

Dvādaśāraṃ Nayacakram of Ācārya Śrī Mallavādi Kṣamāśramana With the commentary Nyāyāgamānusārīṇī of Śrī Siṃhasūri Gaṇi Vādi Kṣamāśramana. Part I (1-4 Aras). Edited with critical notes by Muni Jambūvijayajī (= Śrī Ātmānand Jain Granthamālā, Serial, No. 92). Bhavnagar, Sri Jain Atmanand Sabha, 1966. 8 + 4 + 6 + 98 + 375 + 166 pp. Rs. 25.00.

Mallavādin's *Nayacakra* is one of the most important of the older Jaina philosophical works. It is of very great interest not only for the light it throws on Jaina philosophy, but also for the information on other philosophical schools which can be obtained from it. It is regrettable that the *Nayacakra* itself has not been preserved. However, the *Nyāyāgamānusārīṇī*, a commentary on the *Nayacakra* by Siṃhasūri, has been handed down. Editors of this text have tried to reconstruct the text of the *Nayacakra*. An edition of the first four *ara*-s (the *Nayacakra* consists of three *mārga*-s; each *mārga* comprises four *ara*-s) appeared in the *Gaekwad Oriental Series* in 1952.¹ Another edition has been published in the *Shri Labdhisurishwar Jain Granthamala*.² E. Frauwallner has pointed out the shortcomings of both editions.³ In the same article Frauwallner announced a new edition by Muni Jambūvijayajī. The first volume, comprising the first four *ara*-s, has now appeared as volume 92 of the *Śrī Ātmānand Jain Granthamālā*. The first part contains an English introduction by E. Frauwallner (pp. 1-6), a Sanskrit introduction (prākkathana) by the editor (pp. 7-43) and a Gujarati introduction (prastāvanā) by the same (pp. 44-89). The Sanskrit and Gujarati introductions are not identical, which is clear from the fact that the first refers to the second. However, my ignorance of Gujarati prevents me from indicating which additional information can be found in the prastāvanā. The prākkathana discusses not only many important problems, but it also relates in detail the rather complicated history of this edition and the methods employed by the editor in overcoming the difficulties which confronted him.

In Vikrama 2001⁴ Muni Jambūvijayajī planned to edit Jinabhadra's *Viśeṣāvaśyaka-mahābhāṣya*, but at the request of his Guru Śrī Bhuvanavijayajī Mahārāja, he abandoned this plan and undertook to edit the *Nyāyāgamānusārīṇī* and to reconstruct the original text of the *Nayacakra*. Although six manuscripts were at his disposal, he soon recognized that a correct text could not be established without studying the many works quoted by Siṃhasūri. Of special importance for this purpose were Buddhist works which had been preserved in Tibetan translation. In order to be able to read these works Muni Jambūvijayajī undertook the study of Tibetan. The discovery of an older manuscript of Siṃhasūri's commentary also greatly facilitated the establishment of a correct text.

After having finished preliminary studies the editor prepared his edition of the text and commentary for the press. First the text of *ara*-s 1-7 (pp. 1-552) was printed after delays due to several causes. The printing of this part of the text was completed before the death of his guru and father on 16th February 1959.⁵ Subsequently the eighth *ara*

¹ *Dvādaśāraṃ nayacakram of Srinallavādīsūri, with the commentary Nyāyāgamānusārīṇī of Śrī Siṃhasūri*, ed. by the late Muni Caturvijayajī and Lalcaṇḍra B. Gandhi (= *GOS*, No. CXVI) (Baroda, 1952).

² *The Dvadaśāraṇayachakram of Sri Mallavadi Kshamasramana with the Nyayagamānusārīṇī Commentary by Sri Sinhasuriganī Vadi Kshamasramana*, ed. by Acharya Vijayalabhisuri (= *Shri Labdhisurishwar Jain Granthamala*, No. 20 & 26) (Chhani, 1948 & 1951) (see *WZKSO*, I, 1957, p. 147 n. 1). Part III was published in 1957 (see *WZKSO*, III, 1959, p. 100 n. 33). I have not been able to consult this edition.

³ "The Editions of Mallavādi's *Dvādaśāraṇayachakram*", *WZKSO*, I, 1957, pp. 147-151.

⁴ Muni Jambūvijayajī quotes all dates according to the Vikrama era.

