“A Slap on the Face of the Brahmins”
Introducing a Little-Known Jain Text of Polemical Objectives

Albrecht Wezler

1. In 1923 a *pota* entitled *Vedāikuśa* was published in Ahmedabad as no. 5 of the Āryaṃśaṃ vinā mahābhartādau / itihāsasamuccaye, i.e. in fact a note to inform the reader that the verses quoted subsequently are taken from the ‘Mahābhārata, etc.’, if no specification of the work is given; *itihāsasamuccaye* is the first of these specifications according to which the first two verses belong to the *itihāsasamuccaya*, and they run thus:

srīyānaṃ dharmasārvavsaṃ śrutvā caiva vadhāryatām /
aśmanāḥ pratikūlāni pareṇa na samācaret //1//
slokārdhena pravakṣyāmi yad uktaṃ granthakoṭibhiḥ /
paropakāraḥ pūryāya pūṣāya parapiḍanam //2//

Hence, these references, which always consist of the title of a particular work given in the locative, form a constituent part of the *Vedāikuśa* itself. The
editors have extracted these references for the readers' convenience, removed them to the left margin and separated them from the corresponding quotation by a dash. Indeed, this format considerably facilitates rapid orientation throughout the text.

The ədī of mahābhāratādau in the introductory directional remark is made explicit, to some extent at least, by the concluding statement following upon verse 849, viz. iti mahābhāratasmrītpurāṇādigataślokāḥ. Hence the author also states quite clearly that the verses which he has compiled and quotes in the first part of his work deal with dharma; and this expression is evidently used here not in the peculiar technical meaning it has in Jainism itself, but in that meaning which is well-known from brahmanical, or hinduistic, sources, viz. 'normative rules of conduct' or 'rightful conduct' itself.

All those texts which are not subsumed under mahābhāratādī and hence mentioned by name in the body of the text whenever a verse from them is quoted are enumerated, in alphabetical order, in a list attached by the two editors to their "Prāstāvīka" (written in Gujarati). It consists of the following 40 titles:

Āṅgirasasmṛti, Ātreyasmṛti, Ādityapurāṇa, Ādiparva[n], Āyurveda, Ilīhāsa [samuccaya], Uitaramāṃśā, Ṛgveda, Kātyāyanasmṛti, Gīthā, Govindakītana, Catuvāraṇyaka, Tattiriyā Āranyaka, Daḵṣasmiṃ, Devapurāṇa, Dharmaśāstra, Nagarapurāṇa, Padmapurāṇa, Pārāśarasmiṃ, Brahmapurāṇa, Bhadāraṇyaka, Bhāspatismṛti, Bhāgavata, Manusmṛti, Miṣjāpurāṇa, Mṛgendrapurāṇa, Yājurveda, Yāmasmiṃ, Yājñavalkyasmiṃ, Vājasaneśvarī, Vāsiṣṭhasmiṃ, Vivekavilāsa, Viṣṇupurāṇa, Viṣṇubhakti-candrodaya, Śaṅkhasmiṃ, Śivaśāstra, Śukasandhyā, Śyenasmṛti, Śānaveda and Skandapurāṇa.

Some of these titles, e.g. Āyurveda or Dharmaśāstra, are quite unspecific; that is to say, they are rather names of traditional branches of learning than of individual texts. The necessary critical examination cannot, however, be confined to just such cases. In fact, each and every quotation has to be traced back to its source, not only in order to complete the reference by adding more specific data, but also to take note of the context and to look out for possible variant readings, etc. Time and space being limited, this philologically neces-
sary work cannot, however, be done here.6

