text. Thus *tiyaya* and among the adjectives defining the kuśīla's bad looks *niddhāḍaṇī*, *mayāṇī*, *māraṇī* and *sarīsivā* [10.45, 11.30, 11.54, 11.21 in III.§39].

## NUMERAL

18. See Glossary under *egas(s)i* (I.24\*), *dus(s)ayahā* (III.13\*f. = *dvi-śatadha*). For *cauro-* (II.93\*) see Pischel, §439. Note *pancehiṃ* (I.207\*). [*duvālasavihammi ... III.113\** is to be read as *bārasa-v.* according to MNST.A, p.90, where *ekkasi*, *bittiya* and *igavīsaima* are also recorded.]

## PRONOUN

19. *sa* (I.153\*, II.110\* & 132\*, III.3\* & 10\*) a n d  
*esa* (II.37\*, III.§10.1) [are] nom.sg.masc.

*se* undoubtedly is nom.sg.fem. in II.§16.3f.; §17.2-5 (against *sā* in II.§16.5). In II.§11.11f., §11.29 & 38 it may be either fem. or neut. (with *itthiyaṃ* II.§11.2); the adjectives in this passage are fem. (*saṃdhukijjamāṇī* II.§11.2) or neut. (*abhimuham* II.§11.38).

*ayaṃ* (III.§9.21): nom.sg.neut. ? *iyaṃ* (II.29\*, III.§8.2): nom.-acc.sg.neut.; *te* (I.149\*f.) and *ke vi* (I.148\*) for nom.pl.fem.; *jesiṃ* (I.150\*, Ms.C) and *kesiṃ* (I.147\*) for gen.pl.fem.; *siṃ* (II.186\*) and *esiṃ* (III.§9.8): gen.pl.masc. (Pischel, §423 & 429); *kehi* (II.8\*) stands for *kehi vi*, *kiṃ* (II.199\*) for *kiṃ pi*.

*taya*, *kayara*, *annayara*: see Glossary.

<sup>33</sup> [Ludwig Alsdorf, *The Vasudevahiṇḍī, a Specimen of Archaic Jaina-Māhārāṣṭrī*. IN: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies (BSOAS)*, Vol.8 (London 1935-37), pp.319-333. Reprinted in: *Kleine Schriften* (ed. Albrecht Wezler, Glasenapp-Stiftung, Bd.10), Wiesbaden 1974, pp.56-70. -CBT]

## VERB

## 20. [A] Present Indicative

a. In a good many cases the pres.ind. 1st pers.sg. ends in *-am* (MNSt.A,p.90; Alsdorf, BSOAS.8.1935-37,p.321): *ciṭṭham* (I.81\*), *dharam* (I.114\*), *samārabham* (I.123\*), *geṇham* / *giṇham* (I.125\* & 214\*), *pattham* (I.125\*), *abhiramam* (I.127\*), *kuṇam* (I.130\* & 132\*), *nīharam* (I.132\*), *nijjhāyam* and *ālavam* (I.136\*), *kaham* (I.154\*, twice), *uddharam* (I.181\*), *gaccham ciṭṭham suvam utṭham dhāvam nāsam* (II.35\*), *kaṇḍuyam* (II.37\*), *pavujjhayam* (II.54\*), *caram* (II.68\*), *puccham* (III.42\*).

b. For *vediyahe* (I.133\*), which is a 1st pers.sg.pres.ind., see Alsdorf, BSOAS.8.1935-37,p.322 and Schubring, ZDMG.109.1959,p.455.

c. *-e* may perhaps sometimes stand for *-ai* < *-ati* (e.g. in *ābāhe* II.65\*). Consequently a few forms in *-e* leave us in doubt whether ind. or opt. is meant<sup>34</sup>.

## 20. [B] Optative

a) In I.149\* *lakkhejjo* / *°ijjo* (*lakṣayeyuḥ*) is a Digambara opt.3rd pers.pl.!

b) In *labbhe* (I.115\*) und *janne* (II.134\*) the consonant seems to have been doubled metri causa.

c) In III.§10.7 *vajja* stands for *vajje* (*varjayet*) before *tti* (Pischel,§92).

d) For *adhīyeta* the text has got five different forms: *ahīe* (III.§26.3, §27.1, §31.5); *ahijje* (III.§26.1); *ihijje* (see above par.11); *ahijjīne* (III.§32.2); and *ajjhīe* (III.§26.12). In *ahijjīne*, the part.necess. *ahijjīneyavva* (III.§31.1) and the infin. *ahijjīṇium* (III.§31.2) *adhi-* "to study" seems to have been mixed up with *\*abhi-* or *adhi-ji* (*jyā*) "to conquer completely". *ajjhīe* < *ajjh[ayaṇa]* + *adhīyeta*.

e) There are a few instances of the opt.3rd.pers.sg. in *-iyā* (Pischel,§464; MNSt.A,p.90; C,p.14): *parivajjiyā* (II.§23.3), *bhaviyā* (III.8\*), *vāiyā* (III.10\*), *ṭhaviya* (with metr. short *-a* III.119\*).

[See also MNSt.A,p.90-1 for more forms and a discussion on optative.]

## 20. [C] Future

In I.6\* *gamisse* and *aṇubhavisse* (in Ms.c) are obviously fut.1st.pers.sg. ātmanepada (< *-iṣye*).

<sup>34</sup> [See A. Master (JRAS.1951,p.164: Rev. of MNSt.C, reprinted below ¶10): "The spelling *e* for *ai* does not appear till after the fifteenth century, when Mahārāṣṭrī was no longer used". -CBT]

## 20. [D] Participles

- a) The form *pakuvvāṇa* (III.§17.4) is to be explained by Pischel, §562.
- b) For *jitta* (I.33\* = *jita*, cf. Pischel, §194) see the Glossary where also the derivatives in *-ira* (*nindira*, *paṇaccira*, *bhāṇira/bha°*, *vajjira*, *vicintira*, *hasira*) and a few interesting part.necess. (*pūya*, *avandiyaya*, *dupattijja*; *anuciṭṭhiyavvaya*, *pāsiya* / *pāsiyavvaya*, *pecchiyavvaya*) have been entered<sup>35</sup>.

## 20. [E] Absolutive

- a) There are several absolutes in *-ya* (Pischel, §590): *khaṇḍiya* (repeated I.163\*), *pacciya* (II.76\* twice), *uvavajjiya* (II.87\*), *khaviya* (II.§12.5), *saṃṇirumbhiya* (II.§13.4), *saṃcikkhiya* (II.§15.7), *niḍajjiya* (repeated II.§16.3f.), *paribhassiya* and *acchaḍiya* (II.§18.2), *ghāriya* (II.207\*), *vīmaṃsiya* (III.§27.6), *gahāya* (III.§30.2). To these must be added *samuvaiṣṣa* (III.108\*, Skt. *samupadiṣya*) and *pappā* (I.138\*, Skt. *prāpya*), the latter with lengthened *-a* at the end of the pāda.
- b) Note *kiccāṇaṃ* (II.§15.8) and *passiyāṇaṃ* (II.§18.3) for which see Pischel, §587 and 592.
- c) *laddhā* (II.103\*) < *labdhvā*.
- d) *uttārittu* (see above par.4): absol. = infin. (Pischel, §577).
- e) In *kareuṇaṃ* (I.220\*) the *u* is metr. short, cf. MNSt.C, p.47 (under 188).

## 21. Word-formation

- a. The suffixes *-ttaṇa* (*-tva*) and *-yā* (*-tā*) have been added to substantives in *avacchallaṇattana*, *esaṇayā*, *dohaggayā* and *maddavayā* [III.§3.9.3, I.207\*, I.20\*, and I.196\* respectively].
- b. A number of interesting intensive formations have been listed in the Glossary. They are (1) the verb-forms *phuruphurejjā* / °renti, *ruṇurune*, *salasalasale*; *kaḍhakaḍhakaḍhanta*, *maghamaghamaghenta*; (2) the adverbial genitives *calacalacalassa*, *ṭalaṭalaṭalassa*, *tharatharassa*, *dhagadhagadhagassa*, *saḍahaḍassa*, *khaṇḍākhaṇḍie*, *majjhomajjhiya*; (3) the adverbial accusative *sunṇāsunnī* (see above par.16[B]b under acc.). Cf. MNSt.A, p.92 and a few examples in MNSt.C (Glossaries).

<sup>35</sup> [The occurrences of these words are: III.§11.11(*ni.*), III.53\*(*pan.*), I.66\*, 139\*(*bhā.*), I.1\*(*vajj.*), I.66\*(*vic.*), III.§43.3(*has.*); III.27\*, 53\*(*pūya*), I.76\*(*av.*), I.9\*(*dup.*), I.220\*(*anuc.*), II.22.5(*pāsiya*), II.1\*(*pāsiyavvaya*), III.52\*(*pecch.*).-CBT]

c. Note the inversion of the components in *pakkha-suddha* (I.74\*), *ghora-pacchitta-dukkare lakkhōvasagga-pacchitte* (I.76\*, metri causa<sup>36</sup>), *paḍivajjana-pāyacchitte* (I.102\*, metri causa), *dukkha-māṇasaṃ* (II.134\*, metri causa), *Mandara-giri-aṇanta-guṇiyassa* (II.142\* for *aṇanta-guṇiya-M.-girissa*), *tav'āhiya* (III.§6.9), *tiṭṭhaya-nāma-kamma-goya* (III.§14.4 for *t.-nāma-goya-kamma*), *aṭṭha-lakkhaṇa-sahassa* (III.§14.5 for *aṭṭha-sahassa-l*. "one thousand and eight marks").

d. Many of the loose constructions common in our text are due to faulty compounds. Thus is I.46\* (*su. vi. for suyadevayā vi*), I.68\* (*sammaṃ* detached), I.100\* (if *ahaṃ* splits the compound; in this case we should translate "I am unable to [perform] a heavy penance", i.e. *guru-pacchittāsakke 'haṃ*), II.83\* (the meaning is *vaṇassai-jammaṃ janti*), II.§18.8 (corr.: *vaira-sarīreṇaṃ*), II.§24.5 (corr.: *aṭṭhārasa-sil'anga*), III.§3.11 (*vāyaṇā ...* obviously being ablatives excluded from the compound *āyaṇṇa-apa.*, III. §4.10 (corr.: *eesiṃ ... -dhāraṇāṇaṃ samaṇu.*), III.§11.11 (*jampira, uvagaya* and *nindira* are stems; the compound has got out of hand), III.§11.12f. (*kevalaṃ* detached), III.26\* (*guṇāhio* metri causa for *ahiguṇe*), III.§17.2 (corr.: *abhiggaḥiya-ai-caṇḍa-* etc.), III.85\* (*u* extraneous), III.§27.4 (corr.: *aṭṭhameṇaṃ batti°*), III.§29.16 (*mangala-vahaṇī[havai] khema-vahaṇī-havai*), III.§33.1 (corr.: *aviṇṇāe puṇṇa-* ...), III.§37.4 (corr.: *vāyaṇāi-sajjhāyaṃ jahā-sattie*), III.§39.3.6 (corr.: *parivaḍiya-dhamma-saddhāe sāmaṇṇaṃ ...*), III.§39.12 (*laṭṭhio* splits the compound).

Schubring (MNSt.A,p.93) has already pointed out the precarious construction of the compounds describing the way in which some monks and nuns have obtained Kevalinhood (I.66\*-85\*, 95\*-108\*, 113\*-137\*, 154\*-157\*).

e. Quite often *ca* "and" and *vā* "or" are added to dvandvas. Thus e.g. *para-m-appaṇo ya* (III.§9.12) stands for *parassa appaṇo ya*, *khema-pāvaṃ vā* (II. 132\*) for *khemaṃ pāvaṃ vā*. Likewise *ceiya-sāhū ya* (I.42\*) for *ceiyaṃ sāhū ya*.

