Some Remarks on the Opening Sections in Jaina Epistemological Treatises

Piotr Balcerowicz (*Warsaw*)

1. Even before Hemacandra (1088-1172) expressed succinctly the notion that auspiciousness was to be conveyed by an incipit, presumably in order to facilitate the composition of his grammatical treatise, the *Śabdânuśāsana*[1], Jaina philosophical and religious works had undergone some important changes as regards their opening sections. These developments can be traced back to the time of the composition of *The Sayings of the Seers* (*Isi-bhāsiyāiṁ*, Skt. *Ṛṣi-bhāṣitāni*), a collection of hymns, aphorisms etc. composed by monks and nuns in the first centuries that followed the emergence of Jainism, which starts with a message directed both to coreligionists and, to some extent, to disbelievers:

> 'He [the Jina whose teaching is contained in these hymns] speaks only what one should heed, [similarly] he propounds only what one should heed, whereby the living being is instantaneously released from all kinds of suffering. There is no higher purity than [his teaching] one should pay heed to.'[2]

---

[1] Whose initial *sūtra* consists of a single word: *arhaṁ* (ŚA 1.1.1).

[2] Isibh$_1$ 1: *soyavvam eva vadatī*[a], *soyavvam eva pavadati, jeṇa samayaṁ jīve savva-dukkhāṇa muccati. tamhā soyavvāto paraṁ ṇ'atthi soyaṁ tī*[b] [[a] Isibh$_2$: *vadati.* [b] Isibh$_2$: *ti.*].
In view of the contents of the first section of *Isi-bhāsiyāiṁ* (*Ṛṣi-bhāṣitāni*), where we come across a clear reference to the early Jaina ethical 'teaching of the four restraints' (*cāujjāma-dhamma / cātur-yāma-dharma / cātu-yāma-saṁvara*), this opening passage goes back, despite its prosaic character, to an early stage of the Jaina system. This teaching is well known from oldest strata of the Jaina Canon, e.g. Uttar 23 [837-925] ('The dialogue between Keśin and Indrabhūti Gautama'), Ṭhāṇ 4.1, *sū* 266, p. 103, RP 693 (esp. 'the Story of Paesi'(*Paesi-kahāṇayaṁ*, Skt. *Pradeśi-kathānaka*; (RP 667 [47]-817[84]), see Bollée (2002)). Cf. also Schubring (1942), Schubring (1969: 47-48) and Vinayasagar–Shastri–Sharma (1988: 14-18).

Hemacandra understood the role of the initial *sūtra* to be a concise auspicious *mantra* and felt no need of any additional explanation of his purpose as an author, considering the role of the initial verse obvious, as it transpires from his auto-commentary:

> ‘We place this [auspicious] formula *arhaṁ̐*—which is expressive of the supreme lord, who is the supreme being—at the beginning of the treatise for the sake of auspiciousness.’[3]

In this paper, I shall try to pinpoint common features that opening sections of a number of most important Jaina philosophical treatises display as well as elements peculiar to some of introductory portions, in order to identify a kind of evolution in their formulations and structure over centuries and, finally, to propose a historical explanation to account for a change that, in my opinion, took place after the 6th century.

2.1. The genre of Jaina philosophical writings as they are known to us commences with the oeuvre of ‘a collective writer’ Kundakundâcārya[4], the name practically standing for a series of anonymous thinkers who may have flourished over a span of a few centuries between 3rd and 7th/8th centuries. The opening verses of Kundakunda's works which contain earliest textual layers[5] betray some common features. That is evident when we compare his two works, the *Samaya-sāra* and the *Niyama-sāra*, respectively:

---

[3] ŚA-LVṛ 1.1.1 = ŚA-RVṛ 1.1.1: ***arhaṁ̐*** *ity etad akṣaraṁ paramêśvarasya parameṣṭhino vācakaṁ maṅgalârthaṁ śāstrasyâdau praṇidadhmahe*.

[4] Some of the works ascribed to Kundakunda seem indeed to go back to a certain common source (authorship) and the nucleus of each of them was expanded and elaborated in the course of time: *The Quintessence of Sermons* (*Pavayaṇa-sāra / Pravacana-sāra*; PSā), *The Quintessence of The Main Doctrinal Points* (*Samaya-sāra*; SSā), *The Quintessence of The Five Extensive Entities* (*Paṁca-tthiya-saṁgaha / Pañcâstikāya-samaya-sāra*, PSSā) and *The Quintessence of Restraint* [*of Passions*] (*Ṇiyama-sāra / Niyama-sāra*; NSā). The very earliest core of these writings may go back to the third century, and that may account for Kundakunda’s dating according to some researchers, i.e. 2nd-3rd century: e.g. A. N. Upadhye (1935: 5), Schubring (1957), Schubring (1966: 36), Johnson (1995: 91-97) and Soni (2003). Since most layers of these texts are decidedly later, reaching even perhaps 7th century, that is the reason why a number of scholars assign Kundakunda to a posterior date, e.g. Johnson (1995: 95): ‘early fifth century or later’, Dhaky (1991: 193): ‘second half of 8th century’, similarly Dundas (1997: 507 ff.). Other works ascribed to Kundakunda are distinctly later (probably between 7th and 8th centuries) and different in style, language (later Prakrit and traces of Apabhraṁśa), intellectual framework and character, and it is very unlikely that also these may go back to the same intellectual milieu covered by the name of ‘Kundakunda’, these include: *The Exposition of Things* (*Aṭṭha-pahūda / Artha-prābhṛta*), *The Quintessence of* [*the Three*] *Gems* (*Rayaṇa-sāra / Ratna-sāra*), *Twelve Reflections* (*Bārahânuvekkhā / Dvādaśânuprekṣā*) and *The Six Lectures* (pr. *Ṣaṭ-pāhuḍa*, s. *Ṣaṭ-prābhṛta*). I shall use the conventional author name ‘Kundakunda’ to refer to a nucleus of

> 'Having saluted to all perfected beings, who have attained a firm, immovable and incomparable goal, I will teach this instruction on the main doctrinal points, [once] delivered by the testimonial omniscient[6].'[7]

and

> 'Having paid homage to the Jina [Mahā]vīra, whose nature is endowed with infinite and superior cognition and conation, I will explain the quintessence of restraint as it was [once] preached by both the omniscient [proper] and the testimonial omniscient[8].'[9]

Apart from two different linguistic layers,[10] we can distinguish the following structural elements[11], many of which will reoccur in other *maṅgalâcaraṇa*s:

---

writings that bears certain features that allow us to attribute them a particular philosophical Digambara tradition of the period 3rd-5th century, albeit not to a historical person of Kundakunda.

[5] This does not have to mean that the opening verses themselves belong to the earliest textual strata, inasmuch as there is a possibility of them being a later interpolation.

[6] 'Testimonial omniscient' (*śruta-kevalin*) is someone who is believed to derive his omniscience from, i.e. who knew all the twelve basic Canonical books (*aṅga*) and all the fourteen ancient works (*pūrva*). Another name is therefore *catur-daśa-pūrva-dhara*. The last such person was, according to tradition, Ārya Bhadrabāhu who flourished during the reign of Candragupta Maurya, cf. Dhaky (2004).

[7] *vaṁdittu savva-siddhe dhuvam acalam aṇovamaṁ gadiṁ patte* ।
vocchāmi samaya-pāhuḍam iṇamo suya-kevalī-bhaṇiyaṁ ॥ SSā

[8] See n. 6.

[9] *ṇamiūṇa jiṇaṁ vīraṁ aṇaṁta-vara-ṇāṇa-daṁsaṇa-sahāvaṁ* ।
vocchāmi ṇiyama-sāraṁ kevali-suda-kevalī-bhaṇidaṁ ॥ NSā

[10] The forms *suda*° and °*bhaṇidaṁ* point to dialectical differences and do not have to necessarily have any bearing on the historical assessment of the antiquity / relative chronology of both verses.

[11] For a complete list of such structural elements see p. 73.

E 1 Salutation as a starting point of the undertaking (*vaṁdittu*, *ṇamiūṇa*).

E 2a The object of salutation, in SSā it being all perfected beings (*savva-siddhe*), a category that includes also the Tīrthaṁkāras, whereas in NSā it being Mahāvīra Vardhamāna (*jiṇaṁ vīraṁ*).

E 2b The mention of the object of salutation contains also a brief description of laudable qualities (SSā: *dhuvam acalam aṇovamaṁ gadiṁ patte*, NSā: *aṇaṁta-vara-ṇāṇa-daṁsaṇa-sahāvaṁ*). The importance of these qualities—that are tantamount to liberation (*mokṣa*), although the latter can be referred to either as a final liberated condition (*dhuvam acalam aṇovamaṁ gadiṁ*) or as constituent hallmarks of the condition (*aṇaṁta-vara-ṇāṇa-daṁsaṇa*)—lies in the fact that these set the goal on the spiritual path for any believer.

E 3 A statement of the design to teach (*vocchāmi*).

E 4 The respective subject matter of the teaching. And, finally,

E 5 The indication of a source of the teaching (*suya-kevalī-bhaṇiyaṁ*, *kevali-suda-kevalī-bhaṇidaṁ*) that forms the doctrinal fundament for a given work.

Here, as in all Jaina literature, the salutation to the Tīrthaṁkāras (E 1) cannot be treated as an entreaty or invocation to supreme beings etc., as it was typical of *maṅgala*s in Vedic tradition, starting with *Ṛgveda* 1.1.1. (*agním ī̀ḷe puróhìtaṁ yajñásyà devám ṛtvíjàm* । *hótā̀raṁ ratnadhā́tàmam* ॥), but also in the Hindu *pūjā*, in which the obeisance to a deity was meant both to implore and to invite the deity to attend the sacrifice. Having destroyed all the *karman*, the Tīrthaṁkāras remained aloof from worldly matters and unapproachable to the believers.

The qualities that accompany the goal (E 2b) play an important role inasmuch as they provide an explanation why the person that is an object of laudation (E 2a) should be at all venerated, but also indicate that this is the goal that potentially lies ahead for the believer in a very distant future.

That last element in the list, the explicit reference to a source of the teaching (E 5), seems to be of particular importance, inasmuch as it provides a justification for the doctrine as it is expounded in a given work and, by conferring veracity to it, lends credence to the author's arguments. In other words, the truth that the omniscient one once fathomed remains the cornerstone of the treatise in question. Thereby, the continuity of Tīrthaṁkāra's original message to the world is safeguarded via the Jaina tradition and, at the same time, an access to the salvific teaching once revealed by the omniscient is provided. Interestingly, the common element in both SSā and NSā is that the author grounds his system in the teaching of 'testimonial omniscient' teachers, and it is only NSā that has a wider claim of relying also on the teaching of a *kevalin* (or *kevalin*s), i.e. the omniscient (here Mahāvīra Vardhamāna) who attained their superiority independently of any instructor[12].

When we consider another early text ascribed to Kundakunda, the *Paṁcatthiya-saṁgaha*, we shall see that the *maṅgala* contains, in addition to all the other above-mentioned elements, at least one more feature:

> '[1] Homage to the Jinas, whose qualities exceed all limitations, who are worshipped by hundreds of Indras, whose sweet and clear words are beneficial to the three worlds [and] who conquered worldly existence. [2] Having bowed with my head [in order to show my respect] to the content (i.e. main doctrinal points) which came forth from the mouth of the mendicant (i.e. the Jina), which releases from the four modes of existence[13] and [brings final] liberation with itself, I will explain these main doctrinal points. Listen!'[14]

The new feature can be formulated as follows:

E 6 The *incipit* verses inform the recipients of the text that not only the author but also divine beings join him in worship of the object of laudation E 2a (*iṁda-sada-vaṁdiyāṇaṁ*), thus providing an example to be emulated by the religious community.

In the verses Kundakunda specifies the object of reverence to be twofold: it is not only the victorious *tīrthaṁ-kāra*s (*jiṇāṇaṁ jida-bhavāṇaṁ*) who are 'living' paragons of the spiritual path to follow, but also it is the contents of their teachings as a wholesome instrument that enables an adept to attain the spiritual goal (*cadu-ggadi-ṇivāraṇaṁ saṇivvāṇaṁ … samayam*).

---

[12] Cf. TS$_{\text{śvet}}$ 1.3: *tan nisargād adhigamād vā.*—'The correct cognition [arises] through natural development or through instruction.'

[13] I.e. hellish beings, animals, humans, divine beings.

[14] *iṁda-sada-vaṁdiyāṇaṁ ti-huaṇa-hida-madhura-visada-vakkāṇaṁ* ।
aṁtâtīda-guṇāṇam ṇamo jiṇāṇaṁ jida-bhavāṇaṁ ॥ 1 ॥
samaṇa-muhuggadamaṭṭhaṁ cadu-ggadi-ṇivāraṇaṁ saṇivvāṇaṁ ।
eso paṇamiya sirasā samayam iyaṁ suṇaha vocchāmi ॥ 2 ॥ PSSā

The final goal or purpose of the teaching to be achieved through these two works (E 9, *vide infra*) is not explicitly mentioned in any of them, although it is intimated in the description of the Jina's qualities (E 2b).

Most importantly, in all the above instances the authoritativeness of the source of teaching is not questioned; on the contrary, it is accepted unconditionally.

2.2. An analysis of another of Kundakunda's works, i.e. the *Pavayaṇasāra*, betrays—in addition to all the ones already mentioned—some more elements:

> '[1] Here, I render homage to Vardhamāna, the maker of the passage to moral law, who is venerated by the gods and demons, by humans and sovereigns, who has washed away the dirt of the destructive *karman*. [2] And [I render homage to] all the remaining *tīrthaṁ-kara*s along with all the perfected beings of pure nature, and to the ascetics whose actions [are regulated by correct] knowledge, conation, conduct, penance and energy. [3] I venerate all of them in their entirety as well as each of them individually, but also [I venerate] current saints [living] in the human region. [4-5] Having paid homage to the saints (sc. liberated souls), the perfected beings as well as to congregation leaders (direct disciples of the Jina), to classes of community instructors and to all monks with no exception, [and] having taken up the lifestyle the underlying basis of which are purified knowledge and conation, I embrace equilibrium whereby one attains liberation.'[15]

Firstly, we see that the object of laudation E 2a is even more elaborate and embraces other groups of venerable living beings, in addition to the Tīrthaṁkāras, in the following sequence: (a) Mahāvīra Vardhamāna (*vaḍḍhamāṇaṁ titthaṁ*), (b) all the remaining *tīrthaṁ-kara*s (*sese …titthakare*), (c) perfected beings (*siddhe*, *siddhāṇaṁ*), (d) ascetics (*samaṇe*), (e) the saints, viz. liberated souls (*arahaṁte*, *arahaṁtāṇaṁ*), (f) congregation leaders (*gaṇa-harāṇaṁ*), (g) community instructors (*ajjhāvaya-vaggāṇaṁ*) and (h) monks (*sāhūṇaṁ*).

---

[15] *esa surâsura-maṇus-iṁda-vaṁdidaṁ dhoda-ghāi-kamma-malaṁ* ।
paṇāmi vaḍḍhamāṇaṁ titthaṁ dhammassa kattāraṁ ॥ 1 ॥
sese puṇa titthakare sasavva-siddhe visuddha-sabbhāve ।
samaṇe ya ṇāṇa-daṁsaṇa-caritta-tava-vīriyâyāre ॥ 2 ॥
te te savve samagaṁ samagaṁ pattegam eva pattegaṁ ।
vaṁdāmi ya vaṭṭaṁte arahaṁte māṇuse khette ॥ 3 ॥
kiccā arahaṁtāṇaṁ siddhāṇaṁ taha ṇamo gaṇa-harāṇaṁ ।
ajjhāvaya-vaggāṇaṁ sāhūṇaṁ cêva ssavvesiṁ ॥ 4 ॥
tesiṁ visuddha-daṁsaṇa-ṇāṇa-pahāṇâsamaṁ samāsejja ।
uvasaṁpayāmi sammaṁ jatto ṇivvāṇa-saṁpattī ॥ 5 ॥ PSā

Interestingly, the register of praiseworthy beings found in Kundakunda's *maṅgala* verses corresponds to the list of *The Eulogy of The Five Supreme Beings* (*Pañca-parameṣṭhi-stuti*), which forms the first five lines of the *Pañca-namas-kāra-mantra*—traditionally known also under the names *The First Recollection* (*Prathamaṁ smaraṇam*) and the *Śrī-namas-kāra-mantra*, and currently as the *Nokār* Mantra[16], present practically in all Jaina rituals—but also opens the Śvetāmbara *Sūtra on Obligatory Rites* (*Āvassaya-sutta*, ĀvS) as well as the Digambara *Six-Partite Canon* (*Cha-kkhaṁḍâgame / Ṣaṭ-khaṇḍâgama*; ṢKhĀ) composed by Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali (c. 200):

> 'Homage to (A) the saints (sc. liberated souls), homage to (B) perfected beings, homage to (C) community instructors, homage to (D) spiritual guides, homage to (E) all the monks in the world.'[17]

That is especially true of verse four, which contains all the five *parameṣṭhin*s. A comparison of both passages reveals the following parallelism:[18]

---

[16] On this most basic liturgical formula of the Jainas and contemporary Jaina rituals, see Jaini (1979: 162-164), Laidlaw (1995: 59 ff.), Cort (2001: 61-99, esp. 66 f.).

[17] ṢKhĀ 1.1.1 = ĀvS 1: *namo arihaṁtāṇaṁ namo siddhāṇaṁ namo āiriyāṇaṁ* [ĀvS: *āyariyāṇaṁ*] *namo uvajjhāyāṇaṁ namo loe savva-sāhūṇaṁ*. There are numerous works that deal with this eulogy, see e.g. Leumann (1934), Williams (1963: 184-215), Caillat (1965), Balbir (1993), Flügel (1994), Shāntā (1997: 33 ff.). The antiquity of the formula is confirmed by a number of early inscriptions, e.g. by that of king Khāravela (2nd century BCE) in Kaliṅga: *namo arahaṁtāṇaṁ namo savva-siddhāṇaṁ …*, see Guérinot (1908: 69), after Shāntā (1997: 132).

[18] See Amṛtacandra-sūri's gloss in PSā-TPVṛ *ad loc.*, p. 5.2: *athaivam arhat-siddhâcāryôpādhyāya-sarva-sādhūnāṁ praṇati-vandanâbhidhāna-pravṛtta-dvaita-dvāreṇa…* and Jayasena's gloss in PSā-TVṛ *ad loc.*, p. 5.10-11: ***arahaṁtāṇaṁ siddhāṇaṁ taha ṇamo gaṇa-harāṇaṁ ajjhāvaya-vaggāṇaṁ sāhūṇaṁ cêva*** *arhat-siddha-gaṇa-dharôpādhyāya-sādhubhyaś caiva*. Cf. also Śīlāṅka's gloss in ĀyārṬ ad *sū*. 279, p. 322: *upādhyāyaḥ adhyāpakaḥ*. In his commentary called *The Brightness* (*Dhavalā-siddhānta*), Vīrasena (c. 800) implies that the meaning of *āyariyāṇaṁ* of the *Pañca-parameṣṭhi-stuti* may also refer to those who are conversant with the areas of the fourteen-fold knowledge, i.e. with the *Puvva*s the authorship of which was ascribed to the *gaṇa-dhara*s, see DhṬ ad

Pavayaṇa-sāra		***Pañca-parameṣṭhi-stuti***
*arhant*s (A)	=	(e), including (a) and (b),
*siddha*s (B)	=	(c),
*ācārya*s (C)	=	*gaṇa-dhara*s (f) and (d),
*upādhyāya*s (D)	=	*adhyāpaka*s (g) and (d),
*sādhu*s (E)	=	(h) [and (d)?].