The two verses quoted above from the Ilīhāsasamuccaya with which the Vedāṅkuṣa in fact begins are evidently cited for two reasons: (1) for their own sake, and (2) for the sake of indicating that particular type of the vast sphere of the dharma which will also be dealt with in the following 14 verses. That is to say, the 'golden rule'7 or rather the iniquity of parapiḍāna and the outstanding importance of paropakāra, "doing good to others," which, to be sure, should imply more than just abstaining from "inflicting pain on other [living beings]", form the first topic which the Vedāṅkuṣa treats. The various topics or 'subjects' (viṣaya), each of which is always common to a number of verses and which in fact represents the very reason for the selection and juxtaposition, have been listed by the learned editors as a "Table of Contents" which has also been placed before the Vedāṅkuṣa text itself. But just as in the case of the titles of the works from which the author of the Vedāṅkuṣa quotes, the designations of the various viṣayas reoccur within the body of the text itself, almost stereotypically in the form of atha plus the locative of the corresponding expression. These 'captions' of the individual chapters, which taken together make up the first part of the Vedāṅkuṣa, are regularly printed in bold and larger types and thus, no doubt, serve to facilitate the legibility of the book. However, with regard to them one wonders whether they, too, really form an original constituent part of the text itself; and it takes only a short time to arrive at the conclusion that they have evidently been added later, most probably by the editors themselves. Therefore, there is no such 'caption' at the beginning of the first viṣaya although the "Table of Contents" starts with the entry "1. paropakāra" (followed by the number of the verse with which this 'chapter' starts). In addition, it should be noted that the subject is as a rule quite clearly indicated by the first verse of a 'chapter' itself, sometimes even by its very first word, e.g. p. 1a, 1.10:8 d h a r m a h ŝtruтои dṛśtoи kuto vā kārito vā vā anumoditoи ŝrajendra punāty a saptaṁ kulan // Mbh. [Poona ed.] 14, App. 4, verse 60), or at least by its first pāda, e.g. p. 3a, 1.6: n a p ā p ā m p ā p i n ā m b r ā y ā t (utah pāpaṃ apāpiṁ / satyena tulyadoṣa śyād asatyaṇa āvīdoṣabhaḥ, quoted from the Adityapurāṇa),9 in the case of the chapter given the 'caption' atha nindāyān. Besides, one of these 'captions', albeit one which was not included in the "Table of Contents" and which also differs from the others in
the way it is formulated, viz. rajaṇy api ahaṃṣayāṁ (p. 8b, 1.12), may be suspect in so far as the verses subsumed under it do not really deal with the "abstaining from injury, or killing, by the king, too", but rather proclaim the ideal of the just or righteous king who indeed fulfills his central duty of "protecting" his subjects.

1.2. The second part of the Vedāṅkūśa is not only clearly demarcated from the first part by the latter’s concluding statement (p. 30b, 1.13) iti mahābhūtratamsiptipurāṇādīgatadharmaśālokāḥ, already mentioned above, but it is also of a distinctly different character: Although it contains similar quotations, both in verse10 as well as in prose, it is now the author of the Vedāṅkūśa himself who speaks on his own behalf, and what he wishes to express he states almost right at the beginning, viz. p. 31a, 1.2ff.; yat tāvat kenacid uktaṃ—sarvapradhānaḥ brāhmaṇaḥ iti tat ko 'yam brāhmaṇo nāma?11 kiṁ sarīreṇa? kiṁ jāyā? kiṁ jīvena? kiṁ kulena? kiṁ yonya? kiṁ jānena? kiṁ saucācāreṇa? kiṁ tapasā? kiṁ sanskāreṇa vā? iti iteṣām madhye kena brāhmaṇo bhavati? iti brāvītu kaści[d] brāhmaṇas tatpaksapātī vā./

Already at first sight it is perfectly clear that kiṁ sarīreṇa, etc., are but rhetorical questions, or rather questions asked merely to be answered in the negative, and without further elaboration and uncompromisingly at that. Indeed, the author does not waste any time, but immediately starts his refutation of the implied propositions, addressing them one after another in the sequence of their enumeration, viz. p. 31a, 1.6ff. sarīreṇa tāvan na bhavati brāhmaṇaḥ / kātham? brāhmaṇakṣetriyavāyāvāyādṛṣṭaram brāhmaṇām aviśeṣāt, kiṁ ca śukraśantiMadhyamādīvarṇayauvanādīnām ca bhedābhavāt; kiṁ ca mṛtyasya brāhmaṇasya śārtradahane jñātāṁ tathāgner[1] brahmaṇahatya syāt / ato jñāyate sarīreṇa tāvād brāhmaṇo na bhavati, and so forth.

But as one might expect he is not content simply to prove in this manner that none of these nine factors (śātra, jāti, etc.) can be regarded as constituting brahminhood, but continues his argument by expressing his own opinion, viz. p. 32b, 1.8ff.:

yāt ātmyaḥ pāpamī sa vai brāhmaṇa ucya-te / dānaśṭiṣaṁiṣvṛya dhyāna-prajñādiyo guṇaḥ /
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yatā sarve samāsanī sa vai brāhmaṇa ucya-te / brāhmaṇo brahmacaryena yathā śīpeṇa śīpikāḥ / anyāthā nāma-mātraṁ syād indragopakātavāt //12

Therefore, one cannot but agree with the editors according to whose "Table of Contents" the last topic dealt with in the Vedāṅkūśa is brāhmaṇatvasiddhi, "establishing what constitutes a [t r e] Brahmin [according to our tradition]."13

Now this second part of the Vedāṅkūśa is introduced by three ślokas which run thus (30b. 14–31a.1):

vastutattvavihīnaṁ ajñāsiddhindhyātinām / cātuvarṇoścānto14 vipraḥ khyātaḥ pujitaḥ sakrātāḥ //
y a ime vṛṣalā hīnas te bhikṣīvṛatakarmāṇi / na deyam teṣu na śīryām varṇair anyaṁ kadačana //
pakṣapātaṁ pariṣayajya prastāve 'smin vicāryate /
nyāyaṃ āgartha saṁbhir yuktāyuktāparīṣaṇe //

