

THE RIDDLE OF THE JAINAS AND ĀJĪVIKAS IN EARLY BUDDHIST LITERATURE

Early Buddhist literature¹ is acquainted with both Jainas and Ājīvikas. It calls the former *nirgrantha*, Pa. *nigāṇṭha*,² and the latter *ājīvika* or *ājīvaka*.³ The former are sometimes presented as followers of Nigāṇṭha Nātaputta or Nāthaputta, who has been identified as Vardhamāna, better known as Mahāvīra, the last *tīrthāṅkara* of the Jainas; the name Nātaputta corresponds to Ardhmāgadhī Nāyaputta, known from the earliest surviving canonical texts of Jainism.⁴ The latter are presented in (Śvetāmbara) Jaina canonical literature as the followers of Gosāla Maṅkhaliputta, identified by modern scholars with the Makkhali Gosāla whose views are reported in Buddhist literature. By combining data found in the Jaina and in the Buddhist canon, scholars have tried to reconstitute the ideas which belonged to the early Jainas and Ājīvikas.

Scholars rarely seem to have addressed the question what picture arises if one bases oneself exclusively on Buddhist literature.⁵ What image did the early Buddhists have of the Jainas and Ājīvikas, or perhaps: what information about these movements did they preserve in their oldest texts? This question is legitimate, for there is no guarantee that the ideas current among the Buddhists were necessarily accurate; alternatively, they may preserve memories that are older than anything found in the Jaina canon. Either way they may deviate from the pictures preserved in the early Jaina texts.

Consider first the Ājīvikas. The Pāli canon repeatedly mentions one or several of them. Least informative are the passages that do not tell us anything about the life-style of the person or persons concerned. Among these we may count those that recount the encounter of the Buddha soon after his enlightenment with an Ājīvika called Upaka.⁶ They occur in almost identical form in the Majjhima Nikāya (MN I.170–171; II.93–94, fully printed NDPS vol. 2 pp. 336–337) and in the Mahāvagga (Vin I.8), and tell us nothing beyond the fact that Upaka was, precisely, an Ājīvika. The same is true of the Ājīvika Paṇḍuputta (MN I.31–32), and of the Ājīvika carrying a *mandāra* flower who informs Mahā-Kassapa of the death of the Buddha (DN II.162; Vin II.284).⁷ The Suttanipāta mentions Ājīvikas and Nigāṇṭhas and qualifies them as “argumentative

sectarians" (Sn 381: *tiṭṭhiyā vādasīla*; tr. Norman, 1984: 64), but leaves it at that.

Other passages make clear that Ajivikas could have followers. The term *ājīvakasāvaka* "lay disciple of Ajivikas / of the Ajivikas" is used a few times (AN I.217; Vin II.130, 165; III.135 f.). The fact that a blood-relation (*ñāti sālohitō*) of king Bimbisāra is stated to have gone forth among (the) Ajivikas (*ājīvakesu pabbajito*) confirms that the Ajivikas constituted one or more groups of religious wanderers (Vin IV.74).

A feature of the Ajivikas that is repeatedly stressed is their nakedness. The Mahāvagga (Vin I.290 f.) tells the charming story of disciples of the Buddha who, to refresh themselves, had taken off their clothes to let the rain cool their naked bodies. A servant girl, sent to invite Buddhists but seeing only naked men, mistakes them for Ajivikas. In the Suttavibhaṅga (Vin III.211 f.) monks find themselves naked as a result of a robbery, but the outcome is the same: they are mistaken for Ajivikas. The terms *ājīvaka* and *acelaka* seem occasionally used as synonyms. This appears to be the case in the Suttavibhaṅga (Vin IV.91–92) where the Buddha forbids giving food to naked ascetics (*acelaka*): the introductory story speaks of Ajivikas instead. It is not surprising that the commentator Buddhaghosa more than once explains the term "Ajīvika" as "naked ascetics" (*naggapabbajita*, Mp III.334; *naggasamaṇa*, Ps I.151). Passages like these do indeed create the impression that the expression is used to refer to naked ascetics in general, rather than to any particular movement.⁸

This raises the following important question. We know that at the time of the historical Buddha and of Mahāvīra there were two kinds of Jainas: the followers of Pārśva, who wore clothes, and the followers of Mahāvīra, who were naked. Is it possible that the early Buddhists included the naked Jainas in their general category of Ajivikas,⁹ so that the Jainas mentioned in the Buddhist canon are primarily followers of Pārśva?

Before trying to answer this question, it will be useful to consider the evidence which allows us to conclude that there were indeed two groups of Jainas at the time of Mahāvīra. This evidence comes from the Jaina canon, which describes a few encounters between followers of Pārśva and those of Mahāvīra.¹⁰ One of those encounters is described in *Viyāhappannatti* (*Vyākhyāprajñapti*) I.9, where Kālāsa Vesīyaputta (*Kālāsyā Vaiśīkaputra*), a follower of Pārśva, questions the Jaina Elders and subsequently "accepted the religion based on Five Vows, with *pratikramaṇa* added,¹¹ in place of [the] religion based on Four Vows, and practised it. He led for long years the life of a monk in the order;

and as a monk, he remained nude ...".¹² That five vows and nudity are the marks that distinguished the followers of Mahāvīra from those of Pārśva is clear from the 23rd chapter of the Uttarādhyayana. In this chapter Keśin,¹³ a follower of Pārśva, and Gautama, a pupil of Vardhamāna, engage in the following shared reflection:¹⁴

Is our Law the right one, or is the other Law the right one? are our conduct and doctrines right, or the other? (11)

The Law as taught by the great sage Pārśva, which recognises but four vows, or the Law taught by Vardhamāna, which enjoins five vows? (12)

The Law which forbids clothes [for a monk], or that which [allows] an under and upper garment? ... (13)

The ensuing discussion confirms that Pārśva recognises four vows, Vardhamāna five (Utt 23.23), and specifies that "the Law taught by Vardhamāna forbids clothes, but that of the great sage Pārśva allows an under and upper garment".¹⁵ We learn from this that there were two, and perhaps only two, differences between the teachings of Pārśva and Mahāvīra: the followers of the former recognised four restraints and wore clothes, while the followers of the latter recognised five restraints and wore no clothes. The nakedness of Mahāvīra and his followers finds further confirmation in some other passages of their canon. The Ācārāṅga Sūtra describes how the Venerable Ascetic (*samaṇe bhagavam*), i.e. presumably Mahāvīra, decided not to wear "that piece of cloth". The lines concerned read:¹⁶ "I shall not cover myself with that robe in that winter". He had crossed [the *saṃsāra*] for the rest of his life. This [refusing of dress] is in accordance with his doctrine. ... For a year and a month he did not leave off his robe. Since that time the Venerable One, giving up his robe, was a naked, world-relinquishing, houseless [sage]." And the so-called¹⁷ Kalpa-Sūtra states:¹⁸ "The Venerable Ascetic Mahāvīra for a year and a month wore clothes; after that time he walked about naked, and accepted the alms in the hollow of his hand."

The Jainas in the Buddhist canon are never presented as being naked.¹⁹ As a rule nothing is said about their outward appearance, but at least one passage contrasts them with naked Ajivikas. It occurs in the Aṅguttara Nikāya and reads:²⁰

Pūrāṇa Kassapa has made known six classes (*abhiṇṇā*) of mankind: a black one, a blue one, a red one, a green one, a white one, and a supremely white one. The black class: butchers of sheep, butchers of pigs, fowlers, deerstalkers, hunters, fishermen, thieves, executioners, prison-keepers, and others who follow a cruel occupation. The blue class: Buddhist monks who live as thieves, and believers in karma and [the efficiency of] works.²¹ The red class: Jainas (*nigāṇṭha*) who wear a single garment. The green class: house-holders who wear white cloths and are lay disciples of naked [ascetics] (*acelaka*). The white class: Ajivikas of both sexes. The supremely white class: Nanda Vaccha, Kisa Saṅkicca, Makkhali Gosāla.

