

## TEXTUAL PROBLEMS IN AN EARLY CANONICAL JAINA TEXT\*

*By Herman Tieken, Leiden*

Recently several passages from the Sūyagaḍa were edited and translated by W. B. BOLLÉE (1977). The text is generally considered to belong to the oldest layer of the canon of the Śvetāmbara Jainas. The passages describe, and subsequently refute, certain deviating world-views. The Sūyagaḍa, like, for instance, the Āyāra, is a notoriously difficult text. Therefore BOLLÉE (henceforth referred to as Bo.) felt justified in freely drawing inspiration from the interpretations found in the available commentaries, *in casu* the Cūrṇi (Cū.) and the Tīkā (Tī.). A considerable part of the book is, in fact, concerned with the study of the interpretations found in these commentaries. This involves many discussions on the relation between these interpretations and the text itself which is often obscure. However, the traditional interpretations are hardly ever questioned. The result is, as I intend to show below, a text and translation which cannot stand criticism, and many superfluous notes.

In defence of Bo. it must be added that he merely follows a virtually established tradition, for there is scarcely an editor or translator of a canonical text, past or present, who does not admit to or show a similar dependance on the commentaries<sup>1</sup>. The hazards of the use of such secondary sources are well known from the other fields of indology and are generally acknowledged in these cases as well<sup>2</sup>. The fact that in the

---

\* I should like to thank Professor O. von Hinüber for his criticism on an earlier version of this article.

<sup>1</sup> E. g. JACOBI (1884: li). Note the many bracketed additions given in SCHUBRING's translation (1926), most of which have been based on the commentaries. ALSDORF (1958: 250, and 1965: 43). NORMAN (1981: 169) in a review of the above-mentioned book by BOLLÉE. See also CAILLAT (1965: 43). What is true of translators is equally true of editors. A classic case is CHARPENTIER's edition of the Uttarajjhāyā; see especially p. 5 and ALSDORF's criticism (1962: 110-1). See furthermore CAILLAT's (1983) review of the then available editions of the Jaina Āgama Series.

<sup>2</sup> See the literature quoted in the preceding note. The situation is summed up by SCHUBRING (1935: § 43) as follows: 'Zum Verständnis der Texte tragen die Kommentare bei. Um sie zu charakterisieren, genügt es zu sagen, daß sie die

interpretation of texts like the *Sūyagaḍa* and *Āyāra* the influence of the commentaries has remained decisive, even when they are often conspicuously mistaken, reflects the absence of an attractive alternative.

In the present article I intend to edit and translate, by way of example, a short passage of the *Sūyagaḍa*, namely 1.1.1.1–11a, dealt with by BO. and before him by SCHUBRING (SCH.) and JACOBI (JA.). I will primarily concentrate on the text and its variants in order to see how far one may get without the help of the commentaries, which will only be considered secondarily for the sake of comparison. This approach has yielded several important conclusions regarding the state of the text and the position of the commentaries vis-à-vis this text. These conclusions, which apply only to the passage under consideration, would seem by their very nature to merit a further investigation into their applicability in the case of the other early canonical texts as well.

In the first place it will appear that the text, which is in *Ślokas* and which in the commentaries as well as in all the existing translations is consistently broken up into verses as autonomous and independent units, should in several instances be divided differently. Some sentences presumably continue into the following verses, twice for the length of a *Pāda* and once for the length of a whole line. Considering that the passage consists only of 11 verses the number of instances is unexpectedly high, which raises the question if, and to what extent, this phenomenon is also present in the metrical parts of the other early canonical texts. At the same time the occurrence of enjambement, even if established only for this small piece of text, might have important consequences for the project carried out in Berlin, where a concordance is being prepared of the verses found in, among other texts, those belonging to the *Śvetāmbara* canon. From the reports available on the project it appears that the possibility of enjambement has not been included; see BRUHN-TRIPATHI (1970 and 1977).

Secondly it will be shown that the text is irremediably corrupt at two places, the original readings no longer being available. These corruptions have been completely overlooked by the previous editors and translators. In one place the corruption seems to be due to a simple copying mistake. The other has a more complicated origin. The corruption is found in a verse which shows a remarkable, if only superficial, resemblance to an apparently well-known verse found elsewhere in the canon. I suggest that the former verse has been subjected to a reinter-

---

Vorzüge wie die Mängel scholastischer Schriften aufweisen, also zu Wörtern und Begriffen die Auffassungen ihrer Zeit wiedergeben, die wir nicht vernachlässigen dürfen, der wir aber auch oft nicht folgen können'.

pretation in the light of the latter and that under the influence of this 'new' interpretation its text has been changed.

This instance is not unique. In a discussion of the variants available in the commentaries on the *Dasaveyāliya* C. CAILLAT (1981) has shown that the text was constantly being subjected to 'new' interpretations. Some of these interpretations would indeed seem to have been suggested by parallels. The problem with the instance referred to above is that the stage in which the revision took place apparently lies far beyond the beginning of the present textual tradition of the text, the original reading being no longer available among the variants. The revised text is also older than the commentaries, which are meant to elucidate it.

On the basis of a single clerical error in the *Uttarajjhāyā*, which is common to all the available MSS and the commentaries, ALSDORF (1962: 133-4) has drawn the conclusion that the whole textual tradition of this text goes back to one single MS. The same conclusion may now also be drawn regarding the *Sūyagaḍa*. As already noted by ALSDORF (1965: 42) this conclusion is to a large extent corroborated by the traditional account of the transmission of the *Śvetāmbara* canon. According to the account the canon in its present form goes back to a council held in Valabhī 980 or 993 years after Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa*. At this occasion a correct text was established, which will inevitably have involved commenting upon, and where felt necessary editing, the text. One of the reasons to hold the council seems to have been the paucity of trustworthy MSS; significant in this connection is the emphasis in the account on the subsequent activity of copying and distributing the text sanctioned at this occasion. This would account for the unanimity of the textual tradition.

From the above discussion it becomes clear that the commentaries on the *Sūyagaḍa* are relatively recent works<sup>3</sup>. The text they commented upon had already a history of transmission as a written text, in the course of which it had incurred corruptions. Furthermore it appears that at the time the commentaries were composed the meaning of the text had been completely lost sight of as is shown by, for instance, their failure to recognize the instances of enjambement; instead the text

<sup>3</sup> It is only in a rare case that it is possible to fix a more or less reliable date for a commentary. In this respect those on the *Sūyagaḍa* do not form an exception. The *Cū.* is anonymous. The date of Śīlāṅka, the author of the *Ṭī.*, is uncertain. It is generally assumed that the *Cū.* are older than the *Ṭī.* (see ALSDORF 1965: 38, and 1977). This assumption is, however, solely based on external evidence, the use by the Jainas of Prākṛit, as seen in the *Cū.*, otherwise preceding that of Sanskrit, as seen in the *Ṭī.*

was rather automatically broken up into verses. For the interpretation of the text the commentators could apparently not revert to existing older commentaries but had to start as it were from scratch. Their task was therefore certainly not an enviable one. However, while there is no reason to doubt the sincerity of the intentions of the commentators it has to be concluded that the way they bequeathed themselves of the task is often very immature. For instance, in the interpretation of words they let themselves be led by the vaguest possible associations and speculations. They seemed prepared to accept the most fanciful derivations and to recognize the most far-fetched meanings only in order to get rid of their own embarrassment with the text. As a result the commentaries abound in ad hoc solutions. It follows that one cannot expect to derive any useful information from the commentaries, at least as far as the literal meaning of the text is concerned. In any case, the dependance on the commentaries as has hitherto been shown, however half-heartedly and reluctantly, is in no way justified.

