



Fragments from the Ājīvikas

Piotr Balcerowicz¹

Accepted: 7 November 2021

© The Author(s) 2022

Abstract The paper examines available references to the Ājīvikas that are often identified by scholars, notably by Basham (1951), as genuine quotations from Ājīvikas' lost works. In addition, the paper analyses some additional material not previously identified as possible quotations relevant to Ājīvikism. Unfortunately, none of such references seem to be genuinely derived from an Ājīvika source: All of such passages or verses previously considered genuinely taken from Ājīvika literature turn out to have been composed by non-Ājīvika authors and usually derive either from Jaina works or from fables and narrative literature. There is no clear proof that the Ājīvikas developed their own Sanskrit literature (in addition to Prakrit works), much less philosophical literature in Sanskrit. Further, the faithfulness and reliability of reports of the Ājīvikas and paraphrases of their views cannot be assessed with any certainty.

Keywords Ajivikism · Ājīvikas · Materialists · Destiny · Fate · Fatalism · *Niyati* · *Svabhāva* · *Niyati-dvātrīṃśikā* · *Sāmañña-phala-sutta*

1.

Very little is known about the ancient Indian religion and philosophical system of the Ājīvikas. The doctrine, which predates the emergence of Jainism and Buddhism, albeit by only a slight margin, flourished between the fourth and second centuries

Work on this paper has been generously supported by the National Science Centre of Poland (Research Project: History of Classical Indian Philosophy: non-Brahmanic Schools, National Science Centre, 2011/01/B/HS1/04014).

✉ Piotr Balcerowicz
piotrbalcerowicz1@gmail.com

¹ University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland

BCE. In the period between the fourth and second centuries BCE, it was perhaps one of the most influential non-Brahmanical religions in India, second to Buddhism.¹ Despite attempts having been made by a number of scholars² we still have an impression that we know very little of Ājīvikism. The sources at our disposal for reconstructing their doctrine are both very limited and unreliable.

Any attempt to reconstruct the views propounded by the Ājīvikas and the founders of the system, one of them being Makkhali Gosāla, will face two major difficulties. First, there are no extant complete texts (except one alleged candidate, see below), or even fragments, which can be claimed reliably to have been written by the Ājīvikas or which have been identified beyond doubt as directly stemming from sources known as both closely linked and faithful to the Ājīvikas. This is because there are no such sources; indeed, all references to the Ājīvikas in the whole history of Indian philosophy originate from rather hostile environment. Secondly, the process of a possibly reconstructing the views of the Ājīvikas must be based on our decision about which of the preserved fragments (quotes, paraphrases etc.), again from these hostile environments, that we encounter is original or faithfully reproduces Ājīvika views. Our decision as to which of the preserved fragments we are considering is original or faithfully reproduces Ājīvika views is necessarily based on our knowledge of what the real doctrine of the Ājīvikas actually was (in order to be able to ascribe a fragment to the Ājīvika school or not), which in turn is based on the process of the reconstruction of authentic views of the Ājīvikas. And this is clearly a *vicious* circle. There is, unfortunately, no logical and methodologically satisfactory way out except through a process of gradual approximation, something that treads on the vicious circle itself. All we can do is to examine (or re-examine) the material which was produced by authors and traditions inimically

