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Introduction

In two earlier publications — 1991 (Leiden) and 1993 (Tokyo) — a methodological scheme was described for which we used the term “Sectional Studies”. The latter of these two publications contained a number of improvements and already emphasized “sections” and “strategies” as the basic elements of the scheme (1993: § 11). We now present the scheme in a more finalized form.

Although, as indicated in the title, our primary subject is Jainism, we have included the two great epics as a subsidiary subject. On the one hand, we wanted to demonstrate that our observations are not, by their very nature, restricted to one particular subject, while, on the other hand, we felt that an extension of the subject would enable us to include proposals which are the natural outcome of the sectional concept, but which cannot be demonstrated by an analysis of Jainism alone.

Due to the nature of our argument and the character of our terminology we thought it advisable to add to the five chapter titles (§§ 1-5) a more comprehensive, though not complete, listing of the elements of these chapters at the beginning of the paper:

§ 1. The architecture of the sections. Sectional and subsectional lists. 10

§ 2. The Strategies. «Order» (18-19) and «distinction» (19-21). 15

§ 3. The implementation of the subsectional lists of § 1. «Narrative literature in Jainism» (22-24); «narrative literature in the two epics» (24-26); «Jaina ethics» (26-28). 22

§ 4. Further observations on sectional studies. «Structural phenomena and further peculiarities» (30-41). 28

§ 5. Organization of research. «Adaptation» (41-43); «quantity management» (43-44); «language» (45-47). 41

In the course of the paper, we have quoted our own publications only where it seemed justified and necessary. A short remark on our previous studies may not, nevertheless, be superfluous. Our preoccupation with method from the beginning has taken two different forms. On the one hand, specific suggestions were made, e.g. compare “cluster analysis” (BRUHN Ma: 191-92). On the other hand, theses of a more general character were proposed on several occasions, forming, as it were, prototypes of the present study. This new study may shed some light on both forms, but even then we would like to stress that the specific suggestions, some of which require, no doubt, further clarification are, on the whole, less intriguing than the prototypes. Last but not least, we would like to warn the reader that the present paper does not contain in any way what may be called new discoveries. We do not present any new etymology and, likewise, no new literary parallel. Our object is the planning of research in the sense of a critical examination of the canon of research («extended canon» versus «current canon»), and we hope that, on this level, some results will emerge.

§ 1. The architecture of the sections

As indicated already, sections and strategies are the two pillars on which the scheme rests. The present chapter (§ 1) is concerned with sections in general whereas the details are supplied further on (§ 3). While, broadly speaking, sections can be compared with chapters in a book, the case of strategies is different. They form no systematic or semi-systematic ensemble. Therefore, we have merely selected a small number of strategies (basically five) for detailed treatment (§ 2 and § 5).

Although previously (BRUHN Se, BRUHN Ma) we distinguished between frame subjects (upper level) and sections (lower level), now we would prefer a three level concept, where the sections are, in their turn, subdivided into subsections. Furthermore, we also use the words “section” and “sectional” — in the expression “sectional studies” and elsewhere — in a general manner, so that they cover all three levels: frame subjects (FS), sections (S), and subsections (SS). Certain terminological oscillations between sections in their narrowest (S) and in their widest sense (FS-S-SS) are, however, unavoidable. We start with two sectional lists covering our two frame subjects, «Jainism» and «the two epics», in their entirety (two frame subjects subdivided into sections):

Jainism

I Ethics
II Doctrine of karma, soteriology
III Monastic discipline
IV Ritual
V Literature in general
VI Narrative literature
VII The semi-historical literature (Mahāvira and after)
of three, and only three, levels. After these preliminary remarks we can proceed to
the presentation of three subsectional lists (three sections divided into subsections):

List One: Narrative literature in Jainism

1.1 The universal history: Jina.s, Cakravartins, "triads" (Baladeva, Vāsudeva, and Prativiśudeva)
1.2 The non-Jaina cycles (Harivamśa etc.)
1.3 The stories in the various exegetical "literatures" (Āvaśyaka literature etc.)
1.4 Narrative literature in the Śvetāmbara canon
1.5 Motif types (temptation stories etc.)
1.6 Motifs in general
1.7 Parallel versions
1.8 «Structural phenomena and further peculiarities»

List Two: Narrative literature in the two epics

2.1 The main story
2.2 Other stories
2.3 Individual characters (Krṣṇa etc.)
2.4 Categories of beings (rākṣasa.s etc.)
2.5 Motif types (battle scenes etc.)
2.6 Motifs in general
2.7 Repetition, epic repetition (see also 2.8)
2.8 «Structural phenomena and further peculiarities»
2.9 Conflicting accounts of the same event

List Three: Jaina ethics

3.1 Rules (prohibitions and injunctions)
3.2 Ahinsā and the world of living beings
3.3 Metarules (mainly caution)
3.4 Superfluous rules, peripheral rules
3.5 Passions, states of mind
3.6 Faith, courage
3.7 Repentance and atonement
3.8 The anthropological situation (male/female etc.)
3.9 Situations in general (daily routine etc.)
3.10 Extreme situations
3.11 The status of good actions (see also 3.12)
3.12 Further fundamental aspects (freedom of the will etc.)
3.13 «Structural phenomena and further peculiarities»
3.14 The moral code in the community
The subsectional lists follow in their general structure the sectional lists, but the quality of the subsections is not identical with that of the sections. The diversification is now more subtle, and the lists are, as indicated already, more fluid. Different scholars would set up different lists, and thus there is the likelihood of continuous remodelling. At the same time, we can say that the subsections are more effective and more original than the sections. All sections (FS, S, SS) exercise formal pressures, since they demand completeness in terms of "material" research (study of texts etc.), as well as completeness in terms of "formal" (methodological) research. But it is natural that, in this respect, the main burden is carried by the subsections, which thus become the basic units of research. The subsections are, after all, more specialized than the sections. However, as mentioned already, the systematic specialization cannot be extended beyond the subsections. Subjects within the subsections can be itemized, but such items are not elements of the general scheme. To introduce a new term, we will designate frame subjects and sections as "microcosms" (see below). Subsections are, of course, not "microcosms". However, a subsection is also a well-defined area: a subject sui generis, as well as a category which must be surveyed in its entirety. More pertinent is the aspect character of the subsections. The pluralization of subsections produces a pluralism of aspects, which is not achieved by the sections. Each and every subject is viewed from all conceivable angles. We are thus better guarded against changing attitudes and changing research priorities which are, in the end, symptoms of changes in the Zeitgeist. But, naturally, the concept of subsections, and to a lesser extent even the concept of sections, produces problems of overlapping. If more and more sections are pressed into each frame subject — and more and more subsections into each section — overlapping becomes inevitable. This trend is reinforced by further methodological attempts which are not connected with our lists (§§ 4-5). But the technical disadvantage is the price to be paid for the more intrinsic advantages of the scheme.

The implementation of the three subsectional lists will follow in § 3 and on pp.30-37 of § 4. Furthermore, the sections will be considered again in the general description of the scheme on pp.15-18 of § 2. Here, we shall mainly add observations on the Eigencharakter of the sections (i.e. FS and S), as implied already by the use of the term "microcosm". A description of the sections (FS and S) as microcosms can be drawn up on a formal and on a material, or content-oriented, level. In the first case, the section is simply viewed as the radius of effect of the different methodological procedures. It is also viewed as one out of so many positions in a specific list i.e. as an element in our architecture of sections. In the second case, we change the "point of view" and look at the sections not merely from without, viewing them as constituent elements within our scheme, but primarily from within, in order to get direct access to their peculiar character, and only after this from without, because their peculiar character can only be properly assessed if two, or more than two, sections are compared with one another.

In the second case, the main thrust is not on the comparatively small sections, but on the frame subjects. Each frame subject will appear as a world in its own right and as a material, or content-oriented, microcosm. The German language provides a large number of semantically related words which we can add to the term Eigencharakter. We mention here individuelles Gepräge, Lokalkolorit, Atmosphäre, Kulturstil, Ganzheit und Gestalt. Form-oriented terms are relative Abgeschlossenheit und Über-schaubarkeit. English equivalents will be found in ROGET's Thesaurus under the catchwords "individuality" and "whole". But we suppose that English authors would rather describe the elements of the Eigencharakter than use a single abstract term.

In certain contexts, the German terminology also provides words denoting a "central idea" (Wesen, Mitte) and it is from this angle that we have to understand E. LEUMANN's description of Jainism: "Jedenfalls hat er [Mahāvira] mit souveräner Bestimmtheit die gesamte Wirklichkeit zusammen mit den mönchischen Grundvorstellungen seiner Zeit . . . begrifflich geordnet zu einem halb-religiösen, halb-philosophischen System, und er hat gewiß nicht bloß . . . imponiert durch seine asketische Strenge, sondern ebensowohl . . . eingenommen durch seine umfassenden und geordneten Begriffsscharen." See LEUMANN 43: At least we can say that LEUMANN viewed Jainism, which he more or less understood as the product of Mahāvira's intellectual efforts, as a comparatively coherent whole with a distinctive character.

If we try to give an example of Eigencharakter, we have to choose an appropriate element of the Jaina tradition. Theoretically, the Jainist tendency to value non-activity more than good actions (List Three: 3.11) could be accentuated, but the discussion of this point has only started (BRONKHORST M: p.26 et passim). Jainism is also not indifferent to goodness. Moreover, non-activity would be a type of concept which can be claimed as central, but which does not affect Jainism in its entirety. Like any religion, Jainism is a cultural phenomenon with many different facets. Therefore we will stress in the present context a different point, namely the interface of narrative literature, a very important element in Jaina tradition, and the dogmatic world-view. Although we use the familiar term "cosmography" for the Jaina description of the world, we must add that the Jaina world is not only the world of cosmography. Within the Jaina world we also have to include chronology (or "ages of the world"), the sixty-three great men, and finally the numerous, active or passive, gods and goddesses which surface during different periods of Jainism. In Jaina stories this superworld appears time and again, and its presence is felt in large sections of the narrative literature, mainly in the "history of the sixty-three great men", now used in the sense of a great literary ensemble (UH). Generally speaking, in narrative literature we can isolate
dogmatic matter (cosmography et alia, e.g. compare UPADHYE Va: 29-32), just as we can isolate narrative elements (see 1.3) within dogmatic literature.

If we agree that frame subjects, such as Jainism or the two epics, form "microcosms", in other words, worlds in their own right, we are also free to consider "microcosms" in the teaching practice of colleges and universities and to ask whether the typical student of Sanskrit can be expected to study more than two or three of these peculiar worlds, along with their specific vocabulary. According to the prevalent teaching system, this question applies either to all students of Indology, including those who have chosen Sanskrit as their main subject, or only to students with Sanskrit as a subsidiary subject (in connection with a main subject such as Indian History). For example, the student may concentrate inter alia on the two epics and on epic Sanskrit. The actual curriculum (epics plus Purāṇas plus, or some different combination) is, however, a matter which need not be discussed here.

Another entirely different proposal concerns the procurement of sentences for the teaching of Sanskrit. This can be done on the basis of the epic texts (sentences in the form of epic quarter-verses or half-verses). We admit that the narrow limits of the morphology of epic Sanskrit do not favour such a project, but we feel that this difficulty can be overcome by using certain strategies, the simplest being the variation of original epic sentences by the student (e.g. replacing singular by plural or first person by third person). Instead of collecting examples for each and every form (conjugation etc.), we can search for short epic sentences which lend themselves to exercises of this type.