Brahmins are declared to be the highest [in rank] of the four varṇas, are revered and received as honoured guests by those [only] who lack the true knowledge of things [or: of reality] and who execute the orders [of the Brahmins] exactly and devotedly. [The Brahmins, or those siding with them, say that] those mean men who have lost their caste by the omission of their prescribed duties [and who have deserted from the true faith by becoming Jain monks] and who are engaged in observing the vow [of living] on food obtained by begging [only], — these [men] should never be given [anything] by [members of] the other varṇas [i.e. the Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas (and Śūdras?) nor should these [latter] accept [anything] from them as a gift [or: believe anything (they say)].15 Good men [however] who are able to examine what is correct [or: a valid argument] and what is not and who have chosen the path of logical [or: rational] argumentation, will at this point of the exposition [which seems proper] impartially consider [sicl. whether this contention of the Brahmins, and the opinion of the people who obey them blindly, is at all defendable and tenable].

Thus, the author of the Vedāṅkūśa, who at the very beginning of the second part of his work clearly announces what he intends to do, addresses himself not only to the problem of brāhmaṇatvasiddhi (in the sense explained
above), but also to related questions, such as birhasanā, etc., as an alleged means of gaining merit, or the killing of animals in sacrifice. These kind of brahmanical ‘teachings’ which are, of course, absolutely anathematic to a Jain, are, as one might expect, dwell on: attention is drawn to kāmaṃtiyācārāgyāgamana-pratipādikāni and addāśīdānapratipādikāni vacanaṇī, to mṛyādāsaṃsārakaṇaṃ vacanaṇam and madhyapānapratipādikāni vacanaṇī, but now the author quotes from Vedic texts, too. But there still remains something further which is even more improper, in the view of the Jain author, than having unlawful sexual intercourse, taking of what is not given, lying or drinking alcoholic beverages (practices which the reader is given to understand are recommended by, approved of or habitually indulged in by the Brahmins); and this aparāṃ viruddhataram, as it is called, is the irreconcilable contradiction between what is taught in the brahmanical sources about the proper way of dealing with Śūdras and the actual practice of Brahmins as it can be observed in everyday life. And it is obviously not only the author’s own experience, but also what he considered to be common knowledge, which prompts him to almost exclam (35a. 11f.): sarvam etac chudrapratiagramadikam anuṣṭhīyate (one feels tempted to add an eva here), nu kāṇḍic brāhmaṇena parityaktaṃ tasmāt pāṭhamātraṃ eva kevalam iti viruddhavacanaṃ bhavati. The topic of complete discrepancy between ideal and reality, norm and adherence to it is then pursued further, viz. to Manusmṛti 4.61:17 “Let him not dwell in a country where the rulers are Śūdras, nor in one which is surrounded by unrighteous men, nor in one which has become subject to heretics, nor in one swarming with men of the lowest castes" (Bühler’s translation), upon which the author of the Vedāṅkuṣa comments thus (35b. 13): tad evam viruddhavacanaṃ sakalapṛthivyāṃ apy avasthānāṃ nāṣṭi pratipādītam, “and in this way, what is conveyed by this statement which is at variance with reality, is that there is not a single place on the whole earth where a Brahmin could live!"

The argument of the second part of the Vedāṅkuṣa is finally wound up by arriving at the conclusion (35b. 13f.): kim bahunā? anena prakārene caturṇāṃ varṇanāṃ madhye bahiṣkṛtaḥ brāhmaṇaḥ iti avasyate, “in short, what is clearly discerned in this manner is that the Brahmins amongst the four varnas are excluded [from the society in general]”. Thus the tables are finally turned and it is now the Brahmins, and not any longer the Jain monks, who find themselves ostracized.

The author concludes his work by giving, in three verses, the last two of which are significantly composed in a more complicated metre (Mālāṇī), the following remarkable advice (which is practically tantamount to directions for the use of the Vedāṅkuṣa):18

brāhmaṇo nīcāravādānāśānāṃ yaḥ pratipādyate (recit: "padyate) / sa vaktavyah sadā sadbhīr vedayuktaiḥ subhāśālaiḥ //
dvijavadanacastām nāyāt iti muddrāṃ / śrutipadakāmāśānāḥ bhāṅgakādakṣaṃ //
dvijasāsāni nīcaḥ yoḥ samākārati mām /
kaṇṇabapi (recit: kaṇnum api) na purastāt tasya tiṣṭhanti viprāḥ //.