Below follow the edition and translation of Sūyagaḍa 1.1.1.1–11a. It should at the outset be mentioned that the passage has been selected in the first place for its textual problems. After an introduction of five verses in which in a rather discursive way the matter of the causes of 'bondage' is taken up, a certain doctrine is quoted, and subsequently refuted, which maintains that the individual consists of the five so-called 'gross elements' (*mahābhūtas*). These alone are eternal. Thus, when the five elements disintegrate the soul disintegrates with them. In the refutation no arguments are wasted: an individual who has committed a sin suffers grief himself as a whole person<sup>4</sup>.

The basis of the following edition is formed by the text and the variants collected by Bo. His translation will frequently be referred to. Occasionally those by SCH. (1926: 122–3) and JA. (1895: 235–7) will be referred to as well. For the commentaries, the Cū. and Śīlāṅka's Tī., in as far as not already quoted by Bo., I refer to the Sūyagaḍa edited by PUṆYAVIJAYA (PTS) and to the Sūyagaḍa edited by JAMBŪVIJAYA (Bombay, 1978) respectively.

Finally it may be mentioned that the existence of the corruptions referred to above, whether introduced consciously or unconsciously, makes the success of ever being able to reconstruct anything like a dependable text very small. In these cases the only course open is

<sup>4</sup> Compare the equally terse way in which the nihilistic doctrine (11b–13) is refuted, in 14(ff.): 'But those who speak in this way, where is for them a world to live in? They go from darkness to darkness; they are slow-witted people bent on harmful actions'.

conjecture, the outcome of which is inevitably arbitrary. However, this does not affect the arguments of the conclusion that in a particular place the text is most likely corrupt. Where below an emendation is suggested it should be seen as merely one of the possible starting-points in an attempt to show the origin of the supposed corruption or as one of the possible ways out of the apparently unsolvable problems of the text.

The first verse reads as follows:

*bujjhijja tti tiuttijjā bandhaṇaṃ pariṇāṇiyā*  
*kiṃ āhu bandhaṇaṃ vīro kiṃ vā jāṇaṃ tiuttai. (1)*

My translation, which differs considerably from Bo.'s, is the following: 'Because one should become enlightened, one should conquer bondage. (In order to be able to do so) one should know what one calls "bondage" and how the Hero, who acted with intentness of mind, conquered (it, sc. bondage).'

The possibility that the two questions in the second line are dependent on *pariṇāṇiyā* has so far not been considered. The commentaries take the second line by itself. It would contain two questions Jambusvāmī put to Sudharmā. This interpretation has been accepted by the earlier translators. It leaves us, however, with a first line which is virtually untranslatable. The existing attempts are in any case not convincing. For instance, Śīlāṅka takes the optative *pariṇāṇiyā* as an absolute. Compare JA.'s translation, which is a paraphrase of Śīlāṅka's commentary: 'One should know [*bujjhijja*] what causes the bondage [*bandhaṇaṃ*] of Soul, and knowing (it) [*pariṇāṇiyā*] one should remove it [*tiuttijjā*]'.

It is to be noted that JA. does not translate the particle *tti*. It is possible that it was actually missing in his text, as it apparently was in the one translated by SCH., in which case, however, the text is unmetrical. The particle is completely misrepresented by Bo., his translation 'so' ('Erwachen soll man und so frei werden') being restricted to certain specific idiomatic constructions; see SPEIJER (1886: § 492) and CPD II, p. 277.

Both Bo. and SCH. translate *tiutta-* with 'frei werden'. The origin of this translation is not clear. *tiutta-*, which goes back to Sanskrit *ativṛt-*, usually means 'to pass beyond' (from there my translation 'to conquer') or 'to escape'. There is no reason to assume a different meaning here. *tiutta-* is constructed either with an accusative (as here) or with an ablative (as in verse 5). The verb rarely occurs by itself; see in this connection the instances of Pāli *ativattati* collected in CPD I, pp. 88–9. Occasionally, though, as here in the fourth Pāda, the substantive has to be supplied.

Bo. takes *vīro* as the subject of *āhu* (skt. *āhuh*). He does not comment on the incongruity in number between the subject and the predicate. *vīro* should, despite its position before *kiṃ vā*, be included in the second sentence. For *āhu* Bo. notes a variant *āha*. However, *āhu* is to be maintained as the *lectio difficilior*, for in the present context a change of *āha* into *āhu* is not likely to have taken place.

The translation of the fourth Pāda requires some explanation. The problem is the present participle *jāṇam*. Grammatically the most obvious translation would be ‘and by what knowledge (i. e. knowing what) the hero conquered (it, sc. bondage)’. However, in the light of what follows this hardly makes sense. Another possibility, which has been opted for here, is to assume *jāṇam* is used absolutely. Other instances of this use may be found in Suttanipāta 1051: *yo ve avidvā upadhiṃ karoti | punappunam dukkham upeti mando || tasmā pajānam upadhiṃ na kayirā | dukkhassa jātippabhavānupassī ||* and 320: *tath’eva dhammam avibhāvayitvā | bahussuttānam anisāmiy’ attham | | sayam ajānam avitiṇṇakāṅkho | kiṃ so pare sakkhati nijjhapetuṃ ||*. For later Prākṛit, see *aāṇamī* in Saptasatakam, Gāthā 433. For the meaning assigned to *jāṇam* here, ‘one who acts mindfully’ or ‘one who acts with intentness of mind’, compare especially Sūyagaḍa (ed. Bo.) 1.1.2.25: *jāṇam kāṇ’ aṇāuttī | abuho jam ca himsai || aviyaṭṭam khu sāvajjam | puttḥo samveyaī param ||*, which should in my opinion be translated as follows<sup>5</sup>: ‘Someone who acts with intentness of mind (*jāṇam*) will not cause harm with his body, but if (*jam ca*) someone who acts without intentness of mind (*abuho*) causes harm, his sin will not even be clear (to himself); when asked (about it) (*puttḥo*), he will tell (*samveyaī*) some other person did it’.

In Bo.’s edition the second verse reads as follows:

*cittamantaṃ acittaṃ vā parigijjha kisāma ari  
annaṃ vā aṇujāṇāi evaṃ dukkhā na muccaī. (2)*

His translation runs as follows:

‘Wer Beseeltes oder Unbeseeltes als Eigentum besitzt, wenn auch nur wenig,

– oder es einem anderen erlaubt – wird so nicht vom Leiden erlöst.’