§ 2. The Strategies

We have started our paper with a description of the various sections, because we felt that the sectional and subsectional lists would give immediate access to the basic idea underlying our scheme. Since this scheme is based on both sections and strategies, we now have to introduce the strategies. But before doing so we shall explain in as few words as possible how our sectional concept gradually took its present shape. Since we have sometimes given preference to sections and, at other times, to strategies, a description of the "birth" of the sectional concept seems legitimate at this point, i.e. after the methodical treatment of the sections in § 1 and before the methodical treatment of the strategies in the present chapter (§ 2).

Our basic idea has been to create an extension of the methodological canon (BRUHN Se: 37). This implies that the existing canon or current canon is not touched upon in our present discussion. It must remain as it is, unreviewed and unintegrated in our scheme, which serves simply as a supplement. In addition, it is difficult to draw a clear-cut line of demarcation between the current canon and the extended canon, since any vague line of demarcation which exists at a given point in time may change from day to day. In other words, what is called extended canon today may be called current canon tomorrow. Again, the idea of extension was not conceived in an abstract manner, but was rather linked with the wish to achieve completeness and to avoid selection. This partiality for completeness and suspicion of selection has been reinforced by contemporary discussions during the seventies, which were dominated by the views of the New Left (BRUHN Cf: § 1.5). But whatever completeness may stand for, it had to be linked, from our point of view, with an ordering principle, and this has led to a certain propensity for "classifications". Since the limits of almost all classificatory schemes were all too obvious, we then attempted to arrange the relevant facts in at least a quasi-systematic manner, according to the requirements of each individual case. As the outcome of these various efforts we have now tried to devise, figuratively speaking, finely drawn "squared maps", which can accommodate corpuses of related facts. Thus we can be sure that not a single "square" remains empty and not a single fact unordered. The methodological device we have chosen for this purpose are the lists, as presented in § 1. Still, completeness was not our only objective. We also wanted to stress the specific methodological requirements of each subject, and this led to the conclusion that each subject requires its own method (BRUHN Se: 44). To be sure, this maxim is general and abstract and, as such, different, both in quality and extent, from the consideration of the Eigencharakter of frame subjects as discussed in § 1. In fact, our emphasis on methodological diversification was largely prompted by the growing influence of generalizing theories, which again is a Zeitgeist problem, and by our desire to "protect" the subject under discussion against the neutralization which can occur in a vast theoretical continuum. Summarizing our retrospective, we can also say that the scheme is intended to eliminate contingency. In other words, contingency must be replaced by planning.

There is, finally, a practical and also diplomatic consideration. An extended canon requires new methodological material, which can hardly come from nothing. Not only are we opposed, for several reasons, to claims that something really new is to be presented, but we also think it necessary to explain how the methodological material for the extended canon is procured. Since such material cannot be produced overnight, we state categorically that recourse should be taken to existing methods developed in other fields of research. This import of methods requires, of course, strategies for the selection and adaptation of the relevant methods (BRUHN Se: 44-45, but see pp.48-49 below), although it cannot be denied that the sections also stimulate by themselves fresh approaches of one type or another and with or without tacit use of extraneous resources. We have not changed our opinion since 1991, but for technical reasons we have used adaptation, i.e. adaptation as part of our standard terminology, in this paper only in a specialized sense (§ 5).
sections and subsections as independent realities, and not as products of such and such a strategy, and if, furthermore, we describe the strategies, as is natural anyway, with the help of examples which do not form positions in our five lists. A last point to be mentioned is the fact that the strategies may express both ends and means. The strategy of «completeness», which is not treated explicitly in our paper, is an end—both in individual cases and also if taken in a more general manner. But it is also a means in order to avoid being too one-dimensional in one way or another.

In BRUHN MA: 191 we mentioned that there might be a conflict between sections as particularizing or “autonomous” concepts and strategies as generalizing concepts, in so far as the strategies are bound to encroach on the sections and to endanger their autonomy. This is correct as long as we define the strategies in the abstract sense which is suggested by the individual names («order» etc.). But the conflict disappears as soon as we treat the strategies not in an abstract manner, but in close connection with the sections (i.e. FS, S, and SS).

Before describing «order» as a strategy we would like to explain why “order”, in a general sense, is of such importance for the study of the Jaina tradition. In the first place, it is necessary to consider the issue of order, both on account of the enormous extent of the Jaina literature and because of the complexity of the Jaina doctrine (see JRK and JSK in our bibliography). Furthermore, order is a crucial problem here as elsewhere in Indian traditions, because we have no adequate historical matrix based on absolute dates, dynastic patronage, centres, schools, and oeuvres. Such a matrix may be of limited value, since one could ask if it always matters whether a work has been written “in the eleventh or the tenth century”, but it is, at least, a first step towards a rational organization of the material. Finally, even the concept of a literary work can only be used with caution. A work which is clearly the product of one single author, whether or not the name is known, need not, for that matter, have any individual stamp, let alone true originality. The remaining works need not even have true boundaries. One work may be as good as two works, and two works may be as good as one work. Jaina literature participated in this Indian departure from the classical type of “work” to a considerable extent, a fact which must be borne in mind in every assessment of the situation in Jainology. Last but not least, we have to stress the diversity of the Jaina tradition. No doubt certain elements of the doctrine where fixed at an early date and then repeated time and again. Furthermore, there are many cases where two (or more than two) works are almost identical in their contents. But this does not affect the basic diversity of Jaina religion and culture which could some time in the future be discussed at a special symposium.

Naturally, we are here not concerned with any forms of order which are already inherent in our five lists. Likewise, we need not mention methods of creating order which do not form integral parts of the sectional scheme, such as «quantity manage-
But, in many cases, distinction operates within a larger whole, and while separating subject A from subject B, it may also help in establishing A and B clearly as subjects in their own right, more particularly in cases where a study of one side is less promising than a study of the other. A standard example is the distinction between Jataka verse and Jataka prose (ALSDORF Åk: 42). It was this distinction which made a proper study of the “Jatakas” possible, but we can also argue that this distinction paved the way for a passable study of the prose material (NORMAN Pt: 78), more particularly of the paccuppannavattus. Below we supply a tentative list of cases where distinctions are helpful in organizing and evaluating the material. What matters is not the individual case, which may be trivial, but the emphasis on distinction as a methodological device.

In the Śvetāmbara canon we notice a few cases where a single work can be split into two parts. This is different from a situation which encourages attempts at stratification. Stratifications are complex and may produce quite a number of different layers, whereas distinctions, as we understand them, take mostly the form of dichotomies. Examples are Ācārānga Sūtra (Pt.I vs. Pt.II), Sūtra-aṅgā Sūtra (also Pt.I vs. Pt.II), Uttarādhyayana Sūtra (early chapters vs. late chapters, Śūtra proper vs. āyaṇas), and Bhagavati (nucleus vs. accretions). From single works we proceed to larger literary areas. Within the Śvetāmbara canon, we can separate the “scientific” Bhagavati circle (Bhagavati, Prajñāpana etc.) from the rest. The Prakṛṭakās may be called canonical or postcanonical, but in any case, we have to distinguish between the Prakṛṭakās and the truly canonical texts which precede them. Again we must distinguish within the Prakṛṭaka corpus between earlier (“old nucleus”: CAIĻAT In: 35) and later material. In the case of the exegetical literature (Niryuktis, Cāṇḍis etc.), nothing could be more gratifying than a thorough and far-reaching distinction between different types of texts. However, little can be done in this way at the present stage, with the distinction between “ordinary commentary” and “stories” being the only exception. On the other hand, it may be useful to distinguish between exegetical literature in the narrow acceptance of the term (Niryuktis etc.) and flat exegetical superstructures (Tikās only). The latter category may deserve more attention than it has received hitherto. The last distinction to be mentioned here is that of the difference between texts on monastic and those on laity discipline. So far we have no study describing in a systematic manner the relationship, or agreement and disagreement, between both types of texts. Without going into details, we would finally like to add that a comparison of Śvetāmbara and Digambara literature, at least in some areas, could lead to distinctions as we discuss them here.

A completely different type of distinction separates the academic from the non-academic forms of Jainism. Jainism was, after all, a religion and not a pure śāstra. As a consequence, we can expect that there were discrepancies in those spheres which
were the primary concern of the religious mind, e.g. in connection with gods and goddesses or with eschatology and soteriology. We are not referring to primitive or popular religion in all its facets, but we suggest that a religious idiom in its own right has developed along with academic Jainism. In the Ācārāṅga and Parvaṇaṅkalpa Sūtra.s, Indra and Haripāgamaśīna act together, a constellation which is not derived from the official pantheon (as forming part of Jain cosmography); in early and in pre-medieval Jaina iconography, divinities like Sarasvati, Kubera, and Ambikā play an important part; heaven and hell are certainly viewed by most Jainas as approaching realities and not as purely technical phases in the process of transcendental pudgala-elimination (i.e. of karma annihilation); finally, mokṣa is probably for the majority more easily attainable than a distant state reached after immeasurable periods of time. No doubt, "religion" and "shastra" were not exactly distinct from one another, but we can assume that the world of the typical member of the Jaina community was not identical with the world of a Jaina pandit. Another type of fissure exists within the central sphere of Jainism, reflecting a subtle type of syncretism. We notice a democratic organization of the cosmos of beings where all souls are identical and a hierarchy of beings with the various types having different physical and psychical constitutions; we find true souls (jīva.s) and a secondary population of primitive souls (nīgoda.s); in ethics, emphasis is sometimes on the act and sometimes on the attitude; finally, Jainism, as a whole, oscillates between ahiṃsā legalism and kṣaṭyā soteriology.

LITERARY GENRES. Related to the discussion of «order» and «distinction» is the discussion of the definition and classification of literary genres. Since no general answer is possible, we shall confine our discussion to two "devices" which avoid the crucial questions of definition and classification, rather than solving them.

In the case of the major genres we shall concentrate on early Jainism. Since the narrative material is very heterogeneous, both in form and content, it seems preferable to consider dogmatics alone. Here it is possible to isolate special sets of texts which are homogeneous either in their form or in their content. Although such sets may be large or small, what matters is the treatment, of one and the same subject, in different texts. We mention in the first place cosmotheoretical literature and karma literature. However, it seems worthwhile to consider the question of whether subjects such as the "five great vows", "alm-round", and "fasting to death" do not, likewise, form the basis for major, or rather medium-sized, genres. We can add literary material which seems to be unified by "form principles", such as the anguttara pattern or the nīkṣepa pattern. That all these subjects can be studied with advantage is a truism. What matters in the present context is the question of whether we can demonstrate that such subjects, or isolates, show a certain analogy to genres, so that it becomes profitable to study them under the generic aspect. Amongst the criteria for assigning to a subject the status of a genre is its extent. We try to subdivide a large area, namely dogmatics, into a limited number of sub-areas. Minor subjects as discussed on p.40 are therefore no part of the present scheme. Narrative material is not to be excluded altogether, but it will be considered mainly in its subsidiary function vis-à-vis dogmatics.

A different approach is required in the case of certain minor genres. Here, we will isolate a compact material which is formed through the combination of minor genres, such as proverbs, epigrams etc. These minor genres need not be defined one by one, since we take advantage of the sectional principle which limits the material (only Jaina literature) and thus ensures a degree of coherence where the exact lines of demarcation (proverb vs. epigram, and so on) become less relevant. Taking "proverbs" as our starting point, we distinguish between proverbs in the usual sense of the word (BLOOMFIELD Pā: 208-19) and didactic subhāṣīta.s (BHOJAK Cā: 363-78). Again, all subhāṣīta.s can be classified according to their content (e.g. nārī-nindā and nārī-pratāpa.: BHOJAK Cā loc.cit.). Furthermore, it is possible to isolate proverbs etc. which have formal peculiarities (e.g. sabdālakāra.s) in common. In addition, we can study the cosmos of upamāna.s and the cosmos of kavisamketa.s, as reflected in our material. Last but not least, we have to consider the categories topos and Glossaries, both as included in and as related to our material. Refer for Glossaries (etc.) to BOLLEE Sū-I-II (the registers) and to BOLLEE Ut (jaha stanzas). For general reasons we add that M. BLOOMFIELD suggested not only a catalogue of motifs (BLOOMFIELD Pā: 54) but also an encyclopedia of proverbs (BLOOMFIELD Pā: 208). BLOOMFIELD's "pragmatic sloka" (Pā: 199) could likewise be mentioned in the present context. So far we have only considered stray verses etc., as found in early and later Jaina literature. A different situation arises if we consider subhāṣīta collections, where the special question of a subhāṣīta typology arises. Here the reader is referred to L. STERNBACH who prepared a survey of "non-canonical subhāṣīta collections in Jaina literature" (STERNBACH Su).