A man who considers himself superior to others by referring to the eminence of the Brahmins can be and is to be rebuked and put in his place by good people with the help of witty sayings together with statements of the Veda. The Brahmins do not stand even for a moment in front of a man [i.e. flee as soon as possible from a man] who seeks himself on a Brahmin’s place and [then] gives him a slap on the face which consists of not mincing one’s words with regard to the truth according to rational thought, [a slap] which is uniquely fit [or: which alone is able] to destroy the sequence of syllable instants [?] produced by the words of the Vedic texts.

And thus at the very end of the work it becomes entirely clear that the “slap on the face” is not, of course, to be taken literally, and also that the title Vedāṅkuṣa itself is not only metaphorical, but cannot but be a karmadhāraya compound meaning “a goad in the form of Vedic utterances.” And, to be sure, like a real goad, this special one (in the hands of a Jain or a Jain monk) is also considered as being used only to urge on the elephant-like Brahmins so that they avoid the wrong path (kupatha, etc.), return to the right one (sannārga, etc.) and thus in their turn also reach the final goal (but, of course, alone, i.e. without their ‘mahout’).

2. In the colophon it is stated, immediately after that part which has already been quoted above (p. 2), that “this is a work of Hemacandrasūri” (kṛtī iyāṃ Hemacandrasūrīṇā). And it is obviously this assertion on which
the two editors, and other people also, base their conviction that Hemacandra (fl. 1150) is the author of the Vedāṅkuśa and that this work should therefore be included in his “Granthāvalī.” Certainly they, too, will have doubted for at least a moment the trustworthiness of this statement because they are honest enough to add the remark that “according to what is said in another manuscript [this work] was composed by Haribhadrasūri” (Haribhadrasūrīvircacā [iti pratyanāla]). G. Bühler does not refer to the Vedāṅkuśa in his famous monograph Ueber das Leben des Jaina Mönches Hemachandra . . . .19 evidently it was not only unknown to him,20 as no manuscript of it had yet been discovered, but it was obviously also not mentioned in the “biographical” text material on which his study is based. Pandit Sukhālal Sānghī, on the other hand, seems to have taken the Dvijavadanacapēṭā to be an authentic work of Haribhadra’s, for he lists it along with many others in Pariṣṣṭa 21 attached to his booklet Samādarnāti Ācārya Haribhadra. But if I am not mistaken, he does not even refer to it in his booklet itself, not to speak of providing any evidence for the correctness of this ascription.

So we are faced with the problem of the authorship of the Vedāṅkuśa alias Dvijavadanacapēṭā. At least one attempt at solving it should be made; it is suggested by a remark of Bühler’s, found on p. 35 (38) of his monograph just mentioned: “... and in the text of his work itself [viz. Hemacandra’s Yogaśāstra] at 3.21,26 Manu’s prohibitions against the eating of meat are inserted, his name being mentioned.” As the Manusṛtri is the Dharmāṇśstra work which is most often quoted in the Vedāṅkuśa, it will be interesting to check whether there is any agreement in this regard between the Vedāṅkuśa and the other work the authorship of which is beyond any doubt, the Yogaśāstra.

In the first instance Manu is actually mentioned, but the preceding verse of the Yogaśāstra (3.20) runs as follows:

\[
\text{ḥan}tā \text{pa}ḷṣya \text{viku}ṛtā \text{sa}ṃḥarītā \text{bhak}ṣa\kern.5pt ka \text{ta}thā ī
\text{krei}tā \text{numa}ntā \text{diśā ca \ ghat}ākā \text{eva \ yan \ manu}ḥ ī\n\]

In the autobiography it is explained that \text{yan \ manu}ḥ has been added saṃvādārtham, “in order to show that he agrees [with what Hemacandra himself has said]”; and the next verse which is in fact verbatim identical to

Manusṛtri 5.51 (anumantā viśāsitā nihantā krayovikrīyā / saṃskārī
copahārī ca khādakās ceti ghatākā ī) is introduced, in the commentary, by
the remark: māṇavam evoktaṃ ārdṣayitī. In a similar manner, viz. by
dvītyaṃ api māṇavaṃ ślokaṃ āha, the subsequent verse (3.22) is introduced
which is identical to Manusṛtri 5.48:

\[
\text{nākṛtva prānīnāṃ hiṃsām māṃsam utpadyate kvaicitī ī}
\text{na ca prānīvadhaḥ svargyas tasmān māṃsam vivarjye ī}
\]

In the case of the second passage referred to by Bühler we have to do with
an excellent adaptation of Manusṛtri 5.55, for Yogaśāstra 3.26 reads thus:

\[
māṃ sa bhakṣayītāmutra yasya māṃsau ihādmy ahām ī
etan māṃsaya māṃṣate nīruktām manūr abravlī ī
\]

This corresponds to the Manu verse except for the last four words, for in the
Śrīti the reading is māṃṣatan pravandati maniśīnaḥ!