<sup>36</sup> Deleu,p.151: The meaning of this verse is not quite clear since, for one thing, we do not know to how many kinds of *kevalins* it alludes. Moreover: does *ghora-pacchitta-dukkare* stand for *ghora-dukkara-pacchitte* (as I translated) or, thinking of *āloyaṃ* (*ālokāt* ? see Alsdorf, BSOAS.8,p.330), for *dukkara-pacchitta-ghore* ? *lakkhōvasagga-pacchitta* I interpreted as *upasarga-lakṣa-prāyaścittaḥ* but it may be *lakṣyōpasarga-prā°* "a penance [which consists in enduring] manifest troubles". Finally I read *sammahiy'āsana* i.e. *sammahit'āsana* or *sammathit'āsana*, not *sammahiyāsana* which might be *sammathitāsana*. [The verse reads:

*āloyaṃ nind'avandiyae ghora-pacchitta-dukkare  
lakkhōvasagga-pacchitte sammahiy'āsana-kevali.]*

## SYNTAX

## Use of cases

22. The loc. *aviraesu* (III.43\*) seems to be due to attraction by *thāmesuṃ*; cf. *aviraehiṃ* in the following verse. Note the gen. *cakkhuṇo* with *pāsiya* (II. §22.5) and the loc. with *mettī*, i.e. *maitrī* (I.59\*) and *saddhiṃ* (II. §10.4f.). *antara* "difference" governs both the abl. and the gen. in II.142\*.

23.

## Use of verb forms

23. If we understand *alabhanta* as *alabhanto* (see above par.16 under Nom. b.) vs. III.25\* may be a conditional sentence (cf. Hc.3.180<sup>37</sup>) of the type *jai ramanto jīṇa-desie sāmāṇṇe, ajja ahaṃ gaṇī honto* (Daśavaikālika-sūtra 11.8\*) "if I had felt like entering the Jaina monastic order, I should now have been a Gaṇin!" Note, however, that in the subordinate clause the place of the finite verb is not taken by a pres.part. but by the absolutive. For further examples see Sukumar Sen, *Indian Linguistics*, Vol.13, par.153; Alsdorf, BSOAS.8.1935-37, p.329 fn.

24.

## False concord

24a. in gender: *cauvvihaṃ māyā* (I.26\* attraction by *ghoraṃ* ?), *nippḥīliyaṃ* (I.128\*), *kammāṇi ... niddaḍḍhe* (II.122\*), *vivaṇṇa-juṃ ... bondī* (II. §11.16)<sup>38</sup> *apāsaṇijje* (II. §11.22 attraction by *dose, bhange* etc.), *cintaṇijje* (II. §16.1 attraction by *vibhāge* ?). Cf. also par.19 under *se* and *je*.

24b. in case: *tassa ... bhūyāo* (III. §5.5). See above par.16 under Nom. d.

24c. in number:

(1) Note that *siddhe niṭṭhie pahīṇe* (III. §9.9) is governed by *vāe*, which the author has in mind, instead of by *kayambam*.

(2) For *ahaṃ ... cintimo* (I.113\*) and *ahaṃ...ceṭṭhimo* (I.135\*) see MNSt.A, p.90; Alsdorf, BSOAS.8.1935-37, p.322f.

(3) *atth' ege pāṇī* obviously is a plural (see e.g. I.184\* and 188\*), but it is sometimes loosely connected with the singular, esp. metri causa (I.7\*, 14\*, 180\*, II.121\*, 157\*).

(4) *samuvvahai, vivajjae ... tesim* (II.187\*f.), influenced by II.186\*.

<sup>37</sup> [Hc is the abbreviation for "Hemacandra's Grammatik der Prākṛit-Sprachen" by R.Pischel, see fn.29. CBT].

<sup>38</sup> Deleu: If we do not read *-bondim* (with Ms.C and II. §11.17) or assume change of gender.

---

¶4.B There are also some Apabhraṃśa influences. see e.g. VII.§46 (*paaehim jaṇaṃdaṇu* etc. MNSt.C,p.88.28-30). For passages in Sanskrit see ¶9.6-7.

¶4.C A. Master (JRAS.1951,p.154: see ¶10.1) remarks: "... but it is doubtful if the description has real linguistic significance, as the difference between Jaina Mahārāṣṭrī on the one hand and Lyrical and Dramatic Mahārāṣṭrī on the other lies almost entirely on the degree of stylization. There is no Jaina Mahārāṣṭrī uninfluenced by Ardhamāgadhī, and even the other forms are not so consistently stylized as some Western editors would have us believe. ..." [It is my impression that the style of one passage differs from that of another passage, the style of verses from that of the prose, the style of direct quotations from that of the compositions of the "editor"; there is, hence, nothing like *the* style or *the* language of *the* entire Mahānīśītha. -CBT]

## ¶5. METRES

¶5.0 About the metrical structure of the MNA, Schubring (e.g. MNSt.A,p.34) remarks that anuṣṭubh is the metre favoured by the author, though āryā was the prevailing metre in his time. Both, Hamm (MNSt.C,pp.14-16) and Deleu (MNSt.B,pp.15-17) present a metrical survey of sample verses of Chap.VI and I-II respectively, which is reproduced here. — Note: *a b c d* refer to pādas, *a/c* to pāda *a* OR *c*; *b/d* to pāda *b* OR *d*. *G* = heavy syllable (*guru*); *L* = light syllable (*laghu*) — The use of the asterisk denoting verses is obviously superfluous in our section ¶5.

¶5.1 For the first one hundred anuṣṭubh verses of Chap.VI (vss. 1-101, vs.30 is an āryā) Hamm prepared statistics (1) of the number of syllables in a pāda, (2) of the opening of the pādas, and (3) of the cadence of the pādas. Deleu examined 400 pādas of one hundred verses "selected at random throughout Chap. I-II" to prepare corresponding statistics<sup>39</sup>.

¶5.2.0 Of the total of 422 pādas (some verses having 6 pādas) in Chap.VI, 198 pādas, i.e. 46.9%, do not have the correct number of syllables. In Chap.I-II, out of 400 pādas, 192 pādas, i.e. 48%, have an irregular number of syllables:

Syllables	Chap.VI.vss.1-101	Chap.I-II <sup>39</sup>	Remarks
7	16( <i>a/c</i> : 9; <i>b/d</i> : 7)	11( <i>b</i> :7. <i>c</i> :1. <i>d</i> :3)	
9	138(79;59)	123(41.27.26.29)	
10	35(15;20)	44(12.7.14.11)	
11	7(4;3)	8(3.4.1.1)	
12	1(VI.84 <i>a</i> )	3(all <i>d</i> )	(See below [A])
14	1(VI.85 <i>d</i> )		
15		1(II.93 <i>d</i> )	with
18		1(II.91 <i>b</i> )	extrametrical
?		1(II.108 <i>d</i> )	additions?

[A] These three pādas are: I.79*d*, 137*d*, 138*d*.

<sup>39</sup> The vss. are: I.21-30, 71-80, 91-100, 131-140, 213-222; II.51-60, 91-99, 106-115, 151-160, 191-200.



¶5.2.1 Hamm: Even if one could correct some of the pādas with nine syllables "by elision of an intruding vowel" or "by letting run together an initial vowel with the preceding nasal" in MIA (H. Jacobi, KZ.24,p.613) there would still remain enough cases to prove that the author was either simply careless or even incompetent to compose normally structured ślokaś. It seems, he has selected and overburdened the motto: *na vā ekenâkṣareṇa cchaṃdāṃsi viyanti, na dvābhyām* (Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, I.6.1). The same conclusion can be drawn from the statistics about the opening and cadence of the pādas.

¶5.2.2 Deleu: "Not only is it possible, as Hamm [see 5.2.1] explains, to correct many of the pādas with 9 (and even more) syllables, the author also shows some regularity in his departure from the metrical tradition. This obviously is the case with *b* and *d* pādas of 7 syllables, the metre of which as a rule is *GGGGGLG* (see MNSt.A,p.34). Among the thirty odd instances<sup>40</sup> that are found in Chapters I-II there are only six rather unimportant exceptions to that rule, namely pādas I.28*b*, 165*b*, II.118*d*, 161*d*, III.10*d*, 45*b*.

¶5.2.3 It should be added that one cannot always know for sure whether the supernumerary syllables are not to be put down to some extrametrical addition".

### ¶5.3 Opening.

¶5.3.1 From among the schemes of opening a pāda which are prohibited, we find in Chap.VI: in *a/c* 6 cases,i.e. 2.8% <sup>41</sup>. The opening thus shows relatively few deviations from the schemes allowed, because the number of permitted opening is considerably bigger than those for the cadence. If one may say so, even a less trained author has very few opportunities to miss the structure of the opening.

¶5.3.2 Deleu: "In Chap.I-II, 39 pādas *a/c*, i.e. 19.5%, and 33 pādas *b/d*, i.e. 16.5% show an irregular opening."<sup>42</sup>

<sup>40</sup> The pādas with 7 syllables in the whole of Chap.I-III are: I.20*b*, 28*b*, 70*d*, 86*b*, 90*b*, 101*d*, 103*b*, 138*b*, 142*b*=90*b*, 164*b*, 165*b*, 166*b*, 197*d*, 214*b*, 215*d*, 218*d*; II.16*b*, 27*d*, 50*d*, 53*b*, 62*d*, 95*d*, 103*d*, 112*b*, 117*b*, 118*d*, 140*d*, 153*b*, 161*d*, 190*b*; III.9*b*, 10*d*, 39*b*, 42*d*, 44*d*=42*d*, 45*b*.

<sup>41</sup> The details are: in *a/c* 6 cases, i.e. 2.8% (*GLLG*: 3, *LLLL*: 2, *GLLL*: 1), and in *b/d* 7 cases, i.e. 3.3% (*GLLG*: 3, *LLLL*: 2, *LLLG*: 1, *GGLG*: 1).

<sup>42</sup> The details are: *GLLG* in 32 pādas (*a*: 16. *b*: 5. *c*: 5. *d*: 6), *LLLG* in 18 pādas (4.6.4.4); *LLLL* in 13 pādas (3.5.3.2), *GLLL* in 7 pādas (2.2.2.1), *GGLG* in 2 pādas (*b*:1, *d*:1).

#### ¶5.4 Cadence.

¶5.4.1 Completely different is the picture that emerges out of the statistics of the cadence, for which only *LGGL/G* in *a/c* and *LGLL/G* in *b/d* are allowed.

Chap.VI: Unallowed cadence appears in *a/c* pādas in 69 cases, i.e. 32.7% of the total<sup>43</sup>; in *b/d* pādas in 14 cases<sup>44</sup>, i.e. 6.8%; the cadence is thus wrong in 39.5% cases. Only in end-rhyme the author has made comparatively few mistakes.

¶5.4.2 Chap.I-II: "40 *a/c* pādas, i.e. 20%, and 23 *b/d* pādas, i.e. 11.5%, show an irregular cadence."<sup>45</sup>

#### ¶5.5 Gāhā = āryā.

¶5.5.1 Hamm. The gāthā (gāhā) [āryā] appears in VI.30, 202, 250, 386-411; pathyā āryā are: VI.30, 202, 386-390, 395, 398-99, 401, 403, 405, 410-11; vipulā, otherwise correct, are: VI.391a, 392ab, 396ab, 397a, 402a (gīti), 404a, 408a.

¶5.5.2 Deleu. "The gāhā [āryā metre] is found in: I.10, 37, 148, 208-211; II.105; III.3, 16-38, 46-137. Among these thirty-three<sup>46</sup> are gītis (*b* with 8 gaṇas like *a*), III.51 is an udgīti (*b-a* instead of *a-b*). The āryās are partly pathyā (60%), partly vipulā (40%), i.e. either they have caesura after the third gaṇa or not. On the whole the gāhās are much more regular than the ślokas [anuṣṭubh]. The reason is that in the author's time the gāhā was the metre mainly used in commentaries and that, since he wanted to produce an archaic work, he had to use a metre far less familiar to him".

<sup>43</sup> The deviations are: *GGGG* in 16 cases, *LLGG* in 12, *GLLG* in 11, *LLLG* in 8, *LLGL* in 7, *GGGL* in 4, *LGLG* in 4, *GLLL/G* in 4, and *GGLL/G* 3 cases.

<sup>44</sup> *GGLG* in 6, *LLLG* in 5, *LGGL* in 2, and *GGLL* in 1 cases.

<sup>45</sup> *LGLLL/G* in 7 *a* and 12 *c* pādas, *LLLGL/G* in 6 *a* and 5 *c* pādas, *GGGGG* in 4 *a* pādas, *LLLLLG* in 1 *a* pāda, *GLLLLG* in 1 *a* pāda, *GLLLG* in 1 *a* pāda, *GGLGG* in 1 *a* pāda, *GGLLL* in 1 *c* pāda, *LGGGL* in 1 *c* pāda, *GGLG* in 7 *b* and 8 *d* pādas, *LLLLG* in 4 *b* and 3 *d* pādas, *LGLGG* in 1 *b* pāda.