(pp. 553-737) was printed. In the introduction and appendices references are given to the pages of the printed text of the first eight *ara-s*, although the present volume only comprises the first four.

On p. 11, n. 1, the editor lists the sources which inform us on the life of Mallavādin. 1. Bhadrēśvarasūri's *Kahāvalī* (Vikrama second half of the twelfth century); 2. Prabhāvacandrasūri's *Prabhāvākacarita* (Vikr. 1334); 3. Merutuṅga's *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* (Vikr. 1361); 4. Rājasekharasūri's *Prabandhakośa* (Vikr. 1405); 5. Saṅghatilakācārya's *Samyaktvasaptati* (Vikr. 1422). In the same note the editor reproduces the text of the life of Mallavādin in the *Kahāvalī* and in Āmradevasūri's commentary on Nemican-drāsūri's *Ākhyānanarāṇikośa* (Vikr. 1190). The text of the *Kahāvalī* is also reproduced in the introduction of *GOS* vol. 116. This introduction quotes passages from many texts relating to Mallavādin (pp. 9-29). It also refers to a manuscript, written in Vikr. 1291, and containing a life of Mallavādin in Prakrit (cf. *GOS*, vol. 76, pp. 194-195). However, the manuscript itself was not available to the editor.

According to the *Prabhāvākacarita*, Mallavādin conquered the Bauddhas (i.e. Euddhānarāṇa) in Vira 884 (= Vikr. 414). The *Nayacakra* discusses the doctrines of many philosophers such as Vārṣaganya, Vasurāta, Bhartṛhari, Vasubandhu (the author of the *Kośa*) and Dignāga. According to the editor, the date mentioned by Prabhāvacandra does not conflict with the dates of these philosophers who accordingly must have lived before Mallavādin or in the same period (ca. 350 A.D.). If this is the case, the traditionally assumed dates of many Indian philosophers would have to be revised. However, such a late text as the *Prabhāvākacarita* is not an authoritative source for the date of Mallavādin. More evidence is certainly needed before this date can be allowed.

In the second place, the names of the above-mentioned philosophers seem to occur only in Simhasūri's commentary. In the case of each of them it must be proved beyond all doubt that Mallavādin really refers to the philosophers mentioned by Simhasūri. One must not be misled by the fact that the editor has printed in bold type in the text of the commentary not only the quotations from the *Nayacakra*, but also proper names which are absent from it. Only after the publication of the second volume of this edition will it be possible to consider the available evidence and to examine the reliability of Simhasūri's indications. Muni Jambūvijayaji has already published several articles on the dates of Mallavādin, Bhartṛhari and Dignāga.⁶ According to the passages of Simhasūri's commentary quoted by him (pages 15 and 16, notes 2 and 3) Vasurāta was the teacher of Bhartṛhari. As is pointed out by the editor, the same tradition is found in Puṇyarāja's commentary on Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* II, 486, 489 and 490. Several scholars agree also that, according to Puṇyarāja's commentary on *Vākyapadīya* II, 489, Candracārya = Candragomin was the master of Vasurāta. The dates of Candragomin and Bhartṛhari have been discussed by many scholars.⁷ Of great importance for deter-

⁶ This date is given by Anantalal Thakur in his Introduction to Muni Jambūvijayaji's edition of the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra of Kaṇāda with the Commentary of Candrananda* (= *GOS*, No. 136) (1961). The date, indicated by Muni Jambūvijayaji (prākkathana p. 7 n.1), is Vikrama 2015, the eighth day of the white half of the month Māgha.

⁶ "Mallavādiṇi āne Bhartṛharino samay", *Jaina Satyapraśāsa*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Nov. 1951), pp. 26-30; *Buddhiprakāśa*, vol. 98, No. 11 (Nov. 1951), pp. 332-335; "Bhartṛhari aur Diṇnāga kā samay", *Nāgaripracārini Patrikā*, Vol. 60, Nos. 3-4 (Samvat 2012), pp. 227-233; "Bhartṛhari āne Diṇnāga", *Jaine Ātmānanda Prakāśa*, Vol. 50, No. 2 (15 Sept. 1952), pp. 22-27 (see prākkathana pp. 15 and 16 notes 2 and 3). I have been unable to consult these articles.

