Sectional Studies in Jainology II

Klaus Bruhn

In memory of Jozef Deleu

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:

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 Mā: 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 Mā) 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 (Mahāvīra and after)

VIII History of the church
IX Natural philosophy
X Cosmography
XI Gods and goddesses (from the beginnings to the Middle Ages)
XII Dialectic techniques
XIII Religious instruction and the propagation of the Jaina religion

The two epics

I Literature in general
II Narrative literature
III Mythology
IV Philosophy (Mahābhārata)
V Dharma
VI Culture and society
VII Cosmography (Rāmāyaṇa)

Basically, any list of this type is incomplete and open to revision. Also logical deficiencies in our lists are inevitable with, for example, the headings «narrative literature» and «literature in general» juxtaposed. Furthermore considerable osmosis exists between the positions, as for example between «ethics» and «monastic discipline». We mention, finally, a conflict between two objectives. On the one hand, we wish to make the lists, whether sectional or subsectional, as complete as possible. On the other hand, elements of the «current canon» (or of «current research») should not occupy too much space, as we are mainly concerned with the *extension* of the current canon and not with the current canon as such (§ 2). Topics like linguistics, textual criticism, and manuscriptology have therefore not been included in our two lists. Generally speaking, sectional lists are comparatively simple, whereas in the case of subsectional lists (*infra*) more scope is left for individual decisions.

The question of a system of frame subjects will not be discussed. Experience shows where frame subjects are desirable and *where not*, where they are practical propositions and *where not*. Nor is it necessary that all frame subjects show the same proportions and the same degree of complexity. All frame subjects will be subdivided into sections, but not necessarily all sections into subsections. We are thus not contemplating a large scheme with Indology at the top. Similarly, further division (leading theoretically to sub-subsections) may become necessary in many cases at the bottom of the structure. But "sub-subsections" will not be covered by the general description of the scheme, i.e. downward extensions (divisions of individual subsections) can only be introduced as an *ad hoc* device. Ignoring for the moment the possibility of sections without subsections, we will, therefore, describe a frame subject as a scheme consisting

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, Cakravartin.s, "triads" (Baladeva, Vāsudeva, and Prativāsudeva)
1.2 The non-Jaina cycles (Harivaṃśa 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 (Kṛṣṇa 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 *Ahiṃsā* 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 pluralism 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 *Überschaubarkeit*. 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 [Mahāvīra] 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 Begriffsreihen." See LEUMANN Bu: 43. At least we can say that LEUMANN viewed Jainism, which he more or less understood as the product of Mahāvīra'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 Me: 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 x, 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 Cl: § 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).

A chronicle of its genesis is no substitute for an adequate description of a methodological scheme, and yet it can help to make such a scheme transparent. The difficulties in describing this scheme have more than one cause. They result, in the first place, from the fact that we use as elements both sections *and* strategies, rather than having treated the strategies in a more casual manner. Again we have not only introduced in § 4 the concept of minor research schemes (pp.37-41), but we have also included in our paper a separate chapter on «organization of research», see § 5. This latter chapter is, on the one hand, outside the scheme of sectional studies, but, on the other hand, makes use of the concept of strategies. Under the circumstances, the "chronicle" seemed to be the best way of familiarizing the reader with our methodology. However, its vocabulary is not identical with our standard terminology.

We can now start with the discussion of the strategies. In BRUHN Mā: § 11 we published a *list of sixteen strategies*, but such an enumeration does not measure up to higher methodological standards and is, therefore, not repeated here. However, we cannot do without some sort of inventory, if "strategy" is used as a term for a category of operations. To overcome the dilemma of the strategies, which will be explained presently, we shall treat them as methodological units, but admit, at the same time, that they are little more than convenient vehicles of our exposition.

If the subject of strategies is introduced with a note of caution, it becomes superfluous to discuss the inherent difficulties in great detail. We can refer the reader to the annotated list in BRUHN Mā and to the discussion of «order», «distinction», «adaptation», «quantity management», and «language» in the present paper. To «distinction» we could also add «segmentation», «isolation», and «limitation», and likewise, instead of «language», use the expression «language and information». We do hope that the individual expositions will help both to clarify and to justify the concept of strategies.

Since no attempt will be made to attach special importance to a single strategy, we shall also not try to construe a nucleus of "basic" strategies. Likewise there cannot be any hierarchy amongst the strategies. They are protean in character, they all overlap, and one and the same item can be associated with more than one strategy. There is, for example, no «order» without «distinction», and «distinction» would not be emphasized if we were not also interested in «order». But without the strategies the sections would remain empty, and without the sections the strategies would lack compass. The relation of both sides is not symmetrical in so far as the sections *are the products* of specific strategies, e.g. «order», «distinction», «segmentation», and «isolation». It is thus possible that one and the same item can be treated not only under the heading of a particular subsection, forming a complete subsection or a part of a subsection, but also under the heading of a particular strategy as its product. The strategies are, after all, largely *defined* in terms of their products, and, theoretically, these products may form positions in our lists. The problem is eliminated if we treat the

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 Mā: 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-

ment» in § 5. We have also separated problems of genre theory (below) from the main-stream of our discussion. But however limited the scope of exposition, order must be described as a strategy in its own right. In such a description, it will be *close to classification*. On the other hand, it will be *supported by distinction*, according to the maxim that «distinction» must be used as an ordering principle, where «order» in its narrowest sense cannot be established. Thus distinction becomes a surrogate for order.

However, there are exceptions. In the field of dogmatics, a subdivision into *periods* is possible. One may object that Jaina tradition in its entirety is subject to the dynamism of historical change. But change is more prevalent in some areas than in others, and dogmatics (mainly the theoretical or theorizing parts) is probably the best example of constant change. It is true that some dogmatic elements cannot be studied in their initial stage, because they are already fully developed when they surface for the first time. But such facts, as well as discontinuities in the development of dogmatic traditions, do not reduce the scope of historical studies, including the subdivision into periods. It must be admitted that our observations are based on the Śvetāmbara side alone and that, in the case of Digambara Jainism, the question of periods would appear in a different light.