<sup>46</sup> The gītis are: I.10, 211; II.105; III.3, 19, 27, 35, 37-38, 52-56, 58, 61, (68), 77, 82, 84-87, 89, 91, 93-94, 98, 104, 108, 114, 117, and 119.

## ¶5.6 Additional Remarks

¶5.6.1 Hamm's further remarks are: VI.393, a gīti, in pāda *b* the 7th gaṇa has 5 morae; in vs.394, a vipulā, the 5th gaṇa is amphibrachys; in vs.400, a gīti, pāda *b* vipulā, *patthie* is to be deleted; in vs.406, pāda *b*, the 7th gaṇa has 3 morae; in vs.407, vipulā, pāda *b*, 3rd gaṇa has 5 morae. VI.151 is in *vaṃśastha* metre.

## ¶5.6.2 Deleu remarks further:

(1) "In a number of verses<sup>47</sup> we find extrametrical additions. (2) Metri causa we must read: *paunjamāṇ'* *aiyare* (I.210), etc.<sup>48</sup>. (3) Note the metrical shortening in *yaṇanti* and *vavaṇi* (III.63), *ṭhaviyā*, i.e. °*viyā*, °*vejā* (III.119). (4) Twice we meet *LGG/LG* instead of *LGL/GG* in the 6th and 7th gaṇa, namely in the *a*-lines of III.54 and 118. Cf. *G/LG* instead of *L/GG* in the 6th and 7th gaṇa of III.28*b*. (5) The 6th gaṇa in III.77*b* (... *puno vi bhamadejjā*) and the 5th gaṇa in III.120*a* (but cf. reading of Ms.K) have only three instead of four morae. The 7th gaṇa in I.37*b* and the 3rd gaṇa in III.56*b* (but cf. reading of Ms.K) have five instead of four morae. (6) Note that the rule for *-hiṃ/-hi* [in *anuṣṭubh*, see e.g. I.11*d*, 157, 160 and 174 (*sallehiṃ*), 189, etc.] applies also to the gāhās, as e.g. in I.148, III.16*a*, 32*a* (*indehiṃ*), 46*a*, etc. The same applies to *-āiṃ* in *aidūsahāiṃ dukkhāiṃ* (III.67*a*). (7) The cadence is defective in I.211 (*dhammo*° ... °*nejā*: influenced by śloka?) and at the end of III.127*a* (quotation). (8) Other metres in quotations are: I.11 *sragdharā*, I.36 and 195 two *indravajrās*, and II.147 *vaṃśastha*. There are a few licences [in these verses]".

¶5.7 Hamm: In nutshell one can say that the author is lacking in competence in and an intention for metrics. In using words he makes no choice, hence many of his pādas remain defective.

<sup>47</sup> They are I.10 (*jaṃ*); II.105 (*dukkaya*); III.3 (*sa*), 24 (*agga* and *Kancaṇa*), 38 (*tu*), 56 (*iti*), 58 (*Goyama* etc.), 68 (*akkhayaṃ*, the verse is a gīti if *ti* is omitted), 79 (*mahanta*; read *tatth' ev' abhu*°), 92 (*pariṇeṇe*), 94 (*kammaṃ* and *jogga*), 105 (*pavara*), 110 (*gahaṇ'*).

<sup>48</sup> Further examples are: *tahā* (I.211), *duccittāṇaṃ* and *taveṇaṃ ajho*° (II.105), *ārāhage saraṇṇe* (? III.27), *ddāriddaṃ nāma* (III.30), *guruṇaṃ* (III.34), °*nuthāṇa* and *sakāra* (III.35), *so* instead of *davva-tthao* (? III.37), *ṭhāṇ'* *esiyavva viṣe*° and *c' anuṭṭheyaṃ* (III.48), *na paraṇi* (III.58), °*nuṭṭhāṇassa* (III.68), *nivvattantī* (III.87), *nighosā* with [Ms.] K (III.89), *ḍahaī* and *jhāṇa* (III.94), *sattāṇ'* *aṇu*° (III.108), *bārasa* for *duvālasa* (III.113), *jhāṇa* (III.114), *sajjhāya* (III.117), *ppāvāṇa* (III.121), *ddhūma* and *kāraṇe* with K (III.131), *pāṇe* (III.132).

## ¶6. PARALLELS

¶6.0 The MNA has many verses and also prose passages in common with various texts of the Jaina literature as has been already noticed by A. Weber and other scholars in Germany. Schubring devotes, besides remarks distributed all over his study, a whole chapter to this topic (MNSt.A, pp.50ff.), where he critically evaluates the parallels mostly utilizing the Mss. of the texts concerned. Similarly, Hamm and Deleu not only refer to such texts and works but also utilize them for detecting variant readings they have to offer.

¶6.1 The most outstanding parallel is supplied by the anonymous prakīrṇaka called *Gacchâcāra* (*Gacchâyāra*), about 137 verses, describing "the qualities requisite for both a teacher and his gaccha" (*Doctrine*, p.113). MNSt.A, p.51 gives a list of verses common to the MNA and the *Gacchâcāra* which should be supplemented by references in MNSt.B and C. Accordingly, out of its 137 vss. as many as 54 vss., i.e. about 40%, have been borrowed by the *Gacchâcāra* from the MNA. And this fact is disclosed by the *Gacchâcāra* itself in vs.135, already quoted by Weber (HTJ, p.445 = SLJ, p.xxx and Verz.II, p.622-23) and Schubring (MNSt.A, p.50):

*Mahānisiha-Kappāo Vavahārāo tahêva ya /*  
*sāhu-sāhuṇi-aṭṭhāe Gacchâyāraṃ samuddhiyaṃ (1) //135 or 136//*  
 (1) JĀG.17.1.1.1984, p.349.

This is a sure proof that the MNA is chronologically earlier than the *Gacchâcāra*. But the date of the *Gacchâcāra* is as uncertain as that of related prakīrṇakas. All of them belong to a period in which the Jaina clergy was moving away from its high ideals and some malpractices, which they criticize, had crept into it.

Charts based on the information in MNSt.A-B-C are attached below: 6.6-7.

¶6.2 Next in importance as a parallel text is the *Upadeśamālā* (*Uvaesamālā*) of Dharmadāsa-gaṇi which has thirty-one vss. in common with the MNA. After examining these verses in detail Schubring, MNSt.A (see ¶8.1.5), concluded that it was Dharma-

dāsa who borrowed the verses, and this opinion is supported by Deleu (MNSt.B, p.1,fn.2): "From a close comparison of the verses which the MNA and Dharmadāsa's Uvaesamālā (date unknown, probably about 900 AD) have in common it appears that, most probably, Dharmadāsa is the borrower. ... With regard to the readings of the MNA those of the Uvaesamālā are, indeed, characterized by a certain degree of normalization. -- The reverse process is, I think, rather improbable! -- Everything that is questionable, unmetrical, or merely unusual<sup>49</sup> has been corrected, dropped or smoothed over in Dharmadāsa's work"<sup>50</sup>. On the other hand, Hamm (MNSt.C,p.51: note on VI.386\*ff. which are āryās) opines that this 9th section of the VIth Chapter distinguishes itself from the preceding 8th section by its clarity both in language and contents as most of its verses are borrowed from the *Upadeśamālā* of Dharmadāsa; he thus disagrees with Schubring. Deleu on his part refutes Hamm (see above).

For common verses see the appended chart.

¶6.3 The MNA, Gacchācāra and the Upadeśamālā are obviously to be dated to the same period of decadence as they all deal in detail with the conditions prevalent in it. Moving back in time, it must be noticed here that the MNA not only knows by mere name but also cites the older exegetical literature of the Nirvyūktis, Bhāṣyas and Cūrṇis developed in course of time to explain the still older strata of the Canonical texts. Thus, the Āvaśyaka-niryukti (ĀvNi) is cited: e.g. MNA I.35\*-37\* (Deleu, MNSt.B,p.20) are ĀvNi.101\*-103\*, these verses<sup>51</sup> were quoted already by A. Weber (SLJ,p.184; ¶3.2), see also E. Leumann, Āvaśyaka-Erz.,p.19: II.22.

For twelve verses of the ĀvNi, twelve vss. of the Piṇḍa-niryukti (three of them in the Ogha-niryukti also) appearing in the MNA see the chart.

<sup>49</sup> Questionable are e.g. I.9\* (*dupattijje*), III.119\* (*aṇāghāo*); unmetrical are III.56\*b, VI.393\*b, 394\*a; unusual are for instance III.60\* (*bhaṇṇau*), III.112\* (*logaṇ*), III.119\* = V.105\* (*thaviya/ve*), VI.395\* (*avilā*).

<sup>50</sup> Deleu continues: "... Short verbal forms (*tippe* VI.390\*, *tacche* VII.17\*, *aṇuttthe* and *patthe* VIII.12\*) seem to have been avoided. Nominal forms in -e have been replaced by forms in -ā (VI.393\* and 398\*), -o (III.112\*, VI.402\*) or -aṇ (III.56\*, VI.400\*), gītis have become āryās (III.56\*, VI.393\*, 400\*, 402\*). Note that MNA.I.10\* = UpMā.84\* obviously is a quotation introduced in both works, by extrametrical *jaṇ*".

<sup>51</sup> They recur in the *Viśeṣāvaśyaka-bhāṣya* of Jinabhadra-gaṇi as vss.1156\*, 1162\*,1166\* in Pt. Dalsukhabhai Malvania's edition: LDS.10.1966,pp.220-222.

¶6.4 Daśavaikālika-sūtra, IV.10\*a, is cited e.g. in III.§4.2 (B,p.52.1): *paḍhamam nāṇam tao dayā*. Vyavahāra-bhāṣya, I.291, corresponds to MNA III.119\* (Ernst Leumann). Many passages in the MNA remind us of similar or identical wordings in other canonical and post-canonical texts.

Even the title Mahānisiha-ajjhayaṇa or -suyakkhandha tries to connect our text with the Niśītha-sūtra which is a genuine, and an older, Chedasūtra, and thus with the Canon. The mutual relationship between the Kalpa-, Vyavahāra-, and Niśītha-sūtra has been discussed in detail by Schubring. In *Lehre* he says: "A reminiscence of the Niśītha-sūtra is to be found only in the fact that within the VIIth Chapter, in the so-called *Pacchitta-sutta*, are presented lighter forms of punishment for a great number of offences. At the same time, [the MNA,] this work of the later period tries to secure for itself a legitimacy through some connection with the old text of the Niśītha-sūtra"<sup>52</sup>.

¶6.5 In the subsequent time the MNA has been reflected in some later compositions, some of which may be mentioned here. (See also ¶1.12 for more details.)

(1) As Schubring (MNSt.A,pp.48-50) has proved, the *Susadha-kahā* / *-carita* of Devendra-sūri is a "metrical recast" of the VIIIth Chap. (*Susadha-kahā*) of the MNA. Even the story of Lakkhaṇadevī (Chap.VI.204\*ff.) was inserted by Devendra into his work, which is full of his own embellishments and avoids any verbatim citations of verses from the MNA.

(2) Ratnaśekhara-sūri has, in his *Ācāra-pradīpa* (Skt), composed in saṃvat 1516, cited in extracts a large part of MNA III.§3.15-§36.1 as his classical and canonical source.

(3) Some interesting passages of the MNA (e.g. III.§25, IV.§18<sup>Skt</sup>) were regarded as canonical and therefore worth citation and discussion by Dharmasāgara-sūri in his *Kupakṣa-kaṣikāditya* (Chap.III), composed in saṃvat 1629. Schubring (MNSt.A,pp.46) and Deleu (MNSt.B,pp.1f.) study the original also in the light of Dharmasāgara's comments. It is remarkable to observe how the MNA was drawn into later controversies amongst the Jaina clergy; this observation finds further support in the fact that

<sup>52</sup> It may be added here that the MNA claims for the Pancamangala-tract a series of Niryukti-Bhāṣya-Cūrṇi commentaries which, it says, are extinct! See III.§25.2.

Jñānasāgara, in his *avacūri* on *Caityavandana-bhāṣya*, vs.30 by Devendra cites MNA III.§25 (detected by Ernst Leumann).

(4) Other parallels, not so conspicuous as those registered above, are e.g. the *Ācāravidhi*, "chronologically near to the MNA" (Schubring, MNSt.A, p.55) and the still later *Angacūliyā* (ibid, p.54), and some more works which were then yet unpublished or unavailable to Schubring and other scholars. (5) In contrast, the MNA was denied any canonical authority by a number of schools which did not include it into their lists of the sacred texts (*āgama*). This point has been discussed by Schubring, MNSt.A, pp.99-101. Not only the dissident but also the orthodox doctors of the church must have found some of the views expressed in the MNA to be controversial, if not unacceptable or even heterodox.