If now the corresponding section of the Vedāṅkuśa, viz. the one “on meat”
(ātha māṃṣe), is compared with these verses of the Yogaśāstra, it becomes
immediately clear that not only Manu 5.51 (= YŚ 3.21) and 5.48 (= YŚ 5.22)
are quoted there, too, (viz. 28a. 6 and 7), but also Yogaśāstra 3.20 and 26
(viz. 28a. 5 and 11) and not, to be sure, Manusṛtri 5.55. And finally one real-
izes that it is in fact only ‘Yogaśāstra verses’ which are quoted here, and, to
wit many more than just these four, namely 15 in total, viz. YŚ 3.18–32, and
in exactly the same sequence at that (cf. Vedāṅkuśa 28a. 3–28b. 2)23

Now, this clearly rules out the possibility that the Haribhadra who
flourished A.D. 750 composed the Vedāṅkuśa; of course, one could still think
of one of the later Haribhadras, just as in the case of Hemacandra of his later
namesake.24 But this would certainly mean to give too much importance to
the colophon of just one manuscript (provided there is no other evidence at
all). It is decidedly better to regard the authorship of Hemacandra to whom
we also owe the Yogaśāstra, among other works, as highly probable, i.e. to
start from this working hypothesis. But there is, admittedly, still another pos-
sibility, viz. that it was a later author, perhaps even a disciple of Hemacandra,
who culled verses from Hemacandra’s Yogaśāstra;25 and this is precisely why
the quantity of ślokas found in both works, the Vedāṅkuśa as well as the
Yugasāstra, why the extent of the agreement between these two texts, is of no importance as regards the problem of the authorship. In order to examine this latter alternative it would rather be necessary to carry out a minute comparison between certain parts of the Vedāṅkuśa, first of all those verses which have clearly been composed by its author himself, and the authentic works of Hemacandra in terms of style, vocabulary, etc. But this presupposes a familiarity with the works of the famous Jain polymath which I unfortunately still lack, so that I beg to be excused if I close the discussion for the time being by simply repeating that it seems very probable indeed that Hemacandra is the author of the Vedāṅkuśa, also in view of what is said about his erudition, his life and his relation with Brahmins, and the Brahmins' attitude towards him, in Bühler's highly informative and remarkable book on the life of Hemacandrācārya.

3. If the information I was able to gather is correct,27 practically no work has been done so far on the special subject of the criticism directed by Jain authors against the Brahmins, or Hinduism in general, not to speak of a comprehensive study of its historical development—after all even in Jainism changes are not entirely unlikely. What we have, in contradistinction, is von Glasenapp's short, though informative article on "Die Polemik der Buddhisten und Brahmanen gegen die Jainas."28 This scholar has, albeit much earlier, also discussed the position of Jainism within the history of Indian religions and its relation to other religious doctrines,29 his attention being focussed on the influence to which Jainism was exposed, and which in it turn exercised on other religions. However, from these two articles of von Glasenapp's—along with a third one likewise belonging to the early period of his scholarly activity30—much can be learnt about the attitudes of Jainism and Jains, especially of course of monastic authors, scholars and savants, towards the community of the Brahmins. For the most part, however, it is rather general facts or ideas that are communicated by von Glasenapp, in short a type of information one would expect to and can certainly find in general books on Jainism as well. Nevertheless, it may be useful to just recall what is pointed out by this late German scholar. Even if his assertion that "Jainism is a movement31 directed against the predominance of Brahmins" (1924: 375 [363]) is definitely an exaggeration, to say the least, it is no doubt true:

1) that the Jains (as well as the Buddhists) opposed the brahmanical priests (1924: 323 [371]), did not accept their claim of superiority (1951: 74), or rather denied it strictly (1924: 313 [367]);
2) that they considered Hinduism to be a kind of degenerated Jainism (1924: 319 [367]) and the Hindus to have deserted from the true faith (1926: 345);
3) that they, although they themselves strictly adhered to the caste system (1924: 314 [362]) (and the varṇa system), had their own myth about the creation of the varṇas, including that of the (true) Brahmins, (1926: 341f.; cf. 1951: 80),32 and
4) that they described in this connection what true Brahmins are to them (1924: 314 [362]).

It is clear why it was first of all the Brahmins who became the target of Jain criticism and polemics, and not one of the other varṇas or Hinduism as such: They recognized the Brahmins to be responsible, both historically and morally, for the theory of their own superiority, for the killing of animals in sacrifice, etc.—and it cannot be denied that they were right to a great extent. The antipathy which did not fall short of denouncing the other group as morally wicked, etc., was of course a mutual one;33 but it would be stupid to even ask the question when it began and by which side it was started, for it was bound to arise—it was in almost all its aspects an inevitable confrontation. In any case, this continuous, and still continuing, process is a historical fact which fully deserves the attention of scholars.