This passage is interesting for various reasons. It confirms our earlier observation concerning the strong link between Ājivikas and nakedness. The development that can be discerned from class two to class five is one of increasing nakedness, or respect for nakedness. Buddhist monks are in this respect exceeded by Jainas who wear just one garment;²² these by Ajivikas who wear no clothes at all. Lay disciples of naked monks rank between Jainas and Ajivikas, i.e., higher than Jainas. It seems likely that in this passage, too, *acelaka* is to be understood as a synonym of *ājivaka*.

Interestingly, the same three individuals characterised here as constituting the supremely white class, are presented as naked in the Mahāsaccaka Sutta of the Majjhima Nikaya, in the following passage which is put in the mouth of Saccaka the Nigaṇṭha's son:²³

Well, there are, for example, Nanda Vaccha, Kisa Saṅkicca, Makkhali Gōsāla. They go naked, rejecting conventions, licking their hands, not coming when asked, not stopping when asked; they do not accept food brought or food specially made or an invitation to a meal; they receive nothing from a pot, from a bowl, across a threshold, across a stick, across a pestle, from two eating together, from a pregnant woman, from a woman giving suck, from a woman lying with a man, from where food is advertised to be distributed, from where a dog is waiting, from where flies are buzzing; they accept no fish or meat, they drink no liquor, wine or fermented brew. They keep to one house, to one morsel; they keep to two houses, to two morsels ... they keep to seven houses, to seven morsels. They live on one saucerful a day, on two saucerfuls a day ... on seven saucerfuls a day. They take food once a day, once every two days ... once every seven days, and so on up to once every fortnight; they dwell pursuing the practice of taking food at stated intervals.

For our present purposes it is particularly interesting to see that the Jainas are described in the above passage from the Aṅguttara Nikāya as "wearing a single garment" and therefore as not being naked.²⁴ This supports our conjecture that the Jainas mentioned in the early Buddhist texts are primarily the followers of Pārśva. The followers of Mahāvīra, if this conjecture is correct, might then be included among the Ājivikas. The fact that the lay disciples of the naked ascetics are described as wearing white clothes (*odātavasanā*) does not conflict with this hypothesis: exactly the same term is elsewhere used to describe the lay followers of Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta (e.g. MN II.244), as it is to describe the lay followers of the Buddha (e.g. DN III.37).

If we wish to check our hypothesis to the extent possible we have to keep in mind that the followers of Pārśva distinguished themselves not just on one, but on two counts from the followers of Mahāvīra: they wore clothes and followed four rather than five vows or restraints. What was the position of the Jainas depicted in the Buddhist canon?

The Sāmaññaphala Sutta of the Dīgha Nikāya attributes the following views to Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta:²⁵

... a Nigaṇṭha is bound by a fourfold restraint. What four? He is curbed by all curbs (*varā*), enclosed by all curbs, cleared by all curbs, and claimed by all curbs. And as far as a Nigaṇṭha is bound by this fourfold restraint, thus the Nigaṇṭha is called self-perfected, self-controlled, self-established.

A Sutta of the Saṃyutta Nikaya, too, characterises Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta as well bound by a fourfold restraint (*cattuyāmasasamvuta*; SN I.66). Hermann Jacobi noticed, already in 1880 (p. 160 (799)), that the fourfold restraint here attributed to Mahāvīra and his followers really belonged to Mahāvīra's predecessor Pārśva. It is true that the specification of these restraints in the Sāmaññaphala Sutta does not agree with what we learn from the Jaina canonical texts; T. W. Rhys Davids (1899: 75 n. 1) concluded from this that these restraints were *not* intended to represent the four vows kept by the followers of Pārśva. It seems however safer to agree with Maurice Walshe where he states (1987: 545 n. 115): "[The four restraints of the Sāmaññaphala Sutta] do not represent the genuine Jain teaching but seem to parody it in punning form."

How are the four restraints of Pārśva enumerated in the Jaina texts? The Thaṇaṅga (which qualifies them as taught by "the twenty-two arhats in the middle except for the first and the last one" enumerates them as follows:²⁶

- [1] *savvāo pāṇātivāyāo veramaṇaṃ* "Abstaining from all killing"
- [2] *savvāo musāvāyāo veramaṇaṃ* "Abstaining from all lying"
- [3] *savvāo adinnādāṇao veramaṇaṃ* "Abstaining from all taking what has not been given"
- [4] *savvāo bahiddhadāṇao veramaṇaṃ*.

Regarding the meaning of *bahiddhadāṇa* there is some difference of opinion. Schubring (1962: 30) resumes the situation as follows: "The ... word [*bahiddhādāna*] by [Abhayadeva's *Sthānaṅgavṛtti*] 202 a is taken as *bahirdhādāna* and commented as 'accepting (*ādāna*) from outside', i.e. the accepting of things not belonging to the monk's standard outfit. This prohibition is said to include the 'possession' of a female individual. Thus, as Abhayadeva adds, Pāsa's (= Pārśva's) *fourth* commandment would correspond with Mahāvīra's both fourth and fifth (sexual abstention and non-possession ...).²⁷ The former of these two Leumann sees expressed in *bahiddha-dāna* (sic), 'a decent term for copulation (the delivery of sperm)'.²⁸ Thus it is Pāsa's *third* vow that corresponds with both the third and fifth of Mahāvīra's including

prohibition of any appropriation other than by gift as well as by acquisition."

Rather than concentrating on the possible explanations of the problematic expression *bahiddhādāna*,²⁹ it will be useful to draw some other passages from the Buddhist canon into the picture. The Buddhist Saṅkha Sutta of the Saṃyutta Nikāya attributes the following doctrine (*dhmma*) to Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta:³⁰

- [a] Whosoever slayeth a living creature, – all such go to the Woeful Lot, to Purgatory.
- [b] Whosoever taketh what is not given,
- [c] whosoever acts wrongly in respect of sensual passion,
- [d] whoseover tells lies, – all such go to the Woeful Lot, to Purgatory.

This agrees with the four restraints of Pārśva, with the proviso however that one of Pārśva's restraints – the one that uses the expression *bahiddhādāna* – be interpreted in a sexual sense.

Against this the following objection might be raised. The Saṅkha Sutta enumerates the above four points for the benefit of a lay follower of the Nigaṇṭhas, viz. Asibandhakaputta. It might be maintained that they are really the five vows of Mahāvīra, with the exception of the one that can only be kept by a monk: *apariggaha* "possessionlessness".³¹ This objection, which is not strong in itself, loses most of its force in the light of another Buddhist passage. The Udumbarika-Sīhanāda Sutta of the Dīgha Nikāya uses the expression *cātuyāmasaṃvarasaṃvuto* "restrained by the four restraints" in connection with a hypothetical ideal ascetic, who follows the path of the Buddha. The four restraints are specified thus:³²

- (i) *na pāṇam atipāpeti, na pāṇam atipātayati, na pāṇam atipātayato samanūñño hoti;*
- (ii) *na adinnaṃ ādiyati, na adinnaṃ ādiyāpeti, na adinnaṃ ādiyato samanūñño hoti;*
- (iii) *na musā bhaṇāti, na musā bhaṇāpeti, na musā bhaṇato samanūñño hoti;*
- (iv) *na bhāvitam āsiṃsati, na bhāvitam āsiṃsāpeti, na bhāvitam āsiṃsato samanūñño hoti.*

This has been translated (Walshe, 1987: 390):

- (i) he does not harm a living being, does not cause a living being to be harmed, does not approve of such harming;
- (ii) he does not take what is not given, or cause it to be taken, or approve of such taking;

- (iii) he does not tell a lie, or cause a lie to be told, or approve of such lying;
- (iv) he does not crave for sense-pleasures, cause others to do so, or approve of such craving.