¶6.6 Chart I MNA - Parallels (the correspondence is not always *verbatim*.)

Mahānisiha	Gacchācāra	Upadeśamāla	ĀvaśyakaNi.	Other texts
I.9		23		
I.10		84		
I.35			101	
I.36			102	
I.37			103	
III.3			1414	
III.36		492		Note (A)
III.37			192 bh	Note (A)
III.38			194 bh	Note (A)
III.56		494		
III.59		29		
III.60		30		
III.66		286		
III.67		279		
III.111		338		
III.112		339		

Mahānisiha	Gacchâcāra	Upadeśamāla	ĀvaśyakaNi.	Other texts
III.119		268		MNA.V.105
III.125				PiNi.669
III.126				92
III.127				93
III.128				408
III.129				409 = OhN.883
III.130				520 = OhN.884
III.131				636 = OhN.885
III.133				642
III.134				659
III.135				662
III.136				663
III.137				664
V.3	2			
V.4	3			
V.5	4			
V.6	5			
V.7	6			
V.8	7			
V.23	51			
V.24	52			
V.25	53			
V.26	54			
V.27	55			
V.30	56			
V.31	57			
V.32	58			
V.33	59			



Mahānisīha	Gacchâcāra	Upadeśamāla	ĀvaśyakaNi.	Other texts
V.43			666	
V.44			667	
V.45	60			
V.46	61			
V.47	62			
V.48	72			
V.50	71			
V.51	73			
V.52	74			
V.60	75			
V.61	77			
V.62	79			
V.64	82			
V.65	83			
V.66	85			
V.67	87			
V.68	88			
V.69	90			
V.71	129			
V.78	96			
V.83	91			
V.84	92			
V.85		182		
V.86	94			
V.87	95			
V.90		14		
V.91		15		
V.92			1190	

Mahānisiha	Gacchâcāra	Upadeśamāla	ĀvaśyakaNi.	Other texts
V.93			1191	
V.94			1186	
V.95			1195	
V.96	97			
V.97	98			
V.98	100			
V.100	101			
V.101	102			
V.102	27			
V.103	28			
V.104	30			
V.105		268		MNA.III.119
V.106	36			
V.107	37			
V.128				
VI.132	41			
VI.133	42			
VI.139	43			
VI.140	44			
VI.141	45			
VI.142	46			
VI.143	47			
VI.144	48			
VI.145	49			
VI.390		195		
VI.392		198		
VI.393		199		
VI.394		200		

Mahānisiha	Gacchâcāra	Upadeśamāla	ĀvaśyakaNi.	Other texts
VI.395		201		
VI.398		202		
VI.399		212		
VI.400		204		
VI.401		210		
VI.402		203		
VI.403		465		
VI.404		466		
VI.405		469		
VI.406		258		
VI.409		251		
VI.410		252		
VII.3.*6 (B)		92		
VIII.13.*4 (C)		394		

(A) III.36-38 recur in the *Puṣpamālā* (or *Upadeśamālā*) of Hemacandra maladhārin as vss.233\*-235\*, and III.36 is cited in his svopajña *Yogaśāstra-vṛtti* by ācārya Hemacandra kalikālasarvajña (Bibl.Ind. ed. by Dharmavijaya-sūri,p.504).

(B) See MNSt.C,p.75.38-39 and p.64,fn.1.

(C) See MNSt.C,p.96.35-36 and p.107 (in variants, line 5).

## ¶6.7 Chart II

## Gacchâcāra - Mahānīśītha

Gacch.	MNA	Gacch.	MNA	Gacch.	MNA	Gacch.	MNA
2	V.3	46	VI.142	62	V.47	92	V.84
3	V.4	47	VI.143	71	V.50	94	V.86
4	V.5	48	VI.144	72	V.48	95	V.87
5	V.6	49	VI.145	73	V.51	96	V.78
6	V.7	51	V.23	74	V.52	97	V.96
7	V.8	52	V.24	75	V.60	98	V.97
27	V.102	53	V.25	77	V.61	100	V.98
28	V.103	54	V.26	79	V.62	101	V.100
30	V.104	55	V.27	82	V.64	129	V.71
36	V.106	56	V.30	83	V.65	135	(A)
41	VI.132	57	V.31	85	V.66		
42	VI.133	58	V.32	87	V.67		
43	VI.139	59	V.33	88	V.68		
44	VI.140	60	V.45	90	V.69		
45	VI.141	61	V.46	91	V.83		

(A) This verse names the MNA as a source, see ¶6.1 where it is quoted.

## ¶7. DATE and AUTHORSHIP

¶7.0 In these sections we will only give a very brief note, for details see other sections, especially ¶8, where the detailed conclusions of both Schubring and Deleu are given in their contexts.

¶7.1 The problems of dating anonymous texts and also works of authors mostly known by their names only are, in the field of Indian literature, too familiar to scholars to find special mention here. The MNA is not an exception to this general situation.

¶7.2 The question that demands our attention first is: Is the MNA to be regarded as the *work* or composition of one individual, call him author or compilor, or does it belong to the category of anonymous and fluid *texts* which have grown step by step out of a kernel into their present forms. The answer to this question given by Schubring and others is: There is indeed the hand of a single person visible all through this composition and he is responsible for its present form. Though this person remains unknown (even his name is nowhere mentioned) his efforts to create a kind of unitary and "unique" text are evident in all parts of the MNA.

¶7.3 Taking into account the data provided by the parallel texts (see ¶6), especially the anonymous *Gacchâcāra* (date uncertain) and the *Upadeśamālā* of Dharmadāsa-gaṇi (ca. 900 A.D.), it seems nearly certain that the MNA must be anterior to both of them.

¶7.4 Presuming that the remark in III.§25 (see ¶9.4) is the latest interpolation and has been inserted, surely after the famous Nemicandra (13th cent. AD), into the nearly completed form of the MNA, it can safely be conjectured that it has to be dated between 900 and 1200 AD. This is, however, not to deny the fact that the main parts belong to a much earlier period, perhaps anterior to Haribhadra even, as Schubring suggests, and have been recast to fit into the superstructure.

¶7.5 The earliest evidence for its evaluation as a canonical authority is Ratnaśekhara, who composed his *Ācārapradīpa* in samvat 1516. An event recorded in the MNA can be dated earliest in ca. 640 AD.(MNA VII.§6: p.76.29-37, p.64; MNSt.A p.26; below ¶8.1.3). The Mahānisīha recorded in the Nandī- and Pākṣika-sūtra is surely not identical with the present MNA.

¶7.6 Deleu concludes: "It proves altogether impossible, for the time being, to establish the exact date of the Mahānisiha. The comparatively late date of its composition, however, is an incontestable fact. With regard to the old genuine canon the work undoubtedly is apocryphal" (p.1).

¶7.7 The Jaina tradition does not, on the one hand, ascribe the authorship of the MNA to any person of mythological or historical character, but it does, on the other hand, connect either one person like Jinabhadra-gaṇi or ācārya Haribhadra or several authoritative names with the "editorship" of the MNA.

¶7.8 The Ms(s), it says, being defective, some scholarly authority had to undertake an "edition", see e.g. the *Vividha-tīrtha-kalpa* or the *Prabhāvaka-carita* (¶8.1.7). (Similar reports are current about the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patanjali or the *Nāṭyaśāstra* "of Bharata", too). These legends may have originated in the remarks which appear in the MNA itself, which contains some passages in Chap.II-III-IV (see ¶9) wherein the very deplorable condition of "original Ms(s)" and the regulating efforts to create order in its text by Vajrasvāmin or Haribhadra are clearly mentioned.

¶7.9 The implications of the term "authorship" in Jaina context in particular are surely not the same as those which are now prevalent. A Jaina author would not, for instance, feel guilty of plagiarism if he cites verbatim or with modifications passages and especially verses from earlier literature, the less so if his source and his activity belong to the "sacred" or "ritual" domain. Mostly he quotes from memory, hence there are ample possibilities of an increase of variants or of *standardizing or even normalizing* the wording; he may at times use archaic forms to "lend his work a flavour of antiquity" (Deleu,p.1). Such was, it seems, the case with the compiler of the present MNA. He inserted remarks about his "work" at different places, and these remarks later on attracted further remarks (some sentences in III.§25, perhaps whole of IV.§18).

¶7.10 In the last century Ernst Leumann believed in the "editorship" of Haribhadra, but, as a result of his further studies for more than twenty years, he revoked his opinion in a letter dated 20th March,1917, see MNSt.B,p.174,fn.2. Similarly Schubring accepted some connection of the MNA with Haribhadra in his first study in 1918, but in 1963 he is more cautious in his expressions.

---

¶7.11 In brief, it should now be established clearly that neither Jinabhadra-gaṇin, the bhāṣyakṛt, nor ācārya Haribhadra, the Yākini-mahattarā-sūnu, can be credited with the composition or the editorship of the MNA. Equally certain is the result arrived at by Schubring and others that the MNA owes its present form to one person who was zealous in his ideas and strong in his views but less competent to fulfil his task as far as the language and the metrics are concerned.

## ¶8. CONCLUSIONS

by SCHUBRING and DELEU

¶8.0 Walther Schubring has summarised the results of his studies of the MNA at two places: (1) MNSt.A.1918,pp.95-101, and (2) MNSt.B.1963,pp.171-174. Here we present them in a free translation and with some abridgements. As 8.3 we reproduce some part of "A Preliminary Note" by Jozef Deleu (B,pp.1-2).

¶8.1 Schubring, MNSt.A,pp.95-101.

8.1.1 The most important question, in our opinion, arising out of our studies of the MNA is, whether the text should be regarded as the *WORK* of an individual author or as an anonymous *TEXT* belonging to the Canon. As it is now available, the MNA can, in one sense, be considered as a work, but the author, or rather compiler, has first created this composition out of elements which may, in most cases, be his own work, yet many of them are certainly of foreign origin, and these were either borrowed [verbatim] or at least utilized by him. The passages of transitional character from his pen would have been hardly necessary, if they were not needed to connect tracts of varying origin with one another. From the view point of language, the foreign origin is clearest in the case of the tract about sexuality (II.§10-24: B,pp.38-46) and about *kuṣīla* (III.§1.39-46: B,pp.50.68-71). both of which are composed in Ardhamāgadhī, unlike the rest which is in Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī (except, of course, the introduction to the text which is full of canonical phrases). From the view point of contents, there are numerous insertions in the Vth Chapter. In the *Pacchitta-sutta* we notice a rationality of not allowing extremism while determining the punishments; such extremism does appear in other parts of the MNA, rather just after the rationality mentioned above. We would also like to presume that the complete middle portion, not only the *kuṣīla*-tract, has been inserted into the superstructure. Besides the contents, its form deviating from the main portion, viz. both, the prose and the *āryā* verses, would support our presumption.

8.1.2 The spirit of a definite personality which still remains unknown to us has spread his typical cover of language over all material, his own or borrowed, including that in



Ardhamāgadhī. The compiler uses the nom.sing.masc. in *-e* / *-o* (mainly in *-e* in prose of non-narrative contents, exclusively in *-o* in verses); nom.pl.masc. in *-e* and *-ā* (in *-e* mainly in prose, in verses also in *-e*). In a general neglect of differentiation between genders, he tends to make neuter forms of words which are otherwise masculine. His prose suffers not seldom under the false excess of strange expressions and stylistic clumsiness. In verses, he is not afraid of creating the even pādas of *anuṣṭubh* containing seven *akṣaras*, and composes more gītis than āryās (contrast MNA.III.,37\*: B,p.59 with Āvaśyaka-niryukti, 1332<sup>Jñ</sup>, see MNSt.A,p.58); he does not get disturbed by the break in a verse caused by a prose interpolation. Typical of the compiler is the exuberance in his statements full of arithmetical figures. He exhibits certain insecurity in his relationship to the Canon. He has the tendency to mystify the written form of prayers and charms, which, he feels, are not meant for oral use. He inserts one protective charm to earn the favours of a *tāntrikā* goddess. Let us also mention that he is not in conversant with the brahmanical way of life. ... He has at least some idea about the secular sciences.