¹ Its followers are mentioned three times in two Aśokan edicts. Two of these are inscriptions from Barābār Hill in Bihar (BLOCH (1950, p. 159): 1. *lājīnā piyadassinā duvā-ḍasa-vassābhissitenā iyaṃ niggoha-kubhā dinnā ājīvikehi*.—‘This Banyan Cave was donated to the Ājīvikas by [the king Aśoka] Favourably Disposed, who was consecrated twelve years [ago].’: 2. *lājīnā piyadassinā duvā-ḍasa-vassābhissitenā iyaṃ kubhā khalatika-pavvatassi dinnā ājīvikehi*.—‘This cave of the Khalatika mountain was donated to the Ājīvikas by [the king Aśoka] Favourably Disposed, who was consecrated twelve years [ago].’). They are also mentioned in the seventh pillar edict from Toprā in Haryana (BLOCH (1950, p. 170): *saṅghatṭhassi pi me kaṭe, ime viyāpaṭā hohaṃti ti. hemeva bābhanesu ājīvikesu pi me kaṭe, ime viyāpaṭā hohaṃti ti*.—‘Also with respect to the matters of the [Buddhist] community, I decided that these [high officers (*mahā-mātra*)] are occupied [with them]. Likewise, with respect to Brahmins and Ājīvikas, I decided that these [high officers] are occupied [with them].’). In comparison, the Jainas are mentioned only once in the latter inscription (BLOCH (1950, pp. 170–171): *nigāṃthesu pi me kaṭe, ime viyāpaṭā hohaṃti. nānā pāsaiṃdesu pi me kaṭe, ime viyāpaṭā hohaṃti ti*.—‘Also with respect to the Jainas, I decided that these [high officers] are occupied [with them]. Also with respect to various heretics, I decided that these [high officers] are occupied [with them].’). The sequence reveals the hierarchy of importance: the Buddhists (*saṅgha*), the Ājīvikas, the Jainas, followed by all the remaining heretics. The Buddhists and the Ājīvikas, in precisely this order (which is the same as in the two Aśokan inscriptions), are mentioned by Kauṭilya (AŚ 3.20.16: *sākyājīvakādīn vṛṣala-pravrajitān...*), who is conspicuously silent on the Jainas (Nirgranthas).

² Such as Hermann JACOBI (1880), Bunyiu NANJIO (1884), Ernst LEUMANN (1884), D.R. BHANDARKAR (1912), K.B. PATHAK (1912), Jarl CHARPENTIER (1913), B.M. BARUA (1920), A.F. Rudolf HOERNLE (1926), A. BANERJI SASTRI (1926), B.M. BARUA (1926–1927), N. AIYASVAMI SASTRI (1941), Arthur Llewellyn BASHAM (1951), Arthur Llewellyn BASHAM (1971), Haripada CHAKRABORTI (1973), S.N. GHOSAL (1979) and (1980), Pranabananda JASH (1982a) and (1982b), Gustav ROTH (1993), Johannes BRONKHORST (2000), (2003) and (2007). The latest in the series is: PIOTR BALCEROWICZ (2016).

disposed to the Ājīvikas in the hope that a careful comparison and assessment of such sources may reveal some dependable threads from which we will little by little weave a fabric of more definite and tangible texture. In this way we may give a fresh look to a source which we originally considered not quite related to Ājīvikas to throw more light on the history of the system. A way to approach the extant material is to first determine certain terminology or concepts which were traditionally associated by other systems with the Ājīvikas and then, with the help of these technical terms and notions, we may proceed to detect possible new sources for further examination.

That the Ājīvikas had their early canon known as the eightfold *Mahā-nimitta* is attested in Jaina canonical literature.³ But we also have evidence that the Ājīvikas developed their canon containing 22 *sūtras*, with divisions rather similar to Jaina canon. A reference to it is found in the Jaina *Namdi-sutta*:

Twenty-two *sūtras* are accepted to be the *sūtras* in the arrangement of the Ājīvika *sūtras*, the sections of which are dependent [for meaning] on each other.⁴

We may also suspect that they probably developed some literature in Sanskrit. The question, however, is whether anything of this remains, preserved either in exact citations, loose quotes paraphrases or references.

In this paper I will first re-examine the material which has already been analysed by some scholars heretofore and determined to not only to be related Ājīvikism but to represent genuine quotations from Ājīvika sources. Incidentally, I will also evaluate the methodology so far applied by scholars in their ascribing the authorship of certain passages to the Ājīvikas. Then, I will search for additional passages so far overlooked by scholars and attempt to assess to what extent these can be considered genuine quotations or faithful paraphrases. My intention is to establish a pool of Ājīvika fragments, preferably citations, that is as broad as possible. In my analysis I will concern myself primarily with Sanskrit passages that are possible candidates for original quotations from Ājīvikas' lost sources. The aim of this paper is not to reconstruct the doctrine of the Ājīvikas. However, such reconstructory attempts will be occasionally undertaken if they are necessary to judge whether a particular fragment may be considered authentic or not.