In other words, its appears that the *maṅgala* verses of the *Pavayaṇa-sāra* contain, as a constituent element beside other elements, a reformulation of the most widespread and fundamental eulogistic formula that is basically a component, and usually a starting point, of all ritualistic Jaina practice. Symbolically, therefore the composition — both as the actual production and the act of recitation—of such a philosophical-religious text as the *Pavayaṇa-sāra* may be treated as an activity that has a ritualistic dimension and may correspond to other religious practices such as the six obligatory rites (*āvassaya / āvaśyaka*)[19], recommended also for the lay followers, or the *deva-pūja*, *caitya-vandana* etc. in lay practice.

That it is indeed the case, i.e. that a composition of a work was preceded by or performed a function of an obligatory rite in praise of the five supreme beings is confirmed by Hemacandra-sūri in his auto-commentary to the *Pramāṇa-mīmāṁsā*:

> 'However, the author of the aphorisms has also expressed auspicious salutation in the form of homage paid to the five supreme beings etc.; [hence], with brevity in view, he does not accommodate (sc. expand) it [here explicitly].'[20]

ṢKhĀ 1.1.1, p. 49.8-9: ***namo āiriyāṇaṁ*** *pañca-vidham ācāraṁ carati cārayatîty ācāryaḥ catur-daśa-vidyā-sthāna-pāragaḥ ekādaśâṅga-dharaḥ ācārâṅga-dharo vā…*

[19] Cf. Shāntā (1997: 699-715), Williams (1963: 184 ff.).

[20] PMīV$_1$ 1.1.1 § 4 (p. 2.4): *parameṣṭhi-namas-kārâdikaṁ tu maṅgalaṁ kṛtam api na niveśitaṁ lāghavârthinā sūtra-kāreṇêti.*
Of course, what is meant by *maṅgala* here is a verbal expression of salutation which in itself is conceived of as a ritual, although it does not necessitate any additional performative ritualistic acts. Precisely in such a way is interpreted the *Pañca-namas-kāra-mantra / Pañca-parameṣṭhi-stuti* in a traditional verse that usually accompanies it:
eso pañca-namo-kkāro savva-pāva-ppanāsaṇo ।
maṅgalāṇaṁ ca savvesiṁ paḍhamaṁ havai maṅgalaṁ ॥
—'This is the fivefold homage [to the five supreme beings] which destroys all sins, and among all auspicious salutations this is the foremost one.'

In the concluding verse Kundakunda mentions a new element:

E 7 An explicit reference to his own personal practice as a precondition for his own correct understanding: 'having taken up the lifestyle the underlying basis of which are purified knowledge and conation, I embrace equilibrium' (*visuddha-daṁsaṇa-ṇāṇa-pahāṇâsamaṁ samāsejja uvasaṁpayāmi sammaṁ*).

The ascetic way of life (*āsama / āśrama*) is both a direct application of the Jinas' instruction and its essence is a spiritual composure, or inner equilibrium (*sāmya*), that implies the ascetic ideal of complete withdrawal from the world. Clearly, the element of one's own practice is the third gem of the Jaina *ratna-traya*. A precondition for the ascetic way of life, asseverated to be practised by Kundakunda, is religious belief and reliance on the Jinas' teachings.

Further, Kundakunda indicates

E 8 The purpose of his practice and of ascetic attitude which is liberation (*ṇivvāṇa-saṁpattī*). It is believed to result from the ascetic code of life which one adopts following the example of the *tīrthaṁ-kara*s.

In this way, with the elements E 7 and E 8 taken jointly, Kundakunda expresses the triad of gems (*ratna-traya*) as the path that leads to liberation, i.e. exactly the same idea that is expressed, e.g., by Umāsvāmin in the *Tattvârtha-sūtra*: 'The correct cognition, correct conation and correct conduct are the path to liberation.'[21] He also indicates a hierarchy of the three gems: the correct conduct is subordinate to both correct cognition and correct conation, which are treated by Kundakunda as prerequisites for the correct conduct.[22]

The purpose expressed in E 8 complements E 2b, viz. laudable qualities (*dhoda-ghāi-kamma-malaṁ*) possessed by the object of veneration,

---

If Satkari Mookerjee and Nathmal Tatia render the passage as 'The author of the aphorisms *has performed the auspicious ceremony of salutation* [italics – P.B.] of the (five exalted beings called) *parameṣṭhins*, but he does not propose to incorporate it in the work for consideration of economy (of labour)' (PMīV$_2$, p. 3 of the translation portion), it is only in the sense of verbal expression of eulogy that the italicised passage of the translation should be understood, not in the sense of some ritual that entails additional acts and that preceded the composition of the work.

[21] TS 1.1: *samyag-darśana-jñāna-cāritrāṇi mokṣa-mārgaḥ.*

[22] There was an ongoing discussion among various Jaina thinkers as to which of the three gems had to be given priority or whether all of them are equally important, cf. Tatia (1951: 147-155).

and thus voices a promise of future liberation, being the ultimate purpose for all the Jainas. The difference between the two lies in the fact that E 8 indicates that one has indeed entered into the path that leads to the final goal. Furthermore, element E 2b, especially when supplemented with E 8, contains a clear reference that for a practitioner, and only for a practitioner, there exists a method to verify the veracity of the teachings of the *tīrthaṁ-kara*s: by following the Jinas' instructions one may in the end achieve the same goal. That likelihood that the devotee may attain the promised results confers special authority to the *tīrthaṁ-kara*s as spiritual guides in his eyes. This is, however, very different from an approach when one subjects the teaching to independent critical test.

An analysis of the structure of the argument above reveals that there is some serious circularity involved. On the one hand, praiseworthiness of spiritual guides is an immediate corollary of their authority as 'ford-makers' who demonstrate the correct path of conduct: its veracity relies on its applicability and verifiability through practice of what the teacher imparts. On the other hand, one adopts the indicated path precisely because one considers it justified to give credit to the guide's teaching. In other words, whether one enters the practical path depends on one's belief in the authority and truthfulness of the spiritual guides. Clearly, Kundakunda was not a logician or a consistent analytic philosopher and the logical incongruity was not his concern. The problem of circularity would be inconsequential in case one already was a believer who would not question religious tenets. For that reason the inconsistency did not matter because the recipients of the works were Jaina believers. If the addressees were non-believers whom Kundakunda's work was supposed to convince and win, the argument would be unavailing. That explains why Kundakunda's works are, in general, not polemical in character.

To recapitulate, the circularity confirms that the attitude of the author does not contain any encouragement to question the authority of the Jinas, instead he merely urges fellow believers to follow the path uncritically.

3.1. Historically more or less contemporaneous with the nucleus of Kundakunda's writings was Umāsvāmin, the author of the *Tattvârtha-*

sūtra, whose authorship and dating are still debatable.[23] There seems to be no originally preserved introductory section of TS. Depending on the commentary, the *sūtra*s are preceded by some *maṅgala* variants, probably composed by the commentators themselves.

In the Śvetāmbara version of Umāsvāmin's work[24] the elaborate *maṅgala* stanzas—probably composed by Umāsvāti[25], the author of the *Tattvârthâdhigama-bhāṣya*—comprise several of the 31 initial summary verses (*sambandha-kārikā*), which state that the author's purpose is to describe the path to liberation (*kā* 31d), of which I shall cite only a sample:

---

[23] There have been a number of various opinions as regards the dating of the *Tattvârtha-sūtra*: around *Vīra Saṁvat* 714-798 (e. c. 135-219 C.E.) according the Digambara *paṭṭāvalī* list of teachers (see J. L. JAINI (1920: „Introduction") and WINTERNITZ (1987: II: 555)); between 1-85 C.E. (S. DASGUPTA (1975: I: 171) and S. CH. VIDYĀBHŪṢAṆA (1920: 8); between 150-350 C.E. (J. BRONKHORST (1985: 178)); between 1st and 3rd/4th centuries, but certainly before 5th century (SUKHLAL (1974: 24)); between 350-400, but in any case before 550 C.E. (JACOBI (1906: 288-289), ZYDENBOS (1983: 12)); in 5th century (R. WILLIAMS (1963: 1)) or at the end of 5th century (S. OHIRA (1982: 137)). However, when we take into consideration the structure of the text, simplicity of lucid Sanskrit, a moderate level of philosophical depth, clear influence of ideas present in the *Nyāya-sūtra* (but not in the *Nyāya-bhāṣya*), no reference to later philosophical ideas, we can assign Umāsvāmin's *Tattvârtha-sūtra* to c. 350-400, and Umāsvāti's *Tattvârthâdhigama-bhāṣya* to c. 400-450 (there are strong reasons to believe that the *Bhāṣya* was written by a different person than Umāsvāmin, the author of TS). The upper limit for the *Tattvârthâdhigama-bhāṣya* is the Council of Valabhī (between 450-480; traditionally in *Vīra Saṁvat* 980 or 993, i.e. in 453 or 466 C.E.), presided over by Devarddhi-gaṇin Kṣamā-śramaṇa, where the Śvetāmbara Canon was finally codified (TBh 1.20 reflects an earlier list of the Canonical works).

[24] For the Digambara version see § 4.

[25] The style of the *sambandha-kārikā*s resembles that of the *Bhāṣya*. In addition to that, there are some stylistic devices in the *kārikā*s typical of the prose style of the *Bhāṣya*, e.g. the frequent use of gerundives (e.g. *kā*s 8, 15, 28, etc.) or ablatives of mode that describe their manner of teaching (e.g. *samāsato vyāsataś ca* in *kā* 28, that are evocative of such phrases as *purastāl lakṣaṇato vidhānataś ca vistareṇa* common to the *Bhāṣya*, e.g. TBh 1.1). The subcommentary by Devagupta-sūri and Siddhasena-gaṇin treats the verses as a part of *Bhāṣya*, see TṬ, I: p. 20.15: *sa câyaṁ bhāṣya-kārikābhiḥ prakāśyate*. Cf. also OHIRA (1982: 29-30).

> ‘[1] The one who attains [correct] cognition—purified through correct conation—[which amounts to] nothing but indifference achieves a blissful new life, even though it were occasioned by suffering. … [6] However, such a person—although he has accomplished his [own] goal—instructs others of the highest moral law, having [first] attained [it himself], is indeed most worthy of incessant worship as the best among the best ones. … [10] Just as the sun illuminates the world merely because it has such a nature, in the same way the maker of the passage (*tīrthaṁ-kara*) engages himself in order to set the passage (*sc.* the path to liberation) in motion, [because it has such a nature]. … [21] Having become purified with respect to the three instruments [of the body, speech and mind], [I] render homage to this supreme seer, worthy of worship, the venerable victor, whose delusion has disappeared. [22] I will teach this simple work called “On the understanding of reality”, which is a compendium, [characterised by a] comprehensive subject matter, of [just] one portion of the teaching of the saints, is beneficial to the disciples. [26] The one who is willing to adopt the teaching of the Jina, the meaning of which [is laid down] in numerous books, will strive to surpass the sun which [conquers] darkness (confusion) with daystar rays. [31] And, in this whole world, there is no other (sc. better) teaching on the wholesome except the path to liberation. Therefore, I will demonstrate the path to liberation, because only it is the highest (sc. most wholesome).’[26]

This lengthy passage contains all the elements of a standard *maṅgala* already mentioned: the act of salutation E 1 (*kā* 21: *parama-ṛṣaye*

---

[26] *samyag-darśana-śuddhaṁ yo jñānaṁ viratim eva câpnoti* ।
duḥkha-nimittam apîdaṁ tena sulabdhaṁ bhavati janma ॥ 1 ॥
yas tu kṛtârtho ’py uttamam avāpya dharmaṁ parebhya upadiśati ।
nityaṁ sa uttamebhyo ’py uttama iti pūjyatama eva ॥ 6 ॥
tat-svābhāvyād eva prakāśayati bhāskaro yathā lokam ।
tīrtha-pravartanāya pravartate tīrtha-kara evam ॥ 10 ॥
kṛtvā tri-karaṇa-śuddhaṁ tasmai parama-ṛṣaye namas-kāram ।
pūjyatamāya bhagavate vīrāya vilīna-mohāya ॥ 21 ॥
tattvârthâdhigamâkhyaṁ bahv-arthaṁ saṅgrahaṁ laghu-grantham ।
vakṣyāmi śiṣya-hitam imam arhad-vacanaika-deśasya ॥ 22 ॥
khadyota-prabhābhiḥ so ’bhibubhūṣec ca bhāskaraṁ mohāt ।
yo ’timahā-granthârthaṁ jina-vacanaṁ sa jighṛkṣeta ॥ 26 ॥
narte ca mokṣa-mārgād dhitôpadeśo ’sti jagati kṛtsne ’smin ।
tasmāt param imam evêti mokṣa-mārgaṁ pravakṣyāmi ॥ 31 ॥ TS$_{\text{śvet}}$, p. 1-3

namas-kāram, etc.) and its object E 2a along with his numerous qualities E 2b and a justification why the supreme being is worthy of worship (*kā* 6, *kā* 7ab: *tasmāt arhati pūjām arhann evôttamôttamo loke*, *kā* 8: *tat-pūjanaṁ nyāyyam*, etc.), the design to teach E 3 (*kā* 22: *laghu-grantham vakṣyāmi*, *kā* 31d: *mokṣa-margaṁ pravakṣyāmi*), a very detailed description of the subject matter E 4 (most of the *sambandha-kārikā*s), which goes back to *jina-vacana* (*kā* 26, 27, 28) as its source E 5, an allusion that also other beings worship the *tīrthaṁ-kara*s (*kā* 7cd, *kā* 27), a reference to Umāsvāti's own personal practice (*kā* 21) as a precondition of his purity of mind and understanding. Finally—which is a historical innovation in Jaina philosophical literature—there is an explicit mention of

E 9 the ultimate final goal (*mokṣa*), or purpose of the teaching, that one is hoped ultimately to achieve through the study of this work, the addressee being the disciples (*kā* 22c: *śiṣya-hitam imam*; *kā* 26; *kā*s 28-30).

Umāsvāti makes it explicit that the teaching, the eventual purpose of which is liberation, is meant to uplift both the teacher himself and the disciples on the path to perfection (30cd: *ātmānaṁ ca paraṁ ca*). Such an outspoken formulation of the purpose of the work is indeed a new quality when compared with Kundakunda's works the *incipit*s of which belong to a decidedly earlier period.

The *maṅgalâcaraṇa* contains also an explicit mention of a practice of *pūjā* recommended to worship the *tīrthaṁ-kara*s, although the treatise is not regarded by Umāsvāti as a performance of a *pūjā* or any other kind of ritual, in contrast to Kundakunda's *Pavayaṇa-sāra*. Also in contradistinction to the *Pavayaṇa-sāra*, there is no—even indirect—reference to the *Pañca-namas-kāra-mantra* nor to all other supreme beings of the *Pañca-parameṣṭhi-stuti*, except for the *tīrthaṁ-karas*[27]. That must have been a deliberate choice in view of the extent of the introductory section, which among its 31 verses could easily include an invocation to the remaining Supreme Beings of the *Stuti*.

One more verse that calls for attention is the very first one which demonstrates not only the author's salvific concern which sets liberation as an ultimate aim, that could appeal only to the monastic community, but—in parallel to the *Vaiśeṣika-sūtra* which sets two goals of human existence[28]—it also caters to lay followers by admitting that a blissful birth (*sulabdhaṁ janma*) is not only commendable in itself but is also given proper consideration by the author of the manual. When compared to earlier texts, that seems to be a departure from their preoccupation with the means of attaining liberation, and may be interpreted as acknowledging the aspirations of and the role played by the lay community. This two-tier ideal will hold valid for centuries to come, up to the present day, as Siddharṣi-gaṇin (10th c.) would explain: 'The [purpose of the treatise] pertinent to the ultimate truth [is] the attainment of [either] prosperity in the afterlife or of ultimate deliverance.'[29] Most interestingly, this mundane goal is mentioned by Umāsvāti first.

---

[27] The term *arhant* occurs in *kā* 22, but what it means is clearly *jina*, insofar as it occurs in the context of the teaching promulgated the saints (liberated beings), and the phrase *arhad-vacana* must be understood as *jina-vacana*.

3.2. Umāsvāti is maintained by the Śvetāmbara tradition to have composed also *The Treatise on the Delight of Tranquillity* (*Praśama-rati-prakaraṇa*, PRP) in verse, introduced with a separate chapter of 23 *kārikā*s.

Despite the often repeated claim that there is close ideological similarity between PRP and TBh,[30] a closer examination of both introductory sections of PRP and TBh would demonstrate that, at least in the case of the respective *maṅgalâcaraṇa*s of TBh and PRP, there is no irrefutable proof in support of a common authorship. On the contrary, there are some reasons to doubt it. Both introductions differ in general approach and outline: the author of PRP is extremely humble and modest, emphasising throughout his inadequate intellectual potential and weaknesses (see esp. *kā* 2, 5-6, 8-13). We do not really find anything similar to this attitude in TBh, whose author merely declares his purpose. The *maṅgala* of TBh refers to the ultimate goal or reality (*paramârtha*; *kā*s 2, 3), whereas this crucial expression is absent from PRP. The *maṅgala* of PRP does not at all mention the path to liberation (*mokṣa*, *niḥśreyasa*)—which is the gist of TBh (e.g. *kā*s 5, 8, 16, 17, 26, 31a, 31d)—by name as its goal, but instead, it merely speaks of passionlessness (*vairāgya*) along a range of its synonyms (e.g. *kā* 16, 17), as the opposite of desire (*rāga*: *kā* 18, 20-23) and aversion (*dveṣa*: *kā* 19, 20-23), as well as a path to passionlessness (*kā* 7: *virāga-mārga*, kā 15: *virāga-vārtā-hetuḥ*). Even in the context of inner tranquillity one would expect a reference to the ultimate goal being liberation. Interestingly, in the *maṅgala* of TBh we have no trace of any synonym of *vairāgya*. Both *maṅgalâcaraṇa*s display preference for a different range of expressions to describe 'the teaching of the Jinas', which basically do not overlap: the author of PRP speaks mostly of *jina-śāsana* (*kā* 2), *sarva-jña-śāsana* (*kā* 3) and only once of *jina-vacana* (*kā* 5), whereas the author of TBh speaks generally of *jina-vacana* (23, 25, 26, 27, 28) and *arhad-vacana* (22). The idea of passions (*kaṣāya*), mentioned in PRP a few times, which closely relates to the idea of *karman*, does not occur in TBh at all. Instead, the author of TBh uses rather untypical term *karma-kleśa* (*kā* 2a, 2c). All this would speak against common authorship of both *maṅgalâcaraṇa*s. One would expect some overlapping in terminology and expressions in view of the fact that the goals of these two works are related: one cannot separate the issue of *vairāgya* from *mokṣa*. That seemingly obvious link between passionlessness and desire to attain liberation, albeit surprisingly absent in the introductory section of PRP, is noticed by Haribhadra (12th century)[31] commenting on the title of the work[32] and ultimate purpose of the teaching[33]. Furthermore, PRP does display a peculiar stylistic feature which is not found in TBh, viz. the use of *yad-vat … tad-vat* in relative sentences (PRP 13, 14) to express comparison, on par with *yathā … tathā*.

---

[28] VS(C) 1.1.2: *yato 'bhyudaya-niḥśreyasa-siddhiḥ sa dharmaḥ*.—'Moral law is that through which one attains mundane prosperity or ultimate deliverance.'

[29] NAV 0.5: *pāramārthikaṁ abhyudaya-niḥśreyasâvāptir iti.*

[30] See Yajneshwar S. Shastri's introduction to PRP_2. p. 38.