⁷ See the references given by Sadhu Ram, "Bhartṛhari's Date", *Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute*, Vol. IX (1952), pp. 135-151. See also David Seyffort Ruegg, *Contributions à l'histoire de la philosophie linguistique indienne* (Paris, 1959), pp. 57-64 and the literature quoted by him.

mining the date of Bhartṛhari is the recent discovery of two verses from the *Vākyapadīya* (II, 160 and 157) in the fifth chapter of Dignāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya*. This discovery seems to have been made simultaneously by H.R. Rangaswamy Iyengar and Muni Jambūvijayaḥ.⁸ Frauwallner has recently shown that Dignāga's *Traikālyaparikṣā* is based upon the *Vākyapadīya*.⁹ If one combines Simhasūri's indications and the fact that Bhartṛhari is quoted by Dignāga, the following chronological sequence can be established: Vasurāta — Bhartṛhari — Dignāga — Mallavādin. Even if Mallavādin cannot be dated in the fourth century A.D., there is no doubt that Bhartṛhari must have lived long before the first half of the seventh century as had been generally agreed in the past on the strength of I-ching's testimony.¹⁰ Moreover, if Puṇyarāja's commentary is understood to mean that Candragomin was the teacher of Vasurāta, he must have lived in a period much earlier than any one of those proposed previously.¹¹ However, the text of Puṇyarāja's commentary is not unambiguously clear. Even if the above-mentioned interpretation is correct, how much credit has to be given to the testimony of an author who probably lived many centuries after Candragomin?¹²

According to Simhasūri's commentary Dignāga attacked his guru Vasubandhu (the author of the *Vādaśāhi*). This tradition was already known from Tāranātha's History. Frauwallner has pointed out that this alleged pupilship hails from the late and unsatisfactory Tibetan tradition.¹³ Tāranātha's work was written in 1608 and is not always a reliable source. However, it is clear from Simhasūri's commentary that the tradition of Dignāga's pupilship goes back to a much earlier period. Finally, the editor draws our attention to the fact that Dignāga's doctrines have been refuted by the Jain author Samantabhadra in his *Āptamīmāṃsā*.

The *Frābhāvaka-carita* attributes to Mallavādin the authorship of a *Rāmāyaṇa*, called *Padmācarita*. According to the same text, the *Nayacakra* comprises ten thousand ślokas (i.e. 320,000 syllables). Both indications do not seem very reliable. The second is inadmissible, because Simhasūri's commentary comprises eighteen thousand ślokas and is several times longer than the text commented upon. More credible is the tradition

⁸ H. R. Rangaswamy Iyengar, "Bhartṛhari and Dignāga", *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, New Series, Vol. 26 (1951), pp. 147-149. According to Sadhu Ram (*op.cit.*, p. 142 n. 25) the same verses have been traced by Muni Jambūvijayaḥ in the first two articles mentioned in note 6. Sadhu Ram and Muni Jambūvijayaḥ (prākṛkathana p. 16 n. 3) refer to *Vākyapadīya* II, 156 and 157, Rangaswamy Iyengar (*op.cit.*, p. 149 n. 12), Nakamura Hajime ("Tibetan Citations of Bhartṛhari's Verses and the Problem of his Date", *Studies in Indology and Buddhism. Presented in Honour of Professor Susumu Yamaguchi*, Kyoto, 1955, p. 134) and Frauwallner (*WZKS*, V, 1961, p. 13) to *Vākyapadīya* II, 160 and 157. I have not been able to verify in the edition of the *Benares Sanskrit Series* which of the two indications is correct. Muni Jambūvijayaḥ points out that Dignāga has also quoted another verse of Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* (III, 14.8) in his *vṛtti* on the second verse of the fifth chapter of the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* (prākṛkathana p. 16 n. 3). Quotations from Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* in other works have been studied by Nakamura (*op.cit.*, pp. 122-136).

⁹ *WZKS*, III (1959), pp. 107-116, 145-152.

¹⁰ See e.g. Louis Renou, *La Durghatavṛtti de Śaraṇadeva*, Vol. I, Fasc. 1 (Paris, 1940), p. 37: "Bhartṛhari est l'un des rares noms de la littérature grammaticale exactement datable, depuis que Max Müller a eu reconnu en lui le grammairien mentionné par I-tsing comme étant mort en 651."