In the case of the Śvetāmbara tradition we are rather confident that the concept of periods can be used, with the emphasis being on relative chronology, since one such project has only recently been published by S. OHIRA (OHIRA Bh). However, the very fact that a procedure of this type is not a standard strategy in Indology makes it necessary to add a short comment. The subdivision of complex material into periods in the manner of OHIRA Bh is beset with specific methodological difficulties. In the case of the quite different field of Indian art, such a method has been developed and tested by PH. STERN (e.g. compare VIENNOT Te). In «current research», the emphasis is mostly on the clearly visible evolution of selected concepts (A or B or C), such as terms, patterns etc., but not on the chronological subdivision of extensive materials (A plus B plus C...) which are subject to whole-sale transformation. However, both approaches can converge as soon as traditional research proceeds from the study of the evolution of *selected* concepts to the study of the evolution of complete *mosaics* of concepts.

In order to give at least one more example for «order», we mention the question of different literary styles. The difference between verse and metre, as well as the succession of different idioms (Prakrit, Sanskrit, Apabhraṃśa) has produced a broad spectrum of different modes of expression. As is natural, there are additional differences of style which arise from dogmatic or poetical requirements. A "reader" of Jaina texts could demonstrate the situation and thereby pave the way for a typology of styles.

The discussion of «distinction» will be more detailed than the discussion of «order». At first sight, distinction merely keeps apart what is different in character.

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 Jātaka verse and Jātaka prose (ALSDORF Āk: 42). It was this distinction which made a proper study of the "Jātakas" possible, but we can also argue that this distinction paved the way for a passable study of the prose material (NORMAN Pā: 78), more particularly of the *paccuppannavatthu.s*. 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 Ācārāṅga Sūtra (Pt.I vs. Pt.II), Sūtrakṛtāṅga Sūtra (also Pt.I vs. Pt.II), Uttarādhyayana Sūtra (early chapters vs. late chapters, Sūtra proper vs. *āryā* stanzas), and Bhagavatī (nucleus vs. accretions). From single works we proceed to larger literary areas. Within the Śvetāmbara canon, we can separate the "scientific" Bhagavatī circle (Bhagavatī, Prajñāpanā etc.) from the rest. The Prakīrṇaka.s may be called canonical or postcanonical, but in any case, we have to distinguish between the Prakīrṇaka.s and the truly canonical texts which precede them. Again we must distinguish within the Prakīrṇaka corpus between earlier ("old nucleus": CAILLAT In: 35) and later material. In the case of the exegetical literature (Niryukti.s, Cūrṇi.s 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 (Niryukti.s etc.) and *flat* exegetical super-structures (Ṭīkā.s 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 laic 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 *shastra*. 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 Ācāraṅga and Paryuṣaṇākalpa Sūtra.s, Indra and Hariṇaigamaiṣin act together, a constellation which is not derived from the official pantheon (as forming part of Jaina cosmography); in early and in pre-medieval Jaina iconography, divinities like Sarasvatī, 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 (*nigoda.s*); in ethics, emphasis is sometimes on the act and sometimes on the attitude; finally, Jainism, as a whole, oscillates between *ahiṃsā* legalism and *kaṣāya* 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 cosmographical literature and karma literature. However, it seems worthwhile to consider the question of whether subjects such as the "five great vows", "alms-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 *aṅguttara* pattern or the *nikṣepa* 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 *subhāṣita.s* (BHOJAK Ca: 363-78). Again, all *subhāṣita.s* can be classified according to their content (e.g. *nārī-nindā* and *nārī-praśaṃsā*: BHOJAK Ca *loc.cit.*). Furthermore, it is possible to isolate proverbs etc. which have formal peculiarities (e.g. *śabdālaṃkāra.s*) in common. In addition, we can study the cosmos of *upamāna.s* and the cosmos of *kavisaṃketa.s*, as reflected in our material. Last but not least, we have to consider the categories *topos* and *Gleichnis*, both as included in and as related to our material. Refer for *Gleichnis* (etc.) to BOLLÉE Sū I-II (the registers) and to BOLLÉE Ut (*jaha* stanzas). For general reasons we add that M. BLOOMFIELD suggested not only a catalogue of motifs (BLOOMFIELD Ps: 54) but also an encyclopedia of proverbs (BLOOMFIELD Pā: 208). BLOOMFIELD's "pragmatic śloka" (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 *subhāṣita* collections, where the special question of a *subhāṣita* typology arises. Here the reader is referred to L. STERNBACH who prepared a survey of "non-canonical subhāṣita 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 Bṛhatkathā (Vasudevahiṇḍi

etc.), Harivaṃśa, Mahābhārata, and Rāmāyaṇa, have already been studied by a number of scholars, but the material is vast and, at this stage at least, it would hardly be possible to describe the four cycles in an exhaustive and systematic manner. The most relevant *lacuna* is the unpublished second part of the Madhyamakhaṇḍa of the Vasudevahiṇḍi (refer for the first part to BHAYANI Ma). —— (1.3) Following more or less the terminology adopted by E.LEUMANN for the title of his *Übersicht*, we use the term "literature" for several clusters of exegetical texts: Āvaśyaka literature (LEUMANN Āv, METTE Na, BALBIR St, BALBIR Āv), Cheda literature (TRIPĀṬHĪ Pa), Daśavaikālika literature (LEUMANN Da), Ogha literature (METTE Oh), and Uttarādhyayana literature (JACOBI Er *et alia*). In addition to these, we can mention what may be called "Mūlārādhanā literature" (UPADHYE Br: 47 ff.). All the quotations in the parentheses refer to studies which are partially or exclusively concerned with the *narrative* elements in the relevant literatures. In spite of the work done already and in spite of the fact that the Āvaśyaka and Uttarādhyayana literatures are, in their narrative sections, largely concerned with the UH (if taken together, both contain more than three quarters of the UH in the sense of 1.1), it will take considerable time before the whole narrative material is properly surveyed. Apart from numerous isolated stories, the "literatures" also include accounts which belong to the story cycles surrounding well-known figures like Agaḍadatta, Cārudatta, Kālaka, Mūladeva, and Udayana (see PPN). —— (1.4) The story material in the *canon* is heterogeneous and scattered, and in many cases even the expression "story" can only be used with reservation. But the greater part of the narratives in the canon has been incorporated into the UH (or is already based on the concept of the UH). Considering the UH as a whole, we notice that only one biography, namely the life of Mallī — the 19th Jina (ROTH Ma) — is found in the canon in a complete form and that, in this case, the account is not only complete, but also in agreement with the standard form. A survey of the entire body of stories (canon in its narrowest sense plus Prakīrṇaka.s) would be useful.