On the other hand, there are at least two features which one could theoretically cite in support of common authorship. First, in both cases the author(s) display(s) an extreme liking for lists and classifications (PRP 18, 19, 20-23 and TBh 19, 21, 22). That is, however, nothing unusual in Jaina literature which abounds in numberings and taxonomies. Another common stylistic feature is the frequent use of gerundives as predicates: TBh 6 (*pūjyatamaḥ*), TBh 8 (*nyāyyam*), TBh 20 (*anabhibhavanīyam*), TBh 28 (*grāhyaṁ*, *dhāryaṁ*, *vācyaṁ*), TBh

---

[31] He might be different from Haribhadra-sūri III, the author of *Nemināha-cariya* (1160 CE), see Yajneshwar S. Shastri's introduction to PRP$_2$. p. 9. He is certainly different from Haribhadra-sūri Virahāṅka (first half of 6th century), the author of the *Pañcâśaka* and *Pañca-vastuka*, and from most prolific of all the Haribhadras, Haribhadra-sūri Yākinī-putra (8th century), the author of the *Anekānta-jaya-patākā*, *Ṣaḍ-darśana-samuccaya* etc.

[32] PRṬ 2, p. 4.11-12: *praśama-ratau kathaṁ nāma sthiro mumukṣur bhavyaḥ syād ity ato vakṣye prakaraṇam.*

[33] PRṬ 12, p. 12.7-8: *puṣṭir upacayo jñāna-darśana-cāritrāṇām. tad-upacayāc ca karma-nirjaraṇam, tato mokṣa iti nâsti kaścid doṣaḥ.*

30 (*upadeṣṭavyam*), and PRP 14 (*anuyojyam*), PRP 15 (*cintyam*), PRP 16 (*kāryaḥ*). Again this element is nothing peculiar so as to speak in support of common authorship of TBh and PRP.

As for the structure of the initial verses of PRP, the main elements seem to be contained in the following passages:

> '[1] [All] the twenty-four Jinas, from Ṛṣabha up to the son of Siddhārtha (*sc*. Mahāvīra), [who reached] their final body and know the precepts of moral law, are victorious. [2] Having bowed respectfully before the Jinas, perfected beings, community instructors and spiritual guides as well as before all the monks, I will teach a small portion (lit. 'something') of the Jinas' teaching for the sake of the perseverance [aimed at achieving] the delight derived from tranquillity [as a result of asceticism]. … [5] A number of manuals of the system that gives rise to tranquillity have been imparted earlier by numerous teachers foremost among the seers (sc. *gaṇa-dhara*s) of great insight, who have crossed the ocean of the Jinas' teaching. [6] A few grains were scattered by them, in the form of statements [constituting] the testimony, which were based on [Mahāvīra's] sermons; and thanks to the uninterrupted tradition they [survive] as remains. I have [first] collected [them] like a niggard, [and then]… [7] this [work] the single subject matter of which is the path to detachment has been composed, due to desirability of tranquillity [which detachment gives], by me with [the help of] my own intellectual potential, which is both clouded and limited, albeit stimulated by my devotion to the [testimony of the Jinas].'[34]

Out of the elements characteristic of a *maṅgalâcaraṇa* mentioned so far, the ones that are instantiated here are E 1 up to E 5, E 8 and E

---

[34] *nābheyâdyāḥ siddhārtha-rāja-sūnu-caramāś carama-dehāḥ* ।
pañca-nava-daśa ca daśa-vidha-dharma-vidhi-vido jayanti jināḥ ॥ 1 ॥
jina-siddhâcāryôpādhyāyān praṇipatya sarva-sadhūṁś ca ।
praśama-rati-sthairyârthaṁ vakṣye jina-śāsanāt kiṁcit ॥ 2 ॥ […]
bahubhir jina-vacanârṇava-pāragataiḥ kavi-vṛṣair mahā-matibhir ।
pūrvam anekāḥ prathitāḥ praśama-janana-śāstra-paddhatayaḥ ॥ 5 ॥
tābhyo vistṛtāḥ śruta-vāk-pulākikāḥ pravacanâśritāḥ kāścit ।
pāramparyād uccheṣikāḥ kṛpaṇakena saṁhṛtya ॥ 6 ॥
tad-bhakti-balârpitayā mayâpy avimalâlpayā sva-mati-śaktyā ।
praśamêṣṭatayânusṛtā virāga-mārgaikapadikêyam ॥ 7 ॥ PRP

9 (here the immediate purpose being tranquillity, *praśama* = *vairāgya*, not liberation), whereas the missing elements are two: E 6 and E 7 (the author merely refers to his respectful approach and modesty, but does not mention any element of his monastic career or spiritual practice).

As it was the case with Kundakunda's *Pavayaṇa-sāra*, unlike the *Tattvârthâdhigama-bhāṣya*, the element E 2a is extended in PRP 2 to comprise all the five supreme beings of the *Pañca-parameṣṭhi-stuti*. That aspect is highlighted by the commentator Haribhadra in his *Ṭīkā* (PRṬ, p. 3.9-17). Two different objects of both eulogies may also speak against the common authorship of both *maṅgala*s.

On a few occasions Umāsvāti mentions other works (esp. PRP 5) in a deferential manner as a source of his work, placing himself in the line of tradition initiated by Mahāvīra and descended to him via Mahāvīra's immediate disciples (*gaṇa-dhara*); thus, like his predecessors, he indicates the source of his teaching (E 5):

> 'The themes[35] which were expounded by the Tīrthaṁkāra (sc. Mahāvīra) and then captured by his immediate [disciples (sc. *gaṇa-dhara*s)], found their recapitulation in manifold manner [in various works] that acts only for the sake of spiritual growth.'[36]

For that reason, also PRP is supposed to serve the spiritual growth (*puṣṭi*), which is the purpose of the treatise E 8.

Most importantly, neither in PRP nor in any other work mentioned so far do we find any polemical remark, any reference to logical argument or any justification why the author had undertaken to compose his work that could serve as a justification of his actions also to a non-Jaina. In other words, all the *incipit*s mentioned so far confirm that the recipients of these works were primarily thought to be persons who would question neither the raison d'être of these works nor the religious motivation of their authors. I would take it to mirror the historical context in which these works were composed. That will change with the subsequent commentary on the *Tattvârtha-sūtra*.

---

[35] Haribhadra in PRṬ, p. 12.5, would like to take *bhāvāḥ* in the sense of 'entities' or 'categories': *bhāvāḥ iti jīvâdayaḥ padârthāḥ*.

[36] *ye tīrtha-kṛt-praṇītā bhāvās tad-anantaraiś ca parikathitāḥ* ।
teṣāṁ bahuśo 'py anukīrtanaṁ bhavati puṣṭi-karam eva ॥ PRP 1.12

4. Another introductory verse alleged to be a part of the *Tattvârtha-sūtra* is found in Digambara sources. It is found in the *Sarvârtha-siddhi*, a commentary by Pūjyapāda Devanandin (first half of the 6th century), for the first time:

> ‘I salute to the guide [who reveals] the path to liberation, the conqueror of the mountains of *karman*, the knower of all the categories, for the sake of attaining his qualities.’[37]

There is much evidence to support the thesis that the *kārikā* did not originally belong to TS, even though in a late commentary called the *Tattvârtha-vṛtti* (also known as *Tattvârtha-dīpikā*) on TS, Śrutasāgara-sūri (Vikrama Saṁvat 1552 = 1495 C.E.) takes it to be a part of TS. The author comments on it as if it were a genuine opening verse to TS, and introduces it with words: *bhagavān* (i.e. Umāsvāmin) *api tat praśna-vaśāt* “*samyag-darśana-jñāna-cāritra-lakṣaṇôpalakṣita-san-mārga-samprāpyo mokṣo hitaḥ*” *iti pratipādayitu-kāma iṣṭa-devatā-viśeṣaṁ namas-karoti*. On the other hand, Akalaṅka—who lived a few centuries earlier—in his commentary *Tattvârtha-vārttika* (RVār) does not mention this verse at all. Furthermore, if the verse were a genuine part of TS, it should also have been preserved as such in Śvetāmbara sources, even as being incorporated there as one of the thirty-one *sambandha-kārikā*s found in TS$_{\text{śvet}}$. In addition to that, since Pūjyapāda Devanandin does not have any other verse to open his commentary, although he closes his work by a colophon of three verses, it would be rather surprising to assume that the above *maṅgala* verse belonged to TS and SSi had no (versified or other) opening at all. One should, therefore, conclude that the author of the verse is Pūjyapāda Devanandin himself.

The verse in Digambara recension contains only some elements typical of a *maṅgalâcaraṇa*: the act of salutation (E 1) along with he reverenced object (E 2a), including his laudable qualities (E 2b), as well as the goal (E 9). There is a potential ambiguity hidden in the phrase ‘for the sake of attaining his qualities’, i.e. whether we should understand the compound *tad-guṇa-labdhaye* as ‘so that one attains Mahāvīra’s qualities’ or ‘so that I attain Mahāvīra’s qualities’. For Umāsvāti (see § 3.1), the teaching clearly served both purposes: that of himself and that of his disciples. What is meant here is, as Pūjyapāda Devanandin states in his commentary (*para-hita-pratipādanaika-kāryam*), that the teaching serves primarily the liberation of the Jina's disciples, among whose rank also the author should be included.

---

[37] *mokṣa-mārgasya netaraṁ bhettāraṁ karma-bhū-bhṛtām* ।
jñātāraṁ viśva-tattvānāṁ vande tad-guṇa-labdhaye ॥ SSi, p. 1

Devanandin's subsequent prose explanation of the context of the *maṅgala* verse is also of much interest:

> 'A certain person capable of attaining liberation, who finds himself in the proximity, endowed with a sense of judgement, who wishes to obtain his own well-being, apt to [demonstrate genuine] argumentation and scriptures, respectfully approached the most eminent instructor (sc. Mahāvīra) among the ascetics, who is honoured as the Venerable One, whose sole [selfless] duty is to teach for the sake of the well-being of others, who was [just] describing the path to liberation [merely] through his own wonderful appearance with voiceless emission of sound (i.e. without any words), as if turned into a statue seated in the assembly of monks (i.e. *samavasaraṇa*) in a certain hermitage, a secluded [and] most pleasing place where beings capable of attaining liberation [practice] austerities. [Then], in compliance with the monastic code of behaviour, he asked [him] as follows: "O Lord, what would be unmistakably [most] wholesome for my self (soul)?" [Mahāvīra] said: "Liberation". The same [person] asked again: "What is the nature of liberation? What is the means to obtain it?"[38] The instructor [Mahāvīra] replied: "Liberation is another state, [different from mundane existence], of the soul, freed from the body, with [all] blemishes of dirt [in the form] of *karman* completely erased, [a state that is characterised by] such inconceivable natural qualities as [perfect] cognition etc. and [is characterised by] happiness free of any affliction [and] supreme.'[39]

---

[38] Interestingly, these two elements correspond to the third and fourth Noble Truths of Buddhism (*duḥkha-nirodhaḥ*, *duḥkha-nirodha-gāminī pratipad*).

[39] SSi § 1, p. 1: *kaścid bhavyaḥ pratyāsanna-niṣṭhaḥ prajñāvān sva-hitam upalipsur vivikte parama-ramye bhavya-sattva-viśrāmâspade kvacid āśrama-pade muni-pariṣan-madhye saṁniṣaṇṇaṁ mūrtam iva mokṣa-mārgam avāg-visargaṁ vapuṣā nirūpayantaṁ yukty-āgama-kuśalaṁ para-hita-pratipādanaika-kāryam ārya-niṣevyaṁ nigranthâcārya-varyam upasadya savinayaṁ paripṛcchati sma. bhagavan, kiṁ nu khalu ātmane hitaṁ syād iti? sa āha mokṣa iti. sa eva punaḥ pratyāha—kiṁ-svarūpo 'sau mokṣaḥ kaś câsya prāpty-upāya iti? ācārya āha—niravaśeṣa-nirākṛta-karma-mala-kalaṅkasyâśarīrasyâtmano 'cintya-svābhāvika-jñānâdi-guṇaṁ avyā-*

The story is a direct reference to a belief, widespread among the Digambaras but not among the Śvetāmbaras, that Mahāvīra after he had destroyed all the *karman* and obtained omniscience remained motionless and taught the mankind by emitting a divine sound (*divya-dhvani*), miraculously understood by his first disciples (*gaṇa-dhara*), while being surrounded by an assembly traditionally called *samavasaraṇa* / *samosaraṇa*[40]. In this way we are made to believe, by implication, that Devanandin's commentary is claimed to be based on the teaching imparted by Mahāvīra to that curious person who had happened to be in his proximity and who had handed it down in a succession of teachers directly to Devanandin. Accordingly, he justifies his right and authority to compose his work by indicating a source of his teaching (E 5): it is the authority of Mahāvīra that directly lends legitimacy to the *Sarvârtha-siddhi*.

Subsequently, Devanandin explains why the idea of liberation should be demonstrated in detail:

> '[§ 2] Since this [state of liberation] is directly imperceptible in an absolute manner, therefore persons in the state of bondage who are orators and who consider themselves ford-makers (sc. spiritual guides) [falsely] conceive of its nature completely differently in an account, based on fallacious argumentation, that does not [even] touch [its nature]. … In what follows we shall teach its correct nature. [§ 3] These [persons] disagree also as regards the means to attain this [state of liberation]…'[41]

---

bādha-sukham ātyantikam avasthântaraṁ mokṣa iti. This passage is recounted by Śrutasāgara-sūri in the beginning of the *Tattvârtha-vṛtti*, TV, p. 5-11.

[40] Cf. respective informative entries in JSK *divya-dhvani* (JSK, II: 430-433) and *samavasaraṇa* (JSK, IV: 329-334). On *samavasaraṇa* see also Folkert (1993: 147-152, 287-294). An extensive account of such an event in the centre of which is Ṛṣabha is found e.g. in ĀP(J) 22.76-312 (pp. 513-538). A similar event during which Mahāvīra, 'with the divine sound, narrated the meaning of the scripture' is mentioned in ṢKhĀ 1.1.1, *gāthā* 60d (p. 65): *divva-jjhuṇī kahei suttaṭṭhaṁ* ॥ .

[41] SSi § 2-3, p. 1-2: *tasyâtyanta-parokṣatvāc chadma-sthāḥ pravādinas tīrtha-kara-manyās tasya svarūpam aspṛśantībhir vāgbhir yukty-ābhāsa-nibandhanābhir anyathaiva parikalpayanti … tasya svarūpam anavadyam uttaratra vakṣyāmaḥ. tat-prāpty-upāyaṁ praty api te visaṁvadante ….*

Clearly, difference of opinions is generally regarded as one of the sources of doubt[42], which calls for some kind of elucidation and investigation. The importance of this passage—in which Devanandin also refers to various opinions on the matter of the Vaiśeṣika, Sāṁkhya-Yoga and Buddhist traditions—lies in the fact that it is for the first time in Jaina philosophical literature, it seems, that additional explanation is offered why liberation, being the ultimate goal, stands in need of closer description, the reason being a variance of opinions and existence of wrong beliefs on the subject.

This innovation marks a shift that reflects the reality of debates with rival schools of philosophy and the author's engagement in such debates. From now on Jaina thinkers will no longer direct their works to Jaina addressees only, but they will, with a polemical vein, expect also rivals to read them. Accordingly we are justified, I believe, in claiming that the *maṅgalâcaraṇa* contains two new elements, although related to each other:

E 10 the context of doubt that urges one to philosophical investigation,

and

E 11a a rationale why the task to write the book is justified in itself, apart from serving the attainment of an ultimate goal (*mokṣa*, E 9).

In this way, the contents of the exposition reveals a new phase Jaina philosophical texts entered: that of openly polemical discussion.

The rationale formulated in such a way reveals predominantly a desire to expel all doubts as regards the true nature and to establish the tenets of Jainism, but it does not express any negative, critical aspiration to refute other doctrines (E 11b, see p. 50).

---

[42] See NBh 1.1.23 (p. 25.18-26): *vipratipatter iti. vyāhatam ekârtha-darśanaṁ vipratipattiḥ, vyāghāto virodho 'saha-bhāva iti. asty ātma ity ekaṁ darśanaṁ, nâsty ātma ity aparam, na ca sadbhāvâsadbhāvau sahaikatra sambhavataḥ. na cânyatara-sādhako hetur upalabhyate. tatra tattvânavadhāraṇaṁ saṁśaya iti.*—'[Doubt arises also] due to difference of opinion. Difference of opinion [means] conflicting views about one and the same thing, [which in turn means] inconsistency, contradiction or impossibility of concurrence, e.g. one view is "The soul exists", and the other is "The soul does not exist". It is impossible [to assert] both existence and non-existence with respect to one [and the same thing]. And the logical reason to prove either [view] is not available. Therefore, the impossibility to determine the truth is doubt.'

5. Interestingly, a remark evoking a picture of similar gathering is found in Siddhasena Divākara's *Saṁmati-tarka-prakaraṇa*, a work composed prior to Diṅnāga[43]:

> '[1] The teaching of the Jinas, who have attained a condition of unsurpassable happiness [and] are victors over transmigratory birth, is well established, [it occupies] firm position [and] corrects wrong doctrinal points. [2] Just as [there is] someone who is listening to the gathering of the people who convey (sc. the *gaṇa-dhara*s) the expanse of the ultimate truth of the main doctrinal points [but, at the same time, he] is one whose [inert] heart is like a hub [covered] with dirt with respect to the scriptures, to him I will teach the goal. [3] Elementary analysis of the extent of collective and particular [aspects contained] in the sermons of the ford-makers [is divided into] the substance-expressive [viewpoint] as well as the modal viewpoint. The remaining [viewpoints] are [just] variations.'[44]

The technical term *pajjuvāsaṇa* (Skt. *paryupāsana*) in verse 2, setting a visible example for the believers to follow (E 6), denotes the gathering of congregation leaders (*gaṇa-dhara*) who were Mahāvīra's immediate disciples. They, in their turn, attracted their own disciples, a paragon convert being the one mentioned in the verse who is *āgama-malâra-hiyao*, i.e. with his inner essence, pure by nature and endowed with primordial qualities such as cognitive faculties (*upayoga*), innate energy (*vīrya*) etc. (cf. TS 2.4), obstructed by the dirt of karman, in consequence of which it stands in need of clarification of the contents of the scriptures and the human goal.

---

[43] See: Balcerowicz (2000b) and Balcerowicz (2001b: 369). Saṅghavi–Dośi (2000: 13) assign him to the fifth century *Vikrama Saṁvat*, i.e. fourth/fifth century CE, such an early dating does not take into consideration several ideas that occurred first around the fourth/fifth century CE and are present in STP.

[44] *siddhaṁ siddha-tthāṇaṁ ṭhāṇam aṇovama-suhaṁ uvagayāṇaṁ* ।
ku-samaya-visāsaṇaṁ sāsaṇaṁ jiṇāṇaṁ bhava-jiṇāṇaṁ ॥ 1 ॥
samaya-paramattha-vitthara-vihāḍa-jaṇa-pajjuvāsaṇa-sayanno ।
āgama-malâra-hiyao jaha hoi tam attham unnesuṁ ॥ 2 ॥
tittha-yara-vayaṇa-saṅgaha-visesa-patthāra-mūla-vāgaraṇī ।
davvaṭṭhio ya pajjava-ṇao ya sesā viyappā siṁ ॥ 3 ॥ STP 1.1-3 (pp. 1, 169, 271)
Comp. also the 'translation' of the verses in Saṅghavi–Dośi (2000: 1 ff.); the very detached character of the paraphrase in English renders the work practically useless.