This, too, is obviously a variant of the four restraints of Pārśva. Once again, it is the last item on the list that causes difficulties of interpretation.³³ However, it allows of the interpretation given in the translation. We may therefore conclude, not only that *bahiddhādāna* in the Jaina texts is (also?) to be understood in the sense "sexual intercourse", but that the early Buddhists were aware of the exact meaning of the four restraints of the followers of Pārśva.

We can conclude from what precedes that the early Buddhists knew Pārśva's four restraints but attributed them to Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta and his disciples. This may be a mistake on the part of the Buddhists.³⁴ Alternatively, one might consider the possibility – suggested by Mette (1991: 134) – that Nātaputta and Mahāvīra were not one and the same person, and only came to be looked upon as such in relatively later parts of the Jaina canon.³⁵

[The question whether Mahāvīra died before the Buddha may be considered relevant in this context. After all, if he didn't, we may then be led to believe that he was, though contemporary with the Buddha, a younger contemporary, whose views had not yet reached their final form, or had not yet gained currency, during the latter's life time.³⁶ At first sight this conjecture – that Mahāvīra survived the Buddha for some time – has little to recommend itself, for several Buddhist Suttas mention Nātaputta's death and the Buddha's comments upon it.³⁷ In spite of this, this point of view has been maintained by some modern scholars.³⁸ Whatever the truth in this matter, we do not need this hypothesis to explain the teachings of Pārśva in association with the Nirgranthas, if it can be accepted – as has been argued so far – that the followers of Mahāvīra were included under the more general denomination of Ājīvikas.]³⁹

Our hypothesis to the extent that the early Buddhists used the term Ājīvika to refer to *all* naked religious wanderers, including the Jains who followed Mahāvīra, does not exclude that there may have been "real" Ājīvikas, wanderers who used this expression to refer to themselves, and who may have followed one or more specific teachers and shared among themselves a specific school doctrine.⁴⁰ The passage studied above mentions the names of three individuals who together constituted

the “supremely white class”: Nanda Vaccha, Kisa Saṅkicca, Makkhali Gosāla. It is at least conceivable that these were the recognized saints of the “real” Ājīvikas. This seems confirmed by the concluding remarks of the Sandaka-Sutta of the Majjhima Nikāya (no. 76). Here the wanderer (*paribbājaka*)⁴¹ Sandaka is reported as stating:⁴²

These Ājīvikas, those mothers’ dead sons, laud themselves and disparage others, and they recognise only three emancipated ones, namely, Nanda Vaccha, Kisa Saṅkicca, and Makkhali Gosāla.

A further confirmation may – but this is much less certain – be found in the Tevijja-Vacchagotta-Sutta of the Majjhima Nikāya (no. 71). This sermon (as do some other sermons) presents a wandering ascetic (*paribbājaka*)⁴³ belonging to the Vaccha clan (*vacchagotta*) whose personal name is not given but who is addressed as Vaccha. Vaccha asks whether there is any Ājīvika who, on the dissolution of the body, has made an end to suffering or has gone to heaven; the answer is, of course, negative (MN I.483). It is tempting to identify this *paribbājaka* Vaccha who is so obviously concerned with the fate of the Ājīvikas with Nanda Vaccha. This particular Sutta would then have to be understood as an attempt by the Buddhists to claim for themselves (Vaccha is converted in the very next Sutta) one of the leaders of the Ājīvikas. It is not, however, certain that the Sutta has to be understood in this manner.

The Sandaka Sutta, mentioned above, merits further attention. It contains a sermon addressed by Ānanda to the wanderer Sandaka. At Sandaka’s request Ānanda enumerates four “ways that negate the living of the holy life” (*abrahmacariyavāsa*) and four “kinds of holy life without consolation” (*anassāsikāni brahmacariyāni*).⁴⁴ The four “ways that negate the living of the holy life” are each followed by these comments:⁴⁵ “But it is superfluous for this good teacher to go about naked, to be bald, to exert himself in the squatting posture, and to pull out his hair and beard.” Nakedness, as we have seen, is in the Buddhist texts primarily, or even exclusively, associated with the Ājīvikas, and never with the Jainas; the remaining characteristics – baldness, squatting, pulling out hair and beard – are found among the latter as well. The then following four “kinds of holy life without consolation” are not commented upon in this manner. It is yet among these that we find a position that is elsewhere in the canon attributed to Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta. That is to say, from among the eight positions described by Ānanda, four are attributed to naked ascetics, the remaining four are not. In combination with the fact that Sandaka, as we have seen, mentions the Ājīvikas at the end of this Sutta, it seems justified to think that the

four “ways that negate the living of the holy life” (*abrahmacariyavāsa*) are here presented as positions belonging to Ājīvikas; this does not necessarily mean that they all belonged to the “real” Ājīvikas. These positions are identical with the positions attributed in the Sāmaññaphala Sutta of the Dīgha Nikāya to Ajita Kesakambalin, Pūraṇa Kassapa, Makkhali Gosāla⁴⁶ and Pakudha Kaccāyana respectively. The Sandaka Sutta does not attribute them to anyone in particular; it introduces each of them with the words:⁴⁷ “Here some teacher holds such a doctrine and view as this.”

Among the then following four “kinds of holy life without consolation” (*anassāsikāni brahmacariyāni*) we find a position that is elsewhere explicitly associated with the Jaina leader Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta.⁴⁸ This confirms our earlier conclusion that the Jainas are not counted among the naked ascetics. Ānanda begins the second part of his exposition with the words:⁴⁹

Here, Sandaka, some teacher claims to be omniscient and all-seeing, to have complete knowledge and vision thus: ‘Whether I am walking or standing or sleeping or awake, knowledge and vision are continuously and uninterruptedly present to me.’

This passage literally repeats the words attributed to Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta by his disciples in the Cūḷadukkhakkhandha Sutta of the Majjhima Nikāya.⁵⁰ Omniscience is, of course, an important theme in the Jaina canonical texts.⁵¹ However, the first “kind of holy life without consolation” is followed by a sequel that is particularly interesting. Ānanda first criticises the claim to omniscience of the anonymous teacher by saying:⁵²

He enters an empty house, he gets no almsfood, a dog bites him, he meets with a wild elephant, a wild horse, a wild bull, he asks the name and clan of a woman or a man, he asks the name of a village or a town, and the way to go there.

This cannot but be meant as a criticism of the claimed omniscience, which should be able to avoid all these futile or disagreeable events. Interestingly, the teacher concerned is allowed to reply to this criticism, in the following passage:⁵³

When he is questioned: ‘How is this?’ he replies: ‘I had to enter an empty house, that is why I entered it. I had to get no almsfood, that is why I did not get any. I had to be bitten by a dog, that is why I was bitten. I had to meet with a wild elephant, a wild horse, a wild bull, that is why I met with them. I had to ask the name and clan of a woman or a man, that is why I asked. I had to ask the name of a villager or a town and the way to go there, that is why I asked.’

It does not require much reflection to see that for someone who claims omniscience there can hardly be another way but this to explain his

misadventures to a sceptical critic. A self-proclaimed omniscient person who enters an empty house for alms should have known beforehand that the house is empty, so why does he enter it? The only justification possible would be to maintain that this particular excursion had not been inspired by the incorrect belief that there were people in the house, but was rather determined by a pre-existing set of rules. The omniscient person entered the empty house because he had to enter it. Strict determinism makes even an omniscient person behave like an ordinary one.

Ānanda does not react to the reply of the omniscient teacher, leaving the impression that he finds this reply totally unconvincing and ridiculous. However, it is no more ridiculous than the idea of omniscience. It might even be maintained that it is practically impossible for a human teacher to seriously claim omniscience without at the same time maintaining that human behaviour, including his own, is subject to deterministic rules. How else would he account for his mishaps, whether in the form of absence of almsfood and biting dogs, or elephants and other wild animals that cross his way?