§ 3. The implementation of the subsectional lists of § 1

List One: Narrative literature in Jainism. (1.1) The main task in connection with subsection 1.1 is the ordinary study of the Digambara UH, as well as the systematic comparison of the Śvetāmbara and the Digambara UH. Since all the relevant versions of the UH are known today, a text presenting a piece of the UH in a new form would be a rare discovery. On the other hand, the UH is well suited for a systematic study not of all the parallel versions which it contains, but rather of the general problem of «parallel versions» (1.7). Theoretically, "1.1" includes "1.2", but here we are concerned in the first place with the genuine parts of the UH (i.e. 1.1 without 1.2). —— (1.2) The relevant themes of the non-Jaina cycles, i.e. the Brhatkathā (VasudevaHindī
cases where the interface of folklore and dogmatism is as interesting as the actual motifs (BALBIR Mi, BALBIR No). — (1.7) The subject of «parallel versions», which has already been mentioned in 1.1, will be discussed in some detail on pp.37-39 below, with most of the examples belonging to narrative literature. Parallel versions of one and the same story may vary in more than one respect, but, more often than not, we find only surface differences: i.e. different names given to the same character, the same character introduced with or without a name, changes of the order of events (on the discourse or suṣer level), textual divergences due to didactic and gnomic additions, and textual divergences due to stylistic elaboration («kāvyāization»). — (1.8) Refer for this point to pp.34-36. — Our list does not include narrative literature which belongs to a later period than the material of 1.1-1.4.

List Two: Narrative literature in the two epics. (2.1, 2.2) The distinction between main story and other stories is probably a matter of some importance. First of all, a technical advantage can be derived from the principle that the study of complex works is rendered easier if extraneous or peripheral matter is set apart for separate treatment. In the case of the Mahābhārata, it seems helpful to separate Books XII and XIII (in the Bombay edition, 29% of the whole epic) with their numerous stories from the rest of the work. A further reduction is produced if “Nala”, “Rāmāyaṇa”, and “Śāivist” (all included in the Vanaparvan) are separated from the body of the Mahābhārata. These three sub-parvan.s are also completely unrelated to the main story. It is only after such separations that the contrast between main story and loosely related stories can be discussed, which is a matter of more than technical importance. Outside the main story we find semi-autonomous cycles connected with individuals (Kṛṣṇa, Arjuna etc.) or with certain groups such as the Bhārgava.s (GOLDMAN Go: p.78; Bhārgava and Vasīṣṭha cycles). The “Rāvaṇeśis” of the Uttarakabdga of the Rāmāyaṇa (JACOBI Rā: 26) may be described as extraneous matter or as an associated cycle, but the situation is different in so far as books 1 and 7 are later than books 2-5. — (2.3) One important subject are individual characters, which can be studied both from the point of view of literary criticism (RUBEN Tr, Rāmāyaṇa) and that of the history of motifs. A motif linked through different forms with two different characters is “divine manipulation” (Nārada as manipulator: PEM: 529-30; Kṛṣṇa as manipulator: MATILAL Kṛ: 405 and 409). — (2.4) In the case of motifs it is advisable to describe, first of all, motifs which are not isolated, but which form part of a larger texture (2.3 supra; 2.4 and 2.5). Characters of some importance “attract” or “produce” specific motifs, a tendency which also applies to certain categories of beings, mainly apsara.s, gandharva.s, monkeys, rākṣasa.s (rākṣasa.s and rākṣasa.s), pāls, and snakes. See HOPKINS Ep (Index). — (2.5) In the Bombay edition the four so-called “battlebooks” (Mbh.VI-IX) cover 26% of the Mahābhārata. To this we can add the second part of
the Yuddhakāṇḍa, which may be called the "battle-book" of the Rāmāyāna. In all these texts the amount of repetition, or identity of content and wording, is considerable, although the ancient authors saw the necessity of avoiding all too obvious modes of repetition. There are countless duels and the phases of the duels, often including the use of magic weapons, are arranged in standardized sequences. The battle-books have been studied by G. von Simson (Ep). Other motif types are less frequent, but show, nevertheless, considerable dynamism. There are, for example, many accounts of "saints seduced by apsarās". J.J. Meyer observes: "Daß auch die stärksten Büßer nicht gegen das Weib geacht sind, schildern ja schier zahllose indische Geschichten und auch eine ganze Reihe im Epos" (MEYER Wb: 194). The famous "theophany" of Kṛṣṇa, which occurs not only in the Bhagavadgītā but also in two other cases (crit. ed. V 129, 2: ekoham, XIV 54, 4: tatāḥ sa taṁma), could likewise be mentioned as a motif type. "Temporary transformation as the consequence of a curse," a frequent motif type in later periods, takes place on several occasions, the best known examples being Virādha and Kanda in the Aranyakāṇḍa of the Rāmāyāna.

(2.6) For motif in general refer not only to THOMPSON Mo and BLOOMFIELD Ps, but also to SIROVATKA Mo ("Sage und Märchen") and DAEMRICH Th ("Figurenkonzeption", "Motiv", "Themata"). Epic motifs have been discussed or mentioned in the following books: GAIL Pa, GOLDMAN Go, HOPKINS Ep, MEYER Wb, and RUBEN Kr (see the indices). Besides shouldering the "task of controlling" a "great mass of individual traits" (BLOOMFIELD Ps: 57), the scholar must also try to discover new motifs. For example, J.A.B. Van Buiten mentions in his translation of the Ādi-pārnā "succession conflict", "disqualified eldest", and "complexity of paternity" (xvi-xix [xvi-xxi]), three motifs which had not been noticed previously. Frame subjects may include a specific motif cosmos. Such a motif cosmos need not be homogeneous: Even the motifs contained in the Buddha and Mahāvīra legends, respectively, are not all related in their character. However, certain motifs will occur time and again and thereby contribute to the Eigencharakter of the narrative ensemble. — It is obvious that the isolation of motifs has been less common in epic studies than in the study of story literature. Narrative studies are always analytic and comparative, whereas literary criticism, not uncommon in the case of the epics, tends to focus attention on large literary ensembles. — (2.7) The two epics show numerous instances of repetition. We shall concentrate on a few related types. First of all, we have to recall the fact that legends (Sage) with a travelling hero contain sequences of related events. Large portions of the two epics show structural analogies to this legend type. We mention here Arjuna's expedition in the Ādi-pārnā, Viṣṇu's expedition with Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa in the Bālakāṇḍa, and the wanderings of Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa, and Sītā in the forest (Ayodhya and Aranya Kāṇḍa). Another type of repetition is formed by the endless search for Sītā, which belongs to the Sage by virtue of its extension, but is otherwise closer to the Märchen or fairy tale (chain of informants, TAWNEY Ka: 206). The third type may be called "epic extension". Here, a single event of special importance is transformed into a sequence of parallel sub-events. Several examples are connected with Rāma's exodus from Ayodhya during which, time and again, Rāma is pressed to accept the throne against the instructions of his father. Numerous other attempts to change the course of events are added, so that the actual exodus is delayed indefinitely. The minor episode where Rāma gives farewell presents is likewise prolonged; the poet introduces far more recipients and gifts than are required by the logic of the story. As the last type of repetition, we mention wholesale duplication such as the rejection of Sītā. Although each case must be viewed individually, one has the impression that single duplications are not rare and were tolerated to a certain extent. Some cases are less clear than others: Damayantī's stay at the court of the Cedi king introduces a second incognito episode (Nala lives unrecognized at the court of Rūpta) and it duplicates the motif of Damayantī's asylum (the episode is prefixed to her stay/ asylum at the court of her father). — (2.8) Refer for general information on this point again to pp.34-36. Most of the actual material is found in other subsections (2.7 etc.). — (2.9) Conflicting accounts have been analysed by various scholars (JACOBI Rā: 24 ff; SUKHTHAKAR Na; SRINIVASAN Rā: 3 ff; POLLOCK Ay: 25 ff). For example, S.A. SRINIVASAN has emphasized in this connection that conflicting accounts, or "incoherences", existed already in Vālmiki's Rāmāyāna, i.e. in the nucleus of the Rāmāyāna. Refer to pp.39-40 for further observations on the subject.

List Three: Jaina ethics. First of all, we will supply a synopsis of three studies: The present «List Three» ("1993") and two earlier papers (BRUHN Ah, §§ 3, 5, 7, 9 = "1994"; BRUHN Se, § 6 = "1991"). "1993" stands for the list itself and for the comments added by us to the synopsis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1993</th>
<th>1994</th>
<th>1991</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>§ 5A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>ahimsa and the living beings</td>
<td>§ 5A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Metarules (mainly caution)</td>
<td>§ 5B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Superfluous and peripheral rules</td>
<td>§ 5A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>§ 5D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>§ 5E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Repentance and atonement</td>
<td>§ 5C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Anthropological or bio-psychological situation of the saṅgha</td>
<td>§ 5F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Situations in general</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Extreme situations</td>
<td>§ 5G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV, VI, V
BRUHN Ah (1994) is an improvement over BRUHN Se (1991), and the present article (1993) is mainly a tabular combination of the two previous studies. In contrast to 1991, 1994 is closely linked with the vocabulary of the texts. It is mainly for this reason that 1994 could not incorporate all the material contained in 1991.

Our subsection 3.2 has been added to 3.1 in order to give more emphasis to the interrelation between “ethics” and “natural philosophy.” “Caution” in 3.3 was omitted accidentally in 1991 where it would have found its place in “IV”. In the title of 3.3 we had to choose between singular and plural. We preferred the plural, since the general opposition to actions which is found in Jainism could likewise be called a “metarule”: see 3.11 infra. For practical, rather than for logical, reasons we have included “superfluous” and “peripheral” rules in one single subsection (3.4). In 1994, the issue of superfluous rules is touched on under the caption “Zone des . . . Selbstverständlichkeit”.Of the four “passions”, mostly occurring as the full tetrad, only two opposites (i.e. contentment and humility as opposed to ‘greed’ and ‘pride’) have been specified in 1991 in “IV”. However, the study of 3.5 started already in BRUHN So. In 1991, “faith”, or rather lack of faith, is mentioned under “wrong consciousness”, which is found again in “IV”. The main subject of 3.7 is atonement (an important institution, and in the specific context of monastic discipline loaded with technicalities); see the “second part” of CAI L LAT At.