8.1.3 Certain peculiarities, evaluated singly, seem to point to a comparatively early date of the text. Yet, some other characteristics stand in contrast to them and point to a rather late date. The story of the nun Rajjā, for example, inserted into the MNA (VI.§6.1-36: C,pp.27-28), shows that the expressivity of the prose of the period was at its best; other narratives in our text are, however, much below the average. Moreover, the compiler, when he himself writes, uses exclusively the *anuṣṭubh*, although the *āryā* metre was dominant in his time. The question has to remain unanswered, as to how we are to explain these facts which run contrary to the period. One could well imagine that his is really a conscious attempt at antiquity, both in matter and in form of the MNA, as has been proved by us. This should, however, not mean that we can expect much more than what he could himself accomplish, as far as his mastery over the language and style enabled him. We would rather believe that the place where it was composed was at some distance from the centres of literary activities. The intermingling of alternative forms (in *-e/-o*) may rather hint at an area lying between the eastern parts (where *-e* was predominant) and the western ones (where *-o* was predominant); in other words, compared to Ardhamāgadhī, there is, in terms of geography, a shift towards the western region.

8.1.4 As far as the information which can be gathered directly from the text is concerned, it should be mentioned that the whole of the Jaina Canon (*āgama, siddhanta*) was known to the compiler as a standard corpus and the text regards itself as standing beyond the canonical limits. Also post-canonical texts are available to the compiler, see e.g. *pasatthāim siddhanta-(āyāra-)cariya-purāṇa-dhammakahāo* (III.§41.3: B,p.69), the adjective *pasatthāim* being a clear indication that these texts belong to the Jaina literature. As a legendary account of holy persons we meet with the *Arihanta-cariyā*; and the genre of narratives was certainly fairly developed. The citations from texts like the *Āvaśyaka-. Piṇḍa-, Ogha- and Daśavaikālika-niryukti*; and the *Vyavahāra-bhāṣya* show that the MNA is younger than all of them. One passage of the MNA (IV.§13: B,p.180.34-35) seems to have a very close connection with the now extinct *Praśnavyākaraṇa-cūrṇi*. Besides *Niryuktis* exegetical texts called *Samgrahaṇīs* are named. It is rather unbelievable when our text tells that prominent leaders of the Jaina Church held it in high esteem; perhaps Haribhadra is to be considered as an exception. According to trustworthy sources, he must have known the MNA. (It should be remembered that the language of the MNA differs from that of the *Samarāicca-kahā*.)

8.1.5 We can, therefore, say in brief that the period of the MNA lies between the exegetical texts in Prakrit and Haribhadra, who is now placed in the 9th cent. AD. Haribhadra's older contemporary was Dharmadāsa-gaṇi, whose *Upadeśa-mālā* has many verses in common with our text [see ¶6.2]. The borrower is most probably Dharmadāsa.

8.1.6 If the date of the compilation of our text is comparatively late, how it is, one may ask, that it could secure a place, though not uncontested, in the Canon among the Chedasūtras. The MNA is mentioned only once in the *Nandi-sūtra*<sup>53</sup>. The commentaries to the Nandi- and Pākṣika-sūtra explain the title by merely saying that because it is bigger than the Nīśitha-sūtra it is called Mahānīśitha. It is also likely that the title listed in the Nandi-sūtra belonged originally to a different text, whose traces could perhaps be discovered if we consider the *Pacchitta-sutta*. An examination of the atonements in the

<sup>53</sup> Ed. Muni Puṇyavijaya, Pt. Dalsukh Mālvaṇā, Pt. A.M.Bhojak: JĀG.1. 1968,p.32: §84), and this reference recurs in the *Pākṣika-sūtra*, with Yaśodeva's comm. ed. Candrasāgara-gaṇi (Śrīmad-Vijayabhaktisūriśvara-jaina-granthamālā, 3. saṃ.2006,p.124,line 3. See Yaśodeva' comm. (op.cit.p.126,lines 12-13: nīśitho madhya-rātris, tadvad rahobhūtaṃ yad adhyayanaṃ, tan nīśitham ācārāṅga-paṇcama-cūḍēty arthaḥ. asmād eva granthārthābhyāṃ mahattaraṃ mahānīśitham.

PcchS, if compared with those in other parts of the MNA, will show that they are heterogeneous; those in the PcchS could possibly be a remnant of the older and genuine Mahānīśītha.

8.1.7.1 Moreover, since long the inclusion of the MNA in the Canon has not been undisputed. The remark in Sanskrit (IV.§18: B,p.182) tells that the text is *ārṣa*, i.e. canonical. Another remark in Prakrit (III.§25, esp.11: B,p.63) goes further to give it an archaic authority: the MNA was held, it says, in high esteem (*-pamuhehiṃ juga-ppahāṇa-suyāharehiṃ bahu-manniyam iṇaṃ*) by prominent leaders like Siddhasena divākara. ... As this remark contains the name of Nemicandra, it must be dated in the 12th or rather 13th cent. AD. This remark seems to be directed against certain opponents and can be compared with Jinaprabha-sūri's note in his *Vidhimārgaprapā* (dated saṃvat 1363). Such opponents have been refuted also by Dharmasāgara-sūri in his *Kupakṣa-kauśikāditya* (saṃvat 1629). R.G.Bhandarkar (Rep.1883-84,p.148) in his analysis of Dharmasāgara's *KKĀ* says, "Chandraprabha and his sect as well as the Lumpāka and the Chaityavāsins do not recognise the Mahānīśītha at all". Candraprabha founded in saṃvat 1159 the branch called Pūrṇimā-, Paurṇimāyaka- or Paurṇamiyaka-gaccha.

8.1.7.2 We would be happy to know the exact reasons why these dissidents rejected the MNA. Not only the dissidents but also the conservatives must have found some elements in the MNA which they could not easily accept. Hence its sequence-number among the Chedasūtras is varying in different lists.

8.1.7.3 And for us, there is no doubt that the MNA should not be considered as a canonical text on account of its language, its contents, and also its date.

¶8.2 Schubring, MNSt.B,pp.171-174.

8.2.1 ... Regarding the Mss. used by us, my colleagues have given all details; on my part I would like to join them in heartily thanking Muni Shri Puṇyavijaya, whose willingness to help us by getting the film of one Ms. (Pu) prepared and sending it to Hamburg and lending us also the original of another Ms. (K) has been of immense value for our understanding of the textual transmission. The Ms. K belongs to the collection of Pravarttika Shri Muni Kāntivijaya and could be lent with the friendly consent of the local authorities, to them also we tender our sincere thanks. As we have been informed,

Muni Puṇyavijaya is himself preparing an edition of the complete Mahānisiha. Though we could not wait for his edition to be published, we await it with high expectations. It will be then easy and comfortable to study the Mahānisiha in one book, while it has to be studied at present in not less than three volumes, wherein three scholars have, for example, prepared five glossaries according to their individual preferences. The reader may excuse us for this uncomfortable situation. The editors can, however, claim to have critically worked upon the text.

8.2.2 Already in 1918, I attentively studied the then available Mss. which allowed me only a general survey; on the basis of better material and better understanding I would now not keep unchanged many of the views expressed therein. However, the following, along with some more, remarks retain their validity, if, at the end of my studies, I may characterize the curious work again.

8.2.3 The Mahānisiha does not fit into the framework of the Canon, although some stylistic devices have been employed to create such an impression. There are exegetical quotations in āryās. Besides *āgama* and *siddhanta* (!) younger literary genres are mentioned in the text. More than one *vijjā* = *vidyā* "charm" appear in magical script, where even Apabhraṃśa is not missing. The question of the residence (where should the monks stay: in sacred buildings or in private houses) is discussed with vehemence. The compiler is a zealot advocate of staunch discipline of monks. His attitude is due to the conditions of his time, which he observed. His is a period of decadence, caused by the notorious Kalkin (= Mihirakula). The prophecy in VII.44 (MNSt.C,p.88) refers to a date "a little more than 1250 years" after Mahāvīra's nirvāṇa, traditionally dated 527 BC. (*addha-terasaṇhaṃ vāsa-sayāṇaṃ sāiregāṇaṃ samaikkantāṇaṃ parao*: C,p.88.7), i.e. to a date little later than 623 AD; this date lies nearly one hundred years after the victory over Kalkin in 527 AD. In this wording we detect a hint for the date of the MNA.

8.2.4 The compiler deals zealously with the personal and social behaviour of the monks and nuns, individually and collectively, and towards the gaccha (a new term instead of the older *gaṇa*), and as a leader of the gaccha. Of the monks he demands an absolute honesty in admitting their offences and in faithfully executing the penance and atonement. The results of bad behaviour are indeed dreadful in this world and also in the worlds hereafter. We get astronomical figures which denote the duration of

existences, and an unimaginable lengthy series of catch-words which emphasize their number. Limitless is, on the other hand, the gain won by the unconditional confession which is the Absolute Knowledge (*kevala-jñāna*). It is astonishing to observe, how, according to our text, a monk or a nun, just because of honest confession, equals a muni who, as the old texts describe, has to practice indescribable asceticism and deepest concentration to achieve *kevala-jñāna*.

8.2.5 In another point, the compiler takes recourse to over-simplification. The protection of all living beings is naturally demanded [by Jainism], conspicuous in our text is the emphasis attached to the protection of souls in water- and fire-bodies. This may have been caused by a certain negligence which had spread in the Jaina sangha. Every now and then the water and fire (*āu + teu*) are connected with *mehuṇa*. *Maithuna* is namely an extraordinary case of *prāṇâtipāta*. because in the *yoni* of a woman exist innumerable (to be precise 900.000) living beings, and they are destroyed by the sexual activity. This is surely an invention of the compiler, may be inspired by the *Prajñāpanā-sūtra*.

8.2.6 The legends in this text may be equally ascribed to the compiler, even when he is dependent on his source (Nandiseṇa, Meghamālā), or when he completely borrows it (Rajjā). The Mahānisiha is in any case a conglomerate prepared intentionally as has been examined in detail and proved beyond doubt by us in MNSt.A. In this text inspired by the Canon, there is naturally Ardhamāgadhī to a considerable extent amongst the Jaina-Māhārāṣṭrī, and this is in a partly degenerated condition. The grammatical gender is mostly neglected, verbal forms are at places debased; the nom.sg.masc. ends, like that of pronouns, in *-e*. As there is no parallel case, we can regard all this as vagaries of the compiler, and we may add his numerous incorrect ślokas and his naiveté in matters of dogma. He is a learned deviant (*Außenseiter*) and his text is an Apocryph to the Canon (*siddhānta*). This text, to freely quote Martin Luther, "does not equal the Holy Script, still is useful and easy to read".

8.2.7 This was and is, however, not always the attitude towards the MNA. The Sthānakavāsī because of their orthodox position reject it, as the idols of the Jina are dealt with therein, and they reject also the temples where the idols are worshipped. Even earlier, before the period of a thousand years, the MNA, though included in the

Canon had not been subjected to the well known successive stages of commentaries, [not a single *ṭikā* is available]. An anonymous complains about the miserable condition of the original he was copying, at the same time he defends the MNA. The name of Haribhadra included in this notice may be accepted, who, about the middle of the 8th century AD, might have held in his hands a copy of the text; but the revision of the text ascribed to Haribhadra (III.§25.10: ¶9.4) is not probable. According to the remarks in IV.§18 (see ¶9.7) Haribhadra had his doubts about certain details in the narrative. He might have, therefore, put aside the whole text, as a result of which the Ms. suffered the damages mentioned (see I.§28.3: B,p.30; also A,p.4; Weber, HTJ,p.456). That these damages occurred before Haribhadra is, in view of the shortness of intervening period, not probable, inspite of such remarks in the *Prabhāvaka-carita* of Prabhācandra<sup>54</sup> which clearly follows I.§28.3 of our text. Utilizing III.§25.10, the *Vividha-tīrtha-kalpa* of Jinaprabha-sūri (see JRK,p.160: Tīrtha-k., composed between saṃvat 1365-1390) reports a similar legend, where not Haribhadra, but the much earlier Jinabhadra-gaṇi is brought into picture. If either of these great scholars (Jinabhadra or Haribhadra) had revised the text of the MNA, he would not have allowed so many linguistic and metrical defects and peculiarities in the text to remain uncorrected.