In a statement of his design to teach (E 3), Siddhasena likens his role to that of the *gaṇa-dhara*s and indicates both the subject matter of the teaching (E 4), i.e. the contents of the *Āgama*s, which are at the same time the source of his teaching (E 5). The simile implies that the author is personally engaged in the same spiritual career and practice as the *gaṇa-dhara*s (E 7) with the goal to achieve liberation (E 8). Although the act of salutation as such is not explicitly stated, for instance with such expressions as *namaḥ*, *namas-kāram*, *vande* etc., nonetheless it is implied through the context which mentions the object of salutation (E 2a) along with the laudable qualities (E 2b). Although the mention of the laudable qualities of the Jina as an ideal of the spiritual path may also connote the ultimate goal (*mokṣa*) of the teaching (E 9), that goal is separately mentioned in verse 2 (*tam attham unnesuṁ*). However, there is no mention of any additional, non-salvific rationale why the task to write the book has been undertaken (E 11). Further, the condensed *incipit* is polemical in its character inasmuch as, in verse 1, it claims on the one hand the Jina's teaching to be well-founded (*siddhaṁ siddha-ṭṭhāṇaṁ*) and, on the other hand, that it rectifies wrong views (*ku-samaya-visāsaṇaṁ*). The ideas do not assume, however, an argumentative structure of a proof formula (E 14, see below, p. 49). Last but not least, the *incipit* introduces the reader to

E 12 the strictly philosophical content of the work, as a formulation of Jaina dogmatics,

insofar as the theory of viewpoints, that bifurcate into two main headings, consists of an underlying structure of Siddhasena's philosophical enterprise.

6. A Śvetāmbara work of momentous philosophical significance, that can be assigned to the second half of the sixth century (post-Diṅnāgan, pre-Dharmakīrtian), is *The Wheel of Viewpoints which has Twelve Spokes* (*Dvādaśâra-naya-cakra*) of Mallavādin Kṣamāśramaṇa, the opening of which reads as follows:

> 'Jaina teaching pervades [everything], is well-founded, infinite, although with a limit (or: with a final goal), laid down for the sake of incisiveness of thoughts, not for the sake of confoundment; it is a firm support to transcend the profusion of [frag-

mentary] causal explanations of the world[45]; having gone beyond [one-sided] statements, it is governed by speech; it is accessible [to everybody, although] it is not accessible in the case of some [people]; [it is so] powerful. This [Jaina teaching] is victorious because of the reference to substance as well as of the modes[46]. Whatever [teaching] possesses such qualities, it is going to be victorious precisely by way of subduing other teachings. What's more, it is exactly the nature of possessing such qualities that should be demonstrated. What exactly is that [thing] which should be demonstrated? The only [thing] that possesses such qualities is the teaching which constitutes a whole [in the form] of an ocean of knowledge, the parts of which are cognitions (sc. viewpoints (*naya*)) in their entirety, because it rests on the procedure based on the rule[47] [of application] of one statement to entities differentiated by means of rules that are designed to [express] opinions of (sc. viewpoints based on) infinite angles such as the dyad of the reference as substance and the reference as modes (sc. substance-expressive and mode-expressive viewpoints) etc.'[48]

---

[45] Lit. 'spread', 'production' (*pratāna*). In my understanding of this awkward compound I *partly* follow Siṁha-sūri's commentary, NĀA *ad loc*., p. 4.8-12: *nanv ata eva sthāṇu-puruṣâdi-viṣaya-saṁśaya-viparyayavad nityânityâdy-ekānta-vikalpâtmakatvād* ***vyāmoha****-hetur api, kāla-niyati-svabhāva-puruṣa-daivêśvara-yadṛcchâdy-ekānta-kāraṇa-vikalpa-****jagat-pratāna-visṛti****-darśanād iti. atrôcyate—****na vyatyāsa-dhīrâspada****tvāt. eka-puruṣa-pitṛ-putratvâdivaj* ***jainaṁ*** *hi* ***śāsanaṁ*** *kālâdi-jagat-prabhedaikānta-gatīn* ***vyatyasya*** *vyāvartya paraspara-virodha-nivāraṇena anekāntâtmaka-pratiṣṭhāna-samādhāna-kāraṇam ekāntâneka-vāda-samāhārâtmakaika-pratipattikaṁ para-mata-niṣedhânumodanābhyām eva*.

[46] The compound *dravyârtha-paryāyataḥ* is an abbreviation for *dravyârtha-paryāyârthataḥ*. That is the way also Siṁha-sūri understands it, see NĀA *ad loc*., p. 6.4: *dravyârtha-paryāyârthâśrayaṇaṁ*. What is meant are the two kinds of viewpoints, viz. substance-expressive and mode-expressive viewpoints; cf. Balcerowicz (2003a, esp. 46 ff.) and Balcerowicz (2003b).

[47] The term *vidhi* in DNC seems to mean 'a rule of application of a statement', or 'a rule that proscribes a certain statement to express a certain meaning / context', and is close to the meaning of *naya* ('viewpoint'); that is the way also Siṁha-sūri understands the term in NĀA 7.16: *evaṁ-vidha-****vikalpôpakḷpta****-naya-jālôpaṣṭambha*°. However, on the ambiguity of the term *vidhi* in DNC see Wezler (2003) and Houben (2007). Compare the use of *vidhi*, as a precondition for a *pramāṇa*, in Samantabhadra's SvSt_1 11.2 = SvSt_2 52:
vidhir viṣakta-pratiṣedha-rūpaḥ pramāṇam atrânyatarat pradhānam ।
guṇo 'paro mukhya-niyāma-hetur nayaḥ sa dṛṣṭānta-samarthanas te ॥

[48] *vyāpy ekastham anantam antavad api nyastam dhiyāṁ pāṭave*
vyāmohe na jagat-pratāna-visṛti-vyatyāsa-dhīrâspadam ।

This *incipit* is indeed a radical departure from all the previous traditions in the spirit of which strictly religious devotion was expressed at the very outset. In DNC we neither find any terms to expressly verbalise the act of salutation (E 1) as a starting point of the undertaking (such as *namas-kāram*, *namaḥ*, *praṇipatya* etc.) nor several other typical elements of a *maṅgalâcaraṇa* (E 3, E 5, E 6, E 7, E 8, E 9). Notably it contains no indication of a source of the teaching that furnishes Mallavādin's work with authority. What is original in his approach is the conviction that

E 13 the legitimacy of Jaina doctrine lies exclusively in a critical examination of arguments.

It is not any more religious belief and irrational trust in the scriptures and the Jina's words that matters but argument, logical consistency and sound reasoning. That is clearly an innovation when assessed against the background of the whole Jaina tradition that preceded Mallavādin.

In no longer containing a direct praise of the founders of Jainism, as it had become a standard procedure in all the texts before, although there is indeed a hidden, roundabout glorification of the Tīrthaṁkaras as the authors of the eulogised teaching, it betrays Mallavādin's predominantly philosophical, and not religious concern.

Alone the structure of the passage reveals its markedly argumentative and polemical character, which is typical of a proof formula (*prayoga*). Interestingly, the object of salutation (E 2a), i.e. the teaching (*jainaṁ śāsanam*), becomes the subject of the thesis: 'the Jaina teaching is victorious' (**jainaṁ śāsanam jayati*), whereas the extensive description (E 2b) of laudable qualities possessed by the object of salutation plays the role of the logical reason: 'it pervades [everything] … [it is so] powerful' (*vyāpy* up to *ūrjitaṁ*). In this manner, the *maṅgalâcaraṇa* rests on

E 14 an argumentative structure of a proof formula (*prayoga*).

---

vācāṁ bhāgam atītya vāg-viniyataṁ gamyaṁ na gamyaṁ kvacij
jainaṁ śāsanam ūrjitaṁ jayati tad dravyârtha-paryāyataḥ ॥
śeṣa-śāsana-nyag-bhāvenaiva jeṣyati tad yad evam-vidham. evam-vidhataiva tu pratipādanīyā. kim eva pratipādyam asti? dravyârtha-paryāyârtha-dvitvâdy-anantânta-vikalpôpakḷpta-vidhi-bheda-padârthaika-vākya-vidhi-vidhānād aśeṣa-jñānâvayavam avabodha-samudrâvayavī-bhūtaṁ śāsanam evam-vidham eva. DNC, p. 1.12-7.2.

There is an additional description of the methodological approach defining Jaina teaching that warrants the validity of the thesis asserting the victorious nature of the teaching: 'because of the reference to substance as well as to the modes' (**dravyârtha-paryāyârthataḥ*). That is followed by the statement of the invariable concomitance (*vyāpti*): 'Whatever teaching possesses such qualities, it is going to be victorious precisely by way of subduing other teachings' (*śeṣa-śāsana-nyag-bhāvenaiva jeṣyati tad yad evam-vidham*), i.e. whatever fulfils the demands defined as E 2b is E 2a. Subsequently Mallavādin articulates the subject matter of his work (E 4): 'it is exactly the nature of possessing such qualities that should be demonstrated' (*evam-vidhataiva tu pratipādanīyā*).

In a concealed manner, the introductory passage contains also a rationale (E 11), independent of any potential salvific goal, why Mallavādin undertook the task of composing DNC. In its dialectical structure, the raison d'être is expressed in the form of doubt, which concerns the general nature of a thing[49]: 'What exactly is that [thing] which should be demonstrated?' (*kim eva pratipādyam asti?*). The occurrence of doubt (E 10) naturally prompts one to undertake steps, in the form of some kind of argumentative enquiry[50], to solve it. And that precisely is Mallavādin's task: to examine and define the character of the Jinas' teaching.

The motivation has a two-fold character, both positive (as it was the case already with SSi, see § 4) and negative:

E 11a positive: by examining Mahāvīra's teaching, it aims at establishing his main doctrinal points,

and, which is a novel feature,

E 11b negative: it aims at establishing the Jaina doctrine by refuting, i.e. 'subduing other teachings' (*śeṣa-śāsana-nyag-bhāvenaiva jeṣyati*); for the purpose of refuting rival doctrines, the author is going to examine a victorious teaching (*evam-vidhataiva tu pratipādanīyā*).

---

[49] A general idea of doubt is described e.g. in NBh 1.1.1 (p. 3.7): *sa câyaṁ kiṁsvid iti vastu-vimarśa-mātram anavadhāraṇaṁ jñānaṁ saṁśayaḥ.*—'"What exactly is this [thing]?"—cognition of such type, which consists in a lack of determination [and] in sheer uncertainty concerning the real thing, is doubt.' Its varieties are discussed in NS/NB 1.1.23.

[50] Cf. NBh 1.1.1 (p. 3.3): *tatra nânupalabdhe na nirṇīte 'rthe nyāyaḥ pravartate kiṁ tarhi saṁśayite 'rthe.*—'As for these [categories], argumentative enquiry proceeds neither with respect to an object which has been [directly] apprehended nor with respect to an object which has been [indirectly] ascertained, but with respect to an object which is doubtful.'

A related issue is to what extent Mallavādin's rationale to compose his work (E 11a,b) has reference to another component frequently encountered in Jaina *maṅgalâcaraṇa*s, that of the ultimate goal (*mokṣa*) to be achieved through a treatise (E 9). As we can see, the phrase 'although with a limit' (*antavad api*)—or rather, more faithfully to its spirit: 'although the Jinas' teaching is endowed with the means to put an end to the worldly existence'—contains a hidden reference to the salvific character of the Jinas' teaching, and therefore, especially in conjunction with the statement that 'it is exactly the nature of possessing such qualities that should be demonstrated' (*evam-vidhataiva tu pratipādanīyā*), it might be taken to express the eventual purpose of the teaching, which is the ultimate final goal (*mokṣa*), in achieving of which DNC is hoped to be contributive. This is not, however, tantamount to saying the DNC directly aspires to teach the means of attaining the ultimate final goal (E 9). In order to see this fine difference, it would prove perhaps useful to distinguish here two levels of reference: the first order description, typical of earlier texts, being an authoritative account of the Jinas' teaching by portraying its doctrinal points (contents) directly, and the second order description, found in DNC, being a characterisation of its structure and method. The *incipit* contains also a reference to one of philosophically most fundamental tenets of Jainism, that of viewpoints (*naya*), of which only two most basic ones are mentioned, viz. the substantial, or substance-expressive (*dravyârthika*) and the modal, or mode-expressive (*paryāyârthika*), well attested in earlier literature[51]. In this way, Mallavādin mentions the pre-eminent, in his opinion, component of Jaina dogmatics (E 12), being the doctrine of the viewpoints (*naya-vāda*), one of the fundaments of the doctrine of multiplexity of reality (*anekânta-vāda*).

---

[51] See for instance in Siddhasena Divākara's work, STP 1.3 (see n. 44), STP 2.1cd: *doṇho vi ṇayāṇa eso paḍekkaṁ attha-pajjāo* ॥ —'This modality of the object [viz. its general and particular aspect] is individually [the contents] for both viewpoints;' STP 3.10ab: *do uṇa ṇayā bahavayā davvaṭṭhiya-pajjavaṭṭiyā niyayā* । —'As a matter of fact, two viewpoints were distinguished by the Lord (the Jina), viz. substantial viewpoint (*dravyārthika*) and modal viewpoint (*paryāyārthika*).'

In addition to that, the element of personal practice (E 7), which we have already encountered with Kundakunda (§ 2.2., p. 33), acquires a new dimension in the above verificative context. For Kundakunda, ‘to take up the lifestyle the underlying basis of which are purified knowledge and conation’ (*visuddha-daṁsaṇa-ṇāṇa-pahāṇâsamaṁ samāsejja*) leads one to a spiritual composure, an important step on the way to liberation. Understood in terms of the monastic practice, it is merely an application of Mahāvīra’s teaching. When Mallavādin maintains that Jaina teaching is accessible to everybody (*gamya*), he no longer expresses an aspect of monastic path, but intimates an idea that the genuineness and validity of the teaching can be practically tested by anyone who embarks on it: its practically applicable but also open to everyone to be (positively) verified.

7.1. Before I proceed to discuss potential factors that may have occasioned that change in approach represented by Mallavādin Kṣamāśramaṇa, I shall first briefly refer to some of the opening verses of Samantabhadra’s works (6th/7th centuries)[52]. The most conspicuous feature of the *incipit*s of his works is a much more pronounced character of an eulogy as such than in all other cases analysed so far, which is due to the *stotra* character of Samantabhadra’s works. Nevertheless, the opening verses of at least the *Āpta-mīmāṁsā* contain some elements common with the *Dvādaśâra-naya-cakra*:

> ‘[1] Such superhuman powers as the adoration [on the part] of divine beings, moving in the sky, fly-whisk service [as a symbol of royal power] etc. are found also in magicians. It is not because of these that you are great in our [eyes]. [2] The divine excellence of the individual form etc., be it internal or external, is something real [found] also in heavenly beings; [however] that [excellence] is found [also] in beings possessed of desire etc. [3] And none of all

---

[52] Depending on relative chronology Samantabhadra is often estimated to have lived around 550 CD, see e.g. Dhaky–Jaina (1998) and Nagin Shah in his ‘Foreword’ to edition $\bar{A}M_2$. Williams (1963: 19) believes Samantabhadra lived around 450. There is no convincing reason to accept Paul Dundas’s claim (2002: 349) pointing to 4th century. There are, however, some serious indications that Samantabhadra may be a contemporary of Dharmakīrti; these are discussed in Balcerowicz (forthcoming: § 3.6. and § 4.2.6.). That issue is going to be dealt with in more detail in a separate paper ‘On the relative chronology of Dharmakīrti and Samantabhadra’.

main doctrinal points [taught] by [various] makers of the passage (sc. religious teachers) possesses authority because they are mutually contradictory. [Therefore] none [of them] could be a [true] preceptor.[53] [4] A complete destruction of defects and karmic veils is possible, because a complete consummation [of the gradual purification process] is [possible], just like a [complete] annihilation of both external and internal blemishes in particular cases with the help of respective causes.[54] [5] Objects that are subtle, concealed [from sight] and distant remain [always] directly perceptible to someone, because they are inferable, just as fire etc. [is inferable from visible smoke]—such a proof of the omniscient [Jina]. [6] Only you, being faultless, are such [an omniscient person], whose statements are contradicted neither by reasoning nor by scriptural testimony.[55] There is no contradiction, [because] what is accepted by you [as a tenet of your teaching] is not sublated by what is well-proven. [7] In the case of those who are alien to the nectar of your thought, who are advocates of the absolutist stand in every respect [and] who are consumed by the self-conceit of [their being] authoritative persons, what is accepted by them [only] is sublated by visible facts.'[56]

---

[53] Here, we should construe *nâsti* in accordance with 'the maxim of a crow's eyeball' (*kākākṣi-golaka-nyāya*), i.e. as operating in two statements: (1) *sarveṣām āptatā nâsti*, and (2) *nâsti kaścid eva bhaved guruḥ*. Such is also the way Akalaṅka takes it, see AṣŚ$_2$: *ata eva na kaścit sarvajña ity uktam*.

[54] For the analysis of the verse, being a formulation of a proof of liberation, and its soteriological implications see Balcerowicz (2005).

[55] That is a feature of a cognitive criterion, cf. NA 1ab: *pramāṇaṁ sva-parâbhāsi jñānaṁ bādha-vivarjitam* ।

[56] *devâgama-nabho-yāna-cāmarâdi-vibhūtayaḥ* ।
māyāviṣv api dṛśyante nâtas tvam asi no mahān ॥ 1 ॥
adhyātmaṁ bahir apy eṣa vigrahâdi-mahodayaḥ ।
divyaḥ satyo divaukasu apy asti rāgâdimatsu saḥ ॥ 2 ॥
tīrtha-kṛt-samayānāṁ ca paraspara-virodhataḥ ।
sarveṣām āptatā nâsti kaścid eva bhaved guruḥ ॥ 3 ॥
doṣâvaraṇayor hānir niḥśeṣâsty atiśāyanāt ।
kvacid yathā sva-hetubhyo bahir antar mala-kṣayaḥ ॥ 4 ॥
sūkṣmântarita-dūrârthāḥ pratyakṣāḥ kasyacid yathā ।
anumeyatvato 'gny-ādir iti sarva-jña-saṁsthitiḥ ॥ 5 ॥
sa tvam evâsi nirdoṣo yukti-śāstrâvirodhi-vāk ।
avirodho yad iṣṭaṁ te prasiddhena na bādhyate ॥ 6 ॥
tvan-matâmṛta-bāhyānāṁ sarvathaikānta-vādinām ।
āptâbhimāna-dagdhānāṁ svêṣṭaṁ dṛṣṭena bādhyate ॥ 7 ॥ ĀMī 1-7

A number of typical *maṅgalâcaraṇa* features are concealed by a poetical form, typical of *bhakti* adoration. Verbalisation of homage constitutes a thoroughgoing framework of the whole *stotra* and it is for that reason that it is hard to distinguish when the opening section ends and the work proper begins. However, it is already in the very first verse with the words *tvam asi no mahān* ('you are great in our [eyes]') that we find both a clear pronouncement of the act of salutation E 1 and indication of the object of salutation E 2a. The passage mentions also various laudable qualities (E 2b) of the *tīrthaṁ-kara*s, although not always unique to them, e.g. 'moving in the sky' (*nabhoyāna*), 'the divine excellence of the individual form etc.' (*vigrahâdi-mahodayaḥ*) etc., as well as refers to 'the adoration [on the part] of divine beings' (*devâgama*) and to 'fly-whisk service' as a symbol of royal power (*cāmara*), two elements of religious practice which set an example for the religious community to follow (E 6). There is also a hint of the subject matter to teach (E 4), explicated in verse 3, which is the description of a true *guru* or authoritative teacher (*āpta*). The same verse also provides the rationale to compose the work (E 11), especially in its negative aspect (E 11b), in view of a general confusion, causing doubt, as regards the definition of an authoritative person as well as in view of a claim of many thinkers to possess such an elevated status. From this follows the author's desire to teach (E 3), although it is not expressed in the first person (e.g. *vakṣyāmi*, *pravakṣyāmi*, *vakṣye*), nor in any other direct way.