2. The earliest reference (or, at least, one of the earliest such references) is the well-known account found in the Buddhist description of the six 'heretical' teachers of the *Sāmañña-phala-sutta*, which preserves what is known as 'the doctrine of

³ This was already noticed by LEUMANN (1884, p. 249), BARUA (1920, pp. 20, 41), BASHAM (1951, pp. 213–216) and others. See e.g. *Viy 15.7–9 = Viy 15.4–5 = Viy 15.58 = Viy 15.77: tae nam te chad-disācarā attha-vihaṃ puvva-gayaṃ magga-dasamaṃ saehiṃ saehiṃ mati-damsaṇehiṃ nijjūhaṃti, nijjūhittā gosālāṃ maṃkhaliputtaṃ uvatthāiṃsu. tae nam se gosāle maṃkhaliputte tenaṃ atthagassa mahā-nimittassa keṇai ulloyametteṇa savvesiṃ pāṇāṇaṃ savesiṃ bhūyāṇaṃ savvesiṃ jīvāṇaṃ savvesiṃ sattāṇaṃ imāṃ cha aṇatikkaṃaññijāṃ vāgaraṇāṃ vagareti...* See also BALCEROWICZ (2016, pp. 55–57).

⁴ *NamS₁ 105, p. 74.1–4: ... iccheyāṃ bhāvisāṃ suttāṃ acchiṇṇa-cheyāṇiyāṃ ājīviya-sutta-parivāḍḍie suttāṃ; see also NamCū 106, p. 74.6–18, ad loc. in the same spirit, esp.: ete cēva bhāvisāṃ acchiṇṇa-cchedaṇatābhippāyato ājīviya-sutta-parivāḍḍie thitā.*

Makkhali Gosāla' (*Makkhali-gosāla-vādo*). While it is clearly not a citation, it does seem to reveal certain terminological peculiarities characteristic of the Ājīvikas:

There is no deed [performed by the agent] himself, there is no deed [performed by] someone else [than the agent], there is no deed [performed by] humans [which could influence future births or determine the course of their lives], there is no strength, there is no vigour, there is no human aptitude, there is no human prowess [which could influence future birth or determine fate]. All animate beings, all breathing things, all living beings, all souls are without power, without strength, without vigour; [instead] **they are developed by destiny, predetermined concurrence of factors and [own] nature**. [and] they experience pleasure and suffering in the six classes [of existence]. ... The following is not the case: on account of this virtue, or on account of this vow, or on account of this austerity, or on account of this pure conduct, I will ripen the unripened *karman* or will bring ripened *karman* to destruction by gradually working on [it through such practices]. This is not the case. Happiness and unhappiness are meted out with a measure, their final end is done in (i.e. through) the cycle of rebirths; there is neither [their] diminishing nor expanding, there is neither [their] increase nor decrease. Just like a ball of thread, when thrown, exhausts itself, [simply] unwinding, exactly in the same manner both the fool and the wise—having transmigrated, having gone through the cycle of rebirths—will put an end to unhappiness.⁵

On the basis of this passage—followed in the *Sāmañña-phala-sutta* with a detailed list of divisions of the world, living beings etc.—and a comparison of its vocabulary with a number of other passages generally associated by Indian tradition and scholars with the Ājīvikas we can tentatively identify four such 'Ājīvika keywords':

1. *niyati* (destiny),
2. *saṅgati* / *saṅgati* (predetermined concurrence of factors),⁶
3. *svabhāva* (intrinsic nature),
4. *daiva* (fate)⁷.

The fourth one (fate, or *daiva*), being traditionally related to the Ājīvika and often identified with destiny (*niyati*), is absent from the above passage. These—especially in combinations such as *niyati-vāda* ('the doctrine of destiny', or determinism), *Saṅgati-vāda* ('the doctrine of predetermined concurrence of factors'), *svabhāva-*

⁵ *Sāmañña-phala-sutta*, DN 2.20, p. 53–54: *n'atthi atta-kāre, n'atthi para-kāre, n'atthi purisa-kāre, n'atthi balaṃ, n'atthi vīriyaṃ, n'atthi purisa-thāmo, n'atthi purisa-parakkamo. sabbe sattā sabbe pāṇā sabbe bhūtā sabbe jīvā avasā abalā avīriyā niyati-saṅgati-bhāva-pariṇatā chass'evābhijātisu sukha-dukkhaṃ paṭisaṃvedenti. ... tatha n'atthi: imināhaṃ sīlena vā vatena vā tapena vā brahma-cariyena vā aparipakkaṃ vā kammaṃ paripācassāmi, paripakkaṃ vā kammaṃ phussa phussa vyantiṃ karissāmi. h'evaṃ n'atthi [.]. doṇa-mīte sukha-dukkhe pariyaṇta-kaṭe saṃsāre, n'atthi hāyana-vaḍḍhane, n'atthi ukkaṃsāvakaṃse. seyyathā pi nāma sutta-guḷe khitte nibbheṭhiyamānaṃ eva paletī, evaṃ eva bāle ca paṇḍite ca sandhāvītivā saṃsaritvā dukkhass'antaṃ karissantīti.*