The third Pāda is not grammatically integrated in the sentence. SCH. explains it as ‘eine störende Einfügung’. This explanation is taken up

<sup>5</sup> How Bo.’s translation relates to the text I fail to see: ‘Wenn man zwar wissentlich [*jāṇam*], aber ohne mit dem Körper Schaden zu verursachen. – und wenn man unbewußt [*abuho*] verletzt, erfährt man die (Folgen dieser) religiöse(n) Verfehlung (nur) in beschränktem Umfang und wird höchstens (von ihr) gestreift’.

by Bo., according to whom we have more in particular to do here with a cliché, namely an abbreviated form of the common formula 'he himself (possesses), causes another/others (to possess) or allows (*aṇujāṇāi*) another / others (to possess)'. However, other instances of the abbreviated form of this formula (see, for example, *haṇantaṃ vāṇujāṇāi* in the following verse) show that in such cases *anna* is omitted and not the participle denoting the action concerned. If *annaṃ vā aṇujāṇāi* is not a cliché the explanation that we have to do here with an insertion becomes very unlikely.

In this connection I should like to suggest an alternative interpretation of the verse as a whole. Following the commentaries *parigijjha* has been taken as an absolute. It can, however, equally well be a gerundive to be read in a compound with *kisām*, i. e. *parigijjhakisām*, 'too thin to hold'; for the type of compound, see WACKERNAGEL (1905: § 95ex, *bhojyalavaṇa* 'zum Genießen salzig') and RENOU (1968: § 90, *bhojyoṣṇa* 'trop chaud pour être mangé'). A full stop should be placed after *aṇujāṇāi* which becomes the main verb of the sentence. In the present context a meaning 'he showed favour to' may be considered; compare PW, s. v. *jñā-ānu* (7) 'sich Jmd. (acc.) gnädig erweisen, seine Gewogenheit an den Tag legen'. Consequently for *dukkhā na muccai* we should read *dukkhāṇa muccai*<sup>6</sup>. For the genitive *dukkhāṇa* functioning as an ablative, see SPEIJER (1886: § 126) and compare *savvadukkhāṇa mucca(t)i* in *Isibhāsiyāim*, p. 1 (= 502), line 2. The verse should read:

*cittamantaṃ acittaṃ vā parigijjhakisām avi  
annaṃ vā aṇujāṇāi. evaṃ dukkhāṇa muccai. (2)*

'To a being whether with or without a soul, even if it was (of the kind that is) too thin to hold,

or of any other kind he (i. e. the *vīra*) showed favour. In that way he was freed from all kinds of grief.'

Taken as such the verse gives a direct answer to the second question of the preceding verse. However, the present interpretation of the verse brings with it an entirely new problem. In the next three lines no subject is mentioned. On the other hand, the subject is clearly different from, if not the very opposite of, that of the second verse. In this connection it should be noted that the action *veraṃ vadḍheḥi appaṇo* (3d) is otherwise explicitly ascribed to a 'fool'; see *Āyāra* (JĀS), sū. 114 (ed.

<sup>6</sup> In the paper MSS of Jaina texts a strict distinction is maintained between *-ṇ-*, which occurs medially, and *n-*, which occurs initially. BLOCH (1934: 79) has, however, noted that this distinction is the result of a secondary process of normalisation, the older palmleaf MSS having *ṇ* initially as well. *dukkhāṇa* would first have been divided into *dukkhā ṇa*, which latter word was subsequently written as *na*.

SCH. 1.3.3): *alam bālassa saṃgeṇaṃ v.v.a.* This ‘fool’ is indeed mentioned but only as late as in 4c (*bāle*). Most likely it has to be supplied as the subject in verse 3. This abrupt change of subject in 3 is, to say the least, awkward and it probably accounts for the determination to interpret the preceding verse in a negative sense. A possible solution would be to maintain Bo.’s text of 2d: *evam dukkhā na muccai* ‘In the following way one is not freed from grief’. However, this use of *evam*, referring forwards, is as far as I have been able to check restricted to certain specific idioms; e. g. *evam me śrutam, evam śrūyate*. Furthermore, one would expect some kind of adversative particle. On the other hand, the change of subject may well be less abrupt as it appears. Thus, it is not unlikely that the mere mentioning of someone ‘who acts with intentness of mind’ already suffices to mentally prepare the reader for the mentioning of his opposite, namely ‘one who acts foolishly’. In this connection I may again refer to *Sūyagaḍa* (ed. Bo.) 1.1.2.25, quoted above, where one finds a *jāṇaṃ* immediately followed by his opposite, an *abuho*.

As already indicated above, in the commentaries the text is consistently broken up into verses as autonomous meaningful units. The same is done by Bo., SCH. and JA. For the first two verses this appears to work. In my opinion in the case of the two following verses it does not work. Before discussing this problem Bo.’s text and translation may be quoted<sup>7</sup>:

*sayam tivāyae pāṇe aduvā annehi ghāyae*  
*haṇantaṃ vāṇujāṇāi veraṃ vadḍhei appaṇo (3)*  
*jaṃsi kule samuppanne jehim vā saṃvase nare*  
*mamāi luppaṃ bāle anna-m-annehi mucchie (4)*

Bo.’s translation runs as follows:

‘Wer selbst Lebewesen tötet oder von anderen töten lässt, oder jemandem erlaubt zu töten, gegen dessen Person entsteht Hass (oder: dessen “Sünde” wächst).’

‘In welchem Geschlecht jemand geboren ist oder mit welchen (Leuten) man zusammenlebt – von stets anderen verblendet bindet der Tor sich an diese (und) ist verloren.’

At the outset it should be mentioned that I am unable to bring forward strong formal arguments why these four lines could not be broken up in this way. Also, I do not intend at this stage to discuss in detail the merits of Bo.’s translation. Some remarks should do. One

<sup>7</sup> For a Śloka opening with a choriamb, as 4a (*jaṃsi kule*), see NORMAN (1971: LVIII f.).



concerns his translation of *veraṃ vadḍhehi appaṇo* (3d), which seems inaccurate (see below). The other concerns his peculiar translation of *mamāi* with 'bindet sich', which would show his embarrassment in the present context with the usual meaning of the word, namely 'is greedy'. Instead, what I intend to do is to present my own translation, which, it is hoped, will speak for itself. In my opinion we should introduce a full stop after the first line of verse 4. As I will try to show below, the second line of verse 4 most probably goes with verse 5. The three lines that remain, 3 and 4ab, should, again, be divided into two equal halves, each consisting of three Pādas, namely 3abc and 3d-4ab:

*sayaṃ tivāyae pāṇe aduvā annehi ghāyae  
haṇantaṃ vāṇujāṇāi.*

*veraṃ vadḍhehi appaṇo* (3)

*jaṃsi kule samuppanne jehiṃ vā samvase nare.* (4ab)

The translation of the first part (3abc) presents no serious problems (see below). More complicated is the translation of the following part. Crucial is the interpretation of the words *veraṃ vadḍhehi appaṇo*, of which the existing translations are in any case inaccurate. Thus, Bo.'s translation (see above) does not sufficiently account for the word *appaṇo*. Furthermore, *veraṃ* 'hatred against or towards' is usually constructed not with a genitive but with an instrumental. The same inaccuracies can be seen in SCH.'s translation: '(stets) fördert man das, was einem Feind ist'. More correct, at least grammatically, is JA.'s translation: 'his iniquity will go on increasing'. In my opinion *v. v. a.* should be translated as literally as possible, i. e. 'he fosters feelings of hatred in himself (instead of feelings of love or compassion)'<sup>8</sup>. Then the relative clauses follow naturally:

'He kills living beings himself, has them killed by others  
or allows them to be killed.' (3abc)

'He fosters hatred in himself,

in the (members of the) family in which he is born or (in the people) with  
whom he lives as a man.' (3d-4ab)

The 'he' in my translation is the same as the 'fool' (*bāle*) in 4c (see above).