(1.5) In the case of 1.5 and 1.6 we can ignore the non-Jaina cycles (1.3). The isolation of motif types, which are more varied than single motifs, is a matter of judgment. We suggest "temptation stories" (VERCLAS Āv), "fantastic architecture" (*samavasaraṇa* etc.: AMAR Ar: 529-33), "Jinas and gods" (activities of the gods in connection with the lives of the Jinas), and "the Jina speaks" (dialogues etc., DELEU Vi: 35 ff.). Finally we mention "chain of existences", a motif type which influenced both the form and content of many Jaina stories. —— (1.6) Our general guide to "motifs" is THOMPSON Mo (which appeared later than BLOOMFIELD Ps). For motifs occurring in Jaina literature the reader is referred to BLOOMFIELD Pā (183-207) and BALBIR Dā (254, s.v. "Motifs"). The shastric and didactic trend has exercised considerable influence on the Jaina stories, affecting to some extent their inner unity. Many stories can be evaluated both from the narrative and from the didactic angle, and there are

cases where the interface of folklore and dogmatics 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 *sujet* level), textual divergences due to didactic and gnomic additions, and textual divergences due to stylistic elaboration ("kāvyaization"). —— (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 "Sāvitrī" (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 Vasiṣṭha cycles). The "Rāvaṇeïs" of the Uttarakāṇḍa 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 *apsaras*.s, *gandharva*.s, monkeys, *rākṣasa* (*rākṣasa*.s and *rākṣasī*.s), *ṛṣi*.s, 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 Rāmāyaṇa. 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 *apsaras*.s". J.J. MEYER observes: "Daß auch die strengsten Büßer nicht gegen das Weib gefeit 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: *eko'ham*, XIV 54, 4: *tataḥ sa tasmai*), 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 Kabandha in the Araṇyakāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa.

(2.6) For motif in general refer not only to THOMPSON Mo and BLOOMFIELD Ps, but also to SIROVÁTKA Mo ("*Sage und Märchen*") and DAEMMRICH Th ("*Figurenkonzeption*", "*Motiv*", "*Thema*"). 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 BUITENEN mentions in his translation of the Ādiparvan "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 (*Sagen*) 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 Ādiparvan, Viśvāmitra's expedition with Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa in the Bālakāṇḍa, and the wanderings of Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa, and Sītā in the forest (Ayodhyā and Araṇya Kāṇḍa.s). 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 Ayodhyā 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 Rama 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 Ṛtuparṇa) 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; SUKTHANKAR 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 Vālmīki's Rāmāyaṇa, i.e. in the nucleus of the Rāmāyaṇa. 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.

	1993	1994	1991
3.1	Rules	§ 5A Rules	IV
3.2	*ahiṃsā* and the living beings	§ 5A Low forms of life	
3.3	Metarules (mainly *caution*)	§ 5B Caution	
3.4	Superfluous and peripheral rules	§ 5A Superfluous rules	I, III
3.5	Passion	§ 5D Passion	IV
3.6	Faith	§ 5E Faith	IV
3.7	Repentance and atonement	§ 5C Atonement	IV
3.8	Anthropological or bio-psychological situation	§ 5F Fourfold division of the *saṅgha*	VI
3.9	Situations in general		VI
3.10	Extreme situations	§ 5G *parīṣaha*.s	VI, V

3.11	Status of good actions	§ 9	Criticism of action	
3.12	Further fundamental aspects	§ 7	Free will etc.	VIII
3.13	Structural phenomena . . . (SP)			II, VII, IX
3.14	Moral code	§ 3	Secular moral code	

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 . . . Selbstverständlichen"*. 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 CAILLAT 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 Jn: 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/śiṣya*, 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 (PUṢKARAMUNI Dā: 511-23), and the *mores* connected with gift exchange (SANGAVE Co: 327-28, dowry issue).

«List Three» demonstrates by itself a more or less pronounced departure from the traditional vocabulary. Crucial is the place accorded in a modern description of Jaina ethics to the chains of terms. They should be viewed in the first place as subjects of philological studies, and not as unfailing guidelines in our attempts to organize the material.

§ 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 developed, PFEIFFER's study is bound to exercise considerable influence, generally speaking, on 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 minimal 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 Āv: 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 balancing 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 *guṇasthāna* 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 *successive* 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 analysis of the problem of lasting *identity* (rebirth or no rebirth: in the case of rebirth, analysis 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 jīva* 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 problems. 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 *jīva*. What remains, after the *jīva* 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 *jīva*.s (minimal agglomerations of matter), the mechanism of karmic influx (influx of matter into the *jīva*), 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 *aṅguttara* 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 x^1 we often have the choice between concentrating on the subject x^1 alone and treating it as part of a more extensive subject x^2 (performing an "*a minore ad maius*" operation). For the sake of illustration, we shall equate x^1 with a single verse, and x^2 with the relevant text in its entirety. This case is simple in so far as a *text* (x^2), whether well-known or little known, is normally a well-defined unit. A problem can arise if we want to proceed from the text (x^2) to a still higher unit x^3, 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 will, 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 x^1 then we expect broader areas like x^2 or x^3 above the level of x^1. 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 x^3 as the last member in an established sequence but with x^2 or x^3 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 Āc (1910: 45-63), BLOOMFIELD Pā (1919), ALSDORF Ha (1936), CAILLAT Ca (1971), and BALBIR Dā (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), Jaina works on

the doctrine of karma (ALSDORF Et: 91), ritualistic texts in Jainism (e.g. compare LEUMANN Üb: 7ᵇ-8ᵃ), and Varga literature in the Śvetāmbara canon (BRUHN Re: §§ 2-8).