The threefold subdivision of “situations” (3.8-10) accentuates the importance of the situation in which the agent is. The position 3.8 includes not only basic differences (e.g. male vs. female, young vs. old) but, in principle, all significant differences between different individuals (refer in this connection to MÜLLER Al, pp.66 ff.). Subsection 3.11 (good actions) has been separated from 3.12 on account of its special significance. See 1994: § 9 (“excursus”). BRONKHORST Me: 26, and DUNDAS In: 273 (“minimising of action”). Subsection 3.12 corresponds directly to § 7 in 1994 with its ultimate source “VIII” in 1991. The title of “VIII” (“items for modern analysis”) is, however, misleading, since the “analysis” started already in the ancient texts. Subsection 3.13, parallel to 1.8 and 2.8, illustrates that SP are also relevant to Jaina ethics (pp.36-37). The “moral code”, or 3.14, has been included in Jaina ethics, although it could just as well have been treated as a section in its own right (refer to 1994:§ 3). Basically, the Jainas had a puritanical code which stood for social order and security and was thus opposed to chaos and confusion. Under the circumstances, the moral code of the Jaina community can be viewed as a whole (other societies are less uniform). The Jaina code, nevertheless, combines Jaina and non-Jaina elements, and it is also not free from conflicts between orthodox and pragmatic attitudes. A general issue, which is independent from the character of a given code, is the treatment of human relations considered in their entirety (e.g. father/son, husband/wife, wife-givers/wife-takers, monk/layman, guru/sīya, Jaina/non-Jaina). This perspective amounts to an atomization of human relations comparable to the atomization or particularization of life in a survey of situations. We mention here from Jainism only three relationships which have a special significance in the wider Indian context, i.e. the relationship between the son and the (deceased) father (JAINI Ka: p.234, fn.38), the relationship between Jainas and non-Jainas (PUŠKARAMU NI D: 511-23), and the mores connected with gift exchange (SANGAVE CO: 327-28, dowry issue).

§ 4. Further observations on sectional studies

I.

Sectional studies are basically concerned with separation rather than with relationship. But we have to distinguish between the situation within a single frame subject and the relationship between two or more different frame subjects. In the first case, we separate within the frame subject different sections (subsections) from one another, but at the same time we systematically study the internal connecting lines. This is normally not indicated by special positions in the sectional and subsectional lists. But such studies are a matter of course, and in many cases an examination of the connecting lines is suggested in the explanations accompanying the subsectional lists. In the second case, we have to consider in our studies a second frame subject which is outside the primary frame subject. Here the study of the external connecting lines (frame subject A versus frame subject B) is, in principle, as necessary as the study of the internal connecting lines (i.e. section versus section, subsection versus subsection). However such a study is not central to our scheme, and we regard it primarily as part and parcel of the «current canon». However, a special provision (e.g. a separate subsection on monastic rules in Jaina texts vis-à-vis monastic rules in Hindu texts) can be made in selected cases.

In the case of relationships between different frame subjects one is not only com-
pelled to mention connections of a logically simple type, but one must also consider
connections which are of a complex and fundamental character and which transgress
the range of 1:1 comparisons (such as the comparison between the Brahmanical and
the Jaina version of a story or the Brahmanical and the Jaina meaning of a term). The
fundamental connections are normally not described in standard books and articles,
but they emerge on the basis of more extensive research activities. We mention three
such cases, all different in character and here designated as projects i-iii. We have to
add that the expressions "relationship" and "connection" are a simplification in so
far as we are concerned with all kinds of connection or correspondence or contrast.

We shall start with V. Propp's work, which presents, in contrast to projects ii
and iii infra, a real theory. This theory has been analysed by scholars from different
fields (A. Dundes et alii), and it has also been adapted to the study of Indian narrative
literature (Steermann Pa, Pfeiffer We). The study by M. Pfeiffer does not make use of the "functions" as contained in Propp's sequence, but rather proposes
an analogous scheme developed for the study of Indian cosmogonies. This scheme is,
naturally, in no way connected with Jaina narrative literature. However, we have to
ask whether it has some general relevance for the principle of sectional studies.
Pfeiffer's study is not confined to any single tradition (Veda etc.), but rather includes
all traditions of the Indian subcontinent (Sanskritic or not, literary or oral). Even then,
this material, which is limited to one major motif (cosmogonies), presents a cosmos
in its own right with advantages which seem to be similar to the advantages of a frame
subject. With a methodological vocabulary (classifications etc.) which is highly develop-
ed, Pfeiffer's study is bound to exercise considerable influence, generally speaking,
the study of Indian narrative literature.

For a more informal use of Propp in the study of Indian narrative literature,
we suggest a selective procedure. We can isolate individual functions (e.g. transfer of
the hero to a distant locality) or short sequences of Propp's functions (e.g. XII-XIV:
"donor" etc.). Occasionally a clear parallel to Propp's sequence may surface
(Pfeiffer Ka). It is also possible to establish, now and then, new sequences of mini-
mal complexity which have an analogy to that of Propp. From Jaina literature we
mention only donation stories (Balbir Mi: 147-49) and temptation stories (Verclas
Av: 117-39). Generally speaking, the distinction between etic and emic (Dundes Et,
Pfeiffer We) will become an indispensable instrument for the analysis of our stories.
Jaina literature also uses various forms of narrative repetition (Bruhn Ca: 134-35;
Bruhn Re). An improved analysis of all the relevant texts can probably be achieved
with the help of the work of Propp.

The second project to be introduced is the recent discussion on karma (mainly
O'Flaherty Ka). As in the previous and the following case, the emergence of new
conceptual instruments stands out as a basic characteristic of the discussion. For our

purposes, we only mention an article published later than the O'Flaherty volume
by Y. Krishan, which distinguishes between two lines of thought. In one case, a bal-
ancing of karma (good karma versus bad karma, or karma type-A versus karma type-
B) is possible, while in the other case, such a balancing is not possible, with the guna-
sthāna doctrine of the Jainas as an instance of the second type (Krishan Ba: 123).
This doctrine may have more than one aspect, but one aspect is, in any case, the suc-
cessive elimination of the different types of karma according to a rigid time table (e.g.
Glasenapp Ka: 88-104).

One publication by K. Butzenberger (the third project) is also concerned with
the karma issue, but discusses the karma concept in the context of an extensive analy-

sis of the problem of lasting identity (rebirth or no rebirth: in the case of rebirth, anal-
sis of the substratum of identity) and the problem of causality (effect of the action on
the actor). The scope of Butzenberger's monograph is considerable, since the two
problems are fundamental in all periods and also in many different spheres of Indian
thought. In order to demonstrate the importance of this monograph for Jaina studies
(in this case the natural philosophy of Jainism), we shall underline one single aspect,
namely the rigorous distinction between the invariable jiva and the variable
psychic/physical conglomeration (i.e. the senses and the body which are the results
of the karma). The emphasis on this distinction throws new light on a number of prob-
lems. The four elements (water etc.) of Jainism are no longer living as such — as
implied by statements in some modern descriptions — but are basically dead matter,
merely "enlivened" by the jiva. What remains, after the jiva has left his temporary
abode, is again dead matter, forming part of the physical world. Butzenberger also
considers the character of the bodies of the element jiva's (minimal agglomerations
of matter), the mechanism of karmic influx (influx of matter into the jiva), and, by
implication, the mechanism of karmic emission or "annihilation of karma".

II A

In each of our three subsectional lists we have included a position termed «structural
phenomena and further peculiarities»: 1,8, 2,8, and 3,13. This position (abbreviated
as «SP») has not been annotated in § 3. A collective treatment under a comprehensive
title such as SP seemed the simplest way of organizing and collecting a large number
of facts which would otherwise find no well-defined place within Indology.

That the «SP» have so far not been viewed as a peculiar factor in Indian thought
has more than one reason. First of all they are treated either as peculiarities of certain
sub-areas of the Indian history of ideas or as "typically Indian" in a very general way.
Both attitudes do not encourage a systematic study on a large scale. At the same time,
Jainism occupies in connection with SP issue a special position. Jaina literature is a
vast area where the SP occur on a scale which is unusual, even by the standards of ancient Indian thought and theory. The systematic study of the SP seems, therefore, inevitable in the case of Jainology. But even here, the SP have not received the attention which they actually deserve. Nobody can deny the fact that the SP material of Jainism includes extremes of sophistry. However, to this day the texts where the SP are most prominent (monastic discipline of the Śvetāmbaras and doctrine of karma of the Digambaras) have partially remained a terra incognita. An obstacle of a more general character is the “formal” character of the SP. They are not relevant to the study of “content”, “reality”, or “history” (see also Pollmann Li on E.R. Curtius and Toposforschung). The lack of reality, i.e. of Wirklichkeitsbezug, clearly discourages research on the subject.

Another problem is the lack of a perceptible common denominator. The description of the SP as “formal” is too loose to serve any practical purpose. To be sure, if taken by themselves, the “structural phenomena” form a fairly well-defined area, where the angiuttara pattern could be mentioned as a standard example. But in the case of the second element — “further peculiarities” — we have to mention quite different items, none of which could be called a standard example. As random examples we point out the abundance of parallel versions (pp.37-39 below) and the impact of normalization (Balbir No) in Jaina narrative literature. In the case of “normalization”, imported stories, mostly of Brahmanical origin, are adapted to the ideology of Jainism, as explained below. It is obvious that we cannot characterize the SP in their entirety if we already face difficulties in connection with the description of “further peculiarities”, i.e. of the second element alone.

Although we are not in a position to mention a common denominator for SP, we can give certain hints which make the creation of the term “SP” more plausible. On the one hand, it is obvious that some scholars have shown more interest in SP than others, a fact which suggests that the SP have at least some form of internal unity. On the other hand, we are often faced with the question of whether we should study a phenomenon of the SP type “as such”. The study of the nikṣepa can thus be restricted to cases where it is a true part of the general argument, while it is ignored whenever it is little more than a dialectic ornament. But it is likewise possible to study the nikṣepa, content or no content, “as such”. Again, the study of “normalization” can take place as part of the discussion of individual stories and with emphasis on a special case which may be more interesting than others. But there is also the alternative to survey the entire evidence — i.e. the phenomenon “as such” — whether it is interesting or not.

A METHODOLOGICAL PRINCIPLE (“A MINORE AD MAIUS”). The concept of “SP” can also be viewed as the result of a more general methodological principle. In the study of a limited subject x1 we often have the choice between concentrating on the subject x1 alone and treating it as part of a more extensive subject x2 (performing an “a minore ad maius” operation). For the sake of illustration, we shall equate x1 with a single verse, and x2 with the relevant text in its entirety. This case is simple in so far as a text (x2), whether well-known or little known, is normally a well-defined unit. A problem can arise if we want to proceed from the text (x2) to a still higher unit x3, normally a cluster of works, a literary genre, or a shastra-like body of literature. Such a higher unit is not necessarily “well-defined”, and, as a consequence, some effort may be required to find at least a working definition. Although each case must be judged on its own merits, the sectional scheme would, on the whole, be in favour of the a minore ad maius operation, which is a step towards better «integration» of a topic or a subject — and also a step from the part to the whole.

The example given should only enable us to construe the «SP» per analogiam. If we take, for example, the sthāna pattern as x1 then we expect broader areas like x2 or x3 above the level of x1. The overlying concept for all the relevant phenomena would be the «SP» in toto. This line of argument reflects the general tendency to study the individual phenomena, not in isolation, but as part of a larger and at least quasi-coherent ensemble. Naturally, this problem is greater in the case of the «SP» than in the case of “verse, text, and genre”, since we are not concerned with x2 as the last member in an established sequence but with x2 or x3 as standing for a new subject, namely SP.

AD HOC PHILOLOGY. The sectional principle can be applied to SP in a very rigorous manner if we study the relevant facts on the level of individual works or limited bodies of literature. The “SP evidence” contained in such a narrow orbit is often very limited, but if the studies which are already available mention in their supplements or introductions minor observations connected with «current research» — e.g. observations on grammar or metre — they might likewise mention minor observations on SP, which they already do in a number of cases. In Jainology as elsewhere we already possess a number of studies which show to a greater or lesser extent the combination just mentioned: Hoernle Uv (1888: App. III), Schubring Ac (1910: 45-63), Bloomfield Pa (1919), Alsdorf Ha (1936), Caillet Ca (1971), and Balbir Da (1982). Under the circumstances it is quite sufficient to give more profile to the SP, since the adequate type of treatment already does exist. There is yet another advantage connected with «ad hoc» philology. Whenever a single work or a small body of literature is somewhat isolated, a concentrated effort may be necessary to make the specific character of the text(s) better known and better understood. This applies to the texts in general, i.e. irrespective of the issue of SP. We mention as examples iconographic texts, Hindu, Buddhist, or Jain (Mallmann Ag: p.XII), Jainas works on
the doctrine of karma (ALSDORF Et: 91), ritualistic texts in Jainism (e.g. compare LEUMANN Üb: 7-8), and Varga literature in the Śvetāmbara canon (BRUHN Re: §§ 2-5).