8.2.8 In a kind of expansion, the note in III.§25 goes even further than the material data and the work of a single person is turned into the activity of a large convent of scholars. When the scribe seeks authority in great names, he rather discloses the aloofness of the MNA; the respect due to an authentic text of the Canon would have been too self-evident to need any emphasis. The list of the names is out of sequence and mysterious. [See Deleu's remarks in ¶8.3.] Because of the name of Nemicandra (saṃvat 1278) this note has to be dated as late as the 13th cent. AD. which means that it is comparatively late. The tradition that the Canon owes its origin to Mahāvīra and its authorship to Gaṇadhara (see *Āvaśyaka-niryukti*, vs.92) has been applied to the MNA too, mainly for the purposes of defence. Simultaneously the exegetical sequence of

<sup>54</sup> See Prabhācandra, *Prabhāvaka-carita*, ed. Jinavijaya Muni (Bombay: SJS. 13. 1940), IXth Haribhadra-car., vs.219 on p.75:

cira-likhita-viśirṇa-varṇa-bhagna-pravivara-patra-samūha-pustakastham |  
kuśala-matir ihōddadhāra jainōpaniṣadikaṃ sa Mahānīśītha-śāstram ||

See also Deleu, MNSt.B, p.2, fn.2, lines 5-6.

*Niryukti-Bhāṣya-Cūrṇi* for the *Pancamangala*-tract, interpolated by the patriarch Vajrasvāmin (1st cent. AD) has been simply imagined, it never existed. The word *vāyaṇā* in III.§46 (B,p.71) refers surely to variants and not to recensions. According to passages discussed in MNSt.A,p.2ff. there were recensions [the *Jaina-Granthâvalī* registers three] and the expression *pāṇa* = *prāyasā* occurring in the *granthâgra*-verse (see ¶9.8) refers surely to recensions. This means that we have now the *Vulgata* before us.

8.2.9 We may now return to Haribhadra. Did he leave his own traces in the phrase *śeṣaṃ tu Praśnavyākaraṇa-vṛddhavivaraṇād avaseyam* (IV.§13: see ¶9.6)? There is a collection of similar phrases prepared by Ernst Leumann and now available in his left papers [in Hamburg]; this list makes it clear that Haribhadra used similar expressions to refer to other texts and works. However, we know of no predecessor(s) of Abhayadeva, who wrote his commentary on the 10th Anga four centuries after Haribhadra and who does not mention any older commentator. Hence a later person could adduce only Abhayadeva in his support. Therefore, the composer and the purport of this note (IV.§13) remain unknown.

### ¶8.3 Deleu, MNSt.B,pp.1-2

"...We may further point out the fact that such symptoms as the tantrism of the *vidyās* (A,pp.74ff.) and the *caityavāsin* way of living (denounced by our author, esp[ecially] in Chap.V) are typical of a period of decadence.

In view of these facts the many devices the author uses to lend his work a flavour of antiquity are not very convincing. Neither are some of the allegations we read in I.§28.2f. and III.§25, §46. I would not go so far, however, as to reject all of them. After all, the words *bahu-gantham parigaliyam* (I.§28.3) might apply to the dubious passage we indeed find in I.145\*ff. And, esp[ecially] because of the interpolation concerning *upadhāna*, the construction of Chap.III is, in fact, as loose as III.§25.7 contends it is. Moreover, the passages from the *suya-samudda* (III.§46.7) that are said to have taken the place of a *bahum gantham vippanattham* are perhaps nothing but the many quotations we find in III.§44. Consequently, I do not think it necessary to disbelieve the

assertion that the original (*puv'āyariṣa*, *mūl'ādarisa*) was quite damaged<sup>1</sup>, nor even the fact of this original having been patched up by one or more revisors. This, for one thing, would in some degree account for the numerous grammatical and metrical peculiarities of our text. Yet as soon as we consider the names referred to in III.§25 our suspicion is raised, and justly so. Even Haribhadra's dealing with our text cannot be proved beyond doubt<sup>2</sup>. As for the list of teachers who are said to have held the MNA in high esteem, it is too much a heterogeneous muddle (even from the chronological point of view) to deserve great credit<sup>3</sup>. Not to mention the role attributed to Vajrasvāmin (1st cent.) and the existence of Niryuktis, Bhāṣyas and Cūrṇis which exegetical stages could not possibly develop but on the well-defined texts of the old canon."

\* \* \* \* \*

#### ¶9. PASSAGES

¶9.0 Some passages of the MNA have, because of their unusual contents, attracted the attention of A.Weber and W.Schubring, who quote and discuss them. In our Report also they are mentioned at more than one place. We give their wording and in the case of passages 1-5 attach also the English translation by Deleu.

<sup>1</sup> It is even possible that our text has superseded an older work of the same name, see MNSt.A,p.99.

<sup>2</sup> I do not believe, however, that some later namesake of the famous Haribhadra (8th cent.) is meant in III.§25.10 and in the colophon of IV. According to Prabhācandra's Haribhadra-carita [see above fn.54] it was the author of the "Samarārka-caritra" who saved the MNA: *cira-likhita-* [etc.] (vs.219). Yet according to Jinaprabhasūri's *Vividhatīrthakalpa* (samvat 1389 ...) it was Jinabhadra the Kṣamāśramaṇa: *ittha* (i.e. in Mathurā) *deva-nimmiya-thūbhe pakkha-kkhamaneṇa devayaṃ ārahittā Jinabhadda-Khamāsamanehiṃ uddehiā-bhakkhiya-putthaya-pattattaṇeṇa tuṭṭaṃ bhaggaṃ Mahānisihaṃ samdhiaṃ* (p.19). ... Perhaps the author of the Visessāvassayabhasa and the Jiyakappa (7th cent.?) is meant. See also MNSt.C,p.66 where Schubring points out a prophecy (in MNA VII.§44) bearing on the beginning of the 8th cent.

<sup>3</sup> Vṛddhavādīn's pupil, the famous logician Siddhasena Divākara, and the well-known commentator Jinadāsa-Gaṇin (both belonging to the 7th cent.) are mentioned in one breath together with the equally well-known author Nemicandra (13th cent.). The other names either are wholly unknown (Yakṣasena) or leave us in doubt as to who is meant. One Devagupta (Umāsvāti's commentator?), who is called a mahākavi, is mentioned in the praśasti of Uddyotanasūri's Kuvalayamālā (Śaka 700, see Sandesara, Literary Circle of Mahāmātya Vastupāla (SJS.33.1953), par.17). There is one Yaśovardhana who wrote a Pramāṇāntaḥstava (Jesalmere, No.1194) and we know a Ravigupta who was the author of a Candraprabhavijaya (Madras Govt.[Or.Mss.]Libr. *Velankar*, 3.8.60). Their dates are unknown. Since the term Kṣamāśramaṇa, as a rule, follows the name, I think that Kṣamāśramaṇaśiṣya refers to Yaśovardhana. The rather obscure Yaśovardhana is not likely to have been called a Kṣamāśramaṇa himself. The title is generally used with reference to the famous Devarddhi Gaṇin (5th cent.) but it has also been conferred on Siddhasena Divākara, Jinabhadra, Dinna Gaṇin, one Jakkhadatta and one Simha. Note, finally that sonorous terms such as *ṛṣi* and *yugapradhāna* completely lose their specific meaning in this context and, consequently, fail to impress us.



¶9.1 MNA. I.§28.2-3 (p.30). Also see SLJ,p.182,fn.86; MNSt.A,p.4,No.1.

2. eyassa ya kulihya-doso na dāyavvo suyaharehim.

3. kiṃtu jo c' eva eyassa puvv'-āyariso āsi, tatth' eva katthai silogo, katthai silog'addham, katthai pay'akkharam, katthai akkhara-pantiyā, katthai paṇṇaga-putthiyam, katthai be-tiṇṇi paṇṇagāṇi evam-āi-bahu-gantham parigaliyam ti.  
CHA.

Deleu,p.94:

(2) And the Doctors should not put the blame on the [foregoing] that it has been badly copied.

(3) Rather [consider this]: in that which was its original copy, sometimes a śloka, sometimes half a śloka, sometimes an *akṣara* of a word, sometimes a series of *akṣaras*, sometimes one side of a leaf, sometimes two [or] three leaves etc., consequently a great deal of text, had vanished.

¶9.2 II.§37.2 (p.49)

2. eesiṃ tu doṇham pi ajjhayaṇāṇam vihi-puvvagenam savva-sāmannam vāyaṇam ti.

Deleu,p.118:

(2) The reading of both these chapters [must] wholly and entirely [be done] according to rule.

¶9.3 III.1 (p.50). Also see SLJ,p.182,fn.89.

5\* biy' 'ajjhayaṇe 'mbile panca nav' uddesā tahiṃ bhava.  
taie solasa uddese aṭṭha tatth' eva ambile.

6\* jam taie, tam cautte vi. pancamammi ch' āyambile;  
chaṭṭhe do sattame tiṇṇi; aṭṭhame āyambile dasa  
añikkhita-bhatta-pāṇe.

§6 na saṃghaṭṭeṇam ime *Mahānisīha*-vara-suyakkhandham voḍhavvam ca āūttaga-pāṇagenam ti.

Deleu,p.119:

5\* While [reading] the second chapter there must be five *ācāmlas* and nine lessons (*uddesā*); while [reading] the third sixteen lessons and eight *ācāmlas*;

6\* the fourth [must be read] in the same way as the third; with the fifth six *ācāmlas* [are required], with the sixth two, with the seventh three [and] with the eighth ten *ācāmlas*,

[all this while] the food and drink [obtained by begging] have not been taken [from the dish]. And [the recitation of] this excellent Book *Mahānisīha* may [only] be performed with breath checked, not with uninterrupted breath.

¶9.4 III.§25 (pp.62-3). Also cited and discussed by Sch.MNSt.A,p.4-5,No.2.

1. eyaṃ tu jaṃ *pancamangala*-mahāsuyakkhandhassa vakkhāṇaṃ, taṃ mahayā pabandheṇaṃ aṇanta-gama-pajjavehiṃ, suttassa ya pihab-bhūyāhiṃ nijjuttī-bhāsa-cuṇṇihiṃ jahēva aṇanta-nāṇa-daṃsaṇa-dharehiṃ titthayarehiṃ vakkhāṇiyaṃ, tahēva samāsao vakkhāṇijjaṃ taṃ āsi.
2. aha annayā kāla-parihāṇi-doseṇaṃ tāo nijjuttī-bhāsa-cuṇṇiō vucchinnāo.
3. io ya vaccanteṇaṃ kāla-samaeṇaṃ mah'iddhī-patte payāṇusārī Vaira-sāmī nāma duvālas'anga-suyahare samuppanne.
4. teṇ' eyaṃ *pancamangala*-mahāsuyakkhandhassa uddhāro mūla-suttassa majjhe lihiō.
5. mūla-suttaṃ puṇa suttattāe gaṇaharehiṃ, atthattāe arahantehiṃ bhāḡavantehiṃ dhamma-titthaṃkarehiṃ tiloga-mahiyehiṃ Vira-jiṇ'indehiṃ paṇṇaviyaṃ ti.
6. esa vuḍḍha-sampayāo.
7. ettha ya jattha jattha payampayeṇānulaggaṃ sutt'ālāvagaṃ na sampajjai, tattha tattha suyaharehiṃ kulihya-doso na dāyavvo tti.
8. kimtu jo so eyassa acinta-cintāmaṇi-kappa-bhūyassa *Mahānisīha*-suya-kkhandhassa puvv'-āyario āsi, tahiṃ c' eva khaṇḍākhaṇḍie uddehiyāiehiṃ heūhiṃ bahave paṇṇagā parisāḍiyā.
9. tahā vi, "accanta-sumah'atthāisayaṃ ti imaṃ *Mahānisīha*-suya-kkhandhaṃ kasiṇa-pavayaṇassa parama-sāra-bhūyaṃ paraṃ tattaṃ mah'atthaṃ" ti kaliūṇaṃ,
10. pavayaṇa-vacchalattaṇeṇaṃ bahu-bhavva-sattōvayāriyaṃ ca kāuṃ, tahā ya āyahiy'atthāe āyariya-Haribhaddenāṃ jaṃ tattha āyarise diṭṭhaṃ, taṃ savvaṃ samatiē sāhiūṇaṃ lihiyaṃ ti.
11. annehiṃ pi Siddhasēṇa-divākara--Vuḍḍhavāi--Jakkhasēṇa--Devagutta--Jasavaddhaṇa-khamāsamaṇa-sissa-Ravigutta--Nemicanda-Jiṇadāsa-gaṇi-khamaga--savva-risi-pamuhehiṃ juga-ppahāṇa-suyaharehiṃ bahu-manniyam iṇaṃ ti. CHA.