¹¹ See L. de La Vallée Poussin, *Dynasties et Histoire de l'Inde depuis Kanishka* (Paris, 1935), p. 64 n. 2; D. Seyfort Ruegg, *op.cit.*, pp. 58-59.

¹² For the date of Puṇyarāja see D. Seyfort Ruegg, *op.cit.*, p. 63 n.1.

¹³ Cf. *On the Date of the Buddhist Master of the Law Vasubandhu* (Roma, 1951), p. 63.

which attributes to Mañavādin the authorship of a commentary upon Siddhasena Divākara's *Sammati*.

The *Nayacakra* and its commentary are of great importance for the study of Indian philosophical systems, as is pointed out by the editor in his introduction (*prākkathana*, pp. 19-23). Simhasūri's commentary is of special interest for the information which it gives on the older Sāṃkhya and Vaiśeṣika literature and on Buddhist logic.

One of the most important texts of the older Sāṃkhya literature is the *Śaṣṭitantra* by Vṛṣaganya or Vārṣaganya.¹⁴ Quotations from it are to be found in the third chapter of Simhasūri's commentary.

Simhasūri's commentary on the sixth and seventh *ara*-s is of very great interest for the study of the older Vaiśeṣika literature and of the text of the Vaiśeṣika sūtras. The text of the *Sūtrapāṭha* quoted by Simhasūri is different from the one in Śaṅkaramiśra's *Upaśāra* but agrees with the *Sūtrapāṭha* which has been transmitted together with a commentary by Candrānanda. When the text of the first five *ara*-s of the *Nayacakra* had already been printed, the editor obtained a manuscript containing both a separate text of the *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* and the *Sūtras* together with Candrānanda's *vṛtti* (MS. PS/P, cf. GOS, No. 136, Baroda, 1961, Introduction, p. 1). This manuscript has been used by him for reproducing the complete text of the *Sūtras* and the commentary in the notes of this edition (see p. 141: "Vaiśeṣikasūtrasambandhi pariṣiṣṭam" for a list of the relevant notes). Subsequently, the editor obtained a copy of another manuscript, written in Śāradā script (MS. O).¹⁵ On the basis of these two manuscripts (PS/P and O) he has edited the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra of Kaṇāda with the Commentary of Candrānanda* (GOS, No. 136, Baroda, 1961).¹⁶ This edition contains appendices comparing the *Sūtrapāṭha* with those found in the *Upakāra* and in an anonymous commentary, edited by Anantatal Thakur.¹⁷ Another appendix examines in detail the readings of the *Sūtrapāṭha* according to the two manuscripts and quotations from the *Sūtras* in other texts (pp. 227-234: *Vṛddhipatṛakam*).

Simhasūri quotes several Vaiśeṣika works which have not been handed down to us. These quotations have been brought together by the editor in an appendix to his edition of the *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* (pp. 146-152). The problems relating to these works have been dealt with by him in his *prastāvanā* (pp. 6-8) to the same edition.

Simhasūri gives several references to Āryadeva's *Catuhśataka* and to Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośa* but his main contribution to the study of Buddhist philosophy is to be found in his discussion of Dignāga's philosophy in the first and eighth *ara*-s. In order to enable the reader to understand better Dignāga's doctrines, the editor has translated into Sanskrit large sections from the *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, Dignāga's *vṛtti* and Jinendra-buddhi's *likā* (cf. *Bhotapariṣiṣṭam*, pp. 95-140). Other sections of these works have been translated in notes to the eighth *ara* (cf. *prākkathana*, p. 39 n. 8 for a list of references). The editor had already used the same works for the study of Vaiśeṣika and Nyaya doctrines (cf. GOS, nr. 136, pp. 153-159).¹⁸

¹⁴ Cf. E. Frauwallner, "Zur Erkenntnislehre des klassischen Sāṃkhya-Systems", *WZKS*, II (1958), pp. 84-139; G. Oberhammer, "The Authorship of the *Śaṣṭitantram*", *WZKS*, IV (1960), pp. 71-91. Important for the date of Vārṣaganya is the discovery of a reference to him in Asaṅga's *Yogācārabhūmi*, cf. D. Seyfort Ruegg, "Note on Vārṣaganya and the *Yogācārabhūmi*", *IJJ*, VI (1962), pp. 137-140.