QUOTATIONS. We are afraid that quotations of dissimilar character which are presented with little logical order are a somewhat dubious comment on the SP. Still, we are treading on ground where personal reactions are not without interest. We start with the German Topos of the “Klassifizierungs- und Schematisierungssucht der Inder”. J. SCHÖNBERG already refers in 1884 to the “berühmte [sic!] schwache Seite der Inder, alles einzuteilen, zu classifiziren und als Disciplin in Regeln zu fassen” (SCHÖNBERG Ka: 4). J.J. MEYER has quoted SCHÖNBERG in 1902 and added observations of his own (MEYER Da: 12). A.L. BASHAM has likewise observed in connection with the Śvetāmbara canon: “... the passion for tabulation and classification, which can be detected in much Indian religious literature, is perhaps given freer rein here than in the scriptures of any other sect” (BARY Tr: 55). H. OLDEMBERG describes the embarrassment caused to him by the identifications in the Brāhmans with the following words: “Wir gehen zunächst an die freilich großenteils wenig erfreuliche Aufgabe, den Tatbestand eingehend und bestimmt vorzuführen: soweit Bestimmtheit nicht eben den verschwommenen Charakter der Erscheinungen fälschen würde” (OLDEMBERG Br: 111). A. WEBER observes in connection with the complexities of the Bhagavata: “Eine ganz besondere Eigenthümlichkeit nun der vorliegenden Textgestalt des Werkes ist der bereits oben p. 372 erwähnte überaus große Reichthum an Wiederholungen aller Art, welcher dann, und zwar nicht bloß aus Bequemlichkeit, sondern in der That auch im Dienste der Deutlichkeit und Übersichtlichkeit, zahlreiche Abbreviaturen zur nothwendigen Folge gehabt hat.” There follows a typology of abbreviations (form and content), and further on we read: “Alle diese Mittel, um die Weitläufigkeiten des Textes einzuschränken, erweisen sich übrigens trotz ihrer häufigen und energischen Anwendung ... dem prolixen Charakter der Darstellung gegenüber nur als kärliche Palliative ...” (WEBER Fr: 379-80 and 382). Along with WEBER, it was mainly L. ALSDORF who was struck by the peculiarities of Jaina literature and did not hesitate to describe his reaction to them, using the expression “scholastic methodology” for phenomena such as the nikṣepa, with the observation: “This curious system of subjecting key words to an investigation by applying a scheme of fixed viewpoints may be less fruitful philosophically [nikṣepa compared with śādāvā etc.], but it occupies almost a key position in early scholastic literature ...” (ALSDORF Ni: 257). Again he underlines the necessity of studying the Mudhīdī texts on the doctrine of karma, but he also states: “Certes le schématisme des noms d’une scolastique d’une sécheresse parfois presque insupportable mettra à rude épreuve la patience de celui qui les étudiera, mais le livre de von Glaseapp ... facilitera ... sa tâche ...” (ALSDORF Et: 93). A more indirect than direct reference to SP is contained in J. DELEU’s preface to his study of the Viyāhāpannatti where this work is characterized: “To the prospective reader this monumental text in fact presents itself as a kind of bewildering omnium gatherum of episodes, discussions, expositions, detached statements, calculations, references and quotations, all apparently quite different from each other both in tenor and in style, and even in origin and antiquity.”

In conclusion we would like to stress that the concept of SP seems to be suggested by two observations which are connected with the same material, but derive from different points of view. First, there is the awareness of an excessive growth of scholasticism and mannerism. The two terms may not be sufficient for our strictly methodological discussions, but they can be used in the present context. Second is the inadequacy of the traditional disciplines in connection with this growth. We can extend the number of available disciplines by the emphasis on more and more minor disciplines such as “study of narrative techniques” and we can take the greatest care to adapt each discipline to the requirements of a particular frame subject (e.g. practising “textual criticism” with special reference to Jainism). But in the end we will always feel that the path from the general to the particular is not an easy one, and that it is advisable to start from the particular (i.e. from the conditions within a given frame subject), however important the general background of modern methodology may be.

Both experiences are reflected in the comprehensive SP concept, which seems to be the simplest way of making our sectional and subsectional lists complete. Under the circumstances, it is also not necessary to enter into a discussion as to whether “motifs” and “style” should be studied as parts of the SP, in Jainism or elsewhere, or as parts of international subdisciplines, such as folklore studies and stylistics. The second solution may recommend itself for the study of “motifs” and “style” in the majority of cases, but, in other cases, treatment under a heading like “SP” seems to be preferable. Actual research will, no doubt, always concentrate on the relevant facts, but it is hardly in need of the SP concept as such. After our theoretical discussion we can now proceed to a description of the facts.

II B

Having already discussed certain peculiarities of Jaina narrative literature in our doctoral thesis (BRUHN Ca: 132-37), we have taken advantage in the present paper of the “architecture of sections” in order to accommodate major clusters of “structural phenomena and other peculiarities”. The reader is therefore referred to “dialectic techniques” (p.11, “Jainism”), as well as to “parallel versions” (p.12, “List One”) and “repetition” (p.12, “List Two”). Our actual examples will follow below. They are almost all taken from the two fields of “Jaina narrative literature” and “Jaina ethics”,
and they will be supplemented by the minor research schemes introduced on pp.37-41 below. We should finally add that the SP include not only conspicuous developments, but also sporadic and unobtrusive particulars.

Amongst the most conspicuous instances of SP in the field of «Jaina narrative literature» are the use of clichés and the employment of the sthāna pattern (a form of tabulation). Clichés have been studied by J. DELEU (Ni: 90-95), and further observations will be found in BRUHN Re (§ 3 and §§ 5-8) as well as in BALBIR Vi (75-78). The classical example of the sthāna pattern in Jaina narrative literature is provided by the biographies of the 24 Jinas (BRUHN Re: § 10, § 15), but there are less technical forms as well, see Re: § 3 on “hero-variation”. A related pattern, also associated with the term sthāna, occurs in the doctrine of karma (GLASENAPP Ka, p.64: mārgandasthāna-s). It can be objected that the relevant pattern is a very general feature and that its occurrence in different contexts has no significance. But it is also true that the spiritual progress of a being forms a kind of karmic or soteriological biography and that the spiritual differences amongst the living beings suggest a kind of karmic or soteriological census. In both cases data are tabulated, and it seems, therefore, legitimate to associate narrative and karmic sthāna-s.

Our next subject is the formal or informal subdivision of ancient works. We call “informal” all forms of subdivision which are not identical with the standard method of dividing a work into chapters and subchapters, e.g. the use of phrases, within a running text, which conclude preceding topics and introduce following topics. L. RENOU has discussed the formal and informal subdivision of the Viṣṇusmṛti (RENOU VI). The same scholar has also studied the problem of division on other occasions (see FILLIOZAT B: xxvi). In the case of Jaina literature, observations on subdivision are rare, but N. BALBIR has described the division and composition of the Āvaśyaka-Niryuktī (BALBIR Āv: § 3.3), and L. ALSDORF has made a number of observations on the “äußerordentliche Freiheit in der Behandlung von Sinnesabschnitt und formalem Einschnitt” in Puspadanta's version of the UH (ALSDORF Ha: 182). These references show that subdivision in all its forms is a subject which deserves more than casual treatment in Jaina texts as well as everywhere.

Relevant to the wide field of literary transmission is the following statement by F. LACÔTE, which refers to the Kashmirian Bhṛtkathā: “... quand une histoire existait sous deux versions, même très voisines, ils [les compilateurs] se sont efforcés de ne sacrifier ni l'une ni l'autre” (LACÔTE Es: 141). This fact which was noticed by LACÔTE during his Bhṛtkathā studies can be connected with a more general Indian tendency to preserve and amalgamate traditions and institutions which rival each other. Refer, for example, to the contamination of different versions in the account of the jannābhīṣeka of the Jina (ALSDORF Co: 142-43 and 144) and to the two accounts of Rāma's slaying Vālin (SRINIVASAN Rā: 163-64).

Another subject which has been studied systematically is normalization in Jaina narrative literature (BALBIR No). We have already mentioned normalization as one of the standard examples of SP. This word is used by N. BALBIR mainly in the sense of moral censorship, or “Bowdlerization”. It is, however, self-evident that the omnipresent Jaina doctrine necessitated changes in more than one form whenever Brahmanical themes were incorporated into Jaina literature. Therefore, for the sake of completeness, we refer the reader also to BRUHN Ca (pp.118-19) for the UH in general, and to KULKARNI Rā (Chapter 13), as well as JAIN Rā, for the Rāmāyaṇa.

In the case of «Jaina ethics» it may be expected that we use chains of terms as the standard example of SP. But chains of terms are ubiquitous in Indian thought and their presence in Jaina ethics can hardly be mentioned as a peculiarity. An evaluation under the heading «SP» will only be possible after we have studied the specific role and the specific dynamism of chains in Jaina ethical literature.

Under the circumstances, we select as an example of SP the ambivalence of ethical terms. The highly speculative treatment of the term tapas in Jaina dogmastics can be used as a starting point. The meaning of this term is extended step by step so that we obtain a multi-layered conceptual structure. tapas has twelve forms, one of them being vinayaka, and vinayaka has in turn seven forms, one of them being jīnaka, the latter term forming the well-known pentad of abhinibodhika jīnaka etc. Refer in connection with the tapas dodekad to LEUMANN Au § 30 and to Bhagavati pp.1061-68. In both works the text is almost identical, but see DELEU Vi: 292-94 for minor differences. The word "extension" has been used by K. RUPING (As, p.89: extension of the term yoga), and more comprehensive studies in the complex Brahmanical term tapas have been published recently by M. SHEE (Ta) and M. HARA (see SHEE Ta). It is not difficult to mention further examples from Jainism of ambivalent or equivocal ethical terms. The reader is referred to ahimśa (BRUHN Ah: § 9), ṛīḍ自发 (ALSDORF Ut: 203-04), ārādhana (OETJENS Ši: 93-102), śāriyavahiḥkiṛiḥ (A. 3, 3), parigraha (OHTA Pa), parijāta (TATIA Pa), śṛiyaśicelā (CAILLAT At: 93-95), śaṃkṣepa (JACOBI Ta: 301), and vikītā (OETJENS Ši: 223-31).