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 classificiren und als Disciplin in Regeln zu fassen" (SCHÖNBERG Ka: 4). J.J. MEYER has quoted SCHÖNBERG in 1902 and added obser-vations 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. OLDENBERG describes the embarrassment caused to him by the identifications in the Brāhmaṇas with the follow-ing 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" (OLDENBERG Br: 111). A. WEBER observes in connection with the complexities of the Bhagavatī: "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 kärgliche 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 subject-ing key words to an investigation by applying a scheme of fixed viewpoints may be less fruitful philosophically [*nikṣepa* compared with *syādvāda* etc.], but it occupies almost a key position in early scholastic literature . . ." (ALSDORF Ni: 257). Again he under-lines the necessity of studying the Mudbidri texts on the doctrine of karma, but he also states: "Certes le schématisme des nombres d'une scholastique d'une sécheresse parfois presque insupportable mettra à rude épreuve la patience de celui qui les étudiera, mais le livre de von Glasenapp . . . 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 Viyāhapannatti where this work is characterized: "To the prospec-tive reader this monumental text in fact presents itself as a kind of bewildering omnium gatherum of episodes, discussions, expositions, detached statements, calcula-tions, 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 sug-gested 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 wo terms may not be sufficient for our strictly meth-odological 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 disci-plines 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 doc-toral 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: *mārgaṇā-sthāna.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 Bi: xxvi). In the case of Jaina literature, observations on subdivision are rare, but N. BALBIR has described the division and composition of the Āvaśyaka-Niryukti (BALBIR Āv: § 3.3), and L. ALSDORF has made a number of observations on the "außerordentliche Freiheit in der Behandlung von Sinnesabschnitt und formalem Einschnitt" in Puṣpadanta'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 Bṛhatkathā: " . . . 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 Bṛhatkathā 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 *janmābhiṣeka* 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 dogmatics 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 *vinaya*, and *vinaya* has in its turn seven forms, one of them being *jñāna*, the latter term forming the well-known pentad of *ābhinibodhika jñāna* etc. Refer in connection with the *tapas* dodekad to LEUMANN Au § 30 and to Bhagavatī 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. RÜPING (→ 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 *ahiṃsā* (BRUHN Ah: § 9), *ājñā* (ALSDORF Ut: 203-04), *ārādhanā* (OETJENS Śi: 93-102), *iriyāvahiyā kiriyā* in the Bhagavatī (DELEU Le), *iriyāvahiyā* in Āvaśyaka texts (LEUMANN Üb: 2-3), *parigraha* (OHIRA Pa), *parijñā* (TATIA Pa), *prāyaścitta* (CAILLAT At: 93-95), *samyaktva* (JACOBI Ta: 301), and *vicikitsā* (OETJENS Śi: 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 *nikṣepa.s* as studied by L. ALSDORF (ALSDORF Ni: *āvaśyaka-nikṣepa* and *uttara-nikṣepa*) 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 *parīṣaha*.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, āsāyaṇā, hīlaṇā* ...). Finally, we have to detect semantic structures which are below the surface: If taken in an abstract sense, *ahiṃsā* is "protection" of all beings, but in the daily practice of correct monastic life, *ahiṃsā* is in itself the source of countless restrictions and inconveniences, so that a good deal of Jaina asceticism is already implied by the term *ahiṃsā*. On the other hand, *ahiṃsā* may also have the connotation of compassion (*anukampā*), although neither *anukampā* as such nor *ahiṃsā* 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 Sthūlabhadra-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:

(A+B)+(C)	read:	"B goes with A against C"
(A+C)+(B)		"C goes with A against B"
(B+C)+(A)		"C goes with B against A",

and also

(A)+(B)+(C)	"A, B, and C all differ"
(A+B+C)	"A, B, and C all agree"
(A)	"element so and so is only found in A" (etc.).

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 possibilites, 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 ["viele jinistische Erzählungen"] einmal, meist in uns nicht mehr erreichbaren Literaturschichten,

'stereotypisiert' worden sind, werden sie Jahrhunderte hindurch immer wieder un-
verändert erzählt . . ." (ALSDORF Ku: p.21, fn.1). But as a rule, ALSDORF's last state-
ment 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 compari-
son becomes inevitable (see ALSDORF Ku: 19-44 on Sthūlabhadra, BRUHN Ca: 74-75
and BHAYANI Sa on the Sanatkumāracarita). In this connection one could even visual-
ize a table which lists the different versions available for each part of the UH. Com-
parisons 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 devi-
ations 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 Rāmāyaṇa have already been mentioned. The scope of such enquiries could
be widened by extending the *textual material* — one should include at least the Mahā-
bhārata — as well as the *typological spectrum*. A special configuration exists, of course,
in the Rāmāyaṇa, with the unsolved question of "Vālmīki's version", but that should
not prevent us from studying the problem in the Mahābhārata as well. On the typolog-
ical side, the study should also cover, in addition to incoherences, *gaps, unexplained
details, superfluous repetitions* (GRÜNENDAHL Ga), and *narrative flaws* of every descrip-
tion (compare, for example, the puzzling account of Kali's release in the Nalopākhyā-
na, 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 con-
nected 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 paral-

lels, 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 Pā: 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 *jātismaraṇa* (BRUHN Ca: p.147), curse
(SMITH Ex), oath (HARA Oa), and invigoration (HARA In) as illustrations of the dyna-
mism 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), *pañcanamaskāra* (BALBIR Dā: 176), *rātri-
bhojana* (BALBIR Sp), *anadhyāya* (BALBIR An), and *samyaktvāticāra* (BRUHN Ah: App.
10). Refer for the *pañcanamaskāra* 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 pres-
ently under consideration from dogmatic topics in general.

   A second step takes us to the area of dogmatic *topoi*. We start with the famous
double *topos* of (a) "the turtle and the yokehole" and (b) "the gradation list of rar-
ities". Refer to BOLLÉE Sū I: 29-30, to BALBIR Vi: 77-78 (mainly fn.34), and to
BHOJAK Ca: 252-53. Another well-known *topos*, 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 *topos* 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 *topos* in the strict sense, this series is also relevant to the present dis-
cussion. 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 "iii" 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 dogmatics. In BRUHN So and BRUHN Mā (pp.191-92) we have tried to put the study of the prolix *kaṣāya* 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 Upaniṣaḍ.s 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 (SCHUBRING Ch: 69-70) and we find Niryukti 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 Bhagavadgītā and by difficult topics, such as the *lokapālas* 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-Āgama-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 Jñātādharmakathāṅga Sūtra, have until now not been analysed from cover to cover (SCHUBRING Le: 6 "Unstern der Nichtvollendung"). Again, glossaries not only serve linguistic purposes (see OBERLIES Āv), 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 Āc 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 Et: 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 bibliogra-