Of particular interest are verses 4, 5 and 6, which are constructed as proof formulas (*prayoga*), and even are called as such (*iti sarva-jña-saṁsthitiḥ*), in which they display element E 14 of an argumentative structure. We can easily distinguish the thesis (4: *doṣâvaraṇayor hānir niḥśeṣâsti*; 5: *sūkṣmântarita-dūrârthāḥ pratyakṣāḥ kasyacid*; 6: *sa* [= *sarva-jñaḥ*] *tvam evâsi nirdoṣaḥ*), the logical reason (4: *atiśāyanāt*; 5: *anumeyatvataḥ*; 6: *yukti-śāstrâvirodhi-vāk / avirodhaḥ*, albeit the latter is not expressed in the Ablative) and either the example (4: *yathā mala-kṣayaḥ*; 5: *yathâgny-ādiḥ*) or something that looks like a statement of the invariable concomitance (6: *yad iṣṭaṁ te prasiddhena na bādhyate*), but which actually is supposed to prove the claim that there is no contradiction between Mahāvīra's statements and all available evidence.

The supposed veracity of and lack of contradiction in Mahāvīra's teaching is contrasted with contradictoriness inherent in and vulnerability of rival thinkers spoken of in verse 7, which also expressly mentions the reason for such fundamental flaws: absolutist or one-sided (simplistic) character (*ekānta*) of their teachings. In this way we have an elaborate polemical reasoning which bifurcates into a line or argumentation (verification) to prove the truthfulness of Jaina doctrine and argumentation to disprove (falsification) of countertheses.

In addition to that, from verse 6 it transpires that the Jina is treated as a cognitive criterion (*pramāṇa*), inasmuch as it possesses main characteristics of a *pramāṇa*, such as faultlessness (*nirdoṣa*), lack of contradictoriness (*yukti-śāstrâvirodhi-vāk*, *avirodha*; cf. n. 55) and lack of sublation (*yad iṣṭaṁ te prasiddhena na bādhyate*). Such characterisation of cognitive criterion (*pramāṇa*) partly overlaps with probably the first definition of *pramāṇa* formulated in Jaina tradition by Siddhasena Mahāmati in the *Nyāyâvatāra*: 'The cognitive criterion is the cognition revealing itself and something else [different from it, and it is] free from sublation.'[57] Apart from Samantabhadra's direct reference to the absence of sublation in ĀMī 6, which is a defining element of *pramāṇa*, the aspect of cognitive criterion 'revealing itself and something else' (*sva-parâbhāsin*) is clearly accepted by him as a part of definition of *pramāṇa* both in his *Āpta-mīmāṁsā*[58] as well as in the *Svayambhū-stotra*[59]. Further, other passages in Samantabhadra's works confirm that lack of contradictoriness, mentioned in verse 6, is also considered by him a defining feature of a *pramāṇa*[60].

To recapitulate, such an argumentation laid down in verse 6 clearly describes the Jina as a cognitive criterion (*pramāṇa*) par excellence, albeit he is not called the *pramāṇa* explicitly. Samantabhadra implies the idea indirectly in another verse in which he calls the Jina *pramātṛ*:

> 'You are a bona fide cogniser of all reality, you are the teacher of that which is wholesome [who teaches] the ignorant like a mother

---

[57] NA 1ab: *pramāṇaṁ sva-parâbhāsi jñānaṁ bādha-vivarjitam* ।

[58] Mī 12c: *bodha-vākyaṁ pramāṇaṁ.*

[59] SvSt$_1$ 13.3cd = SvSt$_2$ 63cd: *sva-parâvabhāsakaṁ yathā pramāṇaṁ bhuvi buddhi-lakṣaṇam* ॥

[60] ĀMī 36: *pramāṇa-gocarau santau bhedâbhedau … ekatrâviruddhau*, YA 49ab: *dṛṣṭâgamābhyām aviruddham artha-prarūpaṇaṁ yukty-anuśāsanaṁ te* ।

> [a child], you are the guide to people who behold [your] virtues. Now, you are worshipped also by me with devotion.'[61]

The move to treat the Jina as a *pramāṇa* will subsequently be shown to be of historical relevance (see § 8.2.(4)).

Alone the subject matter of the whole undertaking, viz. the examination of who is entitled to be considered a reliable teacher (*āpta*) marks—unlike all Jaina treatises preceding the *Āpta-mīmāṁsā*, with the sole exception of *Dvādaśâra-naya-cakra*—a new trend: the reliability of Jaina teaching and of Jaina Canon, being a pronouncement of *jina-śāsana*, cannot be accepted at its face value and is not merely a matter of unquestioning religious belief. Rather, the truth of *jina-śāsana*, including the authority of the scriptures, has to be accepted only as based on rational inquiry (E 13). Also the authoritative status of such spiritual guides as the *tīrthaṁ-kara*s, *gaṇa-dhāra*s or immediate teachers (*ācārya*) has necessarily to be examined and tested for, e.g., its consistency, its agreement with empirical evidence and the soundness of reasoning.

7.2. These opening verses of the *Āpta-mīmāṁsā* stand in stark contrast to Samantabhadra's other work *Yukty-anuśāsana*, which draws a decidedly more traditional picture of the *maṅgalâcaraṇa*:

> '[1] We are now desirous to make you—you who are prospering[62] on earth by virtue of great fame, who are the victor [and] who have sundered the bondage of the nooses of defects [such as nescience etc.] and [their] repository (sc. *karman*)—the subject matter of this eulogy. [2] After [you, the Jina,] have transcended [the limited] essence [of the world], the eulogy [in your praise] is called the elevation of [your] virtues among the people, because you

---

[61] *sarvasya tattvasya bhavān pramātā mātêva bālasya hitânuśāstā* ı
guṇâvalokasya janasya netā mayâpi bhaktyā pariṇūyate[a] *'dya* ॥ SvSt$_1$ 7.5 = SvSt$_2$ 35

[a] SvSt$_2$ clearly misreads: *pariṇūyase*.

[62] It is, of course, a play on the name of Vardhamāna. Interestingly, Vidyānanda takes advantage of the opportunity both to read the name of Vardhamāna as the present participle *vṛddhamāna* ('prospering'), and to read the meaning of 'cognitive criterion' (*pramāṇa* = *māna*) into *varddhamāna*; see YAṬ *ad loc.*, p. 2.2-3: *ṛddhamānam iti pravṛddha-pramāṇatvād ity arthaḥ, ṛddhaṁ pravṛddhaṁ mānaṁ pramāṇaṁ yasya sa eva varddhamāna ity ucyate.*

> are the ocean of countless virtues. Being unable to express even an infinitesimal portion [of your virtues], how can we worship you, O Jina?! [3] Nevertheless, although I entertain [some] audacity, I am—as a result of my devotion—your worshipper (sc. I am the author of this eulogy in your praise), with [my] words corresponding to [your] capacity. [For] when the cognisable [task] is accepted, how can people not accomplish [their task (here: the composition of the eulogy),] with their actions, also by dint of their own capacities?’[63]

In the verses which do not contain anything polemical, the author appears much more restrained and humble as well as more religious and devotional, aware of his limitations, including his awareness of his imperfection in literary sphere. These more conventional features, provided they could also supported by additional analysis of the whole text, may point to historical antecedence of *Yukty-anuśāsana*.

8.1. At this stage I should try to propose an hypothesis why, in the sixth century, a set of new features enters the literary practice of framing *maṅgalâcaraṇa*s of Jaina philosophical works, and the focus suddenly shifts from that of primarily enunciating an obeisance in praise of the *tīrthaṁ-kara*s (elements E 1 - E 9) to an argumentation in favour of the validity that assumes a form of a proof formula (E 14), distinctly recognisable in Mallavādin Kṣamāśramaṇa’s *Dvādaśâra-naya-cakra* (§ 6) and Samantabhadra’s *Āpta-mīmāṁsā* (§ 7.1.), a tendency that practically overrides the previous practice.

The earlier phase, up to Umāsvāti and early fifth century, can be called the phase of laudation, in which the works do not seem involved in any philosophical discussion with other systems. Jaina authors compose their treatises meant for a Jaina audience, and do not form arguments either to defend their own system or to criticise other systems. That is true for the authors mentioned in that phase, i.e. Kundakunda, Umāsvāmin, Umāsvāti, but also for all the Canonical literature. These authors do not generally enter into polemics, do not defend their position, do not refute other systems. If there is any criticism expressed, it is not formulated dialectically, and it is not argued for. The authors appear happy to merely lay down their opinions on various matters and systematise Jaina tenets.

---

[63] *kīrtyā mahatyā bhuvi varddhamānaṁ tvāṁ varddhamānaṁ stuti-gocaratvaṁ* ।
ninīṣavaḥ smo vayam adya vīraṁ viśīrṇa-doṣâśaya-pāśa-bandhaṁ ॥ 1 ॥
yāthâtmyam ullaṅghya guṇôdayâkhyā loke stutir bhūri-guṇôdadhes te ।
aṇiṣṭham apy aṁśam aśaknuvanto vaktuṁ jina tvāṁ kim iva stuyāma ॥ 2 ॥
tathâpi vaiyātyam upetya bhaktyā stotā ’smi te śakty-anurūpa-vākyaḥ ।
iṣṭe prameye ’pi yathā-sva-śakti kiṁ nôtsahante puruṣāḥ kriyābhiḥ ॥ 3 ॥ YA 1-3

The latter, third phase that takes shape after mid-sixth century, a phase which one could call the phase of argument, represented here by DNC and ĀMī, is characterised by their predominantly critical character that features two elements: polemical approach and argumentative structure. The works aim at overthrowing rival schools and the major part the text contains various arguments *against* adversaries, and only a smaller portion outlines the Jaina tenets. It is only at this stage that the negative, refutational motivation (E 11b) aimed at 'subduing other teachings', the conviction that one's acceptance of the scripture must be based on rational inquiry (E 13) and the formal structure of a proof formula (*prayoga*) (E 14) enter the *maṅgalâcaraṇa*.

The most important shift that occurs at this stage is an imperative to recognise the authority of the Jina's teaching and of Jaina scriptures on rational enquiry and examination of such internal elements of it as its consistency, its agreement with empirical evidence, soundness of arguments and reliability of the author (*āptatva*).[64] Mere belief no longer is sufficient, albeit it still does play an important role in religious practice and determines a reverential attitude towards the founders of Jainism on the part of Jaina authors.

A historical, second phase in this development— that led to the third stage and introduced two other important elements E 11a and E 12 (present also in the subsequent third phase of argument), strongly marked by its polemical vein—is reflected, among others, in works of Pūjyapāda Devanandin's *Sarvârtha-siddhi* (§ 4) and Siddhasena Divākara's *Saṁmati-tarka-prakaraṇa* (§ 5), respectively. This stage can be termed the phase of polemics. The authors are aware of the rivalry and ongoing discussion on various philosophical problems, which they do reflect. They do also reproduce a variance of opinions on various points. However, their purpose is not that of refuting a rival school. Instead of extensively arguing in favour of or against any of them by taking recourse to detailed proof formulas and detailed formal reasoning, they as a rule restrict themselves to merely stating their position and expressing their disagreement with other ideas. It is conspicuous that the character of a given work, either uninvolved or polemical or argumentative, seems to be as a rule reflected in its *maṅgalâcaraṇa*.

---

[64] Cf. p. 56.

8.2. Whereas it is extremely difficult, if at all possible or even meaningful, to indicate particular rival authors or works that could have triggered the polemical response from such authors as Pūjyapāda Devanandin and Siddhasena Divākara during the second phase, the phase of polemics, who simply appear to reflect a prevailing polemical mood in philosophical India of that time, it does seem possible to attribute the new development in the phase of argument to the Buddhist author Diṅnāga.

There can be no doubt, in the first place, that both the Jaina authors flourished after Diṅnāga and were somehow inspired by Diṅnāga or had Diṅnāga in the background as a target of their polemics. The case of DNC, which was for decades practically the only source of extensive fragments of the *Pramāṇa-samuccaya* preserved in Sanskrit, does not necessitate any additional proof that it was meant to be a response *also* to Diṅnāga.

As for Samantabhadra, since there has not really been done sufficient research on his chronology so far,[65] nor the aim of the present paper is to discuss such chronology in detail, I shall simply refer to just some ideas of Diṅnāga that are beyond doubt reflected in Samantabhadra's works:
(1) The theory of the semantic exclusion (*apoha-vāda*) is either explicitly criticised or alluded to in the following verses (expressions referring to the idea of *anyâpoha* are bolded):

ĀMī 11: *sarvâtmakaṁ tad ekaṁ syād* ***anyâpoha****-vyatikrame* ।
anyatra samavāyena vyapadiśyeta sarvathā ॥
ĀMī 44: ***anyeṣv ananya-śabdo 'yaṁ*** *saṁvṛtir na mṛṣā katham* ।
mukhyârthaḥ saṁvṛtir nâsti vinā mukhyān na saṁvṛtiḥ ॥
ĀMī 112: ***sāmānya-vāg viśeṣe*** *cen na śabdârtho mṛṣā hi sā* ।
abhipreta-viśeṣâpteḥ syāt-kāraḥ satya-lāñchanaḥ ॥

---

[65] One can refer to Sin (1999), albeit the arguments presented are vague and conclusion unclear.

(2) The idea of purely non-conceptual perceptual cognition (*kalpanâpoḍhaṁ pratyakṣam*) is either connoted or disproved in the following verses (respective terms referring to the idea are bolded):

YA 56: *nānā-sad-ekâtma-samāśrayaṁ ced anyatvam adviṣṭam anātmanoḥ kva* | ***vikalpa-śūnyatvam*** *avastunaś cet tasminn ameye kva khalu pramāṇam* ||

YA 17: *na śāstṛ-śiṣyâdi-vidhi-vyavasthā vikalpa-buddhir vitathâkhilā cet* | *atattva-tattvâdi-vikalpa-mohe nimajjatāṁ* ***vīta-vikalpa-dhīḥ*** *kā* ||

YA 26: *vyatīta-sāmānya-viśeṣa-bhāvād* ***viśvâbhilāpârtha-vikalpa-śūnyam*** | *kha-puṣpavat syād asad eva tattvaṁ prabuddha-tattvād bhavataḥ pareṣām* ||

YA 33: *pratyakṣa-nirdeśavad apy asiddham* ***akalpakaṁ*** *jñāpayituṁ hy aśakyam* | *vinā ca siddher na ca lakṣaṇârtho na tāvaka-dveṣiṇi vīra satyam* ||

(3) Diṅnāga's particular understanding of *pramāṇa-phala* that connotes the idea that the result of *pramāṇa* is *pramāṇa* itself[66] is in the background of the verse ĀMī 37:

nityatvaikānta-pakṣe 'pi vikriyā nôpapadyate |
prāg eva kārakâbhāvaḥ ***kva pramāṇaṁ kva tat-phalam*** ||

(4) The idea that the Jina is a *pramāṇa* (see p. 55 ff.), as it is enunciated in ĀMī 6 and SvSt$_1$ 7.5 = SvSt$_2$ 35, goes back to the opening verse of the *Pramāṇa-samuccaya* (see below, § 8.3) in which the Buddha's epithet *pramāṇa-bhūta* functions as the cardinal characteristic, on which all the remaining virtues of the Buddha are based.[67]

8.3. Not only the contents of such works as *Dvādaśâra-naya-cakra* or *Āpta-mīmāṁsā* was, as it transpires from the above verses, provoked at least in part by Diṅnāga's statements but also, to some degree, certain features of the style or mode of the opening verses of Jaina works seem to have been inspired by the *Pramāṇa-samuccaya*.

---

[66] Both the phrase *pramāṇa-phala* and the idea goes back to e.g. PS$_1$ 1.8cd-10. See e.g. Hattori (1968: p. 98-100, nn. 1.55-57) and Balcerowicz (2001a: xxviii-xxix, § [20]).

[67] On the significance of the epithet and its relation to the remaining four see: Nagatomi (1957: iv-vi), Franco (1997: 1-43), Jackson (1988: 338-339). It is true that Diṅnāga is not the first one to use the epithet with respect to the Buddha, see: Seyfort Ruegg (1994), Jackson (1988: 338). It is, however, Diṅnāga who uses the epithet in strictly epistemological context for the first time.

As it is well known, Diṅnāga commences his seminal treatise with the following statements:

> ‘Having paid homage to [the Buddha], who is a cognitive criterion, who seeks the benefit for the world, who is a teacher, the Well-gone [and] a protector, [I shall] compose “the Digest” (sc. *Pramāṇa-samuccaya*) [comprised] of my own thoughts scattered [in my other works such as the *Nyāya-mukha*, by collecting them] here [in this digest] into a uniform [system] in order to establish the cognitive criterion.
>
> In this [opening verse] in the beginning of [my] treatise, an eulogy is expressed [in praise] of the venerable [Buddha, treated] as someone **who is a cognitive criterion** by virtue of [his] perfection as both the cause and the result, in order to demonstrate [his] significance. In this [statement], the cause [means his] perfection in disposition of mind and perfection in practice (application). Disposition of mind [means the Buddha’s status as someone] **who seeks the benefit for the world**, [whereas] practice (application) [means the Buddha’s status as someone] who **is a teacher**, because he teaches the world. Result means [his] perfection in [attaining] his own purpose and the purpose of others. … **Having paid homage to** the teacher of such qualities, [I shall] compose “**the Digest** on the cognitive criterion” **in order to establish the cognitive criterion**, by collecting **here** [various thoughts] from **my own** works such as the *Nyāya-mukha* etc., with the purpose of refuting rival [theories concerning] the cognitive criterion and with the purpose of indicating [superior] qualities of my own [theory of] the cognitive criterion. [Such is the purpose of my work], because the comprehension of the cognoscible rests on the cognitive criterion, whereas there are numerous misconceptions regarding the [cognitive criterion].’[68]

---

[68] *pramāṇa-bhūtāya jagad-dhitaiṣiṇe praṇamya śāstre sugatāya tāyine* ।
pramāṇa-siddhyai sva-matāt samuccayaḥ kariṣyate viprasṛtād ihaikataḥ ॥ 1 ॥
atra bhagavato hetu-phala-sampattyā ***pramāṇa-bhuta****tvena stotrâbhidhānaṁ prakaraṇâdau gauravôtpādanârtham. tatra hetur āśaya-prayoga-sampat. āśayo* ***jagad-dhitaiṣi****tā. prayogo jagac-chasanāc* ***chāstṛ****tvam. phalaṁ sva-parârtha-sampat. … evaṁ-guṇaṁ śāstaraṁ* ***praṇamya pramāṇa-siddhyai sva****-prakaraṇebhyo nyāya-mukhâdibhya* ***iha*** *samāhṛtya pramāṇa-****samuccayaḥ kariṣyate*** *para-pramāṇa-*

The *incipit* of PS opens with the expression (*praṇamya*) of an act of salutation (E 1), followed by the mention of the object of salutation (E 2a) and his laudable qualities (E 2b) as well as by a statement (*kariṣyate*) of the design to teach (E 3) and the mention (*pramāṇa*°) of the subject matter (E 4). The indirect source of the teaching (E 5) is said to be Śākyamuni the teacher (*śāstre sugatāya*), although PS consists of Diṅnāga's own ideas (*sva-matāt*), also scattered in his other works (*viprasṛtād*). There is no explicit mention of religious practice setting an example to be followed by the religious community (E 6) or any reference to Diṅnāga's own personal practice (E 7). Diṅnāga explicitly mentions neither his own practice the purpose of which could be his own liberation (E 8) nor liberation as the final purpose of the teaching to be achieved by the disciples through the study of his work (E 9).