Each case requires a separate semantic analysis, and ambivalence is probably a general state of affairs rather than a specific phenomenon. What could be called a “phenomenon” is, at the most, a more or less uniform tendency on the part of the Jaina theorists to construe pseudo-explanations. Here, a term x is “explained” with the help of quasi-related terms (a, b, c, ...), which are mobilized ad hoc and presented as different forms of x. Many examples are found in the form of post-canonical nīkṣepa-s as studied by L. ALSDORF (ALSDORF Ni: √āvaśyaka-nīkṣeṇa and uttaranīkṣeṇa) but, as the term tapas at least shows, we have seen there are also examples of pseudo-explanation in ethical terminology.
Besides the "internal structure" of a term we have to study the relationship of two independent terms x and y. A comparatively simple instance from Jaina dogmatics is the relationship between external tapas and the twenty-two partgaha.s or hardships. But this example should not create the impression that there are always hard and fast distinctions between the different terms. Rather we are faced with the problem of related terms which exist side by side, being sometimes merely kindred and sometimes truly synonymous (e.g. māna, āsāyaṇa, hilaṇā . . . ). Finally, we have to detect semantic structures which are below the surface: If taken in an abstract sense, ahimsā is "protection" of all beings, but in the daily practice of correct monastic life, ahimsā is in itself the source of countless restrictions and inconveniences, so that a good deal of Jaina asceticism is already implied by the term ahimsā. On the other hand, ahimsā may also have the connotation of compassion (anukampā), although neither anukampā as such nor ahimsā in the sense of anukampā are very prominent in Jaina religious teaching. The best demonstration of all the complexities outlined in the present paragraph is probably the term tapas as used in the epic (see SHEE Ta). But epic tapas, or any term chosen by us, can never be more than a crude paradigm, existing side by side with numerous other cases. As a consequence we need a methodology which enables us to treat the material in its entirety and from all relevant aspects. Refer also to BRUHN Mā (māna studied from numerous angles) and to our observations on synonymy (p.41 below). To be sure, the normal study of "terms and chains of terms", of "synonyms and antonyms" cannot be dispensed with, but in a complex situation it will in no way be the last word. More elaborate forms of analysis must be employed, and extended from basic terms such as tapas, vrata, and śraddhā to all ethical terms, at least to all significant ethical terms.

III

It is also possible to establish a few minor research schemes (i-iv) which are connected with the methodology of SP. Such "schemes" differ from the "positions" in our subsectional lists in more than one respect. In the case of the lists, the emphasis is on exhaustive enumerations, irrespective of the exact scope of future research. By contrast, the schemes are meant to close specific gaps in our knowledge, but they can never produce a complete mosaic. Furthermore, we shall add some notes in the case of each of the four schemes, which may be helpful in carrying out future research. Such a procedure was, as a rule, not taken into account in the case of the positions in the lists.

(i) In the positions 1.1 and 1.7 we have already introduced the problem of "parallel versions", which, with reference to Jaina narrative literature, has been initiated by L. ALSDORF (→ Ku and → Ha). We shall, therefore, start our discussion of parallel ver-

sions with a quotation from ALSDORF Ku: 29 which focuses attention on a specific problem: "Überhaupt stellt es sich immer wieder als unmöglich heraus, die verschiedenen Fassungen der Śhūlabhadra-Geschichte zu einer Art von Stammbaum zu ordnen, da fast jede von ihnen mit jeder andern durch immer wieder eine andere Reihe von einander fortgesetzt schneidenden Übereinstimmungslinien verbunden wird." Since this is a very general phenomenon, which may surface whenever we study more than two parallel versions, it seems useful to also present the relevant facts in symbolic form using formulas such as the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
(A + B) + (C) & \quad \text{read: } "B \text{ goes with } A \text{ against } C" \\
(A + C) + (B) & \quad "C \text{ goes with } A \text{ against } B" \\
(B + C) + (A) & \quad "C \text{ goes with } B \text{ against } A”, \\
\end{align*}
\]

and also

\[
\begin{align*}
(A) + (B) + (C) & \quad "A, B, and C all differ” \\
(A + B + C) & \quad "A, B, and C all agree” \\
(A) & \quad "element so and so is only found in A” (etc.).
\end{align*}
\]

The complexities of this matter only become apparent if we add a few basic observations. First we have to define disagreement which has, roughly speaking, three possibilities, namely (1) deviations, (2) additions or "plus-differences", and (3) omissions or "minus-differences". Another point to be observed is an adequate form of segmentation. We do not compare texts or chapters in their entirety but, one by one, comparatively small textual units which are the products of our analysis. To some extent, segmentation is an end in itself as it enables us to acquire an overview of a text. But whenever we compare two parallel texts, segmentation is, in the first place, a vehicle of comparison. As a consequence, we can isolate large segments if the two texts agree or disagree completely, but we need small segments if agreement alternates at short intervals with disagreement. Moreover, differences in the order of the events are fairly common and invariably present technical problems if synoptic tables are to be prepared. Apart from any abstract "grammar of comparison" we need a practical language for daily use. Thus we are basically concerned with different versions, and statements about "subversions" or "recensions" are of little use if we have not studied the material in its entirety. One always has to start with pointed observations on limited text portions. In some cases it can be said that the common prototype remains visible (ALSDORF: "die gemeinsame Vorlage schimmert noch durch”). In other cases a specific version has elements not found in the other versions, and here ALSDORF would have used the expression Sondergut or "special contribution". Sometimes two or more versions are so closely related that they can be traced back to a single unknown prototype, whereas at some other time two known prototypes have been combined into a third version. ALSDORF also observes: "Nachdem sie ["vieles jiśña-tische Erzählungen"] einmal, meist in uns nicht mehr erreichbaren Literaturschichten,
"stereotypisiert‘ worden sind, werden sie Jahrhunderte hindurch immer wieder unverändert erzählt" (ALSDORF Ku: p.21, fn.1). But as a rule, ALSDORF’s last statement applies only to parts of a version. If we prepare a “running comparison” we notice frequent and abrupt changes between similarity and dissimilarity (BRUHN Ca, pp.136-37: contamination). In short, we cannot explain the dialectics of similarity and dissimilarity, nor do we know the psychology of the ancient authors and redactors, and we will, in most cases, not be in a position to construe convincing genealogical tables. But, in spite of all this, an accurate comparison of different versions is hardly less important than textual criticism. In both cases the original form may remain beyond our reach, so that the approach is, in the long run, in both cases descriptive rather than historical. Furthermore, many textual configurations are midway between a family of manuscripts of the same text and a family of versions of the same story. The Āvaśyaka tradition supplies good examples of such intermediate cases (see LEUMANN Āv and BALBIR Āv). Let us add that we find in the universal history of the Śvetāmbaras many parts which are transmitted in numerous parallel versions so that a systematic comparison becomes inevitable (see ALSDORF Ku: 19-44 on Śhulinabhādra, BRUHN Ca: 74-75 and BHAYANI Sa on the Sanatkumārasacritam). In this connection one could even visualize a table which lists the different versions available for each part of the UH. Comparisons in other parts of Jaina narrative literature, or in the non-narrative literature of the Jainas, can probably be based on the same methodology, but there may be deviations of one type or another.

(ii) Closely related to the preceding subject is the study of conflicting accounts and statements in the two epics (2.9). S.A. SRINIVASAN’s studies on incoherences in the extant Rāmaṇya have already been mentioned. The scope of such enquiries could be widened by extending the textual material — one should include at least the Mahābhārata — as well as the typological spectrum. A special configuration exists, of course, in the Rāmaṇya, with the unsolved question of “Vālmiki’s version”, but that should not prevent us from studying the problem in the Mahābhārata as well. On the typological side, the study should also cover, in addition to incoherences, gaps, unexplained details, superficial repetitions (GRÜNENDAHL Ga), and narrative flaws of every description (compare, for example, the puzzling account of Kali’s release in the Nalopākhyaṇa, BRUCE Na: p.xii). Finally, we would like to add a few remarks on the relationship between scheme “ii” and related parts of this article. Scheme “ii” is not only connected with scheme “i”, but also with the minor strategies recommended on pp.43-44 and connected with “quantity management”. As a consequence, we need in the entire area — whatever the peculiarities of the individual case — a uniform or at least coordinated idiom which makes the investigations accessible to both specialists and non-specialists. Likewise there may be a coordination in the sense that narrative parallels, even parallels of a later date, are used in a systematic manner since they will throw additional light on the basic text in many cases.

(iii) We already mentioned that some motifs occur very frequently in our texts, not in the trivial sense that they enjoy special “popularity”, but because they belong to the bed-rock of Indian narrative literature. Such motifs (e.g. “childlessness”, BLOOMFIELD Pa: 203-04) are so widespread that a collection of stories using them would be a kind of introduction to Indian narrative literature. These motifs deserve our attention for two closely connected reasons. On the one hand, the phraseology of the motifs is standardized but at the same time diversified; on the other hand, the course of events as presented in the motifs is always similar but by no means identical. Therefore we have to define the typology of such motifs, both on the phraseological and on the narrative level. We point only to jītabhajana (BRUHN Ca: p.147), curse (SMITH Ex), oath (HARA Oa), and invocation (HARA In) as illustrations of the dynamism of standard motifs.

We can extend our observations to the field of dogmatics and consider, in the first place, specific topics which are interesting on account of their varied phraseology: Change of existence (LEUMANN Au: 1-2), paścanamāskāra (BALBIR Dē: 176), rātri-bhojana (BALBIR Sp), anadhavya (BALBIR An), and samyakavāticāra (BRUHN Ah: App. 10). Refer for the paścanamāskāra also to JACOBI Er: 35, METTE Na: 130, ROTH Pa, and SHAH St: 97-103. Further examples will be found mainly in the field of practical dogmatics and in the borderline area between dogmatics and narrative literature. It is, on the whole, also the proximity to these two areas which separates the topics presently under consideration from dogmatic topics in general.

A second step takes us to the area of dogmatic topoi. We start with the famous double topoi of (a) “the turtle and the yokehole” and (b) “the gradation list of rarities”. Refer to BOLLÉE Sū II: 29-30, to BALBIR Vi: 77-78 (mainly fn.34), and to BHOJCKA: 252-53. Another well-known topoi, occurring in different forms, is man’s essential loneliness. See BOLLÉE Sū II: 80 and, earlier, UPADHYE Kā (introduction: pp. 24, 41, 46; text: vss.74-79). J.J. MEYER has discussed the same topoi both in MEYER Da (pp.110-11, 362) and in MEYER Hi (pp.153-54). A series of comparisons, all illustrating emancipation, occurs in several early Jaina texts (BALBIR Ta: 454-56), although no topoi in the strict sense, this series is also relevant to the present discussion. Broadly speaking, in the case of dogmatic material scheme “iii” mainly serves the purpose of philological and literary comparison. But the emphasis is always on the individual item, and we consider in “ii” only topics and topoi which occur frequently and which are not restricted to closely related texts. The study of closely related texts may include observations of a similar character (e.g. compare OKUDA Mū), but it is not part of our scheme “iii”.
(iv) We use the term “synonymy” (total or partial synonymy) only in its modern sense and with special reference to the field of dogmatists. In BRUHN So and BRUHN Mā (pp.191-92) we have tried to put the study of the prolix kaśyapa synonymy and antonymy on a firmer basis. The jīva synonymy has been studied by K. BUTZENBERGER and B. BHATT (BUTZENBERGER Id, p.183, fn.606-08; BHATT Co, pp.134, 138). BUTZENBERGER has also examined the buddhi synonymy in the Upanisās and in the philosophical parts of the Mahābhārata (BUTZENBERGER Id, p.94, fn.299). Different from investigations of this type is the study of the different literary forms of synonymy. There are sequences of synonyms in prose texts (SCHÜBRING Ch: 69-70) and we find Niruykti verses consisting only of lists of synonyms (LEUMANN Da: 602 and METTE Oh: 10-19). Metrical compositions using synonymy and antonymy form yet another area of employment, which is related to poetics. What has so far been said in “iv” is more or less outside the area of “current research”. Therefore at the end of “iv” we also refer the reader to CAILLAT Vi, a paper which studies synonyms in early canonical texts according to the current form of philological research.

§ 5. Organization of research

As a continuation of the research schemes “i”-“iv” we offer further proposals in the present chapter which are likewise independent from our “sectional architecture”. Subjects from the “current canon” are now mentioned without restriction so that the sometimes cumbersome distinction between “current canon” and “extended canon” can be dispensed with. The general title, “organization of research”, has been chosen with due deliberation, and we use the term “strategy” as explained in § 2 for the three subjects, namely “adaptation”, “quantity management”, and “language”.