<sup>8</sup> Compare the following *pratikramanasūtra*, quoted in WILLIAMS (1963: 207): *khāmemi savvajīve | savve jīvā khamantu me | | metti me savvabhūesu | veraṃ majjha na keṇa vi | |* 'I ask pardon of all living creatures; may all of them pardon me. I have friendly feelings towards all, I have no feelings of hatred, with nobody.' – Bo. compares *v. v. a.* with Suttanipāta 275: *rajaṃ vadḍheti attāṇo*, which may now be translated with 'He fosters passion in himself'. Compare the earlier translations: 'He waxes fouler still' (CHALMERS 1932) and 'der Unrat in ihm wächst zuhauf' (NYANAPONIKA 1955).

Bo.'s text of the following three lines reads:

*mamāi luppāṭi bāle anna-m-annehi mucchie* (4cd)

*vittam̐ soyariyā ceva savvaṃ eyaṃ na tāṇai*

*sam̐khāe jīviyaṃ ceva kammaṇāo tiuṭṭai.* (5)

His translation, which includes the first line of verse 4 as well, runs as follows:

‘In welchem Geschlecht jemand geboren ist oder mit welchen (Leuten) man zusammenlebt –

von stets anderen verblendet bindet der Tor sich an diese (und) ist verloren.’

‘Besitz und Geschwister, all dies hilft (ihm) nicht.

Nur indem man sich sein Leben wohl überlegt, wird man von Karman frei.’<sup>9</sup>

In itself the first line, 4cd, does not present any problem; Bo.'s ad hoc translation of *mamāi*, ‘is greedy’, with ‘bindet sich’ has already been discussed above. In fact the problems begin only with the following two lines, which form verse 5. According to Bo. the idea expressed in this verse is not uncommon. He is able to refer to several other verses in which a man is warned that after death wealth and relatives will no longer be able to help him. In this connection Bo. fails to comment on a rather obvious problem, namely why of all a man's relatives his sisters (*soyariyā* = *sodarikāḥ*) should be singled out here. Another, less obvious, problem concerns the word *tāṇai*. In the commentaries it is translated with *trāyate*, ‘it rescues’. Bo. explains it conformingly as a denominative verb of *t(r)āṇa*. I do not intend to go into the merits of this derivation but only like to note that the occurrence of this verb is restricted to this one instance. This is peculiar, the more so if one takes into account that it is a verb, and not a technical term, and that it has a quite pedestrian meaning.

From this brief discussion it should have become clear that Bo. has in any case too easily accepted the interpretation of the commentaries, in the process ignoring certain problems and neglecting to explore alternative possibilities. The latter is precisely what I intend to do below.

I should first like to quote in full one of the supposed parallels for verse 5 referred to by Bo., namely *Sūyagada* (JĀS), sū. 441: *mātā pitā ṇhusā bhāyā | bhajjā puttā ya orasā || ṇālam̐ te tava tāṇāe | luppam̐tassa sakammaṇā ||* ‘Mother, father, daughter-in-law, brother, wife and lawful sons will not be able to rescue you when you are being destroyed by

<sup>9</sup> SCH.'s translation of these two lines is, to say the least, peculiar. He completely mixes up the lines, translating 5cd before 4cd.

your own *karman*'. It is to be noted that this particular list of relatives does not include 'sisters'. They are mentioned, though, in other such lists; see, for instance, Āyāra (JĀS), sū. 63 (ed. SCH. 1.2.1.1): *mātā me pitā me bhāyā me bhaginī me bhajjā me puttā me dhūtā me suṇhā me sahisayaṇasaṃgam̐thasaṃthutā me vivittovakaraṇapariyaṭṭaṇabhoyāṇa-acchāyaṇaṃ me*. Otherwise the similarities between Sūyagaḍa 441 and the verse under consideration including line 4 cd are indeed conspicuous.

What is particularly conspicuous is the close verbal agreement, both passages having in common a number of more or less pivotal words, namely *luppa-*, *kamma* and *tāṇai/tāṇāe*. At this point I should like to come back to the problem, already discussed above, concerning the verb *tāṇai*, which apparently is a ἄπαξ λεγόμενον of a suspect nature. A possible explanation is that *tāṇai* actually is a 'ghost'-word, which was secondarily introduced as a result of a reinterpretation of the verse under consideration in the light of, for instance, Sūyagaḍa 441 quoted above<sup>10</sup>. To put it more precisely, it is my contention that *tāṇai* has actually been introduced for another word, the original, on the basis of *tāṇāe*. The original word, which has been irretrievably lost, must then have been very similar to *tāṇai* so as to suggest it was a clerical error for the latter. A possible reconstruction of the original word is *āṇai* (*jānāti*)<sup>11</sup>. 5ab may originally have read as follows: *vittam̐ soyariyā ceva*

<sup>10</sup> In this connection it should be noted that the same verse Sūyagaḍa 441 is also found in Uttarajjhāyā 6, 3. This would indicate that we have to do with a rather well-known independent verse here. See, furthermore, Sūyagaḍa (JĀS), sū. 158: *vittam̐ (!) pasavo ya ṇātayo (!) | tam̐ bāle saraṇam̐ ti maṇṇatī || ete mama tesu vī aham̐ | no tāṇam̐ saraṇam̐ ca vijjai ||*, and sū. 567: *ṇa tassa jāti (!) va kulam̐ va tāṇam̐ . . .*

<sup>11</sup> Another instance where the text has been altered in order to suit a 'new' interpretation is found in Sūyagaḍa (ed. Bo.) 1.1.2.12. In this case, too, the original text is lost completely and has to be reconstructed. The necessity of a new interpretation apparently arose as the original meaning of the text was lost sight of completely. In Bo.'s edition the text reads as follows: *savvappagam̐ viukkassam̐ | savvam̐ nūmam̐ vihūṇiyā || appattiyam̐ akammaṃse eyam̐ attham̐ mige cue ||*. Bo., who follows the commentaries closely, gives the following translation: 'Erst wenn man jede Gier [*savvappagam̐* = *sarvātmakam*] und Selbstüberhebung [*viukkassam̐* = *vyutkarśam*], alles, was einen falschen Eindruck erweckt (?) [*nūmam̐*] und jeden Unmut (?) [*appattiyam̐* = *apratītam*] von sich geworfen hat, wird man von Karman frei [*akammaṃse* = *akarmāṃśah*]. (Handelt man anders) stirbt man deswegen (wie) das Wild (und wird wiedergeboren).' – I do not at this stage intend to discuss each and every detail of this translation. One point should suffice, namely Bo.'s translation of *vihūṇiyā* as an absolutive. This is impossible, *vihūṇiyā* being an optative. It is unlikely then that the verse sums up the four Kaṣāyas, occurring here under such rare denominations: *savvappagam̐* (*lobha*), *viukkassam̐* (*māna*), *nūmam̐* (*māyā*) and

| *savvaṃ eyaṃ na āṇai* || 'Possessions, even (or: and [*ceva*]) sisters born from the same mother, all this he does not acknowledge'. This reconstruction is supported by the following verse quoted by STERNBACH (1974: 95, no. 555): *atithir bālakaś caiva | strījano nṛpatis tathā || ete vittam na jānanti | jāmatā caiva pañcamah* ||.