Deleu, pp.136-7

- (1) Now whereas the Tirthaṃkaras who possess infinite knowledge and belief have expounded this explanation of the Great Text of Pancamangala in a great commentary, with [an] infinite [number of] sentences and paragraphs, and in Nirvyuktis, Bhāṣyas and Cūrṇis independent from the sacred text [itself], it here had to be expounded in brief.
- (2) Now one day, owing to the wane of time, these Nirvyuktis, Bhāṣyas and Cūrṇis disappeared.
- (3) Thereupon, as time went by, the [saint] named Vajrasvāmin appeared, who knew the traditional lore of the twelve Angas, who had magic forces [and] the gift for combination.
- (4) He [it was who] inserted an extract of the Great Text of Pancamangala in the original text [of the Mahānisiha].
- (5) As to [its] wording the original text has been enunciated by the Chief Disciples (*gaṇadhara*), as to [its] inner sense by the Arhat, the venerable Dharmatīrthaṃkara [and] Master of the Three Worlds, the great Jina [Mahā]vīra.
- (6) This is the old tradition.
- (7) Add to this that wherever a paragraph of the text lacks exact coherence, the Doctors should not put the blame on it that it has been badly written,
- (8) but [one must consider that] many leaves of the original copy of the inconceivable wishing-stone-like Great Text of the Mahānisiha that was [available] had partly gone to pieces owing to white ants and other causes.
- (9) Yet, esteeming this Book Mahānisiha [to] rank exceedingly high for [its] very important subject-matter, [to be indeed] the most essential, most true [and] most important part of the whole lore,
- (10) the *ācārya* Haribhadra, out of love for the lore [and] in order to help many beings receptive [to salvation] as well as for his own benefit, wrote down what he had seen in that [original] copy, putting everything in order at his discretion.
- (11) This [text] has also been highly esteemed by the other chief Doctors of the epoch, all the Rishis Siddhasena Divākara, Vṛddhavādin, Yakṣasena, Devagupta, Yaśovardhana [who was Devarddhi Gaṇi-]Kṣamāśramaṇa's pupil Ravigupta<sup>55</sup>, Nemicandra, Jinadāsa Gaṇi-Kṣamaka<sup>56</sup> etc.

<sup>55</sup> I would rather prefer to translate: "Ravigupta, the pupil of Yaśovardhana kṣamāśramaṇa", thus dropping the brackets inserted by Deleu.

<sup>56</sup> This is surely a reference to the famous Jinadāsa gaṇi kṣamāśramaṇa, the author of the *Niśīthabhāṣya-viśeṣacūṇi* and other works.

¶9.5 III.§46 (p.71). Also cited and discussed by Sch.MNSt.A,p.5,No.3.

1. tahā osannesu jāṇe, n' etthaṃ lihijjai.
2. pāsatto nāṇa-m-ādiṇaṃ.
3. sacchande ussutt'-ummagga-gāmi.
4. sabale n' etthaṃ lihijjati gantha-vitthara-bhayā.
5. bhagavayā uṇa etthaṃ patthāve kusil'ādī mahayā pabandheṇaṃ paṇṇavie.
6. etthaṃ ca jā jā katthai ann'-anna-vāyaṇā, sā sumuṇiya-samaya-sārehiṃ  
no paoseyavvā, jao mūl'-ādarise c' eva bahūṃ ganthaṃ vippanaṭṭhaṃ.
7. tahiṃ ca jattha jattha saṃbandhāṇulaggaṃ ganthaṃ saṃbajjhāi, tattha tattha  
bahuehiṃ suyaharehiṃ saṃmiliṇaṃ s'angōvanga-duvālas'-angāo suya-samuddāo  
anna-m-anna-anga-uvanga-suya-kkhandha-ajjhayaṇ'-uddesagāṇaṃsamucchiṇiṇa  
kiṃci kiṃci saṃbajjhamāṇaṃ etthaṃ lihiyaṃ, na uṇa sa-kavvaṃ (= sva-kāvyam)  
kayaṃ ti.

Deleu,p.149:

- (1) Moreover: as to the languid [monks] (*avasanna*) know that nothing is written in this [book].
- (2) The inert [monks] (*pārśvastha*) [are to be classified] in connection with knowledge etc.
- (3) The self-willed [monks] (*svacchanda*) walk in a wrong way, deviating from the sacred texts.
- (4) The stained [monk] (*śabala*) is not described here lest the book become too voluminous.
- (5) Yet on this occasion the Venerable One has dealt with the *kuśilas* etc. in a great commentary [*prabandha*].
- (6) And in case this or that variant [of the text] should come to light, it must not be rejected by the experts in the doctrine, because in the original copy much text has been lost.
- (7) Besides, wherever a coherent and continuous text [had to be] constructed, a congregation of many Doctors has gathered some [passages] from the books, chapters and lessons (*uddeśa*) of the different Angas and Upāṅgas of [that] ocean of Tradition, the Twelve Sections of Angas and Upāṅgas, has brought them together [and] has written them here. Yet they have not given products of their own.

¶9.6 IV.§13 (Skt.) (p.180,l.34-35)

śeṣaṃ tu *Praśnavyākaraṇa*-vṛddha-vivaraṇād avaseyam.

"The rest has to be understood from the old commentary on the P."

¶9.7 IV.§18 (Skt.) (p.182). Also quoted and discussed by A.Weber, SLJ,p.182,fn.87 and Schubring,MNSt.A,p.6 (where (3) is ommitted).

- 1) atra caturthādhyayane bahavaḥ saiddhāntikāḥ kecid ālāpakān na samyak śraddadhaty eva, tair aśraddadhānair asmākam api na samyak śraddhānam ity āha Haribhadra-sūriḥ.
- 2) na punaḥ sarvam evēdaṃ caturthādhyayanam, anyāni vā adhyayanāni, asy = aiva katipayaiḥ parimitair ālāpakair aśraddhānam ity arthaḥ.
- 3) yataḥ Sthāna-Samavāya-Jivābhigama-Prajñāpanādiṣu na kathamcid idam ācakhye yathā: Pratisaṃtāpasthalam asti, tad guhā-vāsinas tu manujās teṣu ca paramādharmikāṇāṃ punaḥ-punaḥ saptāṣṭa-vārān yāvad upapātas, teṣāṃ ca tair dāruṇair vajra-śilā-gharaṭṭa-saṃputair galitānāṃ paripīḍyamānānāṃ api saṃvatsaram-yāvat prāṇa-vyāpattir na bhavatīti.
- 4) vṛddha-vādas tu punar yathā: tāvad idam *ā r ṣ a - s ū t r a ṃ*, vikṛtīr tāvad atra na praviṣṭā, prabhūtās cātra śruta-skandhe arthāḥ, suṣṭhv atīśayena sātīśayāni gaṇadharōktāni cēha vacanāni.
- 5) tad evaṃ sthite na kiṃcid āśankaniyam !

#### IV.§18 (Dt.Übersetzung von WSch,p.216)

- (1) Hāribhadra Sūri hat gesagt, viele Gelehrte könnten gewissen Ausführungen in diesem 4.Kapitel nicht recht Glauben schenken, und nach ihrem Vorgang auch er selbst nicht.
- (2) Das betrifft aber nicht dies ganze 4.Kapitel oder (gar) andere Kapitel, (sondern) nur einige ganz bestimmte Ausführungen in eben diesem hier.
- (3) Denn auf keine Weise ist im Sthāna, Samavāya, Jivābhigama, in der Prajñāpanā und anderen Werken gesagt, daß es ein (Land namens) Pratisaṃtāpasthala gibt mit Höhlenbewohnern, als welche besonders große Sünder immer wieder, sieben- oder achtmal verkörpert werden, die man, nachdem sie in diamantharte, steinerne, mühlenartige Schalen gefallen sind, ein Jahr lang foltert, ohne daß sie sterben können.
- (4) Schon längst aber heißt es: "Wir haben ein echtes Sūtra vor uns, es ist nichts darin geändert worden, dieser Textblock ist sehr vielseitigen Inhalts und die Aussprüche der Gaṇadharas, an sich schon erhaben, sind es hier ganz besonders".
- (5) Unter diesen Umständen darf man nichts anzweifeln!

English rendering:

- (1) Haribhadrasūri has said: many Doctors could not put right faith in certain passages in this fourth chapter, and neither he, following their precedence.
- (2) That does not however concern the complete fourth chapter, or even other chapters, but only certain specific passages in this one only.
- (3) Because it is in no way told in the Sthāna, Samavāya, Jivābhigama, Prajñāpanā and other books: There is a (country called) Pratisaṃtāpasthala where there are cave-dwellers who are reborn seven or eight times as specially worse sinners and who can suffer tormentation for one year after their fall into rocky hemisphere like grinding stones without dying.
- (4) Since long it is being told: we have an authentic sūtra before us, wherein nothing has been changed. This text-block is of multifarious contents and especially the proclamations of the gaṇadharas which are in themselves extraordinary are of special value.
- (5) Under such circumstances there is nothing to be doubted.

¶9.8 The *granthāgra* verse reads (A.Weber, SLJ,p.185; MNSt.A,p.4,fn.1; B,p.174,fn.1; Puṇyavijaya, Cat.ŚBh.Cby,p.60,#34, p.61,#35; Kapadia,Cat.BhORI,17.2,p.31,#457):

*cattāri saḥassāiṃ panca-sayāo tahēva \*cattāri\* /  
cattāri silogā viya Mahānisīhammi pāeṇa //4544.*

Schubring (B,p.174,fn.1) suggests that in place of *\*cattāri\** one should rather expect *cālisaṃ*. Variants in Cat.ŚBh.Cby,#34 are: *\*pancāsā\**, *ganthaggaṃ* (instead of *pāeṇa*), and 4554.

## ¶10. REVIEWS

¶10.0 With the kind permission of the institutions concerned we reproduce four reviews of MNSt.B and C..

¶10.1 MNSt.C.1951 reviewed by Alfred Master in JRAS.1951,p.154.

The *Mahānisīha* is one of the six Jaina *Chedasūtras* or Rules of atonement for breaches of religious vows. They are expounded by question and answer and in exemplary legends. The meaning of the title is obscure, the root *nīsidh-* "prohibit", being perhaps the best guess.

Professor Schubring wrote an account of this work in 1918 and three chapters are now published for the first time with introductions and *variae lectiones*. Dr. Hamm, who edits ch.VI, adds notes and a glossary; Professor Schubring gives only a list of the more important words with Sanskrit equivalents. The introductions also differ in scope. Dr. Hamm's describes the legends, language, and metres of the sixth chapter, while Professor Schubring deals with the doctrinal aspects and technical terms of his two chapters.

Dr. Hamm, who is a pupil of Professor Schubring, agrees with him that the language of the text is "Jaina Mahārāṣṭrī mit einem bald stärkeren, bald schwächeren Einschlag von Ardhamāgadhī", but it is doubtful if the description has real linguistic significance, as the difference between Jaina Mahārāṣṭrī on the one hand and Lyrical and Dramatic Mahārāṣṭrī on the other lies almost entirely in the degree of stylization. There is no Jaina Mahārāṣṭrī uninfluenced by Ardhamāgadhī, and even the other forms are not so consistently stylized as some Western editors would have us believe. Unfortunately in matters of this kind we are at the mercy of undated texts and the vagaries of copyists. For example, in ch.VI, verse 86\*, occurs the form *cche* for (a)*cchai*. The spelling *e* for *ai* does not appear till after the fifteenth century, when Mahārāṣṭrī was no longer used.

The message of the text is, however, not affected by such verbal minutiae and the work is a valuable addition to the literature on Jainism.

One would have liked a somewhat fuller table of contents. The list of abbreviations is unexpectedly buried on p.41, between the *variae lectiones* and the notes.

ALFRED MASTER

¶10.2 MNSt.B.1963 reviewed by A.N.Upadhye in ZDMG.114.1964,pp.457-8.

The *Mahānisīha* is a remarkably exhaustive treatise; and by virtue of its contents and mixed metrical and prose styles, it is a significant work of the Cheyasutta group of the Jaina Canon. Like the Vinaya texts of the Buddhists, it covers elaborately the rules of conduct of Jaina monks and punishment of offences against them.

The work is divided into Eight Chapters. It begins with the recounting of confessions and elaborates the consequences of evil acts and the importance of

*pancamangala*. A number of illustrative stories are embedded in the text; and throughout it is impressed with the idea that devotion to monastic life must be without any condition.