In the first place, “adaptation” may be used in the general sense of updating discipline x by the execution of certain essentials which are well-known from other related disciplines but not yet available in discipline x (e.g. dictionaries, grammars, encyclopedias of one type or another). Adaptation thus stands for the elimination of research deficits which are all too obvious. A closely related strategy would be “institutionalization”. All established disciplines are institutionalized, but some more so than others. In this case we are concerned with certain forms of organization (journals, symposia, bibliographies etc.) which are not as developed in minor or “younger” disciplines as elsewhere, Jainology being a case in point. In both cases we are concerned with a combination of true influx and the extension of developments which have already started within a given discipline.

The discussion of the actual strategy of “adaptation” will start with Sanskrit studies and proceed from there to Jainology. The number of suggestions given will be limited in both cases.

If we compare Sanskrit studies with classical studies (Greek and Latin) we find a general difference, for example, in the standard of the dictionaries. We also notice a conspicuous lack of glossaries for individual works (or authors), as well as a lack of easily accessible computerized versions of Sanskrit works, such as contained in PRP (Vol. 1). Especially as a substitute for glossaries, but for other reasons as well, we need in particular KWIC indices (key-word in context indices) of Sanskrit works. Another requisite for the study of Sanskrit is the publication of modern commentaries, which again are highly developed in classical studies, but rare in the case of Sanskrit texts. This lack is especially obvious to teachers of Sanskrit. Time and again teachers have been troubled by difficult words, such as dharmakṣetra at the beginning of the Bhagavagītā and by difficult topics, such as the lokapāla in the Nalopākhyāna. It is not that one is desperate for commentaries which try to solve all philological problems, but rather for those containing, as much as possible, references to literature on the subject. One would prefer that these commentaries also indicate the unsolved problems in the texts, some of which are clearly evident while others are easily overlooked. No doubt, it will never be possible to reach full agreement concerning the distinction between problems which need to be pointed out and those which do not, but this does not mean that such devices are useless. That progress in the interpretation of larger texts has been made in some cases (Princeton translation of the Rāmāyaṇa, and Chicago translation of the Mahābhārata) is obvious, but so far there is no sign of this being a major trend.

From Sanskrit studies we shall turn to Jainology. Many deficits are too obvious to require much comment (Jainology has, for example, no generally accepted system of abbreviations for canonical and exegetical work titles), and many projects (e.g. editions of all the important unedited works) cannot be carried out because the number of researchers is too small. It is in this connection important to note that, so far, all the major projects have been executed or started by Indian scholars, e.g. the Jaina-Agama-Series started by MUNI PUNYAVIJAYA (1895-1971) as well as the numerous detailed editions of Prakrit and Sanskrit works published by A.N. UPADHYE (1906-75; – BK). Under the circumstances, we merely point to two mutually related problems in the field of early Jaina literature. On the one hand, many works have only been studied up to a certain point, and on the other hand, glossaries for the works have not been prepared on a very large scale. Some of the works are massive in their extent and complex in their subject matter, so that they must be studied according to special schemes devised for the individual case. But even medium-sized and fairly “normal” works, such as the Jñātādikarṃakathāṅga Sūtra, have until now not been analysed from cover to cover (SCHÜBRING Le: 6 “Unsicher der Nichtvollendung”). Again, glossaries not only serve linguistic purposes (see OBERLIES Äv), but they also form a link
between the various available or desirable “text monographs” (editions, translations, analyses), since they tell us where a difficult word occurs. The glossaries of the Jaina-Āgama-Series are an important step in this direction, although they record only the Prakrit words. In the long run, glossaries of the type found in SCHUBRING Äc will be best suited to meet the requirements of further research.

We define the second strategy, «quantity management», in the first place with reference to the exegetical or pseudo-exegetical literature on the Śvetāmbara canon. Until now the general discussion on the vast exegetical literature was not exactly based on, but closely connected with, a descriptive model prepared by E. LEUMANN (Da: 586-92; JACOBI Pa: vi-vii). It seemed that this model described the broad development of the exegetical literature and that it assigned, roughly speaking, each text a place within the whole ensemble. But while LEUMANN was the first to publish such a model, he was also the first to realize that his model was only a first step and that the character of the texts required highly technical analyses, mostly in tabular form. LEUMANN’s model has been quoted and discussed on more than one occasion (BRUHN Bi: § 1), but only very few publications after LEUMANN have supplied additional technical analyses.

Another large body of Jaina literature is formed by the Digambara texts on the doctrine of karma (ALSDORF E: 88-94). It would be easy to add further examples of almost “explosive” literary developments, but they are not exactly on the scale of the two examples just mentioned. Therefore we refer the reader only in a general manner to the JRK mentioned already in a similar context on p.18 supra. It is also with reference to Jaina literature in general that we proposed in BRUHN We: 14-19 four minor technical strategies which we repeat here in tabular form. The new wording is an abstract, with minor revisions, of the description as given in BRUHN We:

1. Catalogues (bibliographies) of text editions.
2. Conspectuses (macroscopic analyses of individual works on the basis of traditional subdivisions; microscopic analyses of the same works by way of systematic segmentation).
3. Specialized and annotated bibliographies of one type or another.
4. Standardized sections in books and articles, informing the reader about the original text(s) on which a study is based. Miniature bibliographies could be added in the case that modern publications on the text(s) have appeared previously.

Topics 1-2 are more “specialized” than topics 3-4 in so far as they are closely connected with the study of early Jaina literature (with topic 2 having a special bearing on the exegetical literature). Specialized bibliographies (topic 3) are not only instruments of research, but also instruments for the engineering of research. Such bibliographies can coordinate scattered material (BRUHN We, BRUHN Bi etc.), and a bibliographical “flash back” can even help to recall to life half-forgotten publications. The extent and the penetration of bibliographical studies increase if we accept miniature bibliographies, normally only found in the form of footnotes, as a bibliographical category in its own right (refer in this connection to the “appendices” in BRUHN Mā and BRUHN Ah). The main responsibility is, to be sure, always on the side of the author rather than on the side of the bibliographer. Short, as well as long, articles are a normal form of publication, but no discipline can do without monographs and no bibliographical device can counterbalance the disadvantages of an unlimited fragmentation of research. The fourth topic in the above list likewise points to what we call “the responsibility of the author”.

A few special observations shall be added to the second topic. The preparation of a conspectus is made easier when we are in a position to isolate “blocks” or when we can distinguish between the main line of the argument and “interruptions” in this line. A “block” (in metrical texts a sequence of eight, ten, or more verses) belongs to the basic exposition, but, although part and parcel of the basic line, it forms a unit in its own right. The character of the “interruptions” is different. They may consist of a single verse or a single sentence but they are in principle outside the basic text. Since “blocks” and “interruptions” differ from genre to genre (there are, of course, also genres where the problem does not arise at all), it is not necessary to describe them in a stringent manner. It may even be said that they point to specific forms of textual analysis rather than to specific phenomena. The following examples are taken from the exegetical literature. The Dhyānāsātaka in the Āvasyakāniruytikā is a typical “block” (LEUMANN Ûb: pp.30\textsuperscript{b} and 31\textsuperscript{b}, “Theil XIV”). The historical question whether a block was a later addition or a part of the original text — if such a text ever existed — is not relevant to the present discussion. Examples of “interruptions” as found in the exegetical literature are program verses (dvāragāthās) and verses with lists of synonyms (p.41 supra). Such verses may be older than the remaining text (LEUMANN Da: 602), but they form at any rate homogeneous sub-corpora. For various reasons it is convenient to treat such sub-corpora separately. It should therefore also be possible to devise a form of conspectus for the exegetical literature where the “interruptions” are typographically distinguished from each other and from the rest of the text. In the case of the “blocks” it may be useful to prepare a subsidiary conspectus which mentions only the “blocks” but not the intervening matter.

So far we have not mentioned the issue of synopses. Although this question arises immediately in a discussion of conspectuses, provided there are parallel versions, we cannot discuss it in the present context. The character of a synopsis may change within one and the same work, and the preparation of such an instrument of interpretation requires refined methods which are adjusted to the different cases.
For our last strategy we use tentatively the term "language". Basically, "language" can be understood, especially at first association, in the sense of "style". Different scholars use different styles, and these differences reflect their temperament, their partiality for certain theories, and, to some extent, also the spirit of the time. However, the number of Jainologists, more particularly of western Jainologists, has always been small, and there have never been major controversies in the discipline. As a consequence, we use the term "language" rarely in the sense of "style", but rather in the sense of a specific "form of information". With this proviso we shall discuss below five different topics, the first three of which will be closely related to each other.

The first topic is the treatment of unsolved problems: How many canonical texts were lost, what happened at the council of Valabha, what is a Niruykti, who was Bhadrabahu? In this connection, we can ignore the different character of the individual cases, but it is important to consider the problem area in its entirety. The four examples mentioned are mainly taken from canonical and post-canonical Svetambara literature, and they were chosen in order to describe a particular situation, which is that we have to choose between greater and lesser reliance on ancient tradition. This is sometimes simply a question of trust and distrust; for example, shall we take the lists of lost canonical works at their face-value or not? In other cases, the alternative presents itself in a more subtle form: i.e. shall we consider all works traditionally designated as "Niruykti.s" or "Bhasyas" as belonging to two related, but mutually distinct literary categories, or shall we discuss the position of these works without regard for the two traditional labels? It would be easy to prepare further lists of questions for other areas, for example for monastic discipline and for the doctrine of karma. This situation forces us to develop an idiom which spotlights rather than camouflages the problems.

Different from the problem of unknown facts is the problem of facts which are well-known, but which cannot be explained in a few words (topic two). It is convenient to speak of the 45 works of the Svetambara canon. But we know that the figure "45" is ephemeral and that some "canonical works" (mainly the → Bhagavati Sutra) are of a higher order than ordinary works, while others (e.g. → the Kalpaavatamsika Sutra) are eccentric compositions of minimal extent, which testify to the close connection between fiction and dogmatics, but do not deserve the designation "work". Another example of our second topic is the "universal history", which is certainly not a "history of sixty-three great men" in the usual understanding of such an expression, but an irregular and, in certain respects, very unusual ensemble. The difference between Digambara.s and Svetambara.s can serve as a third example. Normally, the difference is explained in terms of dogmatics (no "salvation of women" according to the Digambara doctrine) and monastic rule (the Digambara monks are always naked). But actually Svetambara Jainas and Digambara Jainas have developed different religious cultures (e.g. two different literatures) and the difference must be seen from this broader viewpoint. What we want to emphasize in connection with the second topic is the fact that in many cases better information is possible without additional research. In other words this suggests the idea of a brochure or a series of articles giving pointed information on selected areas and serving as an "introduction" to Jainism. But it goes without saying that such a scheme can only be successful if it also includes areas where research is less advanced. This brochure would, nevertheless, differ from a handbook in so far as handbooks are by necessity encyclopedic and cannot serve the same purpose as an "introduction" as we understand it.

PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS. A point which seems to deserve special attention is the fact that in Jainology there are many particulars which are midway between the known and the unknown and where a comparatively small, but concentrated, effort is sufficient to settle an issue, once for all (topic three). We have decided to point out such cases, a procedure which may appear uncommon, but which is in agreement with the typological bias of our enquiry. We also feel that attempts of this type were made, on more than one occasion, by L. ALSDORF and that they even form a major facet of his scholarly work. He was, for example, the first scholar to say what a niksepa actually was and in his niksepa article one can clearly see how he virtually "jumped" at the opportunity to point this phenomenon out (ALSDORF Ni). Another such case is the demonstration by J. BRONKHORST (Ta: 163-71) that Tattvartha Sutra and Tattvartha Bhasya were not written by the same author. A third example is the discussion of the nigoda.s in the O'FLAHERTY volume (JAIN K: 223 ff.). The relationship between such discoveries and the "language" issue is closer than may appear at first sight. On the one hand, unsolved but solvable issues of this type are inconvenient in the description and discussion of Jainism; on the other hand, the way in which such still-open questions are handled can create the impression — which is actually false — that they are either, more or less, answered or can be ignored.