Strict determinism is not normally associated with Jainism. It is a feature of the teachings of Makkhali Gosāla, probably one of the saints of "real" Ājīvikism, as we have seen. It is not commonly associated with the Jainas, but the present passage from the Sandaka Sutta shows that it may very well have been part of the early teachings of this religion. One might conjecture that determinism had an important role to play in the days when Mahāvīra was still alive and in the then following period during which the human behaviour, including errors, of the omniscient leaders of Jainism were still part of collective memory. With the subsequent idealisation of the omniscient sages of Jainism, elements of behaviour that might be taken to be in conflict with their omniscience disappeared, and with them the need for determinism as a means to explain them. What is more, determinism may have started to be felt as a limitation to the power of a Jina.

Determinism, if it did indeed characterise early Jainism, would not be the only feature it shared with Ājīvikism. The similarity between the six "colours of the soul" (*leśyā*) of the Jainas and the six *abhiyātis* of the Ājīvikas has often been commented upon.⁵⁴ It does not really matter here whether Jainism borrowed these notions from Ājīvikism (as has often been maintained), or vice-versa, or both from a common source. This shared feature can be taken as an indication that there may have been others. Determinism may have been one of them, and again it is not necessary (nor indeed possible, it would seem) to resolve the

question who borrowed from whom. The link between omniscience and determinism, suggested above, may have made the latter doctrine particularly attractive for all self-proclaimed Jinas.

Our reflections lead us to the following tentative two-fold conclusion. It seems likely that the Jainas (*nirgrantha*) and Ajivikas mentioned in the Buddhist canon are not simply two distinct and clearly delineated religious movements that existed at the time of the historical Buddha. The situation may have been more complicated. The term Ajivika may have been used for more than just one religious movement, and may indeed have covered the followers of Mahāvīra beside "real" Ajivikas and various other religious wanderers. The feature they all shared was nakedness, but this may have been the only feature they all had in common. On the other hand, one passage in the Buddhist canon suggests that the doctrinal position of the early Jainas may have been less distinct from that of the "real" Ajivikas than has often been supposed. Both may have adhered to a strict determinism, a position which was eminently useful to explain the human shortcomings of their "omniscient" leaders.

NOTES

¹ This article confines itself to the Buddhist canon in Pāli. No attempt has been made to include Buddhist canonical passages preserved in other languages.

² The PTS edition never seems to have *niggantha*, in spite of PTC s.v. "*niggantha* and *niggantha*". Does this explain the question mark at PTSD s.v. *niggantha*: "nis-gaṇṭhi ... is the customary (correct?) etym.?"

³ The Pāli canon (at least the PTS edition) more often uses the term *ājīvaka*. Where I am not directly quoting the texts, I will always use 'Ājīvika', which is the term that has become current, all the more so since it occurs in the title of Basham's important book on the topic (1951).

⁴ Cp. Dundas, 1992: 22 (diacritics and emphases added): "There is no knowledge of Mahāvīra's given name Vardhamāna in the earliest stratum of the biography and the use of the epithet Mahāvīra as a personal name, while occurring in the first book of the Sutrakṛtāṅga, is unknown in the first book of the Acaṅga. Furthermore, the oldest texts never use the term 'fordmaker' and very seldom *jina*, the word which gives Jainism its name. *Instead we find terms such as Nāyaputta*, 'son of the Nāyas', an obscure expression which seems to refer to Mahāvīra's clan, called in Sanskrit Jñātr, and the name by which he is known in early Buddhist writings ...". Cp. Dhaky, 1991. Adelheid Mette has made the suggestion that these different names and epithets did not necessarily refer to one and the same person in earliest Jainism; see below.

⁵ An exception is Jacobi, 1895: xv: "... it is still open to doubt whether the religion of the early Nirgranthas was essentially the same as that taught in the canonical and other books of the present Jainas, or underwent a great change up to the time of the composition of the Siddhānta. In order to come nearer the solution of this question, it may be desirable to collect from the published Buddhist works, as the oldest witnesses we can summon, all available information about the Niganthas.

their doctrines and religious practices.” He comes to the conclusion (p. xx): “It is ... not probable that the doctrines of the Jains have undergone a great change in the interval between the quoted Buddhist records and the composition of the Jaina canon.” See also Mette’s suggestion regarding the identity of Nātaputta and Mahāvira mentioned below.

⁶ Some parallel versions do not specify that Upaka is an Ājīvika; see Bareau, *Recherches* I p. 155 f.

⁷ Some parallel versions do not record that the person with the flower is an Ājīvika; see Bareau, *Recherches* II.2 pp. 218–219. Ājīvikas without further specifications are also mentioned Vin IV.224.

⁸ This does not need to be in conflict with Basham’s (1951: 107) observation to the extent that “[i]n later time the rule of nudity does not seem to have been regularly followed [by the Ājīvikas].”

⁹ Another comparable general category (“Allgemeinbegriff”) in the Pāli canon is designated by the term *paribbājaka*; see Freiburger, 1997.

There can be no doubt that Ud p. 65 – which mentions the presence of seven *jaṭilas*, seven *nigaṇṭhas*, seven *acelas*, seven *ekasātas* and seven *paribbājakas* – does not help to arrive at a correct interpretation of these categories.

¹⁰ See further Schubring, 1962: 29; Sen, 1931: 42–43; Mette (1991: 134) draws attention to the fact that Pārśva may once have been looked upon as the proclaimer of Uttarādhyaṇa 6.

¹¹ On *pratikramaṇa* see Bruhn, 1999: ch. 4.

¹² Vy 1.9.432–433 (ed. Ladnun p. 72); 1.9.300 (ed. Calcutta I p. 133); 1.9.23–24 (ed. Bombay p. 67): *cāujjāmāo dhammāo paṃcamahavaiyaṃ sapadikkamaṇaṃ dhammaṃ uvasampajjitaṃ na viharati/ tae naṃ se kālāsavesiyaputte anagāre bahūni vāsāni sāmaṇṇapariyāgaṃ pāṇai pāṇiṭṭa jassatthāe kīrai naggabhāve*; tr. Lalwani, 1973–1985: I: 134. Cp. Deleu, 1970: 85.

¹³ Mette (1991: 134) takes the name Keśin (“possessing hair”) as a clue that Pārśva’s disciples were not shaven headed.

¹⁴ Utt 23.11–13 (ed. Charpentier p. 170; ed. Ladnun p. 171); 23.847–849 (ed. Bombay p. 208): *keriso vā imo dhammo imo dhammo va keriso/ āyāraddhammapanīhi imā vā sā va kerisū/ cāujjāmo ya jo dhammo jo imo paṃcasikkho/ desio vaddhamāṇeṇa pāseṇa ya mahāmuṇi/ acelaṃ ya jo dhammo jo imo santaruttaro*; tr. Jacobi, 1895: 119 f. Cp. PPN I p. 200 s.v. I. Kesi.

¹⁵ Utt 23.29 (ed. Charpentier p. 172; ed. Ladnun p. 172); 23.865 (ed. Bombay p. 210): *acelaṃ ya jo dhammo jo imo santaruttaro, desio vaddhamāṇeṇa pāseṇa ya mahājasa*.

¹⁶ Āyāra 1.9.1.2&4 (ed. Leipzig; ed. Ladnun p. 72; ed. Delhi p. 201); 1.9.1.255&257 (ed. Bombay p. 89): *‘no c’ev’ imeṇa vatthenaṃ pihiṣṣāmi tamsi hemante’ – se pārāe āvakahāe, eyaṃ khu anudhammiyaṃ tassa. ... samvaccaram sāhiyaṃ māsaṃ jaṃ na rikk’āsi vatthagāṃ bhagavaṃ, acelaṃ tae cāi taṃ voṣajja vatthaṃ aṇḍāre*. Tr. Jacobi, 1884: 79, modified.