This holds true, I think, for the Vedāṅkuśa, too, in spite of the fact that, at least for the time being, one may harbour doubts about its originality. But even if this little work could be shown to be dependent on earlier sources, both as regards the arguments in substance as well as the method applied in argumentation (e.g., contrasting the actual practice of Brahmins with their own normative scriptures), it should be studied more closely. In any case, it should not be totally ignored, and for many reasons, I think: Its first part, the contents of which have been briefly outlined above (§1.1), holds one's attention in that it consists almost entirely of quotations from brahmanical texts.34 And there cannot be any doubt that the intention of the author of the Vedāṅkuśa, Hemacandra, is in this part, too, a critical or even polemical one.
Yet, apparently, his primary aim here is not to mirror to the Brahmins their rules of conduct in order to make them realize how far they have actually diverted from them; it looks rather as though he selected such elements of Hindu dharma, and for each a considerable number of relevant passages (also or perhaps primarily for the use of others), which fall in line with Jain ethics themselves. If this is correct, what he wants to intimate is, of course, that much of the truth of Jainism can also be found in brahmanical literature (which for that very reason can be drawn upon by him eclectically), but also that those injunctions, and they alone, need to be taken seriously and all practices contradicting them must be abandoned. But, again, this is a point in the present article that would call for elaboration which I am not able to offer right now.

In addition, the first part of the Vedāṇkuśa stands out as a collection of dicta of great significance in terms of Indian ethics and history of ideas in general. And anybody is free to profit from Hemacandra’s remarkably wide reading, and to take his compilation as an easily accessible treasury of which one can make use for oneself ad libitum, reading with much sympathy, nay delight, in spite of not being a Jain oneself, verses like the following (4b, 4ff.):

ekataḥ kṛta-vāsaṁ sarve samagravaraikṣiṇāṁ (recte: "nāḥ") | ekato bhayabhīṣyaṁ prāṁino prāṇaraśaṁ | | idam eva purī deveśa tattva-yāṁ samatoleyan (recte: "yat") | prāṇaraśaṁ evaṁ gaurava-vāci-yāṁ | | jāntamāni ca bhūsāṁ sthāvarāni ca ye nāḥ | | ātmavāt prāṇaraśaṁ te yāṁ pramāṇaṁ gatiṁ |

I hope that, if not the present article as a whole, then at least this excerpt will convince the reader that the Vedāṇkuśa is not the least valuable and interesting work of the extraordinarily rich and vast Jain literature to the understanding and knowledge of which Professor Deleu has contributed so much. And as for the controversy between the Jains and the Brahmins, it is, I think, not unfair to quote a dictum of my friend S. A. Srinivasan’s late father, Mr. Srinivas Ayya Sastri, who used to say ironically that “occasionally one comes across a true Brahmin even in India,” and to add on my part the remark that there are not a few Jains and Jains monks, and nuns, too, whom one cannot but pay deep respect for the degree of pious strictness they exhibit in observing in everyday life the rules and regulations of their own tradition.37

Notes

1. The interpretation of this title will be given later in the present article. Here I would just like to mention that in a still unpublished doctoral dissertation (submitted to the University of Trivandrum) by N. V. Kunjamma, viz. “Rāmavarna-yāsabhīṣaṇa by Sadāśivadikṣita: A Critical Edition and Study,” a work entitled Naṭāṇkuśa is mentioned, ascribed to a certain Udaya Śāstrī (ca. 15th century), in which “the defects in certain practices in Kūṭiyāṭiṇam performance are dealt with.” In contradistinction to Vedāṇkuśa, in the title Naṭāṇkuśa those who need to be urged with a goad are directly named.

2. Ed. by Jagajivan Utamacand Śā, Paṭṭanastha-Śīrṇ-Hemacandrācārya-sabhaṭiyāḥ Sekreṭaṁ, Ahmedabad 1923 (number of copies: 250, prize 0-6-0[1]). This is, however, already the second edition (dviṣṭiṇā āvṛtiḥ), and I don’t know when the first was published; according to Prof. Dr. Chandrabhāl Tripathi’s communication this is the only edition of the text, and no commentary has come to light until now; Prof. Tripathi did not also know of any studies on it.

3. Quoted below, p. 2.

4. It should, however, be noted that here, and in all the other instances when I use the expression ‘quote’, the usual it is absent in the text(s) referred to.

5. For months I have tried my very best to get hold of this text either in India or in Europe, but until now without success. The only edition which I was able to find in bibliographies is that published in 1916 in Bombay by the Venkateshvara Press. According to what is said on this work in A. Holtzmann’s Das Mahābhārata und seine Teile, vol. 3, Kiel 1894, pp. 57ff., it seems to be a very interesting text, not only in terms of the reception of the Mahābhārata in India, and it should therefore certainly be reprinted.