The phrase *soyariyā ceva . . . na āṇai* needs some explanation. In the first place the occurrence of the word *soyariyā* instead of a more neutral word for 'sisters' would emphasize a very close relationship and as such suggest certain responsibilities of the brother towards his sisters<sup>12</sup>, which are disregarded by the fool. Most likely it concerns here in particular his responsibility to arrange or make possible a proper marriage for his sisters. The lawbooks specify that on the partition of an inheritance between brothers they should reserve a certain part for the marriage-expenses for their unmarried sisters (see KANE 1946: 619ff.).

In the word-index Bo. identifies *ceva* (Sanskrit *caiva*) as an emphatic particle. As such it may be compared to Māhārāṣṭrī Prākṛit (*c*)*cea* and (*c*)*cia*. Besides, it seems occasionally to function as a copulative; see, for

*appattiyam* (*krodha*). It is my contention that the verse originally read: *savvapagam pi ukkassam | savvaṃ nūmam vihūṇiyā || appattiyam akammāse | eyam attham mige cue* ||. Before giving a translation the meaning and derivation of some of the words should be discussed. *savvappagam* stands for *sarvālpaka* 'small in every respect'; *ukkassam* is the present participle of *utkṛṣ-* 'to pull out'. The derivation and meaning of the word *nūma* would require a more thorough discussion than can possibly be carried out here. For the present purpose it would suffice to note that *nūma* denotes something which is lying deep in the ground or which is hidden. *appattiyam* is the negated present participle of *pattiya-*, 'to believe, to recognize'. The verb, which occurs in, among other texts, the Saptasatakam (Gāthās 216, 245, 353 and 376), probably derives from Sanskrit *pratī-*. *akammāsa* stands for *akalmāṣa*, which seems to provide a pun here, describing the appearance of the deer (compare Sanskrit *kalmāṣa*, which refers to a kind of spotted deer), on the one hand, and its innocence, on the other. The context in which the verse occurs is the following. In the preceding verses it is said that a person who is careless (*aviyatta*) will inevitably come to grief. This idea is elaborated upon through a comparison with a deer. This animal runs away from danger which is visible. However, unable to divine danger which is not clearly visible it dies in a footnoose. A translation of the verse under consideration is the following: 'Pulling out a thing, however small it is, one should remove everything that is *nūma*. Not believing (this to be necessary) (being innocent), therefore the (spotless) deer has died'.

<sup>12</sup> Compare in this connection the occurrence of the adjective *soyarā* in Sūyagaḍa (JĀS), sū. 184, where it is added to the word *bhāyaro*, 'brothers': *pitā te therao tāta | sasā te khuddīyā imā || bhāyaro te saḡā tāta | soyarā kiṃ cayāsi ne* ||. The monk addressed is blackmailed into not leaving his parents' house by pointing out the responsibilities he has towards his parents, brothers and sisters.

instance, Sūyagaḍa (Bo.) 1.1.1.13 (*kuvvaṃ ca kāravaṃ ceva*). In line 5ab both functions seem possible. In the next line (5cd) it seems *ceva* can only function as an emphatic particle. As a copulative it would have to connect the sentence of that line with the one of the preceding line, in which case it would have to have an adversative meaning. While *ca* is indeed occasionally found having an adversative meaning, *ceva* (i. e. *caiva*), at least to my knowledge, is not.

For *saṃkhāe* in the second line of verse 5 Bo. suggests several possible derivations, namely *saṃkhyātaḥ*, *saṃkhyāte* and *saṃkhyāyet*, but he finally decides in favour of the interpretation found in the commentaries, which take it as an absolutive of *saṃkhyā-*. However, the occurrence of the word in Āyāra (JĀS), sū. 230, *aṇupuvvīe saṃkhāe āraṃbhā(-)ya tiuṭṭati*, which is actually quoted by Bo. himself, shows that we almost certainly have to do here with the instrumental singular of the substantive *saṃkhā* (*saṃkhyā*), meaning ‘deliberation’; compare Āyāra (JĀS), sū. 191, *sīlamaṃtā uvasaṃtā saṃkhāe rīyamāṇā asīlā aṇuvayamāṇassa bitiyā maṃdassa bāliya* ‘People who are virtuous, tranquil and wandering with deliberation, calling those “people without virtues”, that is the second foolishness of the slow-witted man’<sup>13</sup>.

Then *jīvīyaṃ* can no longer be directly linked to *saṃkhāe* as is done by Bo. Instead it would seem to be an accusative of time, meaning ‘during one’s life’ or, with the emphatic particle *ceva*, ‘one’s whole life long’.

As already mentioned above this line would require the presence of an adversative particle. Bo. suggests to attribute this function to *ca*, while the text actually reads *ceva*. Besides, he discusses the possibility to adopt instead of *kammunāo* the variant *kammunā u*, in which *u* represents Sanskrit *tu* (see PISCHEL 1900: § 185), but he concludes that it is not necessary to do so as the adversative particle need not always actually occur. In this connection it should be noted that in Bo.’s interpretation (and translation) of the verse as a whole the presence or absence of an adversative particle does not really matter. However, given the fact that one has a choice between basically two variants, *kammunāo* and *kammunā u*, and that the sentence in the ‘new’ context does require an adversative particle or with such a particle fits in much better than without it, I do not see why one should not adopt *kammunā*

<sup>13</sup> Āyāra (JĀS), sū. 230, quoted earlier (see also note 14), is probably to be translated as follows: ‘One escapes from activity (*āraṃbhāo*) by (acting with) deliberation in the successive (situations)’. The successive situations most likely refer to the *aṇupuvveṇa vimohāim* mentioned in the verse which precedes this one. Alternatively, they refer to the different steps by which a monk fasts himself to death, described in the verses which follow.