¹⁷ For a description of this text and its position in the Jaina canon, see Winternitz, 1920: 309–310.

¹⁸ Kalpa Sūtra (ed. Lalwani) p. 64: *saṃaṇe bhagavaṃ mahāvire samvaccaram sāhiya-māsaṃ jāva ... civaradhari hoṭhthaṃ teṇa paraṃ acele paṇi-paḍiggahie ...*; tr. Jacobi, 1884: 259–260.

¹⁹ The fact that the Nigaṇṭhas are described as shameless (*ahirika*) at AN V.150 does not change this. DPPN II p. 64 s.v. Nigaṇṭhā paraphrases Dh-p III.489–490 in the following words: “Unlike the Acelakas, [the Nigaṇṭhas] wore one garment, a covering in front. But when praised for their modesty, they answered that their reason for wearing a garment was to prevent dust and dirt from falling into their

alms-dishes. For even dust and dirt are actual individuals and endowed with the principle of life.”

²⁰ AN III.383–384: *Puraṇeṇa bhante kassapeha chalaḥbhijāṭiyo paṇṇattā: kaṇḥābhijāṭi paṇṇattā, nīlābhijāṭi paṇṇattā, lohitaḥbhijāṭi paṇṇattā, haliddābhijāṭi paṇṇattā, sukkābhijāṭi paṇṇattā, paramasukkābhijāṭi paṇṇattā. Tatr’ idaṃ bhante puraneṇa kassapeṇa kaṇḥābhijāṭi paṇṇattā: orabbhikā sūkarikā sākaṇikā māgavikā luddā macchaghataka cora coraghataka bandhanagarikā, ye va paṇ’āñhe pi keci kurārakamantā. Tatr’ idaṃ bhante puraneṇa kassapeṇa nīlābhijāṭi paṇṇattā: bhikkhū kaṇḍakavattika, ye va paṇ’ āñhe pi keci kammavada kiriyavada. Tatr’ idaṃ bhante puraneṇa kassapeṇa lohitaḥbhijāṭi paṇṇattā: nigaṇṭhā ekasātakā. Tatr’ idaṃ bhante puraneṇa kassapeṇa haliddābhijāṭi paṇṇattā: gihi odātavasaṇā acelasāvaka. Tatr’ idaṃ bhante puraneṇa kassapeṇa sukkābhijāṭi paṇṇattā: ajīvaka ājivikiniyo. Tatr’ idaṃ bhante puraneṇa kassapeṇa paramasukkābhijāṭi paṇṇattā: nando vaccho kiso saṅkicco makkhali gosālo. Puraṇeṇa bhante kassapeṇa imā chalaḥbhijāṭiyo paṇṇattā ti. Cp. Basham, 1951: 243–244.*

²¹ For this translation, see Basham, 1951: 139.

²² It is not clear why the Jains are here described as wearing just one garment (*ekasāṭaka*) where the followers of Pārśva are allowed to wear an under and upper garment.

²³ MN 1.238: “*Seyyathidaṃ: Nando Vaccho, Kiso Saṅkicco, Makkhali Gosālo – ete hi bho gotama acelaḥ mutācārā hatthāpalekhaṇā, na ehiḥhadantikā, na tiṭṭhāhadantikā, na abhihaṭaṇaṃ na uddissakaṭaṇaṃ na nimantaṇaṃ sādiyaṇti. Te na kumbhīmukhā patigaṇṭhaṇti, na kaḷopimukhā patigaṇṭhaṇti, na eḷakamantaram, na daṇḍamantaram, na musalamantaram, na dvinnam bhuñjamaṇānaṃ, na gabbhīniyā, na pāyamaṇāya, na purisantaragatāya, na saṅkittisu, na yattha sā upaṭṭhito hoti, na yattha makkhikā saṇḍasaṇḍacārīni, na macchaṃ, na maṇsaṃ, na suraṃ na merayaṃ na thusodakaṃ pipanti. Te ekāgārikā vā honti ekāloṇikā, dvāgārikā vā honti dvāloṇikā, sattāgārikā vā honti sattāloṇikā. Ekissā pi dattiyā yāpenti, dvīhi pi dattīhi yāpenti, sattahi pi dattīhi yāpenti. Ekāhikam pi āhāraṃ āhārenti, dvīhikam pi āhāraṃ āhārenti, sattāhikam pi āhāraṃ āhārenti. Iti evaṇiṇaṃ addhamāsikam pi pariyaṇvabhataḥhojanānuyogam anuyutā viharanti*” ti. Tr. Nānamoli and Bodhi, 1995: 333. Note that the Mahāsihanāda Sutta of the Majjhima Nikāya uses the same words to describe the ascetic practices of the Buddha before his enlightenment (MN 1.77–78). These are the practices of someone who tortures himself and pursued the practice of torturing himself (*puggalo attantapo attapariṭṭāpānuyogam anuyutto*; MN 1.342: 412).

²⁴ It is intriguing that the Digambaras “describe Makkhali Gosāla (called Makkadi or Masayari) as a mendicant in the tradition of Pārśva who wished to become one of Mahāvira’s gaṇadharas” (Jaini, 1979: 24–25 n. 57).

²⁵ DN 1.57: *... nigaṇṭho cātu-yāma-samvara-samvuto hoti. Kathaṃ ca ... nigaṇṭho cātu-yāma-samvuto hoti? ... nigaṇṭho sabba-vārī-vārito ca hoti, sabba-vārī-yuto ca, sabba-vārī-dhuto ca, sabba-vārī-phuttho ca. Evam ... nigaṇṭho cātu-yāma-samvara-samvuto hoti. Yato ... nigaṇṭho evam cātu-yāma-samvara-samvuto hoti, ayaṃ vuccati ... nigaṇṭho gatatto ca yatatto ca iṭṭatto cati*. Tr. Walshe, 1987: 96–97.

²⁶ Thāṇa 4.136 (ed. Ladnun p. 609); 4.1.266 (ed. Delhi p. 134); 4.1.266 (ed. Bombay p. 103).

²⁷ Cp. Sthānaṅgasūtram and Samavāyaṅgasūtram, with the Vṛtti of Abhayadeva, p. 135: “*bahirdhādāṇā*” ti bahirdhā: maithunam parigrahaḥśeṣaḥ adanam ca parigrahas tayoṛ dvandvaikatvam athava adhyata ity adanam parigrahaṃ vastu, tac ca dharmopakaraṇam api bhavāṇi ata āha: bahistāt dharmopakaraṇād bahir yad iti; iha ca maithunam parigrahe ‘ntar bhavati, na hy aparighṛtā yoṣid bhuja[re].

²⁸ Note that Ratnachandra’s Illustrated Ardhā-Magadhi Dictionary III p. 673, s.v. *bahiddha*, *bahiddhā*, gives the Sanskrit equivalent *bahiradhyān* for these two terms.

²⁹ Cp. Mette, 1991: 135 f.

³⁰ SN IV.317: [a] *yo koci pāṇam atimāpeti sabbo so āpāyiko nerayiko*, [b] *yo koci adinnam ādiyati sabbo so āpāyiko nerayiko*, [c] *yo koci kāmesu micchācarati sabbo so āpāyiko nerayiko*, [d] *yo koci musā bhanati sabbo so āpāyiko nerayiko*. Tr. Woodward, 1927: 223–224.