One of two most conspicuous features of the introduction to PS, instead, is the purpose of the work, being the desire to establish the cognitive criterion (*pramāṇa-siddhyai*), independent of the salvific character of the Buddhist doctrine (E 11). This raison d'être comprises two aspects: a positive one, the intention to directly vindicate his own thesis (E 11a), with 'the purpose of indicating [superior] qualities of own [theory of] the cognitive criterion' (*sva-pramāṇa-guṇôd-bhāvanāya*), and a negative one, that of disproving rival teachings (E 11b), with 'the purpose of refuting rival [theories concerning] the cognitive criterion' (*para-pramāṇa-pratiṣedhāya*). Especially the latter, critical aspect (E 11b) is, historically speaking, a novel element.

On the top of that, Diṅnāga discloses also a pivotal premise of his philosophical system (E 12), viz. the dependence of any metaphysical project to establish any kind of ontology primarily on the investigation into epistemology and into foundations of our cognition (*pramāṇâyattā prameya-pratipattiḥ*).

The context in which one develops a desire to embark upon the philosophical project to search for the foundations of our cognition is, according to Diṅnāga, the existence of doubt (E 10) as regards its nature and its valid sources: 'there are numerous misconceptions regarding' the cognitive criterion (*bahavaś câtra vipratipannāḥ*).

The other most conspicuous feature is a pronouncedly argumentative structure (E 14) of the introduction as a whole, noticeable only

pratiṣedhāya sva-pramāṇa-guṇôdbhāvanāya ca, yasmāt pramāṇâyattā prameya-pratipattir bahavaś câtra vipratipannāḥ. PS in the auto-commentatorial prose portion (but absent in the verse), that assumes a form of a proof formula (*prayoga*). The argumentative structure is to serve a purpose, however. As Hattori (1968: 73, n. 1.1) points out: 'Unlike his predecessors, Dignāga does not accept the unconditional authority of Scripture. According to him, the words of the Buddha must be subjected to a critical test before they are accepted as valid.'[69] Critical examination of possible arguments in favour of and against the scripture, which can only be achieved rationally (E 14), replaces unfounded belief in the reliability of Buddhist tradition and becomes a preliminary condition to accept the authority of the *buddha-vacana* (E 13).

Indeed, even a cursory comparison with *maṅgala*s of earlier Buddhist works would reveal that their contents was generally restricted to some standard elements such as the act of salutation (E 1), along with the object (E 2a) and a description of his laudable qualities (E 2b) of salutation, followed by a statement of the design to teach (E 3) a respective subject matter (E 4), as it was the case with Vasubandhu's *Abhidharma-kośa*:

> 'Oṁ! Homage to the Buddha! Having rendered homage to the teacher [who instructs] in accordance with reality, who in every respect causes all blindness be destroyed, who has drawn out the world from the mire of transmigration, I will recite the treatise [called] "A Treasury of the Higher Doctrine".'[70]

Most notably, all five epithets of the Buddha enlisted by Diṅnāga are interpreted by Dharmakīrti as a part of a formal proof to establish the authority of the Buddha.[71] The way Diṅnāga explicates the epithets is not merely a standard manner of semantic or linguistic explanation, but presents a kind of argument in most cases. For instance, the thesis that the Buddha is praised 'as someone who is a cognitive criterion' (*pramāṇa-bhūtatvena*) is substantiated with a reason that it is the case 'by virtue of [his] perfection as both the cause and the result' (*hetu-phala-sampattyāḥ*), although no example (*dṛṣṭānta*) is mentioned. Further, Diṅnāga's own assertion that Buddha possesses the status of being a teacher, precisely *because he teaches the world* (*prayogo jagac-chasanāc chāstṛtvam*) indicates that also, in his own understanding, the introductory verse had, at least in part, an argumentative structure in a formal sense of an inferential proof. In addition, the fact that the Buddha's status as a bona fide teacher materialises in the form of his perfection in practice (*prayoga-sampat*) points to his instructive function which cannot but entail the use of formal arguments (*prayoga*).[72]

---

[69] On the contents of the verse and Dharmakīrti's interpretation see also Bijlert (1989: 115 ff.), Jackson (1988: 338 ff.) and Franco (1997: 15 ff.).

[70] AKBh: *oṁ namo buddhāya.*
yaḥ sarvathā sarva-hatândha-kāraḥ
saṁsāra-paṅkāj jagad ujjahāra ।
tasmai namas-kṛtya yathârtha-śāstre
śāstraṁ pravakṣyāmy abhidharma-kośam ॥ 1 ॥

[71] See Nagatomi (1957: ii-xi), Steinkellner (1982: 7), Bijlert (1989: 117 ff.), Jackson (1988: 339-359) and Franco (1997: 19 ff.).

HATTORI's contention (see p. 63) that Diṅnāga departs from the tradition of his predecessors in no longer accepting unconditionally the authority of scripture and in postulating instead a critical test for the validity of *buddha-vacana* retains its validity also in the case of Jaina literature. Indeed, prior to ca. 530-540, i.e. the time of the composition of the *Pramāṇa-samuccaya*, we do not come across any work whose author would present the same critical and investigative attitude as Diṅnāga did. It is only in treatises of such authors as Mallavādin and Samantabhadra, who are known to have already been acquainted with Diṅnāga's works that we encounter precisely the same approach. The similarities between the *maṅgala* of the *Pramāṇa-samuccaya*, on the one hand, and the *Dvādaśâra-naya-cakra* and the *Āpta-mīmāṁsā*, on the other, concern at least three novel elements which we find in the introduction to Diṅnāga's treatise for the first time. They all contain a conviction that:

E 11b The aim of a philosophical work is *also* to refute other teachings, inasmuch as mere positive validation of one's own standpoint is felt to be insufficient.

The need to examine how water-proof one's own system is by exposing it to objections and by, subsequently, refuting the objections may have been prompted by the same line of thought that eventually led Diṅnāga to devise a paradigm of inference based on the idea of both the procedure of verification (i.e. the search for positive instantiations) and the procedure of falsification (i.e. confirmation that there are no counter-instances), encapsulated in the notion of threefold condition of validity (*trairūpya*) of the logical reason, developed in the second chapter (*anumāna-pariccheda*) of his PS and diagrammed in the *Hetu-cakra-ḍamaru*. Thus, a critical examination has to entail, beside a straightforward justification of a claim by providing positive reasons to accept it, the probing of the assumption for its vulnerability to objections, that in its turn presupposes a room for some kind of their falsifiability.

---

[72] On the other hand, in the term *prayoga* occurring in the context of the introduction to PS, Jinendrabuddhi sees only the ethical aspect of 'the application of compassion', specially adjusted to the goal, see PSṬ ad loc., p. 9. 12-13: *yasya yatra dayā, sa tayā yathā tasyârtho bhavati tathā prayujyate, yathā mātuḥ putre dayā, sa ca yathā tasyârtho bhavati tathā prayujyate.*

E 13 The teaching of the religious founder should be submitted to a critical test and the authority of the scripture should be accepted only on the basis of rational examination that proves its validity.

Again, behind the desideratum to expose the teacher and the teaching to a critical test, which Diṅnāga felt the need of, is related to his general epistemological approach to ground his project, being a case of foundationalism,[73] in irreducible existents, after everything else tainted with conceptually constructed ideas is abstracted.

The similarity of structural design lies in the search for knowledge invulnerable to doubt that is grounded in something characterised by infallible self-evidence that no longer can be falsified or rejected. Thus, the phenomenological content of immediate perceptual cognition, on which Diṅnāga's epistemological scheme rests, is eventually accepted only after it has proved itself to acquire certainty,[74] and so equally incontrovertible must the teacher and his teaching be determined in order to be eventually accepted.

E 14 The introduction is given a formal structure of a proof formula (*prayoga*) or, at least, evokes such a structure more or less indirectly.

That is an obvious corollary of two previous elements E 11b and E 13 that posit the context of debate and argumentation.

Irrespective of whether or not Diṅnāga's arguments concerning validity as such can be interpreted as (vulnerable) transcendental arguments or not,[75] all these three elements taken together introduce a new approach of inter-subjective character with respect to the validity of scripture. It is no longer the case that what stands in the background of *incipit*s of philosophical works, which usually reflect certain unspoken presuppositions of their authors, a kind of circular reasoning: in order to accept the truth of claims postulated in a work one has to rely on the validity of the source of the teaching (the authoritative tradition stemming from the Buddha or the Jina), and in order to accept the validity of the teacher, one has to first take the validity of the tradition for granted that informs the faithful believer of the authority of the source.

---

[73] See Arnold (2005: 13-56).

[74] Cf. Hayes (1988: 136).

[75] On Diṅnāga's foundationalism see Griffith (1998) and Arnold (2005: 286, n. 7.76).

I do not think the above similarities are a matter of mere coincidence. We have seen (§ 8.2.) that the two Jaina authors in question were acquainted with and stimulated by the ideas expressed in the *Pramāṇa-samuccaya*. That being the case, it is therefore but natural to assume that the new elements that found their way into the *incipit*s of the *Dvādaśâra-naya-cakra* and the *Āpta-mīmāṁsā* and that overlap with the structural features of the introductory section of the *Pramāṇa-samuccaya* must have been influenced by the latter.

9.1. The opening lines to Diṅnāga's *Pramāṇa-samuccaya* influenced, to a certain extent, another Jaina author, namely Akalaṅka. He opens his *Laghīyas-traya* with the following two verses:

> '[1] [I pay] earnest homage to those who are the makers of the passage to moral law, propounders of modal description, from Ṛṣabha to Mahāvīra—for the sake of the apprehension of [my] own self. [2] Since personal series of trains (series) of consciousnesses, who are [believed to be] without continuity and momentary—[but] who are by nature, in accordance with truth, neither results nor causes—are undeniably non-existent, then [there is a quandary]: if (*cet*) the Buddha himself exists, by the conviction of himself and others, for the sake of living beings because of compassion, then he would be by nature false notion (i.e. an illusion), just like the permanence [of things]. [Such] a real thing does not possess causal efficacy with regard to this doctrine.'[76]

---

[76] *dharma-tīrtha-karebhyo 'stu syād-vādibhyo namo-namaḥ* ।
ṛṣabhâdi-mahāvīrântarebhyaḥ svâtmôpalabdhaye ॥ 1 ॥
santāneṣu niranvaya-kṣanika-cittānām asatsv eva cet
tattvâhetu-phalâtmanāṁ sva-para-saṅkalpena buddhaḥ svayam ।
sattvârthaṁ vyavatiṣṭhate karuṇayā mithyā-vikalpâtmakaḥ

The first verse contains certain standard elements (E 1, E 2a, E 2b), whereas the second verse formulates a direct criticism of Buddhist claims to the reliability of the Buddha. Akalaṅka points out an inconsistency to which Buddhist doctrine is liable. On the one hand there is the conviction, grounded in Buddhist ontology, that personal series of consciousnesses, believed to absolutely momentary, are fictions as any other reducible whole. That stands in contradiction with a fundamental soteriological belief, on the other hand, that the Buddha appeared in the world being prompted by his compassion. That being the case, both living beings as objects of the Buddha's compassion and the Buddha himself should be considered fictitious. The Buddha, having accepted his ontological claim that the wholes are fictitious, should neither act, being a fictitious whole, nor succumb to compassion with respect to other fictitious wholes.

The expression *tattvâhetu-phalâtmanāṁ* that characterises personal series of consciousnesses (*santāna*) refers to their ficticious status as wholes that are neither results nor causes is clearly a reference to Diṅnāga's claim to the opposite, absolutely central to his project, that the Buddha is someone who is a cognitive criterion *precisely* on account of his 'perfection as *both the cause and the result*' (*bhagavato hetu-phala-sampattyā pramāṇa-bhūtatvena*). By referring to the idea that fictitious wholes can neither be really caused by anything nor cause anything, Akalaṅka wishes to undermine Diṅāga's justification *why* the Buddha is a cognitive criterion (*pramāṇa*), and the legitimacy of the Buddha's teaching.

In the opening verses Akalaṅka could not but assault his archenemy Dharmakīrti directly as well, beside an attack against the latter's spiritual teacher. He does so by applying Dharmakīrti's concept of causal efficacy (*artha-kriyā*) to Diṅnāga's idea of the Buddha conceived as a pure and reliable cause of the Buddhist teaching, a cause that signifies the Buddha's 'perfection in disposition of mind and perfection in practice (application)' (*hetur āśaya-prayoga-sampat*). Since a whole cannot possess causal efficacy in general, the conclusion is that the Buddha cannot be treated as a cause Buddhist doctrine (*tatra samaye nârtha-kriyā vastunaḥ*).

There is still one more intriguing element in the introductory section of Akalaṅka's work. It is his confession that he undertakes the

syān nityatvavad eva tatra samaye nârtha-kriyā vastunaḥ ‖ 2 ‖ LT composition of the *Laghīyas-traya* 'for the sake of the apprehension of [his] own self' (*svâtmôpalabdhaye*), which indicates

E 15 the author's primarily personal interest as a motivation to compose his treatise.

Such seemingly selfish motivation is rather a rarity. The commentator Prabhācandra-sūri, in his *Nyāya-kumuda-candra*, attempts to mitigate the self-centred undertone of Akalaṅka's statement by a suggestion, contained in the first, rather awkward interpretation[77] of two proposed ones, that *sva*° would have to mean *sakala-janasya*: 'for the sake of all people's knowledge' (*sakala-jana-pratītaye*).[78]

However, the self-interest expressed by the author of a work does have a predecessor in person of Dharmakīrti (vide infra § 10), whose philosophical oeuvre had immense impact on Akalaṅka's ideas[79].

9.2. Before I proceed to discuss one aspect of Dharmakīrti's possible influence on Akalaṅka with respect to the *incipit*, it is worth noting in passing, the opening verse of Akalaṅka's other important work *Tattvârtha-vārttika* presents a brief and standardised version of *maṅgalâcaraṇa*:

> 'Having paid homage to the [Great] Hero (sc. Mahāvīra), the immense abode of omniscience, of extensive auspiciousness, who shook off moral stains, I will teach the commentary on "the Treatise on Reality".'[80]

---

[77] Awkward inasmuch as it leaves °*ātma*° out, instead of the expected *sakala-janâtma-pratītaye* ('for the sake of the apprehension of every person's own self').

[78] NKC, p. 4.2-4: ***svâtmôpalabdhaye***. *svasya namas-kartuḥ ātmā nāstikatā-parihārâdi-viśiṣṭaṁ svarūpaṁ, tasya upalabdhaye sakala-jana-pratītaye. athavā svasya namas-kartur ātmano 'nanta-jñānâdi-svarūpasya upalabdhyaye siddhaye "siddhiḥ svâtmôpalabdhiḥ" ity-abhidhānāt*.—'[Akalaṅka] says: **for the sake of the apprehension of** [his] **own self**. Own, i.e. of the homage-payer; self, i.e. intrinsic nature qualified by the avoidance of heresy etc. For the sake of the apprehension of this [own self], i.e. for the sake of all people's knowledge. Or, alternatively: for the sake of the apprehension, i.e. the accomplishment of [his] own self, i.e. the homage-payer's intrinsic nature consisting in infinite cognition etc., on account of the explicit statement: 'accomplishment is the apprehension of one's own nature'.

[79] Shah (1967), Balcerowicz (2005).

[80] *praṇamya sarva-vijñāna-mahâspadam uru-śriyam* ।
nirdhūta-kalmaṣaṁ vīraṁ vakṣye tattvârtha-vārttikam ॥ RVār

The verse lacks all the philosophically advanced and novel elements, some of them introduced by Diṅnāga, which confirms my conjecture that the *Laghīyas-traya* is a later and more mature work of Akalaṅka (as compared to the *Tattvârtha-vārttika*), of polemical character and not aiming primarily at Jaina followers.

10. Irrespective of whether the story that Dharmakīrti placed the two opening verses after he had composed and circulated his *Pramāṇa-vārttika*, and was prompted to do so by his disillusionment with the reception of his work, is true or not[81], the verses do seem to be of some relevance for our discussion on Jaina *maṅgalâcaraṇa*s:

> 'Oṁ! Homage to the Buddha! [1] Homage to the All-Auspicious One who shook off the snare of conceptually constructed ideas and whose forms are profound and illustrious, whose brilliance radiates all round. [2] People, as a rule attached to profane domains, with inadequate sense of judgement, not only are not guided by good counsels at all, but they are even hostile [to them], being enveloped with dirt of malice. Therefore, my intention is not that this [work will bring] benefit to others, but rather my heart, with my determination furthered by continuous study of wholesome manuals, has developed a desire to [compose] it.'[82]

Characteristically there are some standard elements to be taken notice of in the verses, namely obeisance paid by Dharmakīrti to the founder of Buddhism and ideal teacher (E 1, E 2a), description of the Buddha's major virtues owing to which he is worthy of the salutation (E 2b), an indication of a source of inspiration and teaching (E 5) and the author's own personal practice (E 7). However, we find here neither any statement of Dharmakīrti's design to teach (E 3) nor any mention of the subject matter (E 4), nor other elements. In neither containing any reference to Buddhist dogmatics nor being framed in an argumentative structure, the verses do not pursue the polemical vein which one could observe in Diṅnāga's work.

---

[81] See Stcherbatsky (1930: 35-36) and Gillon–Hayes (1991: 13-16).

[82] PV: *oṁ namo buddhāya.*
vidhūta-kalpanā-jāla-gambhīrôdāra-mūrtaye ।
namaḥ samantabhadrāya samanta-spharaṇa-tviṣe ॥ 1 ॥
prāyaḥ prākṛta-saktir apratibala-prajño janaḥ kevalaṁ ।
na anarthy eva subhāṣitaiḥ parigato vidveṣṭy apîrṣyā-malaiḥ ॥
tenâyaṁ na parôpakāra iti naś cintâpi cetaś ciraṁ ।
sūktâbhyāsa-vivardhita-vyasanam ity atrânubaddha-spṛham ॥ 2 ॥

What is most conspicuous here is Dharmakīrti's expression of his bitterness, his criticism of and disillusionment with common people who not only are incapable of understanding the elevated teaching but are even hostile to it. As if against the established practice, Dharmakīrti expressly relinquishes the desire or hope, as primary motivation, to disseminate beneficial ideas for the betterment of the people, and stresses his strictly personal impulse in composing his philosophical work (E 15).

Since one can easily notice how Akalaṅka directly refers to and practically applies Dharmakīrti's idea of causal efficacy (*artha-kriyā*) in the *maṅgala* of his *Laghīyas-traya* (see § 9.1.), there is also reason to belief that also Akalaṅka's departure from Jaina practice of selfless teaching in favour of pursuance of his own goal was influenced by the personal and bitter aspect of Dharmakīrti's statements that opened way to verbalise personal feelings.

11. Unlike in the *Śabdânuśāsana* mentioned in the very beginning of this paper, Hemacandra turns much more verbose in the most important philosophical work *Pramāṇa-mīmīṁsā*. Immediately after two introductory verses in a standard style[83], he enters a brief discussion concerning his motivation to compose a work in *sūtra*-style:

> '§ 1. [Objection:] "If these aphorisms on Jaina doctrine are of your [authorship], then which or of whose [authorship] were [the aphorisms] before you?"—What you've enquired about is a really trivial thing. You could also ask the following: Which or of whose [authorship] were [the aphorisms] on grammar etc. before Pāṇini, Piṅgala, Kaṇāda, Akṣapāda and others? These disciplines, which

---

[83] *ananta-darśana-jñāna-vīryânanda-mayâtmane* ।
namo 'rhate kṛpā-kḷpta-dharma-tīrthāya tāyine ॥ 1 ॥
bodhi-bījam upaskartuṁ tattvâbhyāsena dhīmatām ।
jaina-siddhānta-sūtrāṇāṁ sveṣāṁ vṛttir vidhīyate ॥ 2 ॥ PMīV$_1$ 1.1.1 (p. 1)
— '[1] Homage to the saint, whose essence consists of infinite conation, cognition, innate energy and bliss; [homage] to the protector who, out of compassion, created a passage to righteousness. [2] This commentary is composed [by me] on my own aphorisms on Jaina doctrine in order to provide, through rehearsed exertion that concerns truth, the seed of [ultimate] wisdom for the intelligent ones.'