phies 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 Dhyānaśataka in the Āvaśyakaniryukti is a typical "block" (LEUMANN Üb: pp.30^b and 31^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 (*dvāragāthā*.s) 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-corpuses. For various reasons it is convenient to treat such sub-corpuses 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 Valabhī, what is a Niryukti, who was Bhadrabāhu?* 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 Śvetāmbara 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 "Niryukti.s" or "Bhāṣya.s" 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 Śvetāmbara canon. But we know that the figure "45" is ephemeral and that some "canonical works" (mainly the → Bhagavatī Sūtra) are of a higher order than ordinary works, while others (e.g. → the Kalpāvataṃsika Sūtra) 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 Śvetāmbara.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 Śvetāmbara Jainas and Digambara Jainas have developed different religious

cultures (e.g. two different literatures) and the difference must be seen from this broader view-point. 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 *nikṣepa* actually was and in his *nikṣepa* 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 Tattvārtha Sūtra and Tattvārtha Bhāṣya were not written by the same author. A third example is the discussion of the *nigoda*.s in the O'FLAHERTY volume (JAINI Ka: 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 an anachronism. One article by L. ALSDORF (ALSDORF It) 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

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 *Bhagavatī 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	1.1 (etc.): see § 1 for Lists 'One', 'Two', and 'Three'.
ALSDORF Āk	L. ALSDORF "The ākhyāna theory reconsidered", in → *HGS* 10: 36-48.
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	—— *Harivaṃśapurāṇa*. Hamburg 1936. [In German]
ALSDORF It	"Itthiparinnā. A chapter of Jain monastic poetry, edited as a contribution to Indian prosody", in → *HGS* 10: 193-214.
ALSDORF Ku	—— *Der Kumārapālapratibodha*. Hamburg 1928.
ALSDORF Ni	"Nikṣepa — A Jaina contribution to scholastic methodology", in → *HGS* 10: 257-65. —— Refer also to B.BHATT, *The Canonical Nikṣepa*. E.J.Brill, Leiden 1978, reprint Delhi 1991 (Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan).
ALSDORF Ut	—— *The Āryā Stanzas of the Uttarajjhāyā*. Franz Steiner 1966. [Mayence Academy]
AMAR Ar	G. AMAR "Architecture", Ch.36 in: A.GHOSH (ed.) *Jaina Art and Architecture*, I-III. New Delhi 1974-75.
BALBIR Āv	N. BALBIR Volume I (*Introduction générale. Traductions*) in: N.BALBIR und TH.OBERLIES *Āvaśyaka-Studien*. Franz Steiner 1993.
BALBIR Dā	—— *Dānāṣṭakakathā*. Paris 1982.
BALBIR Mi	—— "The micro-genre of *dāna*-stories in Jaina literature", in: *Indol.Taur.* 11.1983 (C.CAILLAT Fel. Vol.), pp.145-61.
BALBIR No	—— "Normalizing trends in Jaina narrative literature", in: *Indol.Taur.* 12.1984, pp.25-38.

BALBIR Sp	—— "Souper de jour: Quatrains", in: *Indol.Taur.* 14.1987-88, pp.47-77.
BALBIR St	—— "Stories from the *Āvaśyaka* commentaries", in: PH. GRANOFF (ed.) *The Clever Adulteress*, Oakville 1990 (Mosaic Press), pp.17-74.
BALBIR Ta	—— Review of R.J. ZYDENBOS *Mokṣa in Jainism*, in: *Journal Asiatique* 272(3-4).1984, pp.453-57.
BALBIR Vi	—— "Jaina exegetical terminology", in → JSD: 67-84. —— See pp.74-78 for clichés in the exegetical literature of the Śvetāmbaras.
BARY Tr	W.TH. DE BARY (gen. ed.) *Sources of Indian Tradition*. Columbia Univ. Press 1958.
Bhagavatī	See *JĀS* (Viyāhapaṇṇatti). — The Bhagavatī occupies no less than 556 pp. of the Suttāgame edition.
BHATT Co	B. BHATT "The concept of the self", in: *Self and Consciousness. Indian Interpretation.* Centre for Indian and Interreligious Studies. Rome 1989. Pp.132-172.
BHAYANI Ma	H.C. BHAYANI and R.M. SHAH *Vasudevahiṃḍi. Madhyama Khaṇḍa.* Pt.I. *L.D.Series* 99.1987.
BHAYANI Sa	—— "The evolution of the Sanatkumāra-carita", in: *Indological Studies* (selected papers H.C. BHAYANI), Ahmedabad, Parshva Prakashan, 1933, pp.230-34. —— BHAYANI has listed on pp. 230-31 thirteen versions of the SC in chronological order (up to Hemacandra).
BHOJAK Ca	A.M. BHOJAK *Cauppannamahāpurisacariyaṃ by Ācārya Śrī Śīlāṅka. Prakrit Text Society Series* 3.1961. Ahmedabad, Varanasi. —— On pp.363-78, BHOJAK has listed sententious stanzas in alphabetical order. Each stanza is followed by a caption indicating its content (*karma-vipāke* etc.).
BLOOMFIELD Pā	M. BLOOMFIELD *Life and Stories of the Jaina Savior Pārśvanātha.* Baltimore 1919.
BLOOMFIELD Ps	—— "On recurring psychic motifs in Hindu fiction", in: *JAOS* 36.1917, pp.54-89.
BOLLÉE Sū	W.B. BOLLÉE *Studien zum Sūyagaḍa.* Pt. I: Franz Steiner 1977. Pt. II: Franz Steiner 1988.
BOLLÉE Ut	—— "Pourquoi il faut respecter un savant. Uttarajjhāyā XI", in: *Indol. Taur.* 14.1987-88, pp.145-62.
BRONKHORST Me	J. BRONKHORST *The Two Traditions of Meditation in Ancient India.* Franz Steiner 1986.

BRONKHORST Ta — "On the chronology of the Tattvārtha Sūtra and some early commentaries", in: *WZKS* 29.1985, pp.155-84.

BRUCE Na CH. BRUCE *Die Geschichte von Nala.* St.Petersburg 1862. — Refer for Kali's release also to the following: L. GRASBERGER . . . *Quaestiones in Nalum* . . . Würzburg 1868, p.216. H.C. KELLNER *Das Lied vom Könige Nala*, Leipzig 1885, p.151.