³¹ The five vows of Mahāvīra are described as follows at Āyāra II (Āyārācūla) ch. 15 (ed. Ladnun pp. 241–246; ed. Bombay pp. 278–288; ed. Delhi pp. 283–285): [1] *pacchakkhāmi savvaṃ pānāvāyāṃ* ...; [2] *pacchakkhāmi savvaṃ musāvāyāṃ vāidosāṃ* ...; [3] *pacchakkhāmi savvaṃ adinṇādānaṃ* ...; [4] *pacchakkhāmi savvaṃ mehuṇaṃ* ...; [5] *savvaṃ pariggahaṃ pacchakkhāmi*. Tr. Jacobi, 1884: 202–208: “[1] I renounce all killing of living beings ...; [2] ... all vices of lying speech ...; [3] ... all taking of anything not given ...; [4] ... all sexual pleasures ...; [5] ... all attachments ...”.

³² DN III.48–49.

³³ Cp. Walshe, 1987: 600 n. 766; T.W. and C.A.F. Rhys Davids, 1921: 44 n. 1. Mette (1991: 136) translates “he aspires not the object of his imagination” and comments: “*Bhāvita*, the product of *bhāvanā*, the unfolding of pictures on the inward eye, appears to be equivalent to the content of the term *bahiddhā* in just that sense, in which the warning of the Dasaveyāliya stanza was meant”. The stanza of the Dasaveyāliya concerned (2.4) states (Mette, 1991: 135): “It could be that, while he wanders about with equanimity, his senses digress outwards (*bahiddhā*). ‘She is not mine, nor am I hers’, only by thinking of her in this way can he curb his passion.” (*samāe pehāe parivvayaṃto siyā maṇo nissaraī bahiddhā/ na sā mahaṃ no vi ahaṃ pi tīse icceva tāo viṇaṇṇa rāgaṃ/*; ed. Bombay p. 2; ed. Ladnun p. 28; ed. Lalwani p. 6).

³⁴ Jacobi (1895: xxi) draws attention to another “significant blunder” of the Buddhists: “they call Nātaputta an Aggivesana, i.e. Agnivaiśyāyana; according to the Jainas, however, he was a Kāśyapa, and we may credit them in such particulars about their own Tirthakara.”

³⁵ It would be interesting to know whether Jacobi’s “significant blunder” (see the preceding note) might be explained in the light of this possibility. At first sight the Sūyagaḍa would seem to identify Nāyaputta (= Nātaputta) and Kāsava (= Kāśyapa): see Sūy I.6.7ab: “The omniscient sage, Kāśyapa, has proclaimed this highest Law of the Jinās” (*anuttaram dhammam iṇaṃ jīṇaṃ, ṇetaṃ muṇī kāsava āsupanne*), beside verses 14cd: “... the Śramaṇa Jñātrputra (= Nāyaputta/Nātaputta), who is noble, glorious, full of faith, knowledge, and virtue” (... *samaṇe nāyaputte, jāti-jaso-damsaṇa-nāṇasīle*) and 23d: “the Śramaṇa Jñātrputra [is] the highest of men” (*louttame samaṇe nāyaputte*) of the same chapter (tr. Jacobi; text cited from Bombay edition). Utt 2.1 (ed. Charpentier), on the other hand, speaks of “the Venerable Aseetic Mahāvīra of the Kāśyapa Gotra” (*samaṇeṇaṃ bhagavayā mahāvīreṇaṃ kāsaveṇaṃ*; tr. Jacobi) and therefore identifies Mahāvīra with Kāśyapa.

³⁶ It is yet interesting to see that Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta is depicted as scheming against the Buddha, e.g. in the Abhayarājakumāra Sutta (MN 1.392 f.) and Upāli Sutta (MN 1.371 f.).

³⁷ MN II.243 f. (no. 104: Sāmagāma Sutta); DN III.117 f. (no. 29: Pāsādikā Sutta); DN III.209 f. (no. 33: Saṅgīti Sutta). There is no canonical support for the claim, made by Buddhaghosa (Ps III.99–100), to the extent that Nātaputta died soon after spitting blood as a result of the defection of Upāli described in the Upāli Sutta (MN 1.387).

³⁸ E.g. Basham, 1951: 75; see further Bechert, 1983 (on Jacobi).

³⁹ Jacobi maintained that “the Buddhists ascribed the old Nirgrantha creed [and dressing habits] to Nātaputta, who then took the lead of the community, and of whose reforms, being indeed only trifling, his opponents were not aware” (1880: 160 (799)). Later (1895: xxxi–xxxii) he gave expression to the assumption “that

the original Nigaṇṭhas, of whom the Buddhist records usually speak, were not the section of the church, which submitted to the more rigid rules of Mahāvīra, but those followers of Pārśva, who, without forming a hostile party, yet continued, I imagine, to retain within the united church some particular usages of the old one.”

⁴⁰ A different kind of naked (*acela*) ascetic is the one known by the name *kukkuravatika* “imitating a dog”. Examples are Seniya, depicted in the Kukkuravatika Sutta (MN 1.493 f.), and Korakkhattiya (DN III.6). The Buddha himself is stated to have practised nudity before his enlightenment: MN 1.77 f.

⁴¹ See note 8, above.

⁴² MN 1.524: *Ime paṇ’ ājīvaka puttamatāya puttā, attānaṃ c’ eva ukkamsenti pare ca vāmbhenti, tayo c’ eva niyyātāro paññāpentī, seyyathidaṃ nandaṃ vacchaṃ, kisaṃ saṅkiccaṃ, makkhalin gosālaṃ ti*. Tr. Nānamoli and Bodhi, 1995: 628.

⁴³ See note 8, above. The use of the expression *paribbajaka* here and in the Sandaka Sutta suggests that this term also covers the Ajivikas. A passage that might be taken to suggest the opposite, is the one presenting the views of Makkhali Gosāla (DN 1.53–54; MN 1.517–518; SN III.211–212), which in one reading enumerates 4’900 *ajivakas* and 4’900 *paribbājakas*.

⁴⁴ MN 1.514: tr. Nānamoli and Bodhi, 1995: 618.

⁴⁵ MN 1.515: *atirekaṃ kho paṇ’ imassa bhoto satthuno naggiyaṃ muṇḍiyaṃ ukkuṭikappadhānaṃ kesamassulocanaṃ*. Tr. Nānamoli and Bodhi, 1995: 620.

⁴⁶ The Sandaka Sutta presents the long enumeration of often obscure items elsewhere attributed to Makkhali Gosāla at the end of the last position, i.e. the one elsewhere attributed to Pakudha Kaccāyana.

⁴⁷ MN 1.515, 516, 517: *idha ekacco satthā evaṃvādī hoti evaṃdiṭṭhi*.

⁴⁸ The remaining three “kinds of holy life without consolation” are less revealing. Ananda mentions a teacher who is “a traditionalist, one who regards oral tradition as truth”, one who is “a reasoner, an inquirer”, and finally one who is “dull and confused” (MN 1.520: *anussaviko ... anussavasacco; takkī ... vimamsī; mando ... momuho*). The last of these, the dull and confused one, is said to engage in verbal wriggling, in eel-wriggling: “I don’t say it is like this. And I don’t say it is like that. And I don’t say it is otherwise. And I don’t say it is not so. And I don’t say it is not so. And I don’t say it is not so.” (MN 1.520–521: *so mandattā momuhattā tathā tathā paññaṃ puttā samāno vācāvikkhepaṃ āpajati amarāvikkhepaṃ; evaṃ – pi no, tathā pi me no, aññathā pi me no, no ti pi me no, no no ti pi me no ti*.) Exactly the same words are attributed to Saṅjaya Belatṭhiputa in the Sāmaññaphala Sutta (DN 1.58). It is hard to derive a clear position from these descriptions.

⁴⁹ MN 1.519: *idha Sandaka ekacco satthā sabbaññū sabbadassāvī aparisesaṃ nānadassanaṃ patijānāti: carato ca me tiṭṭhato ca suttassa ca jāgarassa ca satatam samitam nānadassanaṃ paccupatthitaṃ – ti*. Tr. Nānamoli and Bodhi, 1995: 623–624.