The language of translations (topic four) has only recently become a subject of scholarly discussions in Indology (GOLDMAN Bā: 96-117). This problem is to some extent a problem of the linguistic "purity" of the translations. In other words, should we translate each and every Sanskrit and Prakrit word or should we leave a good number of words untranslated? In the latter case we must explain all the Sanskrit and Prakrit words which are used in our translation. A translation which replaces all words of the original text by a modern word is today probably anachronism. One article by L. ALSDORF (ALSDORF II) contains no explicit discussion of the language problem, but rather solves it in a very natural manner. It goes without saying that this article is, above all, an excellent demonstration of how to handle a difficult Prakrit text.
As our last topic, we mention mutually opposed undercurrents in research which are best described in the form of a series of opposites:

Jainism is a religion/a shastra;
Jainism is static/dynamic, rational/overburdened with scholastic growth, transparent/not transparent, coherent/incoherent, überschaubar/not überschaubar (see JRK and JSK);
Jaina terms are an adequate means of screening the Jaina doctrine/they must be supplemented by modern terms;
Jaina works are a whole/they are composites.

It can be argued that the preference always depends on the individual case. However, in a general survey of Jainism, we cannot consider all the individual cases and, in the discussion of an individual case, the decision is often a matter of discretion. A specific work may, in many respects, form a unit, but at the same time it may contain significant elements which already occur in earlier sources. Again, a specific work may be varied in its composition and, yet, show a certain degree of logical coherence. Considering all these complexities, it becomes obvious that the preference is not simply based on "facts" and that the presentation of the material reflects, to some extent, the disposition of individual scholars.

Postscript

We owe the reader at least a few words regarding further work on our scheme (§§ 1-5). More lists should be added to the lists given in § 1, even if the scheme is extended only gradually. Additions of one type or another are also necessary, a case in point being the group of minor research schemes described on pp.37-41. More theoretically, one could ask for a better definition of the strategies, in other words for a re-consideration of the concept of strategies. This would include a new discussion of the strategies already treated, as well as the presentation of new strategies. Furthermore, our paper stands for typological variety, and such variety could be discussed along with a more extensive description of the strategy of "distinction", which in itself leads to different types of investigation and to increased differentiation amongst the phenomena. Finally, our exposition is dominated by a pronounced pluralism of aspects, which produces considerable overlapping. Such pluralism will also require a more detailed presentation, which would again be connected with the issue of the strategies. A point of theoretical and practical importance is the limitation of this pluralism. Thus one cannot make use of all terms which are either suggested by common sense or required by more exacting methodological standards.

The sectional principle also leads to the discussion of subjects which by their very nature transgress sectional boundaries and which require specific methodological effort. We shall mention a few such subjects in order to illustrate what we are driving at. One subject is doctrinal incoherence, an issue which was touched upon on pp.20-21 as well as on p.47. Here, the doctrine of karma is a case in point. On the one hand, it is obvious that the karma doctrine of Jainism is neither a consistent whole nor a concept which tries to explain human experience in its entirety. On the other hand, we notice not only high-level syncretism, but also the dynamism of popular beliefs and the parallelism of karma and fate. Our second subject is 'situation', first mentioned in BRUHN Se (p.50) and outlined again on pp.27-28. When we try to study 'situation' or 'situations' systematically, we must also try to explain why such enquiries have nowhere been made in the past. The third subject is semantics (pp.36-37). In BRUHN Mā (p.165-166) we have proposed a <field of concepts>; on p.41 above we have referred to <synonymy>; finally, we have mentioned on p.36 above <ambiguity>. The three subjects (incoherence etc.) show that considerable conceptual efforts are required if completeness in a more rigorous sense is to be achieved.

Key to the text and bibliography

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT. A discussion of methodological issues requires careful wording. We are therefore grateful to Mrs. SHARON LIVNY (Berlin) who read the English text of this paper and made a great number of suggestions for its improvement.

THE TEXT. The symbol "§" is to be read as "chapter". Terms and titles of Prakrit works almost always appear in their sanskritized form. For all captions which are closely connected with the structure of our paper (e.g. «current canon», «parallel versions», and «distinction»), we have used angle brackets (« ») whenever called for (e.g. for a first quotation). In the postscript (p.47) we mention the problem of overlapping which is caused by the «pluralism of aspects». In the text of the article, actual overlapping has been kept to a minimum, but in some cases the reader will find closely related observations at different places, traditional ethical terms being a case in point. We mention chains-of-terms on p.28, as well as on p.36, "criticize" the traditional vocabulary on pp.36-37, and discuss on p.41 the issue of synonymy in the area of dogmatical terms.

REVISION OF BRUHN Se. Although only a preliminary attempt, still BRUHN Se would have been easier to read if the discussion of some of its topics had been reserved for a later occasion. Broadly speaking, § 1 (general observations) was more difficult than § 2 (the scheme), but the inevitable difficulties of exposition were increased by the lengthy discussion on model-guided research in § 1. In a similar way, § 2 suffered under the conjectural inclusion of parallel versions, as well as of the topic of Bhagavatt studies.
Both subjects were presented as examples of «selection-cum-adaptation».

THE BIBLIOGRAPHY. In spite of its breadth, the bibliography does not convey an impression of the état présent of Jainology. However, bibliographical information on recent studies in the discipline will be found in the Felicitation Volume for Jozef Deleu, both in the bibliographical part of JSD and in the individual papers. The entries explaining the abbreviations serve, to some extent, also as notes, i.e in a number of cases they contain additions which are not part of the actual quotation. As a rule, reprints have not been mentioned.

1.1 (etc.): see § 1 for Lists 'One', 'Two', and 'Three'.

ALSDORF Åk

ALSDORF Co
— "Further contributions to the history of Jain cosmography and mythology", in → HGS 10: 136-59.

ALSDORF Et
— Les études jaina. État présent et tâches futures. Collège de France 1965. — We have not included the tâches futures aspect in our vocabulary, but we have mentioned several cases of this type in our text.

ALSDORF Ha
— Harivamapariprā. Hamburg 1936. [In German]

ALSDORF It

ALSDORF Ku

ALSDORF Ni

ALSDORF Ut
— The Ārya Stanzas of the Uttarajñāna. Franz Steiner. 1966. [Mayence Academy]

AMAR Ar

BALBIR Āv

BALBIR Dā

BALBIR Mi

BALBIR No

50

K. Bruhn

BALBIR Sp

BALBIR St

BALBIR Ta

BALBIR Vi
— "Jaina exegetical terminology", in → JSD: 67-84. — See pp.74-78 for clichés in the exegetical literature of the Śvetāmbaras.

BARY Tr

Bhagavati
See IĀS (Viśayapaṇṇati). — The Bhagavati occupies no less than 556 pp. of the Suttāgame edition.

BHATT Co

BHAYANI Ma

BHAYANI Sa

BHOJAK Ca

— On pp.36-78, BHOJAK has listed sententious stanzas in alphabetical order. Each stanza is followed by a caption indicating its content (karma-vipāk etc.).

BLOOMFIELD Pa

BLOOMFIELD Ps
— "On recurring psychic motifs in Hindu fiction", in: JAOS 36.1917, pp.54-89.

BOLLÉE Sü

BOLLÉE Ut

BRONKORST Me
J. BRONKORST The Two Traditions of Meditation in Ancient India. Franz Steiner 1986.
Sectional Studies


BRUHN Ca — Śīlākās Cauppanṇamaḥāpurisacariya. Hamburg 1954. [Monograph]


BRUHN So — “Soteriology in early Jainism”, in: H. FALK (ed.) Hinduismus und Buddhismus (U. SCHNEIDER Fel. Vol.), Freiburg 1987, pp.61-86. — In BRUHN So, we have used the term “sectional studies” for the first time (pp.61-63 ubi alia).

BRUHN We — “Jainology in Western Publications I”, in → JSD: 13-42. — Read on p.20: “up till now to now and then give preference”.


CAILLET In — “Interpolations in a Jain pamphlet or the emergence of one more Āṭurapratyākhyāna”, in: WZKS 36.1992, pp.35-44.


DELEU Vi — Viyāhapanattī (Bhagvatī). Brugge (Belgié) 1970.


FS = frame subject, S = section, SS= subsection. See § 1.


HOPKINS Ep  
E.W. HOPKINS Epic Mythology. Strassburg 1915. [Grundrissband]  

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

JACOBI Pa  

JACOBI Rā  
— *Das Rāmāyaṇa*. Bonn 1893.  

JACOBI Ta  

JAIN Rā  

JAIN Ka  

JAS  
*Jaina-Āgama-Series*. See JSD: 1-12. — JĀS 3 = Thānamgāsa-suttam and Samavibhāgamgāsa-suttam (pp.1-32, 323-480); JĀS 4 = Vyāhāpānuttisutta (Pīta-1); JĀS 15 = Dasaavyādīyasuttam, Uṭtarājāghanīyaṁ and Āvattasutta (pp.1-18, 83-329,331-358).  

JRK  

JSD  

JŚK  

Kalpāvatamsika  
*The ninth Uṇāṅga*. The Kalpāvatamsika Sūtra occupies only 47 lines of the Suttāgama edition. See DELEU Ni: 114-16.  

KRISHAN Ba  

KULKARNī Rā  

LACÔTE Es  

LEUMANN Au  
explained here this is more than a common place. The principle can be extended to cases where several related Indian terms are under consideration.


SCHÖNBERG Ka  J. SCHÖNBERG, Kshemendra’s Kavikanṭābhārana. Wien 1884. [Vienna Academy]


SCHUBRING Do  — The Doctrine of the Jains. Transl. from the original German by W. BEURLEN. Motilal Banarsidass 1962. — The text of SCHUBRING Le is revised and abridged.


SP  «Structural phenomena and further peculiarities». See § 4 (II A).


STEERMAN Pa  G. STEERMAN-IMRE Untersuchung des Königswahlmottos in der indischen Märchenliteratur: Paścadīvādīvāsā. Franz Steiner 1977. — Our discussion focuses attention on two cases: application of PROPP’s method to a clearly related material and
creation of quite new sequences in analogy to PROPP. The paricadīyādhvāsa motif does not seem to be an illustration of either case. See also J. BANASZKIEWICZ “Königliche Karrieren ...”, in: Saeculum 33.1982, pp.265-286.

STERNBACH Su
L. STERNBACH “On some noncanonical subhāṣita-collections in Jaina literature”, in: A.N. UPADHYE et alii (eds.) Mahāvīra and His Teachings. Bombay 1977, pp.41-75. — The terminology of the author may not be quite consistent, but he distinguishes clearly between collections which are, in their content, strictly Jaina (pp.59-75) and collections which are prepared by Jainas but which are, in their content, non-Jaina rather than Jaina (pp.59-59). — Refer also to N. BALBIR “Prakrit Riddle Poetry”, in: Annals of the Bt.O.R.I. 72/73.1991/92, pp.661-73.

SUKTHANKAR Na

TATIA Pa

TAWNEY Ka

THOMPSON Mo

THOMPSON Ty

TRIPĀTHĪ Pa

UH
«Universal history» of Jaina tradition (= history of the sixty-three great men).

UPADHYE Bk

UPADHYE Bṛ
— Bṛhat Kathākośa of Hariṇa (A.D.931-32). Singhi Jaina Series 17.1943. We quote the introduction (pp.1-122).

UPADHYE Kā