BRUHN Ah K. BRUHN "Die Ahimsa in der Ethik des Jaina-Autors Amrta-candra", in: A. WEZLER (ed.) *Ahimsā.* Hamburg 1994.

BRUHN Bi — "Bibliography of studies connected with the Āvaśyaka-commentaries", in: B. PLUTAT *The Literary Remains of Ernst Leumann.* Hamburg 1994.

BRUHN Ca — *Śīlānkas Cauppaṇṇamahāpurisacariya.* Hamburg 1954. [Monograph]

BRUHN Cl — "Classification in Indian iconography", in: Embassy of the FR Germany (eds.) *German Scholars on India.* Vol.II. Delhi 1976 (Nachiketa Publications), pp.26-50.

BRUHN Mā — "The concept of *māna* (pride) in Jaina dogmatics", in → JSD: 163-206.

BRUHN Re —"Repetition in Jaina narrative literature", in: *Indol. Taur.* 11.1983, pp.27-75. — Read on p.33: "some narrative units".

BRUHN Se — "Sectional studies in Jainology", in: C. CAILLAT (ed.) *Middle Indo-Aryan and Jaina Studies.* Leiden 1991, pp.36-54. — *MIAJSt* is Vol.VI of the *Panels* of the VIIth World Sanskrit Conference, Leiden 1987.

BRUHN So — "Soteriology in early Jainism", in: H. FALK (ed.) *Hinduis-mus 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".

BUITENEN Ād J.A.B. VAN BUITENEN *The Mahābhārata. 1 The Book of the Beginning.* Univ. of Chicago 1973.

BUTZENBERGER Id K. BUTZENBERGER *Identität, Kausalität und Konditionalismus als Grundprobleme der indischen Philosophie.* Berlin 1992. Unpublished.

CAILLAT At C. CAILLAT *Atonements in the Ancient Ritual of the Jaina Monks.* L.D.Series 49.1975. [English transl. of *Les expiations dans le rituel ancien des religieux Jaina*, Paris 1965]

CAILLAT Ca — *Candāvejjhaya.* Paris 1971.

CAILLAT In — "Interpolations in a Jain pamphlet or the emergence of one more Āturapratyākhyāna", in: *WZKS* 36.1992, pp.35-44.

CAILLAT Vi — "Words for violence in the 'Seniors' of the Jaina canon", in → JSD: 207-36.

DAEMMRICH Th H.S. DAEMMRICH and I. DAEMMRICH *Themen und Motive in der Literatur.* Tübingen 1987.

DELEU Ni J. DELEU "Nirayāvaliyāsuyakkhandha", in: *Orient. Gand.* 4.1969, pp. 77-150.

DELEU Le — "Die Schonung der Lebewesen in der Viyāhapannatti", in: A. WEZLER (ed.) *Ahimsā.* Hamburg 1994.

DELEU Vi — *Viyāhapannatti (Bhagavaī).* Brugge (België) 1970.

DUNDAS Jn P. DUNDAS *The Jains.* London, . . . 1992 (Routledge).

DUNDES Et A. DUNDES "From etic to emic units in the structural study of folktales", in: A. DUNDAS *Analytic Essays in Folklore.* The Hague, . . . 1975 (Mouton), pp.61-72.

FILLIOZAT Bi J. FILLIOZAT "Bibliographie des travaux de Louis Renou", in: *Mélanges d'Indianisme* (L. RENOU Comm. Vol.), Paris 1968, pp.xiii-xxix.

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

GAIL Pa A. GAIL *Paraśurāma.* Otto Harrassowitz 1977.

GLASENAPP Ka H. VON GLASENAPP *Die Lehre vom Karman in der Philosophie der Jainas.* Leipzig 1915. Engl. transl. Bombay 1942 (B.V.J. Pannalal Charity Fund).

GOLDMAN Bā R.P. GOLDMAN *The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki.* Vol.I. *Bālakāṇḍa.* Princeton Univ. Press 1984.

GOLDMAN Go — *Gods, Priests, and Warriors.* Columbia Univ. Press 1977.

GRÜNENDAHL Ga R. GRÜNENDAHL "Zu den beiden Gandhamādana- Episoden des Āraṇyakaparvan", in: *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 18.1993, pp.103-138.

HARA In M. HARA "Invigoration", in: H. FALK (ed.) *Hinduismus und Buddhismus* (U. SCHNEIDER Fel.Vol.), Freiburg 1987, pp. 134-51.

HARA Oa — "A note on the ancient Indian oath (2), Use of the periphrastic future", in: *Indol. Taur.* 14.1987-88, pp.201-14.

HGS *Helmuth von Glasenapp-Stiftung (Glasenapp-Stiftung).* — Bd.10.1974 = *Ludwig Alsdorf, Kleine Schriften.* Bd.13.1977 = *Walther Schubring, Kleine Schriften.*

HOERNLE Uv A.F.R. HOERNLE *The Uvāsagadasāo.* Vol.I, *Text and Commentary.* Calcutta 1890. Vol.II, *Translation.* Calcutta 1888.

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

JACOBI Er H. JACOBI *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāshṭrī.* Leipzig 1886.

JACOBI Pa —— *Sthavirāvalīcarita or Pariśiṣṭaparvan.* Second ed. Calcutta 1932.

JACOBI Rā —— *Das Rāmāyaṇa.* Bonn 1893.

JACOBI Ta —— "Eine Jaina-Dogmatik", in: *ZDMG* 60.1906, pp.287-325 and 512-51.

JAIN Rā J. JAIN "An old version of the Jain Rāmāyaṇa", in: *Studies in Early Jainism* (selected papers J. JAIN), New Delhi 1992 (Navrang), pp.39-45.

JAINI Ka P.S. JAINI "Karma and the problem of rebirth in Jainism", in → O'FLAHERTY Ka: 217-38. —— Refer in connection with fn.38 also to PH. GRANOFF "Worship as commemoration", in: *Bull. d'Études Indiennes* 10.1992, pp.181-202.

JĀS *Jaina-Āgama-Series.* See JSD: 1-12. —— *JĀS* 3 = *Ṭhāṇaṃgasuttaṃ and Samavāyaṃgasuttaṃ* (pp.1-322, 323-480); *JĀS* 4 = *Viyāhapaṇṇattisuttaṃ* (Pts.1-3); *JĀS* 15 = *Dasaveyāliyasuttaṃ, Uttarajjhayaṇāiṃ and Āvassayasuttaṃ* (pp.1-81, 83-329, 331-358).