It is to that great savant, Prof. Dr. W. SCHUBRING, the unquestioned authority on the Jaina canonical studies, that we owe the first critical study of this work (*Das Mahānisiha-sutta*, Berlin 1918). Later, along with F.-R. HAMM he gave us an edition (in the above studies, No.6. Hamburg 1951) of Chapters VI-VIII, with a critical observation, variants and lists of words. More or less on the same pattern are presented here the remaining Chapters (I-V) of the *Mahānisiha*, the first three by J. DELEU and the other two by W. SCHUBRING himself. Here, however, in addition to the critical Introductions etc. we are given the translations of the chapters edited, in English by DELEU and German by SCHUBRING. These renderings are very meticulous and very useful for the study of the contents of this work in details.

The problems about the authenticity of the text as a whole and its age are very intriguing. May be that the work has grown from time to time round an older kernel, something like the Chapter VII, the *Pacchittasutta*. The internal references, the nature of the language and the verbose style clearly indicate, as shown in the Preliminary Note, a comparatively late date for this work. The association of a number of authors with it, as culled out from various traditions, is uncertain and complicated. We get here a good glimpse into the critical apparatus of the Editors who have presented a dialectally normalized text according to accepted discipline for Prākṛit works of this class. With the entire text duly published it should now be possible for others to work out in details the relation of the *Mahānisiha* with other texts of the Jaina canon and allied branches of Indian literature.

Dr. W. SCHUBRING and his younger colleagues have given us a worthy edition of this work which really enriches our knowledge of the Jaina monastic literature and enhances the prestige of the Series in which it has appeared.

A.N.UPADHYE, KOLHAPUR

¶10.3 MNSt.B.1963 reviewed by K.R.NORMAN in BSOAS.27.1964,pp.631-2

In 1918 Professor Schubring published *Das Mahānisiha-Sutta* (APAW,1918), a survey of the form and contents of the Jain canonical *Cheyasutta* text. In 1951 he published, with Dr. F.-R. Hamm, a critical edition of chapters VI-VIII of this text, and now in collaboration with Dr. J. Deleu he has produced this edition of the first five chapters, Deleu being responsible for I-III and Schubring himself for IV-V. The edition is based upon the MSS used in 1951 and two others which have become available since then. One of these contains a Gujarātī *ṭabbā* which has proved, however, 'disappointingly insignificant'.

Dr. Deleu prefixes to his section an introduction in English, and adds an English translation. Professor Schubring gives a brief introduction and a somewhat truncated translation, both in German. Both editors give explanatory notes and lists of selected words, and correct where necessary the 1918 and 1951 publications. In his introduction Dr. Deleu gives a survey of the interesting features of the grammar of chapters I-III, and draws attention to some points not mentioned in Pischel's grammar, including such contractions as *indi-* < *indiya-*, and the use of adverbial genitive forms in *-assa* e.g.



*calacalacalassa*. He concludes that although it is impossible to date *Mahānisīha*, it is clearly a late composition, the occasional archaic form being a deliberate attempt by the author to invest his work with the sanctity of antiquity.

The editors have tackled the frequent obscurities and occasional corruptions of the Prakrit text with ability. Dr. Deleu's section appears as a fairly coherent portion of three chapters of theorizing about the extraction of the *śalyas*, the explanation of the ripening of *karma*, and the avoidance of unworthy monks, whose bad attributes are categorized at great length in a typical Jain manner. This section serves as a prelude to the more legendary chapters which follow. The fourth chapter tells the story of Sumai and Nāila, and the fifth, entitled *Navanīyasāra*, includes a long section on the relationship between the teacher and the *gaccha*.

The complaints which can be made against this book arise mainly from the fact that the two editors have worked separately, and there is a resultant lack of unity in their notes and indexes. Select lists are always open to the objection that one editor's selection may not coincide with another's, but in this case readers can be misled when, for example, Schubring lists *āsāyaṇā*, while Deleu does not, although he devotes a note to it (p.153); similarly, Deleu lists *cunṇajoga* with a reference to Hamm's note on the word, but Schubring does not, although he has a footnote about it on p.234, with a reference to Jacobi's note on p.133 of SBE,XLV. Other examples could be given, and one feels that extra time spent in combining the indexes and standardizing the notes, with an extension of the grammatical study to cover Professor Schubring's chapters, would have made this volume even more useful.

There are some points which call for comment: the traditional derivation of *sasarakkha* < *sarajaska* was questioned by Charpentier (*Uttarādhyayanāsūtra*, p.341), who suggested \**saśaraska*; *saḍahaḍassa* is probably < *śatati* not *śaṭati*, cf. Schubring's derivation of *sāḍaṇa* < *śātana*; Pischel (para.550) takes *labbh-* as a passive used actively rather than doubling of the consonant *metri causa*; to refer to *vosirai* as being an example of the interchange of *ut-* and *ava-* is surprising in view of the derivation by Pischel < \**vy-ava-sr*.

These complaints are, however, of minor importance when compared with the merits of this pair of editions. To have now available a critical edition of the whole of this text, important both for purposes of language study and knowledge of the development of Jainism, will be of inestimable benefit.

K.R.NORMAN

¶10.4 MNSt.C reviewed by Ludo Rocher in JAOS.88,3.1968,pp.563-565.

Twelve years after the publication of the *Studien zum Mahānisīha, Kapitel 6-8* (F.R. Hamm and W. Schubring) the present volume deals with the remaining chapters 1-5 of the same *cheyasutta*; chapters 1-3 are edited and translated (into English) by J. Deleu, chapters 4-5 are edited and translated (into German) by W. Schubring.

In a Preliminary Note (p.1-2) Deleu points out the comparatively late date of the *Mahānisīha*; however, with Schubring and against Hamm, he holds the text to be older than Dharmadasa's *Uvaesamālā*, "date unknown, probably about 900 A.D."

The edition is based on eight manuscripts, which are described on p.3-4. The variant readings of four of these (M, P, p, π) are immediately rejected. Deleu does refer

to the *constitutio textus* "in accordance with the genealogical relation of the Mss," but we should have liked to see this genealogical relation included in his text. As it is now, it is not always easy to understand the principles which he follows. For lack of more complete information we must also question some of the "intrinsic criteria" used on p.5. E.g., in I.206\* the reading *savvam annam* has been adopted from C rather than the reading *savvasallam*, which is that of all manuscripts including c which is said to be generally superior. We are told that this and a few other readings "have been preferred because they give a better sense"; we wonder, however, whether this principle did not lead the editor to discarding some valuable *lectiones difficiliores*. On p.5-6, Deleu raises a problem which all critical editors must have been faced with, namely: normalization. The question is whether, if for a particular phenomenon the manuscripts do not show any consistency, the critical editor has a right to be more consistent than his materials. We too, have "normalized" on a number of occasions, but never without a feeling of guilt. We would not, however, go as far as Deleu and say: "I have tacitly corrected the transmitted texts:" if avagrahas are nearly always omitted, can we then really pretend that, by introducing them, we *correct* the transmitted text ? We would have preferred "normalized" rather than "corrected".

The grammar section (p.9-14) contains some very interesting points. One possible remark concerns the author's tendency to derive the forms occurring in the *Mahānisiha* directly from Sanskrit. We would personally hesitate to say: "*ahijje* < *adhīyeta*" (no.11), and rather try to be more cautious: "*ahijje* < \**adhīyet*; Sk. *adhīyeta*." The difference is mainly methodological; we fear that too often the impression is created that all Prakrit formations can be derived from Sanskrit.

The editorial portion (p.18-72) with the variant readings (p.72-77), the translation (p.78-149) with notes (p.149-161), and the glossary (p.162-168) are models of painstaking scholarly research. For all passages in which we carefully compared text and translation, our notes never contain more than remarks on details; we shall reproduce a few specimens of them here.

In II.1\* we were puzzled by the interesting form *pāsiyavvayam* which, on p.12, is called a "part. necess.", and which, consequently, in the glossary (p.166) is explained as "(*draṣṭavya*)". *Pāsiyavva* is, of course, well known; shall we assume that we are dealing here with a double gerundive, having both the suffixes *-yavva-* and *-ya*? There are, indeed, other instances of forms constructed with double suffixes or double endings (cf., e.g., Macdonell's *Vedic Grammar*, p.200, with a reference to Brugmann's *Grundriss* 2, p.661). When advancing this hypothesis, we imply that the last *-y-* derives from an old *-y-*; if it proves to be a later development for an older intervocalic stop, the situation would be completely different.

If our interpretation of the translation of II.8\* - "though they go through the cycles [of existence] for an endless (space of) time" (p.95) - is correct, we have the impression that *parivarttante* is taken as a 3rd pl. of the present tense. In reality it is a loc.sg. of the pres.part. of which *aṇante vi kāle* is the subject. The translation of this verse also affords an excellent opportunity to raise a completely different point. In his effort to provide a really accurate translation, Deleu made ample use of brackets to include each and every word of the translation which was not actually in the original text. Yet, his translation would be equally accurate without the brackets, and, what is more important, it would be more readable. Thus the last pada of II 8: *kehi punā'nādi*

*pāviyam* reads, in Deleu's translation: "yet by some [beings this state] has been attained to from [all] eternity;" either the brackets could be omitted, or one might simply translate: "yet, others have it right from the beginning." Moreover, it is difficult to be consistent in using brackets; e.g., in the translation of II 1 : "somebody who has totally extracted [his] *śalyas* with all his heart," there is no reason to put the first "his" in brackets and not the second (*nimmūl'uddhiya-salleṇaṃ savva-bhāveṇa*).

In II 5d, *tā dukkhaṃ tattha vī bhava* is translated as follows: "Yet even there [they] would be [in] grief." Apart from the fact that here too, the brackets are misleading — it was not until we made a special effort to visualize the sentence without the words in brackets that we understood why they were there —, the translation fails to do justice to *tā*. According to the translation, *pāda d* expresses people's disappointment in not finding the happiness they were expecting (*hohi sokkhaṃ kil' amhāṇaṃ*). In our opinion *pāda d* indicates a reason, introduced by *tā* "therefore;" beings with defective senses are never happy with the situation they are in, and they think that they would be happy in the opposite situation: when it is warm, they are unhappy and they imagine that they would be happy if it was cool, but once there they again long for the original situation; "therefore even there they would be unhappy."

The introduction to *his* contribution to the volume is an opportunity for Professor Schubring to look back upon the *Mahānisīha* as a whole; and there is ample reason for him to do so; after having first analyzed the text in 1918, after having published chapters 6-8 in collaboration with F.R.Hamm in 1951, and after having supervised Deleu's work on chapters 1-3 in the late fifties and early sixties, "war es mir ein Gebot der Ordnung, mich wiederum zu beteiligen und die restlichen Kapitel 4 und 5 zu übernehmen" (p.171). Schubring follows the pattern adopted by Deleu: edition of the text (p.175-205), variant readings (p.206-208), translation (p.209-235); those who are interested in reading the translation only will appreciate that "Die deutsche Wiedergabe stellt sich unserem *jain'aupaniṣadika śāstra*, wo es sich in allbekannter Weitschweifigkeit ergeht, in Freiheit gegenüber"), and glossary (p.236-240).

Jain scholarship and Indic scholarship generally are grateful to Hamm, Deleu, and above all, Schubring, for having made available to them such a vast amount of scholarly materials on the *Mahānisīha*. The fact that these materials are scattered over three volumes is — to paraphrase Schubring — "eine Unbequemlichkeit, die der Benutzer gerne entschuldigen will."

University of Pennsylvania

LUDO ROCHER

### *EPILOGUE*

To conclude this Report we may repeat briefly the main results of the Mahānisiha studies in Germany:

- 1) The MNA is not canonical but apocryphal and thus not identical with its namesake mentioned in the Nandisūtra.
- 2) It is later than the Niryuktis, Bhāṣyas and "vṛddha-vivaraṇa" quoted or referred to in it.
- 3) It is earlier than the Gacchācāra and the Upadeśamālā of Dharmadāsa-gaṇi.
- 4) There are a few remarks in it which may be even as late as 13th cent. AD.
- 5) Its language and metrics present many unusual and some incorrect features which are surely due to the "work" of one still unknown person.
- 6) Neither Jinabhadra-gaṇi nor ācārya Haribhadra can be regarded as the editor of "original Ms(s)." in deplorable condition.
- 7) Its position in the sacred literature of the (śvetāmbara) Jains has been since its composition not uncontested.

My Report though based on the critical work of A. Weber, W. Schubring, F. R. Hamm and J. Deleu is, in its present form, my writing and I am responsible for all its defects of omission and commission and all mistakes in grammar and style as neither English nor German is my mother-tongue. For saving me from many more mistakes I am sincerely obliged to some friends who want to remain unnamed.

*kṛtaṃ karaṇīyam.*

Chandrabhal Tripathi