*u*. Furthermore, it seems easier to understand why and how *kammunā* *u*, read as *kammunāu*, was changed into *kammunāo* than the other way around. In this connection the forms of *kammunā* and *kammunāo* should be considered more closely. As to *kammunā*, it should be noted that apparently no other instances of an ablative of a neutre *an*-stem are found. On the other hand, its existence may be inferred, at least for Pāli, from such ablatives as *pitarā* and *attanā* (GEIGER 1916: § 91–2). These ablatives are identical to the respective instrumentals. In fact, an instrumental *kammunā* is found in Ardha-Māgadhī texts as well (for instances, see PISCHEL 1900: § 404). The ablative *kammunāo* is equally problematic. Bo. explains it as a ‘double’ ablative. It should be noted that the ending *-āo*, which is regular with original thematic nouns, is found only very rarely with secondary thematic nouns. PISCHEL (loc. cit.) quotes only one example, namely *jammāo*. The word *kammunāo* is itself found once more, namely in Āyāra (JĀS), sū. 230, quoted above, but there, as here, as a variant, namely beside, among other variants, *āraṃbhāo*. In the case of *āraṃbhāo* the ending *-āo* is, again, regular<sup>14</sup>. Both *kammunā* and *kammunāo* would, as ablatives, seem unsupported in Ardha-Māgadhī. At the same time it is difficult to understand why, if the text originally read *kammunāo*, which at least clearly looks like an ablative, the latter word was changed into the much ‘darker’ *kammunā(-)u*. 5ab should probably read as follows: *saṃkhāe jīviyaṃ ceva / kammunā u tiuttai ||* ‘But only by (acting with) deliberation one’s whole life long one escapes from *karma*’.

The three lines together read:

*mamāi luppāi bāle anna-m-annehi mucchie* (4cd)

*vittam soyariyā ceva savvaṃ eyaṃ na ānai*

*saṃkhāe jīviyaṃ ceva kammunā u tiuttai* (5)

‘He is greedy; infatuated then by this then by that, he, a fool, is broken.’

‘Possessions, even (or: and [*ceva*]) sisters born from the same mother, all this he does not acknowledge.

But only by (acting with) deliberation (one’s whole) life long one escapes from *karma*.’

The next unit comprises verse 6, for which, however, I have adopted a text different from Bo.’s. The latter, on the authority of the Tī., reads *ayānantā viussittā*. So did SCH. and JA. The derivation and meaning of *viussittā* constitute a problem. Bo. discusses several possibilities but his

<sup>14</sup> It is not be ruled out that the variant *kammunāo* in Āyāra (JĀS), sū. 230 was introduced on the basis of a conflation of the text with the line under consideration: *saṃkhāe jīviyaṃ ceva kammunāo* (: *kammunā u*) *tiuttai* vs. *aṇu-puvvīe saṃkhāe kammunāo* (: *āraṃbhāo*) *tiutta(t)i*.

final position does not become clear. In any case I fail to see any connection between the text and his translation: 'unwissende Leute trotz ihrer prahlerischen Reden'. SCH. suggests, and translates accordingly, that *viussittā* stands for *viussantā* (= \**vidvasyamānāḥ*), which he compares with *viussanti* in Sūyagaḍa (ed. Bo.) 1.1.2.23: *je u tattha viussanti / saṃsāraṃ te viussiyā / /*. The latter verb most probably goes back to *vyut-śrayanti* 'they resort to'. It remains unclear, though, what particular formation *viussittā* is supposed to be, irrespective of the question how the meaning 'to resort to' should fit in the present context. Instead, I should like to suggest to read *ayāṇantā vi ussittā*, in which *ussittā* stands for *utsiktāḥ* 'arrogant'. For my translation of *ganthe* with 'words', see Bo.'s discussion of the word, who himself, however, translates it with 'Bindungen'; compare SCH.: 'Fessel'. For the instrumental *kāmehi*, which would function as a locative here, see Bo.

*ee ganthe viukkamma ege samaṇamāhaṇā  
ayāṇantā vi ussittā sattā kāmehi māṇavā* (6)

'Some *śramaṇas* and *brāhmaṇas*, having disregarded the foregoing words,

even though they thus betray their ignorance, behave arrogantly; they are people sticking to passions.'

I intend to discuss the next seven lines together. Starting-point is the text and the translation of Bo.:

*santi pañca mahabbhūyā iha-m-egesim āhiyā  
puḍhavī āu teū ya vāu āgāsapañcamā* (7)

*ee pañca mahabbhūyā tebbho ego tti āhiyā  
aha tesim viṇāse u viṇāso hoi dehiṇo* (8)

*jahā ya puḍhavīthūbe ege nāṇāhi dīsai  
evam bho kasiṇe loe vinnū nāṇāhi dīsai* (9)

*evam ege tti jappanti mandā ārambhanissiyā* (10ab)

'Es gibt in dieser Welt nach der Lehre einiger fünf große Elemente: Erde, Wasser, Feuer, Wind und als fünftes die Luft.'

'Das sind die fünf großen Elemente. Daraus (geht) der Eine (hervor). In dieser Weise lehrt man sie.

Wenn sie sich aber auflösen, geht das Individuum zugrunde.'

'Ebenso, wie die Erdmaterie mit ihrer Vielheit (von Bestandteilen doch) als eine Einzige erscheint,

so – merkt Euch – erscheint die ganze Welt mit ihrer Vielheit als (ein) geistiges Prinzip (d. h. bildet eine geistige Einheit).'

'So ist (oder: gibt es) [nur] der Eine (den Einen). Derart reden Toren, in ihren Handlungen rücksichtslos.'

This passage may be broken up into several smaller segments, the first comprising the lines 7–8ab. Before giving a translation of these three

lines the meaning and derivation of the word *āhiya* should be considered. In the commentaries this word is translated with *ākhyāta* 'enumerated' or with *ākhyātavantah* 'they enumerated'. This interpretation is accepted by Bo., who, undaunted by any phonetical considerations, suggests that *āhiya* is actually derived from *ākhyāta*. In doing so he completely ignores the fact that there are no convincing parallels for the development of (*ākhy*)*āta* into (*āh*)*iya*. Rather *āhiya* stands for *āhita*, as has already been suggested earlier by SCH. This *āhiya* in the present context seems to mean either 'put forward' (derived from 'placed') or 'accepted' (derived from 'taken, received'). In the translation given below 'accepted' has been opted for.

*santi* at the beginning of the sentence in 7ab requires some explanation. The sentence should almost certainly be translated with 'by some here are "accepted" five gross elements' (i.e. as against people who accept six; see 1.1.1.15). This supposedly redundant usage of *santi* is in itself not unknown. What is rare, though, or has apparently not yet been established otherwise, is the construction of *santi* with a past participle. CPD I, p. 112b, quotes only instances of *santi* either with a verb inflected for person or with an adjective. The present construction may be compared especially to the latter. A translation of 7-8ab is the following:

'By some here are "accepted" five gross elements,

(namely) earth, water, fire, wind and, as the fifth, ether.'

'These five gross elements are "accepted", saying: "From these is (made) the individual".'