JRK H.D. VELANKAR *Jinaratnakośa. An Alphabetical Register of Jain Works and Authors.* Vol.I *Works.* Poona 1944, pp.1-466 (two columns on each page).

JSD R. SMET and K. WATANABE (eds.) *Jain Studies in Honour of Jozef Deleu.* Tokyo 1993 (Hon-no-Tomosha). The volume includes a bibliographical section (pp.1-66).

JSK JINENDRA VARṆĪ *Jainendra Siddhānta Kośa.* Pts.I-IV. Bhāratīya Jñāna Pīṭha 1970-73. —— 503, 634, 637, 544 pp. (two columns on each page).

Kalpāvataṃsika *The ninth Upāṅga.* The Kalpāvataṃsika Sūtra occupies only 47 lines of the Suttāgame edition. See DELEU Ni: 114-16.

KRISHAN Ba Y. KRISHAN "Is there balancing of *karma*?", in: *South Asian Studies* 7.1991, pp.121-25.

KULKARNI Rā V.M. KULKARNI *The Story of Rāma in Jain Literature.* Ahmedabad 1990.

LACÔTE Es F. LACÔTE *Essay sur Guṇāḍhya et la Bṛhatkathā.* Paris 1908.

LEUMANN Au E. LEUMANN *Das Aupapātika Sūtra.* Pt.I. Leipzig 1883. [*Abhandlungen der DMG*] —— See also SCHUBRING Le: 5 (and Do: 4-5).

LEUMANN Āv —— *Die Āvaśyaka-Erzählungen.* Fasc.I. Leipzig 1897. [*Abhandlungen der DMG*] See also BALBIR Āv.

LEUMANN Bu —— "Buddha und Mahāvīra", in: *Zeitschrift für Buddhismus* 4.1922. München-Neubiberg. [4,1-3:3-22; 4,4-6:129-52; 4,7-12:233-54.]

LEUMANN Da —— "Daśavaikālika-sūtra und -niryukti", in: *ZDMG* 46.1892, pp.581-663.

LEUMANN Üb —— *Übersicht über die Āvaśyaka-Literatur.* Hamburg 1934. [Ed. by W. SCHUBRING]

MALLMANN Ag M.-TH. DE MALLMANN *Les enseignements iconographiques de l'Agnipurana.* Paris 1963.

MATILAL Kṛ B.K. MATILAL "Kṛṣṇa: In defence of a devious divinity", in: A. SHARMA (ed.) *Essays on the Mahābhārata.* E.J.Brill 1991. See pp.401-18.

METTE Na A. METTE "The tales belonging to the *namaskāra-vyākhyā* of the *Āvaśyaka-Cūrṇi.* A survey", in: *Indol.Taur.* 11.1983, pp.129-44.

METTE Oh —— *Piṇḍ'esaṇā. Das Kapitel der Oha-nijjutti über den Bettelgang.* Franz Steiner 1973.

MEYER Da J.J. MEYER *Daṇḍins Daśakumāracaritam.* Leipzig. No year (1902). [Transl. into German]

MEYER Hi —— *Hindu Tales.* London 1909. [Transl. of → JACOBI Er]

MEYER Wb —— *Das Weib im altindischen Epos.* Leipzig 1915.

MÜLLER Al R. MÜLLER-FREIENFELS *Die Seele des Alltags.* Berlin 1925.

NORMAN Pā K.R. NORMAN *Pāli Literature.* Otto Harrassowitz 1983. [*Hist. of Ind. Lit.* 7.2]

OBERLIES Āv TH. OBERLIES Volume II (*Glossar ausgewählter Wörter*) of the *Āvaśyaka-Studien.* See BALBIR Āv.

OETJENS Śi K. OETJENS *Śivāryas Mūlārādhanā.* Hamburg 1976. Printed as a dissertation.

O'FLAHERTY Ka W.D. O'FLAHERTY (ed.) *Karma and Rebirth in Classical Indian Traditions.* Univ. of California 1980.

OHIRA Bh S. OHIRA *A Study of the Bhagavatīsūtra.* Prakrit Text Series 28.1994. —— See also S. OHIRA "An abstract of 'A Study of the Bhagavatīsūtra. A chronological analysis'", in → JSD: 395-411.

OHIRA Pa —— "Concept of parigraha", in: *Tulsī Prajñā* 2(6). April/June 1976: 28-32.

OKUDA Mū K. OKUDA *Eine Digambara-Dogmatik.* Franz Steiner 1975. [Study of Mūlācāra V]

OLDENBERG Br — H. OLDENBERG *Die Weltanschauung der Brāhmana-Texte.* Göttingen 1919.

PEM — VETTAM MANI *Purāṇic Encyclopedia.* Motilal Banarsidass 1975. [Transl. from the original Malayalam]

PFEIFFER Ka — M. PFEIFFER "Altindische Zaubermärchen: Zur Struktur einiger Erzählungen des Kathāsaritsāgara", in: *Berliner Indologische Studien* 1.1985, pp.11-19.

PFEIFFER We — —— *Indische Mythen vom Werden der Welt.* Berlin 1994 (Dietrich Reimer).

POLLMANN Li — L. POLLMANN *Literaturwissenschaft und Methode.* Athenäum Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag 1971.

POLLOCK Ay — SH.I. POLLOCK *The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki.* Vol.2. *Ayodhyākāṇḍa.* Princeton Univ. Press 1986.

PPN — M.L. MEHTA and K.R. CHANDRA *Prakrit Proper Names.* Edited by D. MALVANIA. Pts.I-II: 1970, 1972. *L.D.Series* Nos.28 and 37.

PROPP Mo — V. PROPP *Morphology of the Folktale.* Second ed. Indiana Univ. 1968.

PRP — H. VON STIETENCRON (ed.) *Purāṇa Research Publications,* Tübingen. Vol.1: P. SCHREINER and R. SÖHNEN *Sanskrit Indices and Text of the Brahmapurāṇa.* Otto Harrassowitz 1987. [Twenty-six microfiches enclosed] Vol.2: R. SÖHNEN and P. SCHREINER *Brahmapurāṇa.* Otto Harrassowitz 1989.