6. I should add here that this article was written during a stay in Tokyo (April 1990), and that I was also a little restricted by the fact that I would simply have taken too much time to try to get hold of all the Sanskrit texts required. At the same time I should like to avail myself of the opportunity to thank Prof. Dr. Minoru Hara and Dr. Akira Yuyama for the assistance which they have kindly
rendered me by supplying books and permitting me to use their own and their institutes' libraries.


8. Since I used a xerocopy, and not the edition itself, I am not sure that the distinction between verso (= a) and recto (= b) is correct, here and in the other cases.


10. They are, however, not numbered consecutively, but the enumeration starts again after each prose passage.

11. It should be noted that I generally follow the orthography and punctuation of the edition(s) used.

12. For this word and the living being denoted by it (which is indeed not "a protector of Indra," but perhaps itself "protected by Indra [in so far as this god gives rain]"), cf. S. Lienhard's article "On the meaning and use of the word indragopa," Indologica Taurinensia 6 (1978) (= Proceedings of the Third World Sanskrit Conference [Paris, 20-25 June 1977]), pp. 177-188.

13. The first part of the Vedāṅkūsā contains also a long 'chapter' on dvijatva (p. 14a, 1-3- p. 18a, 1.12), but in accordance with the division of the text as such into two systematically and formally different parts, it is entirely devoted to quoting bhūmāni sources on this subject. Hence the material collected in it throws light on the question how the Brahmins perceived themselves as a distinct and highly privileged group.

14. Read either catur or varṇyo.

15. In view of the expression bhikṣāvratakarmāṇi I don't think that this verse refers to the Brahmins, i.e. that they are the vṛ̣ṣalā hihāḥ here. Unfortunately the way in which the author expresses himself is very concise indeed.

16. Of course, viruddhātara, too, could refer, or also refer, to the gap between theory and practice.

17. Strangely enough in the text itself this verse is said to belong to the "eleventh" (ekādaśe) adhyāya of the Manusmṛti; I don't know what to make of this assertion except for assuming that the author committed an error or that his memory failed.

18. This may well be the reason why the first part consists only of quotations: The author has collected, and with remarkable diligence at that, relevant passages from a great number of brahmanical texts and now offers the results of his reading to the members of his own community for their use.

19. Wien 1889. An English translation, prepared by Manilal Patel, was published 1936 in Santiniketan (as no. 11 of the Singhi Jaina Series) under the title The Life of Hemacandraśārya by Prof. Dr. G. Bühler. In the following, references to this translation are always added in parentheses.

20. Cf. G. Bühler, op. cit., p. 3 (2), p. 44 (49)—where he speaks of the list of Hemacandra's works as "having now been exhaustively mentioned"—and p. 13 (14)—where the expression "authentic works of Hemacandra's" is used.

21. In a footnote it is, however, explained: Yogaśātaka pariṣīṭa 6 ke aḥār par, katipay pariwartanomaṃ ke sāthā[1].

22. Ed. by Śāntilīl M. Jain, Rājasthān Purāṇ Granthamālā no. 68, Jodhpur 1963. (This book was kindly made accessible to me by Prof. Dr. K. Brulm.)

23. There is another instance of a verse of the Yogaśātara (3.31) being identical to a verse in the Manusmṛti (5.32) which clearly shows that the former text also calls for a thorough and detailed study. The edition used by me is Yogaśātara with the Svapājnānavarana, Bhavnagar: Jainādharmaprasādakāshā, 1926.

24. On this second Hemacandra, see G. Bühler, op. cit., n. 53 on pp. 74f. (83f.).

25. A careful comparison of the Yogaśātara and the Vedāṅkūsā might lead to the discovery of even more parallels or identical verses.

26. Cf. pp. 16 (16), 19f. (19f.), 22 (23), 27 (29), 29 (32), 35f. (38f.), 40 (45), 46 (52), and n. 78 on p. 83 (92).

27. My thanks are due to Prof. Dr. Chandrabhabh Thapathi also in this regard. Some information, though primarily on the criticism of systems of brahmanical philosophy by Jain authors, can, however, be found in W. Bollée's Studien zum Sākyagāda ..., Teil 1, Wiesbaden 1977, pp. 51 and 78; in H. Nakamura's History of Early Vedānta Philosophy, Delhi 1987, pp. 266-293 (on the relationship between Jain philosophy and Vedānta); and in N. Balbir's article "The Perfect Sūtra as Defined by the Jains," Berliner Indologische Studien 3 (1987), pp. 16ff. Last but not least I should like to mention an article (in Japanese) by Atsushi Uno, published in the Proceedings of the Okurayama Institute for Cultural Research 1 (1954), pp. 55-69, which is listed in K. H. Potter's Bibliography of Indian Philosophies, Delhi 1983, under the somewhat misleading title "On a work of Hemacandra," but is in reality dealing with "The Criticism directed against Non-Jains from the Viewpoint of Jainism on the Basis of a Work of Hemacandra's," viz. the 32 verses of the Anyayogavacchedikā Dvārīṃśākā which are quoted and translated.