Bo. links the word *aha* (*atha*) in 8c to immediately following *viṇāse*. He ingeniously suggests that we have to do here with a contamination of the two following phrases, namely *aha viṇāse* (nominative) *hoi*, 'when there is a destruction', and *viṇāse* (locative), 'id.'. In doing so he explicitly rejects the solution put forward by SCH., who takes *aha* as a kind of interjection by the person who enumerates the main arguments of the materialists. Partly in agreement with SCH. I should like to link *aha* directly to *jappanti mandā ārambhanissiyā* in 10ab. Already at this point I should also like to introduce an emendation on Bo.'s text, namely *jampanti* (of the majority of the witnesses) for *jappanti*. For *jampanti* (*jalpanti*), see PISCHEL (1900: § 296). It is in fact not clear why Bo. preferred the latter form, which is uncertain; see PISCHEL, loc. cit. *ya* (*ca*) in 9 (*jahā ya . . .*) belongs in my opinion to the same level as *aha*, i.e. *aha . . . ya . . . tti jampanti mandā ārambhanissiyā* 'Furthermore [*aha*] they, slow-witted people bent on harmful actions, say . . ., and [*ya*] (they say) . . .'.

A translation of 8cd is the following: 'Furthermore, they . . . say:



“But in case they (i. e. the five gross elements) are destroyed, there is also the destruction of the soul”.’

Verse 9 contains some serious textual problems, which, however, have so far remained unnoticed. The first problem concerns the word *nāṇāhi*. Bo. does not discuss the word, which is strange as it concerns a formation, the adverb *nāṇā* followed by the ending *-hi*, which is otherwise unknown, and as beyond the two instances of the word in the verse under consideration no other instances seem to be known; *nāṇāhi* is virtually a ἄπαισθητόν. Beside all this, Bo.’s translation is inaccurate as it assumes a word corresponding to Sanskrit *nānārūpa*, linked to *thūbe* in the first line and to *vinnū* in the second. As already said above a formation like *nāṇāhi* is otherwise unknown. A comparison with, for instance, *piṭṭhāhi*, ‘from behind’, is probably not justifiable, and would still leave us with the problem of its meaning: ‘from diverse or manifold . . . (?)’. *-(ā)hi* in, for instance, *alāhi*, ‘stop’, probably originates from the conflation of *alam* with such phrases as *mā vaṭṭāhi*. Another possibility is to suppose *nāṇā* is for once inflected as an adjective here as it is, however rarely, in Sanskrit (PW, s. v., quotes *nārīṣu nānāsu* from Pañcar.). This, however, would saddle us with an adjective in the ablative singular or in the instrumental plural feminine, which as far as I see is impossible to fit into the respective contexts. By way of alternative I suggest in the first line to read instead of *nāṇāhi*, *nāṇā hi*: *jahāya puḍhavīthūbe ege nāṇā hi dīsai* ‘and (they say): “For [*hi*] as one heap of earth is seen (to consist of) diverse (elements) (*nāṇā*), so . . .”’. The same solution does not seem to be possible for *nāṇāhi* in the second line; the causal particle *hi* hardly makes sense here. The same line contains yet another problem, namely the meaning of the word *vinnū* (*viñña*). Its usual meaning ‘wise’ or ‘intelligent’ does not make sense. In the commentaries it has been given a very specific sense. The Cū. equates it with the so-called *bhūtātman* as mentioned in Brahmabindūpaniṣad 12. Śīlāṅka identifies *vinnū* with *ātman*. Bo. translates it accordingly with ‘geistige Prinzip’, SCH. with ‘Geist’ and JA. with ‘the intelligent (principle, viz. the *ātman*)’. These meanings are quite unexpected. On the other hand, the text as it stands does not seem to allow a very much different interpretation. This suggests the possibility that the text is actually corrupt. In this connection I may refer again to the word *nāṇāhi* in this same line. The only available variant, *nāṇā ya*, does not seem to be an improvement. It would appear then that the original reading has been irretrievably lost. It therefore has to be reconstructed. A possible emendation is to read for *vinnū nāṇā(-)hi dīsai*, *nāṇā vinnūhi dīsai*. The corruption may be reconstructed as follows. A scribe while copying Pāda d got it mixed up with Pāda b (*ege nāṇā[-]hi dīsai*), which

resulted in *nāṇā(-)hi dīsai*. On detecting his error he may have corrected it by, as was a common practice, adding *vinnū* in the margin and indicating its original position with a small cross or some other sign. When subsequently this particular MS was copied *vinnū* may have come to be misplaced before *nāṇā(-)hi*.

At this point the text of 7–10ab may be given in its entirety with the changes I have suggested above. It should be noticed that my translation of the first part of Pāda 10a (*evam ege*) is again completely different from those given earlier. This difference should be evident.

*santi pañca mahabbhūyā iha-m-egesim āhiyā*  
*puḍhavī āu teū ya vāu āgāsapañcamā. (7)*  
*ee pañca mahabbhūyā tebbho ego tti āhiyā.*  
*aha tesim viṇāse u viṇāso hoi dehiṇo (8)*  
*jahā ya puḍhavīthūbe ege nāṇā hi dīsai*  
*evam bho kasiṇe loe nāṇā vinnūhi dīsai (9)*  
*evam ege tti jampanti mandā ārambhanissiyā (10ab)*

‘By some here are accepted (the) five gross elements:  
 earth, water, fire, wind, and, as the fifth, ether.’

‘These five gross elements are accepted, saying: “From these is (made) the individual”.

Furthermore (they say): “But in case they (the five gross elements) are destroyed, there is also the destruction of the soul”;

‘and: “For as one heap of earth is seen (to consist of) diverse (elements), so, mark you, the wise consider the whole earth (to consist of) diverse (elements),’

‘so (also) the individual”;

so (they) say, slow-witted people, bent on harmful actions.’

Only so far this particular materialistic doctrine has been quoted. A refutation is to follow. It is obvious that as such the second line of verse 10 does not suffice. In my opinion it includes the first Pāda of verse 11 as well, i. e.:

*ege kiccā sayam pāvam tivvam dukkham niyacchai (10cd)*  
*patteyam kasiṇe āyā. (11a)*

A translation is the following:

‘When an individual [*ege*] himself has committed a sin (he) will come to terrible grief’,

‘he himself [*āyā*] by himself [*patteyam*] (and) all of him [*kasiṇe*].’