PUṢKARAMUNI Dā — PUṢKARA MUNI *Jain dharm meṃ dān.* Udaipur 1977.

RENOU Vi — L. RENOU "On the structure of the Viṣṇusmṛti", in: *Bulletin of the Deccan College* 20.1960 (S.K. DE Fel.Vol.), pp.319-23.

ROTH Ma — G. ROTH *Mallī Jñāta.* Franz Steiner 1983.

ROTH Pa — —— "Notes on the *Paṃca-namokkāra-parama-maṅgala* in Jaina literature", in: H. BECHERT and P. KIEFFER-PÜLZ (eds.) *Indian Studies* (selected papers G. ROTH), Delhi 1986 (Indian Books Centre), pp.129-46.

RUBEN Kr — W. RUBEN *Krishna.* Istanbul 1944. —— See pp.210-47 and 281-286 (Kṛṣṇa in the Mahābhārata).

RUBEN Tr — —— "Vier Liebestragödien des Rāmāyaṇa", in: *ZDMG* 100. 1950, pp.287-355.

RÜPING As — K. RÜPING "Zur Askese in indisehen Religionen", in: *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* 1977, pp.81-98. —— RÜPING writes on p.82 that "Askese" stands for *tapas* in its various meanings, i.e. it signifies "was in Indien mit dem Wort *tapas* bezeichnet wird". For reasons which cannot be

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

S(SS) — See FS.

SANGAVE Co — V.A. SANGAVE *Jaina Community.* Second revised edition. Bombay 1980.

SCHÖNBERG Ka — J. SCHÖNBERG, *Kshemendra's Kavikaṇṭhābharaṇa.* Wien 1884. [Vienna Academy]

SCHUBRING Āc — W. SCHUBRING *Ācārāṅga-Sūtra. Erster Śrutaskandha.* Leipzig 1910. [*Abhandlungen der DMG*]

SCHUBRING Ch — W. SCHUBRING, C. CAILLAT *Drei Chedasūtras des Jaina-Kanons.* Hamburg 1966.

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

SCHUBRING Le — —— *Die Lehre der Jainas.* Berlin und Leipzig 1935. [*Grundrissband*]

SHAH St — U.P. SHAH *Studies in Jaina Art.* Banaras 1955.

SHEE Ta — M. SHEE *tapas und tapasvin in den erzählenden Partien des Mahābhārata.* Reinbek 1986. —— Refer to p.xiv for M. HARA's publications on the subject.

SIMSON Ep — G. VON SIMSON *Altindische epische Schlachtbeschreibung.* Unpublished *Habilitationsschrift,* Göttingen 1974. [Quoted from GRÜNENDAHL Ma: 110] —— Study of Books 6-9 of the Mahābhārata.

SIROVÁTKA Mo — O. SIROVÁTKA "Zur Morphologie der Sage und Sagenkatalogisierung", in: L. PETZOLDT (ed.) *Vergleichende Sagenforschung,* Darmstadt 1969, pp.326-36.

SMITH Ex — W.L. SMITH "Explaining the inexplicable: Uses of the curse in Rāma literature", in: *Kalyāṇamitrārāgaṇam* (N. SIMONSSON Fel. Vol.), Norvegian Univ. Press 1986, pp.261-76.

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

SRINIVASAN Rā — S.A. SRINIVASAN *Studies in the Rāma Story.* Vols.I-II. Franz Steiner 1984.

STEERMANN Pa — G. STEERMANN-IMRE *Untersuchung des Königswahlmotivs in der indischen Märchenliteratur: Pañcadivyādhivāsa.* 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 *pañcadivyādhivāsa* 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.41-59). —— Refer also to N. BALBIR "Prakrit Riddle Poetry", in: *Annals of the BH.O.R.I.* 72/73.1991/92, pp.661-73.

SUKTHANKAR Na — V.S. SUKTHANKAR "The Nala episode and the Rāmāyaṇa", in: *V.S. Sukthankar Memorial Edition* (selected papers V.S. SUKTHANKAR) Vol.I. Bombay 1944 (Karnatak Publishing House). See pp.406-15.

TATIA Pa — N. TATIA "Parallel developments in the meaning of *parijñā*", in: *Indol. Taur.* 11.1983, pp.293-302.

TAWNEY Ka — C.H. TAWNEY *The Kathā Sarit Sāgara.* Vols.I-II. Calcutta 1880, 1884. Enlarged edition in ten volumes by N.M. PENZER. London 1924-28. —— Refer for the 'chain of informants' (pp.25-26) also to PENZER Vol.II, p.190.

THOMPSON Mo — S. THOMPSON *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature.* Vols.1-6. Copenhagen and Bloomington 1955-58.

THOMPSON Ty — A. AARNE, S. THOMPSON *The Types of the Folktale. Second Revision.* Helsinki 1961.

TRIPĀṬHĪ Pa — C. TRIPĀṬHĪ "Narratives in the *Pañcakalpabhāṣya* and cognate texts", in: *Indol.Taur.* 11.1983, pp.119-128.

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

UPADHYE Bk — A.N. UPADHYE *Books and Papers by Prof. A.N. Upadhye.* xi, 67 pp. Kolhapur 1957. —— See also the obituary for A.N. UPADHYE, written by C. CAILLAT in *Sambodhi* 5(2-3), July-October 1976, pp.201-14.

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

UPADHYE Kā — —— *Svāmi-Kumāra's Kārttikeyānuprekṣā.* Rajachandra Ashram, Agas 1960.

UPADHYE Va — —— *The Varāṅgacarita. Māṇikachandra Digambara Jaina Granthamālā* 40.1938.

VERCLAS Āv — K. VERCLAS *Die Āvaśyaka-Erzählungen über die Upasargas des Mahāvīra* . . . Hamburg 1978. Printed as a dissertation.

VIENNOT Te — O. VIENNOT *Temples de l'Inde centrale et occidentale.* T. I-II. Paris 1976. —— O. VIENNOT's extensive study is a good demonstration of the method of PH. STERN.

WEBER Fr — A. WEBER *Über ein Fragment der Bhagavatī.* Pt.I (1866, pp.367-444), Pt.II (1867, pp.155-352). Refer for a more complete quotation to BRUHN We: 42.