28. Originally published in Beiträge zur indischen Philologie und Alturumskunde. W. Schubring zum 70. Geburtstag dargebracht, Hamburg 1951, pp. 74-83, referred to in the following as (lv. Glasenapp 1951); this article is among those


31. In the German original the word "Bewegung" is found which could still be used in such a sense in 1926.


33. Glasenapp (1951: 83) reports that "Dayānand Sarasvati severely criticizes the Jains for their intolerance, by referring to various passages of the Prakarāṇātānakara and the Vivekaśāra, because they regard their own as the 'only true church' and even prohibit their followers to have social intercourse with the adherents of other religions."

34. An inventory of the various types of adaptations as well as purposes which quotations made of those of the Vedaṭīkāśa are made to serve is still a desideratum of Indology. The keyword 'adaptation', of course, brings to one's mind also E. Frauwaldner's observations on Dīṇgāga's Trākāiyaparīkṣā in his article "Dīṇgāga, sein Werk und seine Entwicklung," *WZKSO* 3 (1959), pp. 83–164, especially pp. 107ff. and 145ff. A. Andamatsu's observation regarding a kārikā in Śāntarākṣita's Tattvasamgraha and "the different use" to which it is put by Karmakangomin is also noteworthy in this connection; cf. his article in *Indogakuho* [Indological Review] 3 (1981), p. 54.

35. In this respect it should be noted that the Jains are of the opinion that the Veda has by and large been falsified by the Brahmīns; cf. e.g. H. v. Glasenapp, *Der Jainismus ...*, Berlin 1925, p. 269 together with n. 60 and Pathak's article referred to in n. 31 above.

36. This verse corresponds almost fully to Mahābhārata (Poona ed.) 3.643.1p. (= vol. 3, p. 427) except for the fact that the reading in pāda b is samāpya (vara) and in d dhārāṇam, and that the readings which are attested in the Vedaṭīkāsa are not mentioned in the apparatus of the Mbh. The two subordinate verses appear not to

have been taken over from the Mbh., but they in fact show similarities to Mbh. verses (e.g. 12.170.10).

37. I must confess that I am rather sceptical of the correctness of the interpretation which v. Glasenapp (indirectly) gives of the verse from the Prabandhacintāmāni which he quotes at the very end of his article (1951), and in a German translation at that which is rather difficult to swallow. I think Menutuñga's verse śrutvā yas cakravatādharṣa yārhanāḥ yādā tho vā y积 kāyākathā yādbhāvā karaṇāh śāyāḥ it verse 104 in Muni Jīnajīvajī's ed., *Śānkiniketan* 1933) has rather to be understood in the context of what Būhler says on the corresponding legend and the historical truth it probably contains (cf. op. cit., pp. 21ff. [21f.]), and should not be taken as testimony of the idea of 'doctrinal tolerance', i.e. of the idea that "the various religious and philosophical systems are but different expressions of the human desire for salvation and have equal rights."

**ADDENDA**

Although I was not able in the course of the last two and a half years to continue my work on the Vedaṭīkāsa in a systematic manner, yet I have chanced upon additional information which seems to be of some importance for what I have written in my brief essay, while not, however, leading to any corrections or revisions:

I should like to draw attention to the "Introduction" of A. B. Dhruvra's edition of the *Śyādvādaṃāṭārājī* (BSPS LXXXIII), Bombay 1933, as regards my article as a whole.

As for the list of works of Hemacandra's cf. also: The Yoga Shastra of Hema-chandra tr. by A. S. Gopani, Mevānagar 1989, p. 274.

Similar polemical works have been composed by Buddhist monks, too; cf. e.g. J. W. de Jong's article "Buddhism and the equality of the four castes" in: Earliest Buddhism and Madhyamaka, ed. by D. Seyfort Ruegg and L. Schmithausen, Leiden 1990, p. 58, and, with regard to the Vajraśiśī in particular, Minoru Hara's article "Vajraśiśī 3-4" in: Nakagawa Zenkyō Sencei Jutaku Kinnren Ronshū. Bukkyō to Bunka, Kyoto 1983, pp. 221-241. Finally, I should like to add that L. Rocher (see note 9 above) mentions on p. 146 f. a number of texts (dealing with the problem whether the Bhāgavata (purāṇa) is a mahāpurāṇa or not) the titles of which also contain the word capetiśa, "slap in the face".