> are, as a matter of fact, without beginning, become renewed and updated, with the intention of abridgement or enlargement, and are said to have this or that author. Have you not heard the [saying] that "The world has never been different [than it is today]"? …
> § 2. [Objection:] "If that is [the case], then why do you not compose a proper study like Akalaṅka or Dharmakīrti? What is the use of this boastful talk that [you compose] authoritative aphorisms?"—Don't say that, because all people have different tastes, so that there is neither public nor royal dictate to restrict the [author's] free will. Therefore this [objection of yours] is irrelevant.'[84]

The very first remark objects to Hemacandra's right to compose a work in *sūtra*-style, reserved basically for authoritative treatises of system founders. In reply, Hemacandra exhibits historical consciousness, rarely found in India, that disciplines of learning and systems of knowledge do develop. Not only is it impossible to ascribe the inception of a system to a particular author, but also ancient authorities esteemed as inventors of a branch of learning must have had their predecessors, even though their names fell into oblivion. Moreover, the process of 'growing ever anew' (*nava-navī-bhāva*) does not have to connote any idea of an eternal discipline of science or learning established for ever, which is only occasionally refreshed and rejuvenated by new authors, albeit it does not really change. The process of advancement and enrichment of our knowledge, which Hemacandra, being a polymath active in a range of fields, must have been intimately conversant with, is implied by the latter element of the phrase *saṅkṣepa-vistara-vivakṣayā*, i.e. by notion of the intention to enlarge an extant system of learning. Whereas it poses no logical or practical difficulty to abridge an existing system of learning into a compendium (which is actually always the case!), even when

---

84 PMīV$_1$ 1.1.1 (p. 1): § 1. *nanu yadi bhavadīyānîmāni jaina-siddhānta-sūtrāṇi tarhi bhavataḥ pūrvaṁ kāni kimīyāni vā tāny āsann iti? atyalpam idam anvayuṅkthāḥ. pāṇini-piṅgala-kaṇādâkṣapādâdibhyo 'pi pūrvaṁ kāni kimīyāni vā vyākaraṇâdi-sūtrāṇîty etad api paryanuyuṅkṣva. anādaya evaitā vidyāḥ saṅkṣepa-vistara-vivakṣayā nava-navī-bhavanti tat-tat-kartṛkāś côcyante. kiṁ nâśrauṣīḥ "na kadācid anīdṛśaṁ jagat" iti? …*
§ 2. *yady evam—akalaṅka-dharmakīrty-ādivat prakaraṇam eva kiṁ nârabhyate, kim anayā sūtra-kāratvâho-puruṣikayā? maivaṁ vocaḥ, bhinna-rucir hy ayaṁ janaḥ tato nâsya svêcchā-pratibandhe laukikaṁ rājakīyaṁ vā śāsanam astîti yatkiṁcid etat.*

the system is considered permanent and given for ever in an ideal full-fledged form, an expansion of such a system has to logically entail an idea of adding some new elements to the body of knowledge already possessed. Hemacandra's rejoinder to the second objection emphasizes the role of any author's autonomy to freely follow his own taste and choose any style he deems either proper for his project or simply pleasing.

The saying Hemacandra cites ('The world has never been different [than it is today]') could not here mean absolute immutability of processes that take place in the world or changeless nature of knowledge to which nothing can be added. On the contrary, it implies that developments that had occurred long before were parallel to the processes one could observe contemporaneously, including an independent composition of a philosophical work in *sūtra*-style, and it is only due to lapse of collective memory that one can have an impression of their permanence.

Hemacandra's remarks, trivial as they may seem nowadays, reveal noteworthy awareness that one's creativity and innovative contribution is an integral part of tradition. He also demonstrates his independence from the established tradition in which one is expected to conceive his thoughts mostly as commentaries and footnotes to treatises of ancient teachers, the way Akalaṅka or Dharmakīrti did.

12. Incidentally, and most probably not intended by Hemacandra, the joint mention of Akalaṅka or Dharmakīrti as representatives of two contesting traditions substantiates a general point that the style and structure of opening sections of a number of Jaina philosophical works reflected their authors' engagement (or disengagement at an earlier phase for that matter) with philosophical dispute in India and that the persuasive thought of such Buddhist authors as Diṅnāga and Dharmakīrti influenced also the manner some Jaina thinkers expressed their salutation to the founders of their religion. In other words, the tradition of *incipit*s grew mature in a concrete historical context of debate and opening sections can occasionally be used as an additional tool to determine the relative chronology of some works.

A list of structural elements of opening sections

E 1	The act of salutation as a starting point of the undertaking.
E 2a	The object of salutation.
E 2b	A catalogue of laudable qualities of the object of salutation.
E 3	A statement of the author's design to teach.
E 4	The respective subject matter of the teaching.
E 5	The indication of a source of the teaching.
E 6	An example of devotion to be followed by the religious community.
E 7	A reference to the author's own personal practice being a precondition for his own correct understanding.
E 8	The purpose of the author's ascetic practice which is liberation.
E 9	Liberation (purpose of the teaching) to be achieved through this work, the addressees being the disciples.
E 10	The context of doubt that urges one to philosophical investigation.
E 11	A rationale (in addition to liberation) why the task to write the book is justified in itself.
E 11a	Positive motivation: establishment of one's own doctrine.
E 11b	Negative motivation: refutation of rival teachings.
E 12	Reference to dogmatics.
E 13	Critical examination of arguments to provide legitimacy to Jaina doctrine.
E 14	An argumentative structure of a proof formula (*prayoga*).
E 15	The author's personal interest as a motivation to compose his treatise.

Bibliography

AKBh = Vasubandhu: *Abhidharma-kośa-bhāṣya*. (1) Swami Dwarikadas Shastri (ed.): *Abhidharmakośa and Bhāṣya of Ācārya Vasubandhu with Sphuṭārthā Commentary of Ācārya Yaśomitra* (= BBS 5, 6, 7, 9). Varanasi 1987 [1. ed.: 1970-1973]. (2) P. Pradhan (ed.): *Abhidharmakoshabhāṣya of Vasubandhu* (= TSWS 8). Patna 1967 [2nd revised edition: A. Haldar: 1975].

ĀMī = Samantabhadra: *Āpta-mīmāṁsā*. (1) Pannālāl Jain (ed.): *Āpta-mīmāṁsā* of Samantabhadra Svāmi, with two commentaries: *Aṣṭa-śatī* of Bhaṭṭākalaṅka and *Devāgama-vṛtti* of Vasunandi (= SJG 7-8). Benares 1914. (2) Nagin Shah (ed., tr.): *Samantabhadra's Āptamīmāṁsā. Critique of an Authority* [*Along with English Translation, Introduction, Notes and Akalaṅka's Sanskrit Commentary Aṣṭaśatī*]. Ahmedabad 1999.

ĀP(J) = Jinasena: *Ādi-purāṇa*. Pannalal Jain (ed.): *Ādipurāṇa of Āchārya Jinasena*. Sanskrit text with Hindi translation. Eighth/Seventh Edition. Part 1 & 2 (= Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Jaina Grantha-mālā 8-9). Delhi: Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha Prakāśana 2000-2001.

Arnold 2005 = Arnold, Dan: *Buddhists, Brahmin, and Belief. Epistemology in South Asian Philosophy of Religion*. New York: Columbia University Press 2005.

AṣŚ = Akalaṅka: *Aṣṭa-śatī*. See: ĀMī.

ĀvS = *Āvassaya-sutta* [*Āvaśyaka-sūtra*]. (1) Muni Puṇyavijayaji and Pt. Amritlāl Mohanlāl Bhojak (ed.): *Dasaveyāliyasuttaṁ, Uttarajhayaṇāiṁ and Āvassaya-suttaṁ* (= Jaina-Āgama-Series 15). Bombay: Śrī Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya 1977. (2) Muni Śrī Phūlchandjī Mahārāj (ed.): *Suttâgame.* Vol. II. Bombay: Sūtrāgama Prakāśaka Samiti 1954.

ĀyārṬ = Śīlāṅka: *Ācârâṅga-sūtra-ṭīkā. The Ācāraṅga-sūtra with Niryukti and Śīlāṅka's Ṭīkā*. Mumbaī–Surat: Śrī Siddhacakra Sāhitya Pracāraka Samiti 1935-1936.

Balbir 1993 = Balbir, Nalini: *Āvaśyaka-Studien – Introduction générale et Traductions* (= Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 45,1). Stuttgart: Steiner 1993.

Balcerowicz 2001a = Balcerowicz, Piotr: *Jaina Epistemology in Historical and Comparative Perspective. Critical Edition and English Translation of Logical-Epistemological Treatises: Nyāyâvatāra, Nyāyâvatāra-vivṛti and Nyāyâvatāra-ṭippana with Introduction and Notes* (= Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 53,1-2). Stuttgart: Steiner 2001.

Balcerowicz 2001b = Balcerowicz, Piotr: Two Siddhasenas and the Authorship of the *Nyāyâvatāra* and the *Saṁmati-tarka-prakaraṇa*, in: *JIPh* 29 (2001) 351-378.

Balcerowicz 2003a = Balcerowicz, Piotr: Some Remarks on the *Naya* Method, in: Balcerowicz (2003c) 37-67.

Balcerowicz 2003b = Balcerowicz, Piotr: On the Relationship of the *Nyāyâvatāra* and the *Saṁmati-tarka-prakaraṇa*, in: *Proceedings of the XIth World Sanskrit Conference (Turin, April, 3rd-8th, 2000)*, in: *Indologica Taurinensia* 29 (2003) 31-83.

Balcerowicz 2003c = Balcerowicz, Piotr (ed.): *Essays in Jaina Philosophy and Religion* [*Proceedings of the International Seminar on Jainism 'Aspects of Jainism'. Warsaw University 8th-9th September, 2000*]. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass 2003.

Balcerowicz 2005 = Balcerowicz, Piotr: Akalaṅka und die buddhistische Tradition: Von der Nichtwahrnehmung von Unsichtbarem (*adṛśyânupalabdhi*) zur Allwissenheit, in: *WZKS* 49 (2005) 151-226.

Balcerowicz (forthcoming) = Balcerowicz, Piotr: Dharmakīrti's criticism of the Jaina doctrine of multiplexity of reality (*anekânta-vāda*), to be published in *the Proceedings of the Fourth International Dharmakīrti Conference, Universität Wien, Vienna, 23.-27.08.2005.*

Bijlert 1989 = Bijlert, Vittorio A. van: *Epistemology and Spiritual Authority. The Development of Epistemology and Logic in the Old Nyāya and the Buddhist School of Epistemology with an Annotated Translation of Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttika II (Pramāṇasiddhi) vv. 1-7.* (= WStTB 20). Wien 1989.

Bollée 2002 = Willem B. Bollée: *The Story of Paesi (Paesi-kahāṇayaṁ). Soul and Body in Ancient India. A Dialogue on Materialism. Text, Translation, Notes and Glossary*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2002.

Bronkhorst 1985 = Bronkhorst, Johannes: On the Chronology of *Tattvārtha Sūtra* and Some Early Commentaries, in: *WZKS* 29 (1985) 155-184.

Caillat 1965 = Caillat, Colette: *Les expiations dans le rituel ancien des religieux jaina*. Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard 1965 [English translation: *Atonements in the Ancient Ritual of the Jaina Monks* (= Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Series 49). Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology 1975].

Cort 2001 = Cort, John E.: *Jains in the World. Religious Values and Ideology in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press 2001.

Dasgupta 1975 = Dasgupta, Surendranath: *A History of Indian Philosophy* (5 Vols.). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass 1975.

Dhaky 1991 = Dhaky, M.A.: The Date of Kundakundācārya, in: M.A. Dhaky, Sagarmal Jain (ed.): *Aspects of Jainology, Vol. III: Pt. Dalsukhbhai Malvania Felicitation Volume I*. Vārāṇasī: P.V. Research Institute 1991: 187-206.

Dhaky 2004 = Dhaky, M.A.: Ārya Bhadrabāhu, in: M.A. Dhaky, Jitendra Bhai Shah (eds.): *Jambū-jyoti (Munivara Jambūvijaya Festschrift)*. Ahmedabad: Shresthi Kasturbhai Lalbhai Smarak Nidhi 2004: 108-155.

Dhaky–Jaina 1998 = Dhaky, M.A.; Jaina, H.L.: Svāmī Samantabhadra-no Samaya [in Gujarati: 'The date of Samantabhadra'], in: *Nirgrantha* 3 (1998).

DhṬ = Vīrasena: *Dhavalā-ṭīkā*. A commentary to *Cha-kkhaṁḍâgame* (*Ṣaṭ-khaṇḍâgama*). See: ṢKhĀ.

DNC = Mallavādin Kṣamāśramaṇa: *Dvādaśâra-naya-cakra*. Muni Jambūvijayajī (ed.): *Dvādaśāraṁ Nayacakraṁ of Ācārya Śrī Mallavādī Kṣamāśramaṇa. With the commentary Nyāyāgamānusāriṇī of Ācārya Śrī Siṁhasūri Gaṇi Vādi Kṣamāśramaṇa*. Edited with critical notes by …. Pt. I (1-4 Aras). Bhāvnagar: Śrī-Jaina-Ātmânaṁda-sabhā 1966 [reprinted: Bhāvnagar 2000]; Pt. II (5-8 Aras): Bhāvnagar 1976; Pt. III (9-12 Aras): Bhāvnagar 1988.

Dundas 1997 = Dundas, Paul: The Laicisation of the Bondless Doctrine: A New Study of the Development of Jainism, in: *JIPh* 25 (1997) 495-516.

Dundas 2002 = Dundas, Paul: *The Jains*. Second [revised] edition. London–New York: Routlegde 2002.

Flügel 1994 = Flügel, Peter: *Askese und Devotion: Das rituelle System der Terāpanth Śvetāmbara Jains*. Unpublished doctoral thesis: Mainz 1994.

Folkert 1993 = Folkert, Kendall W.: *Scripture and Community. Collected Essays on the Jains*. Ed. by John E. Cort. Atlanta (Georgia): Scholars Press 1993.

Franco 1997 = Franco, Eli: *Dharmakīrti on Compassion and Rebirth* (= WStTB 38). Wien 1997.

Gillon–Hayes 1991 = Gillon, Brendan S.; Hayes, Richard P.: Introduction to Dharmakīrti's theory of inference as presented in Pramāṇavārttika Svopajñavṛtti 1-10, in: *JIPh* 19 (1991) 1-73.

Griffiths 1998 = Griffiths, Paul: Transcendental Arguments and Dialectical Failure, in: Yoav Ariel, Shlomo Diderman, Ornam Rotem (eds.): *Relativism and Beyond*. Leiden: E.J. Brill 1998: 179-196.

Guérinot 1908 = Guérinot, Armand Albert: *Répertoire d'épigraphie jaina, précédé* *d'une esquisse de l'histoire du jainisme d'après les inscriptions*. Paris: E. Lerioux 1908.

Hattori 1968 = Hattori, Masaaki: *Dignāga, On Perception, being the Pratyakṣa-pariccheda of Dignāga's Pramāṇa-samuccaya, Edition of Tibetan translations and the Sanskrit text as well as the English translation of the Chapter I*. Cambridge (Massachusetts): Harvard University Press 1968.

Hayes 1988 = Hayes, Richard P.: *Dignāga on the Interpretation of Signs* (= Studies of Classical India 9). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press 1988.

Houben 2007 = Houben, J.E.M.: Doxographic introductions to the philosophical systems: Mallavādin and the grammarians, in the present volume.

Isibh = *Isi-bhāsiyāiṁ* [*Ṛṣi-bhāṣitāni*]. (1) Schubring (1969). (2) Vinayasagar–Shastri–Sharma (1988).

Jackson 1988 = Jackson, Roger R.: The Buddha as *Pramāṇabhūta*: Epithets and arguments in the Buddhist "logical" tradition, in: *JIPh* 16 (1988) 335-365.

Jacobi 1906 = Jacobi, Hermann: Eine Jaina Dogmatik – Umāsvātis *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra*, in: *ZDMG* 60 (1906) 287-325; 512-551.

Jaini 1920 = Jaini, J.L.: *Tattvarthadhigama Sutra (A Treatise on the Essential Principles of Jainism)* (= The Sacred Books of the Jainas 2). Arrah 1920.

Jaini 1979 = Jaini, Padmanabh S.: *The Jaina Path of Purification*. Berkeley–Los Angeles–London: University of California Press 1979 [reprinted: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass 1998].

JSK = *Jainendra Siddhānta Kośa*. Ed. by Jinendra Varṇī, Parts 1-5 (= Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Jaina Grantha-mālā 38, 40, 42, 44, 48). Delhi: Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha Prakāśana 1997, 1999, 2000.

Laidlaw 1995 = Laidlaw, James: *Riches and Renunciation. Religion, Economy, And Society Among the Jains*. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1995.

Leumann 1934 = Leumann, Ernst: *Übersicht über die Āvaśyaka-Literatur*. Aus dem Nachlass hrsg. von Walter Schubring. Hamburg 1934.

LT = Akalaṅka: *Laghīyas-traya*. (1) Mahendra Kumār Nyāya Śāstri (ed.): *Nyāya-kumuda-candra of Śrīmat Prabhācandrācārya. A Commentary on Bhaṭṭākalaṅkadeva's Laghīyastraya*. With an introduction (*Prastāvanā*) by Kailāścandra Śāstri. 2 Vols. (= Sri Garib Dass Oriental Series 121-122). Delhi: IBC 1991 [1. ed.: Bombay 1938-1942]. (2) Nyāyâcarya Mahendra Paṇḍita Kumār Śāstri (ed.): *Śrīmad-Bhaṭṭâkalaṅka-deva-viracitam Akalaṅka-grantha-trayam* [*Svôpajña-vivṛti-sahitam Laghīyas-trayam, Nyāya-viniścayaḥ, Pramāṇa-saṅgrahaś ca*]. Ahmedabad 1996 [1. ed.: Ahmedabad–Calcutta 1939].

NA = Siddhasena Mahāmati: *Nyāyâvatāra*. See NAV.

NĀA = Siṁha-sūri: *Nyāyâgamânusāriṇī*. See: DNC.

Nagatomi 1957 = Nagatomi, Masatoshi: *A Study of Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttika: An English Translation And Annotation of the Pramāṇavārttika, Book I*. [= Pramāṇa-siddhi]. Unpublished thesis presented by… to the Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University. Cambridge (Massachusetts) 1957. Part 1 & 2.

NAV = Siddharṣi-gaṇin: *Nyāyâvatāra-vivṛti*. Piotr Balcerowicz (ed.): *Jaina Epistemology in Historical and Comparative Perspective. Critical Edition and English Translation of Logical-Epistemological Treatises: Nyāyâvatāra, Nyāyâvatāra-*

vivṛti and Nyāyâvatāra-ṭippana with Introduction and Notes. 2 Vols. (= Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 53,1-2). Stuttgart: Steiner 2001.

NBh = Vātsyāyana Pakṣilasvāmin: *Nyāya-bhāṣya*. See: NS.

NKC = Prabhācandra-sūri: *Nyāya-kumuda-candra*. See: LT$_2$.