⁵⁰ MN 1.92–93: *Nigaṇṭho ... Nāthaputto sabbaññū sabbadassāvī aparisesaṃ nānadassanaṃ patijānāti: carato ca me tiṭṭhato ca suttassa ca jāgarassa ca satatam samitam nānadassanaṃ paccupatthitaṃ – ti*. The same attribution occurs MN II.218; AN 1.220; IV.429. These words are attributed to Pūraṇa Kassapa at AN IV.428. At MN 1.482 the Buddha denies that this characterisation applies to him; at MN II.127 he specifies that no one can know and see all simultaneously.

⁵¹ Cp. Schubring, 1962: 327; Jaini, 1979: 27–28; Dundas, 1992: 22.

⁵² MN 1.519: *So suññaṃ pi agāraṃ pavisati, piṇḍaṃ pi na labhati, kukkuro pi ḍasati, candena pi hatthinā samāgacchati, candena pi assena samāgacchati, candena pi gonena samāgacchati, iṭṭhiyā pi purisassa pi nāmaṃ pi gottam pi pucchati, gāmassa pi nigamassa pi nāmaṃ pi maggaṃ pi pucchati*. Tr. Nānamoli and Bodhi, 1995: 624.

⁵³ MN 1.519: *So kim idan ti puttā samāno suññaṃ me agāraṃ pavisitabbaṃ ahoṣi, tena pavisaṃ. Piṇḍaṃ me aladdhabbaṃ ahoṣi, tena nālattaṃ. Kukkurēna*

dasitabbam ahoṣi, ten'amhi dappho. Candena haṭṭhinā samāgantabbam ahoṣi, tena samāgamam. Candena assena samāgantabbam ahoṣi, tena samāgamam. Candena gonena samāgantabbam ahoṣi, tena samāgamam. Iṭṭhiyā pi purisassa pi nāman pi gottam pi pucchitabbam ahoṣi, tenāpucchim. Gāmassa pi nigamassa pi nāman pi maggam pi pucchitabbam ahoṣi, tenāpucchim ti. Tr. Nāṇamoli and Bodhi, 1995: 624.

⁵⁴ E.g. Leumann, 1889: 331 (517); Jacobi, 1895: xxx; Basham, 1951: 245; Frauwallner, 1956: 283; Schubring, 1962: 196 n. 2; Jaini, 1979: 114; 26; Tsuchihashi, 1983. A passage in the Devadaha Sutta suggests at first sight that the Nigaṇṭhas themselves accepted the abhijātis (MN II.222: *sace, bhikkhave, sattā abhijātīhetu sukhadukkham paṭisaṃvedenti, addhā, bhikkhave, Nigaṇṭhā pāpābhijātikā yam etarahi evarūpā dukkhā tippā kaṭukā vedanā vediyanti* "If the pleasure and pain that beings feel are caused by class [among the six classes of birth], then the Nigaṇṭhas surely must belong to a bad class, since they now feel such painful, racking, piercing feelings"; tr. Nāṇamoli and Bodhi, 1995: 833). However, this passage is part of a list of similar remarks, some of which (such as the belief that feeling pleasure and pain is caused by the creative act of a Supreme God, *issaranimmānaheṭu*) clearly do not concern the Jainas.

REFERENCES

- Āyāra (= Ācārāṅga Sūtra). 1) Āyāraṅga-Suttam, ed. Muni Jambūvijaya, Bombay: Shri Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, 1977 (Jaina-Āgama-Series No. 2 (I)). 2) Ācārāṅgasūtram and Sūtrakṛtāṅgasūtram, with the Nirukti of Bhadrabāhu and the commentary of Śīlāṅka, ed. Śāgarānandasūri, re-edited with appendices etc. by Muni Jambūvijaya, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1978 (Lālā Sundarlāl Jain Āgamagranthamālā I) 3) Ācārāṅga-Sūtram, Erster Śrutaskandha. Text, Analyse und Glossar von Walther Schubring, Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1910. 4) Anga Suttāni I, ed. Muni Nathamal, Ladnun: Jain Viswa Bhārati, V.S. 2031.
- Basham, A.L. (1951). *History and Doctrines of the Ājivikas. A Vanished Indian Religion*, 1951. Reprint: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1981.
- Bechert, Heinz (1983). 'A Remark on the Problem of the Date of Mahāvīra', IT 11: 287–290.
- Bruhn, Klaus (1999). Fünf Gelübde und sechs Avashyakas – Grundzüge der Jaina-Ethik / Five Vows and Six Avashyakas – The fundamentals of Jaina ethics. HERE-NOW4U (<http://www.here-now4u.de/ger/spr/religion/Bruhn/> and <http://www.here-now4u.de/eng/spr/Bruhn/>).
- Dasaveyāliya Sutta (= Daśavaikālika Sūtra). 1. Bombay edition; for details see Uttarajjayana. 2) Nava Suttāni V, ed. Yuvācārya Mahaprajña, Ladnun: Jain Vishva Bhārati, 1987. 3) = Lalwani, 1973.
- Deleu, Jozef (1970). *Viyāhapannatti (Bhagavāi): The Fifth Anga of the Jaina Canon*. Introduction, critical analysis, commentary & indexes. Reprint: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1996. (Lālā Sundar Lal Jain Research Series, 10.)
- Dhaky, M.A. (1991). "'Nātaputta' in Early Nirgrantha Literature", Pt. Dalsukh Bhai Malvania Felicitation Volume I. Ed. M.A. Dhaky & Sagarmal Jain. Varanasi: P.V. Research Institute. (Aspects of Jainology, 3.) Pp. 120–124.
- Dundas, Paul (1992). *The Jainas*. London and New York: Routledge. (The Library of Religious Beliefs and Practices.)
- Franke, R. Otto (1913). *Dighanikāya. Das Buch der langen Texte des buddhistischen Kanons in Auswahl übersetzt*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Frauwallner, Erich (1956). *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie. II. Band: Die naturphilosophischen Schulen und das Vaiśeṣika-System; das System der Jainas; der Materialismus*. Salzburg: Otto Müller. (Reihe Wort und Antwort, 6/II.)
- Freiberger, Oliver (1997). 'Zur Verwendungsweise der Bezeichnung *paribhājaka* im Pāli-Kanon', Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur, Zweite Folge. Gustav Roth zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet. Ed. Heinz Bechert, Sven Bretfeld und Petra Kieffer-Pölz. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997. (SWTF, Beiheft 8.) Pp. 121–130.
- Jacobi, Hermann (1880). 'On Mahāvīra and his Predecessors', Indian Antiquary, June 1880, pp. 158–163. Reprint: KISchr II pp. 797–802.
- Jacobi, Hermann (1884). *Jaina Sūtras. Part I: The Ācārāṅga Sūtra; the Kalpa Sūtra*. Reprint: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1980.
- Jacobi, Hermann (1895). *Jaina Sūtras. Part II: The Uttarādhyayana Sūtra; the Sūtrakṛtāṅga Sūtra*. Reprint: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1968.
- Jaini, Padmanabh S. (1979). *The Jaina Path of Purification*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Lalwani, Kastur Chand (1973). *Ārya Sayyambhava's Daśavaikālika Sūtra (Dasaveyāliya Sutta)*. [Text, [translation and notes. Delhi etc.: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Lalwani, K.C. (1973–1985). *Bhagavati Sutra, Prakṛit Text with English Translation and Notes Based on the Commentary of Abhayadeva Suri*. 4 vols. (Satakas 1–11). Calcutta: Jain Bhawan.
- Lalwani, Kastur Chand (1979). *Kalpa Sutra of Bhadrabāhu Svami*. Translation and notes. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Leumann, Ernst (1889). Review of *The Uvasaga-dasao ...* by R. Hoernle. WZKM 3, 328–350. Reprint: KISchr pp. 514–536.
- Mette, Adelheid (1991). 'The Synchronism of the Buddha and the Jina Mahāvīra and the Problem of Chronology in Early Jainism', *The Dating of the Historical Buddha / Die Datierung des historischen Buddha*, Part I (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, IV.1). Ed. Heinz Bechert. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (AAWG, Dritte Folge Nr. 189.) Pp. 132–137.
- Nāṇamoli, Bhikkhu, and Bhikkhu Bodhi (1995). *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha. A New Translation of the Majjhima Nikāya*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Norman, K.R. (tr.) (1984). *The Group of Discourses (Sutta-Nipāta)*, Volume I. With alternative translations by I.B. Horner and Walpola Rahula. London: PTS. (PTSTS, 44.)
- Ratnachandra (1923). *An Illustrated Ardha-Magadhi Dictionary, with Sanskrit, Gujarati, Hindi and English Equivalents. References to the Texts and Copious Quotations*. 5 vols. Reprint: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1988.
- Rhys Davids, T.W. (1899). *Dialogues of the Buddha, Translated from the Pāli*. Part I. Reprint: Pali Text Society, London, 1977. (SBB, 2.)
- Rhys Davids, T.W. and C.A.F. (1921). *Dialogues of the Buddha. Translated from the Pāli of the Dīgha Nikāya*. Part III. Reprint: PTS 1977. (SBB, 4.)
- Schubring, Walther (1962). *The Doctrine of the Jainas. Described After the Old Sources*. Translated from the revised German edition by Wolfgang Beurlen. Reprint: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1978.
- Sen, Amulyachandra (1931). *Schools and Sects in Jaina Literature*. Being a full account compiled from original sources of the doctrines and practices of Philosophical School[s] and Religious Sects mentioned in the canonical literature of the Jainas. Calcutta. (Visva-Bharati Studies, 3.)
- Thāṇa (= Sthānāṅga Sūtra). 1) Thāṇaṅgasuttam and Samavāyaṅgasuttam, ed. Muni Jambūvijaya, Bombay: Shri Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, 1985 (Jaina-Āgama-Series No. 3). 2) Sthānāṅgasūtram and Samavāyaṅgasūtram, with the Vṛtti of Abhayadeva, ed. Śāgarānandasūri, re-edited with appendices etc. by Muni Jambūvijaya, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1985 (Lālā Sundarlāl Jain Āgamagranthamālā II). 3) Anga Suttāni I, ed. Muni Nathamal, Ladnun: Jain Viswa Bhārati, V.S. 2031. (I have also