¹⁵ As this manuscript was not at the disposal of the editor for the establishment of the text of the *Sūtras* and the *vṛtti* in the notes of his edition of the *Nayacakra*, a list of better readings to be found in MS. O is given in a special appendix (pp. 158-161).

¹⁶ Cf. E. Frauwallner's review, *WZKS*, VI (1962), pp. 184-185.

¹⁷ *Vaiśeṣikadarsana of Kaṇāda with an anonymous commentary*, ed. by Anantatal Thakur (Darbhanga, 1957).

¹⁸ GOS, No. 136 reproduces the Tibetan text in Tibetan characters (cf. p. 1-11). In

The editor points out that in the eighth *ara* Mallavādin discusses the *apohavāda*, but does not seem to refer to the fifth chapter of the *Pramāṇasamuccaya*. He advances the hypothesis that Mallavādin has taken the *pūrvapakṣa* from Dignāga's *Sāmānyaparikṣā* mentioned on pages 627-628 of the text. I-ching has translated a short work by Dignāga (T. nr. 1623), of which the Sanskrit title has been reconstructed as *Sāmānyalakṣaṇaparikṣā* by Frauwallner (WZKSO, III, 1959, p. 139). In a letter to Muni Jambūvijajāji, Frauwallner gives some information about this text (cf. GOS, No. 136, p. 153, n. 2). It is possible that Dignāga had written a commentary upon this text which consists of eleven verses. Probably he had studied the *apohavāda* in this commentary. It seems difficult to imagine that Dignāga would have written both a *Sāmānyalakṣaṇaparikṣā* and a *Sāmānyaparikṣā*.

Simhasūri refers also to a commentator of a work by Dignāga. According to the editor, the commentator is not Dignāga himself nor Dharmakīrti nor Jinendrabuddhi who both belong to a later period. Śīvarasena is known to have written a commentary on the *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, but his work is lost.¹⁹ According to Frauwallner, he was probably the teacher of Dharmakīrti.²⁰ The identity of the commentator to whom Simhasūri refers, is a problem the solution of which must be left to future research.

Obviously, Simhasūri's work quotes many Jain texts. The editor points out that the quotations from the Āgamas often give a text different from the one established in Vira 980 (= Vikr. 510). He admits that both Mallavādin and Simhasūri must have lived before that date. Further he remarks that the quotations from the *Nandīsūtra* in the eighth *ara* prove that originally this work consisted of two parts, *sūtra* and *bhāṣya*, which were later amalgamated into one work.

Little is known about Simhasūri. A verse from another work by him is quoted by Koṭṭārya in his commentary upon the *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya*. Koṭṭārya quotes Dignāga, the *Avāśyakacūṛṇi* and Simhasūri's commentary, but not Kumārila and Dharmakīrti. Simhasūri quotes three verses which also occur in the *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya*, but according to the editor the source of this quotation is a different work. He supposes that Simhasūri lived shortly after Mallavādin, because he refers to Dignāga as a "contemporary Bauddha" (*adyatanabauddha*) and quotes the Āgamas according to a tradition different from the one established in Vikrama 510.

As mentioned above, the editor first used six manuscripts. All these manuscripts go back directly or indirectly to a manuscript written by Yaśovijayaya (MS. YA) in Vikrama 1710. Only when the first seven *ara*-s had been printed, did this manuscript come to the notice of the editor. In establishing the text of these *ara*-s, the editor gives the variant readings of these six manuscripts. In an appendix he lists the reading of MS. YA for those places where the six manuscripts have not the same readings (pp. 142-146). In editing the text of the last five *ara*-s, the editor does not give the variant readings of the six manuscripts, but only refers to MS. YA. As mentioned earlier, the discovery of an older manuscript was of great help to the editor. This manuscript, referred to by the editor as Ms. BHĀ, was written by Puṇḍra at the order of Dharmamūrti who lived from Vikrama 1585 to 1670. It gives many correct readings not to be found in the six manuscripts derived from MS. YA. The editor assumes that it has been written about Vikrama 1650 and consequently is sixty years older than MS. YA. MS. YA seems to be more correct than MS. BHĀ, but both share several incorrect readings. For this reason the editor believes that both manuscripts descend from a common archetype.²¹

the *Bhoṭapariśiṣṭa* Tibetan texts are transliterated in devanāgarī. Would it not have been possible to use romanization?