## Bibliography and Abbreviations

- ALSDORF (1958) L. ALSDORF, *Itthīparinnā*. A Chapter of Jain Monastic Poetry, edited as a Contribution to Indian Prosody. *IJ* 2 (1958) 249–270 (= *Kleine Schriften*, hrsg. von A. WEZLER. Wiesbaden 1974, pp. 193–214).
- ALSDORF (1962) Id., *Uttarajjhāyā Studies*. *IJ* 6 (1962–1963) 110–136 (= *Kleine Schriften*, pp. 225–251).
- ALSDORF (1965) Id., *Les études Jaina. État présent et taches futures*. Paris 1965.
- ALSDORF (1977) Id., *Jaina Exegetical Literature and the History of the Jaina Canon*. In: *Mahāvīra and His Teachings*, edd. A. N. UPADHYE et al. Bombay 1977, pp. 1–8.
- Āyāra *Āyāraṅga-Suttam*, ed. by Muni JAMBŪVIJAYA. [*JĀS* 2 (1)]. Bombay 1976.  
See SCHUBRING (1910)
- BLOCH (1934) J. BLOCH, *L'Indo-aryen du Veda aux temps modernes*. Paris 1934.
- BOLLÉE (1977) W. B. BOLLÉE, *Studien zum Sūyagaḍa*. Die Jainas und die anderen Weltanschauungen vor der Zeitenwende. Textteile, Nijjutti, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen. Teil I. [Schriftenreihe des Südasiens-Instituts der Universität Heidelberg, Bd. 24]. Wiesbaden 1977.
- BROUGH (1962) J. BROUGH, *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*. Ed. with an introduction and commentary. [London Oriental Series, vol. 7]. London 1962.
- BRUHN-TRIPATHI (1970) K. BRUHN-C. B. TRIPATHI, *Prospectus of a New Verse Concordance*. *Jain Journal*, January 1970, 159–169.
- BRUHN-TRIPATHI (1977) Id., *Jaina Concordance and Bhāṣya Concordance*. In: *Beiträge zur Indienforschung*, Ernst Waldschmidt zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet. [Veröffentlichungen des Museums für indische Kunst Berlin, Bd. 4]. Berlin 1977, pp. 67–80.
- CAILLAT (1965) C. CAILLAT, *Les expiations dans le Rituel ancien des religieux Jaina*. [Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne, Fasc. 25]. Paris 1965.
- CAILLAT (1981) Ead., *Notes sur les variantes dans la tradition du Dasaveyāliya-Sutta*. In: *Dr. Ludwik Sternbach Commemoration Volume*. [*IndT* VIII–IX (1980–81)]. Torino 1981, pp. 71–83.
- CAILLAT (1983) Ead., *The Recent Critical Editions of the Jain Āgama*. In: *XXI. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 24. bis 29. März 1980 in Berlin*. *Ausgewählte Vorträge*, hrsg. von F. STEPPAT. [*ZDMG*, Supplement V]. Wiesbaden 1983, pp. 234–240.
- CHALMERS (1932) Lord CHALMERS, *Buddha's Teachings. Being the Sutta-Nipāta or Discourse-Collection*, edited in the original Pali text with an English version facing it. [*HOS* 27]. Cambridge, Mass. 1932.
- CHARPENTIER (1916) J. CHARPENTIER, *Beiträge zur alt- und mittelindischen Wortkunde*. *ZDMG* 70 (1916) 216–250.

- CPD A Critical Pali Dictionary, begun by V. TRENCKNER. Copenhagen 1924ff.
- GEIGER (1916) W. GEIGER, Pāli. Literatur und Sprache. [GIAPA I/7]. Strassburg 1916.
- Isibhāsiyāim Isibhāsiyāim. Aussprüche der Weisen. Aus dem Prākṛit der Jainas übersetzt von W. SCHUBRING. Nebst dem revidierten Text. [ANIS 14]. Hamburg 1969.
- JACOBI (1884) H. JACOBI, Jaina Sūtras. Translated from Prākṛit. Part I: The Ākārāṅga Sūtra – The Kalpa Sūtra. [SBE XXII]. Oxford 1884 (repr. Delhi 1973).
- JACOBI (1895) Id., Jaina Sūtras. Translated from Prākṛit. Part II: The Uttarādhyayana Sūtra – The Sūtrakṛitāṅga Sūtra. [SBE XLV]. Oxford 1895 (repr. Delhi 1973).
- JĀS Jaina-Āgama-Series
- KANE (1946) P. V. KANE, History of Dharmaśāstra. Vol. III. Poona 1946.
- NORMAN (1971) K. R. NORMAN, The Elders' Verses II: Therīgāthā. [PTSTS 40]. London 1971.
- NORMAN (1976) Id., The Labialisation of Vowels in Middle Indo-Aryan. StII 2 (1976) 41–58.
- NORMAN (1981) Id., Sūyagaḍaṅga Studies. WZKS 25 (1981) 195–203.
- NYANAPONIKA (1955) NYANAPONIKA, Sutta-Nipāta. Früh-buddhistische Lehr-Dichtungen aus dem Pali-Kanon. Konstanz 1955.
- PISCHEL (1900) R. PISCHEL, Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen. [GIAPA I/8]. Strassburg 1900.
- PTS Prakrit Text Society
- PW Sanskrit-Wörterbuch herausgegeben von der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, bearbeitet von O. BÖHTLINGK und R. ROTH. Theil I–VII. St. Petersburg 1855–1875.
- RENOU (1968) L. RENOU, Grammaire Sanscrite. Paris 2 1968.
- Saptaśatakam Das Saptaśatakam des Hāla. Herausgegeben von A. WEBER. [AKM VII/4]. Leipzig 1881 (repr. Nendeln 1966).
- SCHUBRING (1910) W. SCHUBRING, Ācārāṅga-Sūtra. Erster Śrutaskandha. Text, Analyse und Glossar. [AKM XII/4]. Leipzig 1910 (repr. Nendeln 1966).
- SCHUBRING (1926) Id., Worte Mahāvīras. Kritische Übersetzungen aus dem Kanon der Jainas. [Quellen der Religionsgeschichte]. Göttingen 1926.
- SCHUBRING (1935) Id., Die Lehre der Jainas nach den alten Quellen dargestellt. [GIAPA III/7]. Berlin–Leipzig 1935.
- SPEIJER (1886) J. S. SPEIJER, Sanskrit Syntax. Leiden 1886 (repr. Delhi 1973).
- STERNBACH (1974) L. STERNBACH, Mahā-Subhāṣita-Saṁgrahaḥ (Anthology of delightful verses). Sanskrit Text with English Translation, Critical Notes, Introduction and Index. Volume I. Delhi 1974.
- Suttanipāta See CHALMERS (1932)

- Sūyagaḍa Sūyagaḍaṅgasutta (Part I) with Bhadrabāhu's Nir-yukti and Cūrṇi by anonymos writer, ed. by Muni Shri PUNYA-VIJAYAJI. [PTS 19]. Ahmedabad 1975.  
Sūyagaḍaṅgasuttaṃ, ed. by Muni JAMBŪVIJAYA. [JĀS 2 (2)]. Bombay 1978.  
Ācārāṅgasūtram and Sūtrakṛtāṅgasūtram with the Nir-yukti of Ācārya Bhadrabāhusvāmī and the Commentary of Śīlāṅkācārya, ed. by JAMBŪVIJAYA. [Lālā Sundarlāl Jain Āgamagranthamālā I]. Delhi 1978.
- Uttarajjhāyā The Uttarādhyayanasūtra being the First Mūlasūtra of the Śvetāmbara Jains, ed. with an introduction, critical notes and a commentary by J. CHARPENTIER. [Archives d'Études Orientales, vol. 18]. Uppsala 1922 (repr. Delhi 1980).
- WACKERNAGEL (1905) J. WACKERNAGEL, Altindische Grammatik II/1: Einleitung zur Wortlehre. Nominalkomposition. Göttingen 1905.
- WILLIAMS (1963) R. WILLIAMS, Jaina Yoga. A Survey of the Mediaeval Śrāvākācāras. [London Oriental Series, vol. 14]. London 1963.