consulted another edition of Thāṇaṅga brought out by Muni Nathmal (Ladnun: Jain Vishva Bhārati, 1976) which contains Sanskrit and Hindi translations.)
 Tsuchihashi, Kyōshū (1983). 'On the Literal Meaning of Leśyā', IT 11, 195–202.
 Uttarajjhayaṇa / Uttarajjhāyā (Uttarādhyayana Sūtra). 1) The Uttarādhyayanasūtra. An introduction, text, critical notes and a commentary, by Jarl Charpentier, 1914; reprint New Delhi: Ajay Book Service, 1980. 2) Nava Suttāṇi V, ed. Yuvācārya Mahāprajña, Ladnun: Jain Vishva Bharati, 1987. 3) Dasaveyāliyasuttam, Uttarajjhayaṇam and Āvassayasuttam, ed. Muni Punyavijayaji and Pt. Amritlāl Mohanlāl Bhojak, Bombay: Shri Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, 1977 (Jaina-Agama-Series No. 15).
 Viyāhapannatti (= Vyākhyaprajñapti). 1) Bhagavati Viyāhapannatti, ed. Muni Nathmal, Ladnun: Jain Visva Bhārati, V.S. 2031 (Aṅga Suttanti, 2). 2) Viyāhapannattisuttam, ed. Becharadas J. Doshi and Amritlāl Mohanlāl Bhojak, Bombay: Shri Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, 1974–1982, 3 parts (Jaina-Agama-Series, 4). 3) Bhagavati Sūtra, Prakrit text with English translation and notes based on the commentary of Abhayadeva Sūri, by K.C. Lalwani 4 vols. (Śatakas 1–11), Calcutta: Jain Bhawan, 1973–1985.
 Walshe, Maurice (1987). *The Long Discourses of the Buddha. A Translation of the Dīgha Nikāya*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
 Winternitz, Moriz (1920). *Geschichte der Indischen Literatur. Band 2. Die Buddhistische Literatur und die Heiligen Texte der Jainas*. Nachdruck: K.F. Koehler, Stuttgart, 1968.
 Woodward, F.L. (1927). *The Book of the Kindred Sayings (Saṃyutta-Nikāya)*, Part IV. London: PTS. (PTSTS, 14.)

ABBREVIATIONS

AAWG	Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl.
AN	Aṅguttara-Nikāya, ed. R. Morris, E. Hardy, 5 vols., London 1885–1900 (PTS); vol. 6 (Indexes, by M. Hunt and C.A.F. Rhys Davids), London 1910 (PTS)
CPD	A Critical Pāli Dictionary, begun by V. Trenckner, ed. D. Anderson, H. Smith, H. Hendriksen, vol. I, Copenhagen 1924–1948, vol. II (fasc. 1ff.), Copenhagen 1960 ff.
Dhp-a	Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā, ed. H.C. Norman, 5 vols., London 1906–1914 (PTS)
DN	Dīghanikāya, ed. T.W. Rhys Davids, J.E. Carpenter, 3 vols. 1890–1911 (PTS)
DPPN	G.P. Malalasekera, Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names, 2 vols., London 1937–1938
IT	Indologica Taurinensia, Torino
KISchr	Kleine Schriften [in der Serie der Glasenapp-Stiftung], Wiesbaden, Stuttgart
LDS	Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Series, Ahmedabad
MN	Majjhima-Nikāya, ed. V. Trenckner, R. Chalmers, 3 vols., London 1888–1899 (PTS)
Mp	Buddhaghosa, Manorathapūraṇī, Aṅguttaranikāya-aṭṭhakathā, ed. M. Walleiser, H. Kopp, 5 vols., London 1924–1956 (PTS)

PPN	Agamic Index, vol. I: Prakṛit Proper Names, compiled by Mohanlal Mehta & K. Rishabh Chandra, edited by Dalsukh Malvania, 2 parts, Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology, 1970–1972 (LDS 28, 37)
Ps	Buddhaghosa, Papañcasūdanī, Majjhimanikāya-aṭṭhakathā, ed. J.H. Woods, D. Kosambi, I.B. Horner, 5 vols., London 1922–1938 (PTS)
PTC	Pāli Tipitakam Concordance, ed. F.L. Woodward, E.M. Hare, London 1952 ff.
PTS	Pāli Text Society, London
PTSD	The Pāli Text Society's Pāli-English Dictionary, ed. T.W. Rhys Davids, W. Stede, London 1921
PTSTS	Pāli Text Society Translation Series, London
Sn	Suttanipāta, ed. D. Andersen, H. Smith, London 1913 (PTS)
SN	Saṃyutta-Nikāya, ed. L. Feer, 5 vols., London 1884–1898 (PTS), vol. 6 (Indexes by C.A.F. Rhys Davids), London 1904 (PTS)
Ud	Udāna, ed. P. Steinthal, London 1885 (PTS)
Utt	Uttarajjhayaṇa
Vin	Vinayaṭṭhaka, ed. H. Oldenberg, 5 vols., London 1879–1883 (PTS)
Viy	Viyāhapannatti
WZKM	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Wien

Section de langues et civilisations orientales
Université de Lausanne
BFSH 2
CH-1015 Lausanne
Switzerland