¹⁹ Cf. Ernst Steinkellner, "Bemerkungen zu Śīvarasenas Lehre vom Grund", WZKSO, X (1966), pp. 73-85.

²⁰ Cf. WZKSO, V (1961), p. 141.

²¹ The edition of the *Nayacakra* published in GOS, No. CXXI is based upon two

The editor does not provide us with a palaeographic description of the manuscripts, but gives a useful list of *akṣara*-s which have been misread by the scribes (prākkathana, p. 37). The numbers in the margin of the text refer to MS. BHĀ (e.g. recto and verso of f. 4 are indicated by 4-1 and 4-2). In quoting the text of the *Navacakravṛtti* in his notes at the bottom of the pages, the editor always refers to the folios of this manuscript.

The reconstructed text of the *Nayacakra* is printed at the top of each page in bold type. The commentary is printed below and is separated from the reconstructed text by a line. Quotations from the *Nayacakra* in the commentary also printed in bold type. The notes at the bottom of the page record variant readings and quotations which are helpful for the establishment of the text. Extensive notes and quotations from many texts are to be found in a separate appendix (pp. 1-94).

It will probably be useful for the reader to indicate briefly the contents of the three which constitute this volume.

Part I. Introduction by E. Frauwallner: pp. 1-6; Sanskrit introduction (prākkathana) by the editor: pp. 7-43; Gujarati introduction (prastāvanā) by the editor: pp. 44-89; detailed table of contents of parts II and III: pp. 90-98.

Part II. Text of the first four *ara*-s: pp. 1-375.

Part III. A. Tippanāni: pp. 1-94; B. *Bhoṣaparīṭīkām*: pp. 95-140; C. *Vaiśeṣika-sūtrasambādhi parīṣṭam*: p. 141; D. *Yā prapīṭhāparīṣṭam*: pp. 142-146; E. *Nayacakre vṛttau vā caturṣv areṣṭullikhitānām vāda-vādi-grantha-granthakṛnnāmnām sūciḥ*: pp. 147-148; F. *Sampādānopayuktāgranthasūciḥ saṅketādivivaraṇam ca*: pp. 149-157; G. *Candrānandaracitavṛttiyutasya Vaiśeṣikasūtrasya adhyākrameṇa O. pustake suddhāpāṭhāḥ*: pp. 158-161; H. *Nayakraprathamavibhāgasya buddhipratikāḥ*: pp. 162-166.

The editor announces that the second volume, containing the remaining eight *ara*-s, will be published in the near future. This edition will be of the greatest importance for the study of the older period of Indian philosophy which is relatively unknown because many works have not been preserved. It would be difficult to mention another edition of an Indian philosophical text which has been edited with so much care. Already from the long list of books, consulted by the editor (cf. Part III F), it is obvious that he has spared no pains in preparing this edition. How many works, some only existing in manuscript form, have been consulted by him in order to trace the quotations in the text! The translation of complicated logical texts from Tibetan into Sanskrit must have demanded great efforts as the editor states in his introduction: *anekavarṇāni bhṛsarṣi parīśramyā:mābhiḥ saṅkalitam idam bhoṣaparīṭīkām* (p. 40). The reconstruction of the *Nayacakra* was perhaps even more difficult. In the first place the *pratika*-s have to be traced in the commentary. In many places the commentator quotes only the first and last words of a passage. Sometimes no explanation is given by the commentator who, in such cases, contents himself with stating that the text is *spāḥam* or *sugamam*. An entirely correct reconstruction of the original is perhaps impossible, as long as no other materials are available. As Frauwallner remarks in his preface, the reconstruction has been carefully considered and deserves our full attention. We are looking forward to the second volume of this *magnum opus* which does great honour to the scholarship of Muni Jambūvijayaji.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

manuscripts, MS. PA (one of the six manuscripts based upon YA) and MS. BHA (MS. BHĀ of Muni Jambūvijayaji's edition). These two manuscripts seem to have been used only by the second editor Laīacandra B. Gandhi (cf. prastāvanā, pp. 37-38). In the foot of the text references are given to MSS. KA, KHA, GA and GHA, but no information is given about these manuscripts. A few readings from PA and BHA are quoted on pages 1-10. Probably they were added later by the second editor.