NS = Akṣapāda Gautama: *Nyāya-sūtra*. Anantalal Thakur (ed.): *Gautamīyanyāya-darśana with Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana*. New Delhi: ICPR 1997.

NSā = Kundakunda: *Niyama-sāra*. (1) Uggar Jain (ed., tr.): *Niyamasāra of Kundakunda* (= Jagmandarlal Jaini Memorial Series 5). Lucknow 1931. (2) Jagdish Prasad Jain "Sadhak": *Niyamasara of Kundakunda. Translated with an Introduction*. New Delhi: Radiant Publishers 2005.

Ohira 1982 = Ohira, Suzuko: *A Study of the Tattvārthasūtra with Bhāṣya with Special Reference to Authorship and Date* (= Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Series 86). Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology 1982.

PMī = Hemacandra-sūri: *Pramāṇa-mīmīṁsā*. (1) Sukhlalji Sanghavi, Mahendra Kumar and Dalsukh Malvaniya (eds.): *Kavikālasarvajña-Śrī-Hemacandrâcārya-viracitā svopajña-vṛtti-sahitā Pramāṇa Mīmāṁsā* [*with Bhāṣā Tippaṇa of Pandita Sukhlalji Sanghvi*]. Ahmedabad 1998. (2) Satkari Mookerjee and Nathmal Tatia (transl., eds.): *Hemacandra's Pramāṇa-mīmāṁsā. Text and Translation with Critical Notes*. Varanasi: Tara Publications 1970.

PMīV = Hemacandra-sūri: *Pramāṇa-mīmāṁsā-svopajña-vṛtti*. See PMī.

PRP = Umāsvāti: *Praśama-rati-prakaraṇa*. (1) Vijaya-jinendra-sūrîśvara, Vijaya-karpura-sūrîśvara, Viyayāmṛta-sūrîśvara (eds.): *Pūjyavara Śrīmad-Umāsvāti-vācaka-viracitaṁ Praśama-rati-prakaraṇaṁ Ṭīkā-sahitam*. Lākhābāval-Śāṁtipurī (Saurāṣṭra) 1991. (2) Yajneshwar S. Shastri: *Ācārya Ūmāsvāti Vācaka's Praśamaratiprakaraṇa* (= Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Series 107). Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology 1989.

PRṬ = Haribhadra: *Praśama-rati-ṭīkā*. See: PRP$_1$.

PS = Diṅnāga: *Pramāṇa-samuccaya*, Chapter I. (1) See: Hattori (1968). (2) See: Steinkellner (2005).

PSā = Kundakunda: *Pavayaṇa-sāra* [*Pravacana-sāra*]. A.N. Upadhye (ed.): *Śrī Kundakundācārya's Pravacanasāra (Pavayaṇasāra), a Pro-Canonical Text of the Jainas, the Prakṛit Text critically edited with the Sanskrit Commentaries of Amṛtacandra and Jayasena*. Agās: Śrī Paramaśruta-Prabhāvaka-Maṇḍala, Śrīmad Rājacandra Āśrama 1984 [1. ed.: Bombay 1935].

PSā-TPVṛ = Amṛtacandra-sūri: *Pravacana-sāra-tattva-pradīpikā-vṛtti* (°-*ṭīkā*). A Commentary on *Pavayaṇa-sāra*. See: PSā.

PSā-TVṛ = Jayasena: *Pravacana-sāra-tātparya-vṛtti*. A Commentary on *Pavayaṇa-sāra*. See: PSā.

PSSā = Kundakunda: *Paṁcatthiya-saṁgaha* [*Pañcâstikāya-samaya-sāra*]. (1) A. Chakravartinayanar and A.N. Upadhye (eds.): *Pañcāstikāyasāra. The Building of the Cosmos*. Prakrit text, Sanskrit *chāyā*, English commentary. Delhi 1975 [1. ed.: Lucknow 1920 (= SBJ 3)]. (2) Manoharlāl (ed.): *Śrīmat-Kundakunda-svāmi-viracitaḥ Pañcâsti-kāyaḥ Tattva-pradīpikā-Tātparya-vṛtti-Bālâvabodh-aka-bhāṣêti ṭīkā-trayôpetaḥ*. Agās: Śrīmad Rājacandra Āśrama 1998.

PSṬ = Jinendrabuddhi: *Pramāṇa-samuccaya-ṭīkā*. Ernst Steinkellner; Helmut Krasser; Horst Lasic (eds.): *Jinendrabuddhi's Pramāṇasamuccayaṭīkā: Chap-*

ter 1. Part I: Critical Edition. Part II: Diplomatic Edition (2 Vols.). Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press; Bejing: China Tibetology Publishing House 2005.

PV = Dharmakīrti: *Pramāṇa-vārttika*. (1) Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana (ed.): *Pramāṇavārttikam by Ācārya Dharmakīrti*. Appendix to *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 24, Patna 1938: 1-123. (2) Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana (ed.): *Pramāṇavārttikam Ācārya-Manorathanandi-kṛtayā vṛttyā saṁvalitam* [*Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttikam with a commentary by Manorathanandin*]. Parts I-II, Appendix to *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 24-26, Patna 1938-1940.

RP = *Rāyapaseṇiya* [*Rājapraśnīya-sūtra*]. (1) *Śrīmat Rājapraśnīyasūtram* (= Āgamodaya-samiti 149). Bombay 1925. (2) Becardās Jīvrāj Dośī (ed.): *Rāyapaseṇiya-suttaṁ*. Ahmedabad 1937-1938. (3) Yuvācārya Śrī Miśrīmalajī Mahārāj 'Madhukar' (ed.); Śrī Ratan Muni (tr.): *Rājapraśnīya-sūtra. Second Upānga Rājaprashniya Sūtram* [*Original Text, Hindi Version. Notes, Annotations and Appendices etc.*] (= Jināgama Grantha-mālā 15). Beawar (Rājasthān): Śrī Āgam Prakāśan Samiti 1982. (4) Yuvācārya Mahāprajna (ed.): *Rāyapaseṇaiyaṁ*. Lāḍnūn 1987.

RVār = Akalaṅka: *Tattvârtha-vārttika* (*Rāja-vārttika*). Mahendra Kumar Jain (ed.): *Tattvārtha-vārttika* [*Rāja-vārttika*] *of Śrī Akalaṅkadeva*. Edited with Hindi Translation, Introduction, Appendices, Variant Readings, Comparative Notes etc. Parts I-II. First edition (= JMJG 10, 20). Delhi 1953-1957 [2. ed.: Delhi 1982].

Saṅghavi–Dośi 2000 = Saṅghavi, Sukhlāl; Dośi, Becardās (eds.): *Siddhasena Divākara's Sanmati Tarka with a Critical Introduction and an Original Commentary*. Translated from Hindu by A.S. Gopani, reprinted by Jitendra Shah. Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology 2000 [1. ed.: 1939].

Schubring 1942 = Schubring, Walther: *Isibhāsiyāiṁ. Ein Jaina Text der Frühzeit*. Nachrichten von der Akad. Wiss. in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse. Göttingen 1942: Nr.1, S. 481-576, 1952: Nr. 2, S. 21-52.

Schubring 1957 = Schubring, Walter: Kundakunda echt und unecht, in: *ZDMG* 107 (1957) 537-574.

Schubring 1966 = Schubring, Walter: *The Religion of the Jainas* (= Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series 52). Calcutta 1966.

Schubring 1969 = Schubring, Walther: *Isibhāsiyāiṁ. Aussprüche der Weisen aus dem Prakrit der Jainas*. Übersetzt nebst dem revidierten Text (= Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 14). Hamburg: Cram, de Gruyter u. Co. 1969.

Seyfort Ruegg 1994 = Seyfort Ruegg, David: *Pramāṇabhuta*, **pramāṇa(bhūta)-puruṣa*, *pratyakṣadharman* and *sakṣātkṛtadharman* as Epithets of the *ṛṣi*, *ācārya* and *tathāgata* in Grammatical, Epistemological and Madhyamaka Texts, in: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 57 (1994) 303-320.

Shah 1967 = Shah, Nagin J.: *Akalaṅka's Criticism of Dharmakīrti's Philosophy—A Study* (= Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Series 11). Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology 1967.

Shāntā 1997 = Shāntā, N.: *The Unknown Pilgrim. The Voice of Sādhvīs: The history, spirituality and life of the Jaina women ascetics*. With a Presentation by Raimond Pannikar, Translated from the French by Mary Rogers (= Sri Garib Dass Oriental Series 219). Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications 1997 [French original: *La Voie Jaina*. Paris: OEIL 1985].

Sin 1999 = Sin, Fujinaga: Samantabhadra's Epistemology: Combining Jaina Ideas with the Ideals of Other Schools, in: N.K. Wagle, Olle Qvarnström (eds.): *Approaches to Jaina Studies: Philosophy, Logic, Rituals and Symbols*. Toronto 1999: 131-136.

ṢKhĀ = Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali: *Cha-kkhaṁḍâgame* [*Ṣaṭ-khaṇḍâgama*]. Hirarlal Jain, Phoolachandra Siddhanta Shastri, Balachandra Sidhanta Shastri (eds.): *Shatkhandagama of Pushpadanta and Bhootabali with the Commentary Dhavala of Veerasenacharya*, edited with Introduction, Hindi translation, Notes and Indexes (16 Vols.). Amaravati: Jaina Sāhityoddhāraka Fund 1939-1959 [revised fourth edition: Solāpur: Jain Saṁskṛti Saṁrakṣak Saṅgha 2000].

Soni 2003 = Soni, Jayandra: Kundakunda and Umāsvāti on *Anekānta-vāda*, in: Balcerowicz (2003c: 25-35).

SSā = Kundakunda: *Samaya-sāra*. Pannālāl Jain (ed.): *Śrīmad-bhagavat-Kundakundâcārya-viracitaḥ Samaya-sāraḥ Ātma-khyāti-Tātpārya-vṛtti-Ātma-khyāti-bhāṣā-vacanikā iti Ṭīkā-trayôpetaḥ*. Agās: Śrī Paramaśruta Prabhāvaka Maṇḍala, Śrīmad Rājacandra Āśrama 1997.

SSi = Pūjyapāda Devanandin: *Sarvârtha-siddhi*. (1) Phoolchandra Shastri (ed.): *Ācārya Pūjyapāda's Sarvārthasiddhi* [*The commentary on Ācārya Griddhapiccha's Tattvārtha-sūtra*]. Edited and translated [into Hindi]. Varanasi 1934 [reprinted: Delhi 2000 (= JMJG 13)]. (2) Jinadasa Śastri (ed.): *Tattvārthavṛttiḥ Sarvārtha-siddhiḥ—Pūjyapāda Devanandin* (Śrīsekhārāma Nemicandra Granthamālā 128). Ṣodaśapur: Devajī Sakhārām Diśī & Māṇikacandra-digambara-jaina-parīkṣālaya-mantri 1939 [= Digāmbara Recension].

Stcherbatsky 1930 = Stcherbatsky, Th.: *Buddhist Logic* (Vol. I & II). Delhi 1993 (first edition: Издательство Академии Наук СССР, Ленинград 1930).

Steinkellner 1982 = Steinkellner, Ernst: The Spiritual Place of the Epistemological Tradition in Buddhism, in: *Nanto Bukkyō* 49 (1982) 1-18.

Steinkellner 2005 = Steinkellner, Ernst: *Dignāga's Pramāṇasamuccaya, Chapter 1. A hypothetical reconstruction of the Sanskrit text with the help of the two Tibetan translations on the basis of the hitherto known Sanskrit fragments and the linguistic materials gained from Jinendrabuddhi's Ṭīkā*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften 2005 (April): www.oeaw.ac.at/ias/Mat/dignaga_PS_1.pdf

STP = Siddhasena Divākara: *Saṁmati-tarka-prakaraṇa*. (1) Sukhlāl Saṅghavi; Becardās Dośi (eds.): *Saṁmatitarkaprakaraṇam by Siddhasena Divākara with Abhayadevasūri's Tattvabodhavidhāyinī* (= Gujarātpurātattvamandir Granthāvalī 10, 16, 18, 19, 21*)*. Ahmedabad: Gujarātpurātattvamandir 1924-1931 [reprinted: Kyoto: Rinsen 1984 (2 Vols.)]. (2) For a paraphrase in English see Saṅghavi–Dośi (2000).

Sukhlal 1974 = Sukhlal, Sangahvi: *Pt. Sukhlalji's Commentary on Tattvārtha Sūtra of Vācaka Umāsvāti* (= Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Series 44). Ahmedabad: L.D.

Institute of Indology 1974.

SvSt = Samantabhadra: *Svayambhū-stotra*. (1) Jugal Kiśor Mukhtār 'Yugavīra' (ed., introd.): *Śrīmat-svāmi-Samangabhadrâcārya-viracita catur-viṁśati-jina-stavanâtmaka Svayambhū-stotra (*= Vira-sevā-mandira-grantha-mālā 7). Sahāranapura: Virasevā Mandira 1951. (2) Devendra K. Goyal (ed., tr.): *The Path to Enlightenment. Svayambhu Stotra by Acharya Samantabhdra Svami. English Translation with introduction*. New Delhi: Radiant Publishers 2000.

SvSt = Samantabhadra: *Svayambhū-stotra*. Jugal Kiśor Mukhtār 'Yugavīra' (ed., introd.): *Śrīmat-svāmi-Samangabhadrâcārya-viracita catur-viṁśati-jina-stavanâtmaka Svayambhū-stotra* (*stuti-paraka jainâgama*) (= Virasevā-mandira-grantha-mālā 7). Sahāranapura: Virasevā Mandira 1951.

ŚA = Hemacandra-sūri: *Śabdânuśāsana*. (1) Muni Jambuvijaya (ed.): *Ācārya-bhagavat-kali-kāla-sarvajña-śrī-hemacandra-sūri-praṇītaṁ svôpajña-laghu-vṛtti-vibhūṣitaṁ śrī-siddha-hemacandra-śabdânuśāsanaṁ*. Pāṭaṇ 1994. (2) Muni Jambuvijaya (ed.): *Ācārya-bhagavat-kali-kāla-sarvajña-śrī-hemacandra-sūri-praṇītaṁ svôpajña-rahasya-vṛtti-vibhūṣitaṁ śrī-siddha-hemacandra-śabdânuśāsanaṁ tathā a-kārâdy-anukrama-sahitaḥ siddha-hema-saptâdhyāyī-sūtra-pāṭhāḥ*. Pāṭaṇ 1995.

ŚA-LVṛ = Hemacandra-sūri: *Śabdânuśāsana-laghu-vṛtti*. See: ŚA$_1$.

ŚA-RVṛ = Hemacandra-sūri: *Śabdânuśāsana-rahasya-vṛtti*. See: ŚA$_2$.

Tatia 1951 = Tatia, Nathmal: *Studies in Jaina Philosophy*. Calcutta 1951 [reprinted: Vārāṇasī: P.V. Research Institute 1987].

TBh = Umāsvāti: *Tattvârthâdhigama-bhāṣya*. See: TS$_{\text{śvet}}$.

Ṭhāṇ = *Ṭhāṇaṁga-sutta* [*Sthānâṅga-sūtra*]. Muni Jambuvijaya (ed.): *Ṭhānaṁga-suttam and Samavāyaṁgasuttam* (= Jaina-Āgama-Series 3). Bombay: Śrī Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya 1985.

TS$_{\text{dig}}$ = Umāsvāmin: *Tattvârtha-sūtra*. See: SSi [= Digāmbara Recension].

TS$_{\text{śvet}}$ = Umāsvāmin: *Tattvârtha-sūtra*. (1) M.K. Mody (ed.): *Tattvârthâdhigama by Umāsvāti being in the Original Sanskrit with the Bhāṣya by the author himself* (= Bibliotheca Indica New Series 1044, 1079, 1118). Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal 1903, 1904, 1905 [= Śvetāmbara Recension].

TṬ = Devagupta-sūri and Siddhasena-gaṇin: *Tattvârthâdhigama-ṭīkā*. Hīrālāl Rasikdās Kapadia (ed.): *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra by Śrī Umāsvāti Vāchaka, together with His connective verses commented upon by Śrī Devaguptasūri & Śrī Siddhasenagaṇi and His own gloss elucidated by Śrī Siddhasenagaṇi* (2 Vols.) (= Sheth Devchand Lalbhai Jain Pustakoddhar Fund Series 67, 76). Bombay 1926 (Part I: Chapters i-v), 1930 (Part II: Chapters vi-x).

TV = Śrutasāgara-sūri: *Tattvârtha-vṛtti*. Mahendra Kumar Jain (ed.): *Tattvārtha-vṛtti of Śrī Śrutasāgara Sūri, The Commentary on Tattvārtha-sūtra of Umāsvāmi with Hindi Translation*. New Delhi 1999.

Upadhye 1935 = Upadhye, A.N.: 'Introduction', see PSā: 1-126.

Uttar = *Uttarajjhayaṇa-sutta* [*Uttarâdhyayana-sūtra*]. Muni Puṇyavijayaji and Pt. Amritlāl Mohanlāl Bhojak (eds.): *Dasaveyāliyasuttaṁ, Uttarajhayaṇāiṁ and Āvassayasuttaṁ* (= Jaina-Āgama-Series 15). Bombay: Śrī Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya 1977.

VIDYĀBHŪṢAṆA 1909 = Vidyābhūṣaṇa, Satis Chandra: *Nyāyāvatāra. The Earliest Jaina Work on Pure Logic by Siddhasena Divākara (The celebrated Kṣapaṇaka of Vikramāditya's Court). With Sanskrit Text and Commentary, Notes and English Translation*. Calcutta 1909 [reprinted: *Edited, re-arranged and augmented with an Introduction and Notes* by Satya Ranjan Banerjee. Calcutta1981].

VINAYASAGAR–SHASTRI–SHARMA 1988 = Vinayasāgara, Mahôpādhyāya (ed., Hindi tr.); Shastri, Kalanath (Eng. tr.); Sharma, Dinesh Chandra (Eng. tr.): *Isibhasiyam Suttam (Rishibhashit Sutra)* (= Prakrit Bharati Pushpa 46). Jaipur: Prakrit Bharati Academy 1988.

VS(C) = Kaṇāda: *Vaiśeṣika-sūtra*. Muni Jambuvijaya (ed.): *Vaiśeṣikasūtra of Kaṇāda with the Commentary of Candrānanda*. With the Introduction by Anantalal Thakur (= GOS 136). Baroda: Oriental Institute 1961.

WEZLER 2003 = Wezler, Albrecht: Studien zum *Dvādaśâra-naya-cakra* des Śvetāmbara Mallavādin. II: The Twelve *Ara*s of the *Dvādaśâra-naya-cakra* and their relation to the Canon as seen by Mallavādin (First Part), in: Balcerowicz (2003c: 13-23).

WILLIAMS 1963 = Williams, Robert: *Jaina Yoga*. Oxford University Press, Oxford 1963 [reprinted: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1983].

WINTERNITZ 1987 = Winternitz, Moritz: *A History of Indian Literature*. Vols. I-II: Calcutta 1927-1933; Vol. III: Calcutta 1963-1967.

YA = Samantabhadra: *Yukty-anuśāsana*. Indra Lāl: (ed.): *Yukty-anuśāsana of Samantabhadra*. Edited with the *Ṭīkā* of Vidyānandācārya (= MCDJG 15). Bombay 1919.

YAṬ = Vidyānandācārya: *Yukty-anuśāsana-ṭīkā*. See: YA.

ZYDENBOS 1983 = Zydenbos, Robert J.: *Mokṣa in Jainism, According to Umāsvāti* (= Beiträge zur Südasienforschung 83). Wiesbaden: Steiner 1983.