⁶ Equated with *niyati*, see e.g. SūyVṛ 1.1.2.30, p. 38.38: *sā saṅgati niyatīs.*

⁷ See §§ 11, 14.

vāda ('the doctrine of intrinsic nature'), or *daiva-vāda* ('the doctrine of fate', or fatalism), which suggest that the usage of these terms is not casual but refers to some kind of world view—will also be the terms which I will use in order to unearth possible 'concealed citations' from the Ājīvikas or at least to identify passages that may closely be linked to them, and then I will critically evaluate such passages with an attempt to discard those which do not betray any closer link to Ājīvika doctrine despite the use of one of the above technical terms. In addition, I will follow an obvious procedure: I will examine the passages which are identified by Indian authors with the Ājīvikas, either as describing (paraphrasing) their views or as citing them *verbatim*.

In my critical enquiry I will make liberal use of a selection of passages listed by BASHAM (1951) in his *History and Doctrines of the Ājīvikas*, especially a chapter section 'Quotations by the Commentators', which he considers genuine quotes from Ājīvika sources. He concludes his selection of quotations from allegedly original Ājīvika Sanskrit sources⁸ as follows:

These verses indicate that, beside their early literature in Prakrit, and the Tamil scripture *Onpatu-katir*, the Ājīvikas possessed a later literature in Sanskrit, containing much philosophical poetry. It might be suggested that these verses were composed by the commentators themselves, to illustrate the views they were discussing. Yet here are eight verses, quoted by different commentators in different centuries, and all attributed to Ājīvikas or *niyatīvādins*. It is more probable that some at least are genuine, than that all are spurious.⁹

3. With respect to these eight verses mentioned by BASHAM, I will start my critical enquiry with a passage found in Guṇaratna-sūri's commentary *Tarka-rahasya-dīpikā* (TRD) to Hariḥhadra-sūri's *Ṣaḍ-darśana-samuccaya* (ṢDSa) which describes a fourth view out of various theories of 'what makes the world go round' and which contains two such verses:

For these [proponders of the fourth view] argue as follows: {A} There is another category [which is responsible for change in the world], namely destiny, [and] by its force all entities without exception manifest themselves in a strictly determined manner, not otherwise. For it is as follows: if [object] x arises from [factor] y [at time] t , then [object] x is understood to exist in a strictly determined manner due to [factor] y [at time] t ; otherwise there would be no basis for [any talk about] effect and cause and about any individually definite form [which an object assumes], because there would be no determining factor [for things to occur this way and not otherwise]. Therefore, in this way, who on earth, being expert in the method of cognitive criteria, could possibly disprove destiny [as determining factor] which is [clearly] apprehended on account of strict determinism of effect?! [There is] no way he

⁸ BASHAM (1951, pp. 220–223).

⁹ BASHAM (1951, pp. 222–223).

can achieve it; otherwise there would be an undesired consequence of self-abortiveness of the method of cognitive criteria. So, accordingly, it is said:

V 1: “{B} Since all entities occur in a strictly determined form, therefore [all of] them are produced by destiny in conformity with their own intrinsic nature.

«The what» (i.e. the object), «the when» (i.e. the time of its occurrence), «the because of» (i.e. its causal factor), «the as long as» (i.e. its duration) occur as determined in a strictly specified manner. Who could possible oppose this [destiny]?”¹⁰

Two layers are distinguishable at first glance in Guṇaratna-sūri’s commentary: Section {A} is Guṇaratna-sūri’s own paraphrase or account of the views of Ājīvikas the way he knew or understood them, whereas Section {B} seems to be a quotation of two verses. These appear to be genuine, especially due to how they are introduced: *tathā cōktam*. However, upon closer inspection of Guṇaratna-sūri’s introduction to the verses—Section {A}—it becomes obvious that he does not go beyond the contents the two verses: Section {A} is basically their paraphrase and does not bring in any new material or information. BASHAM (1951, p. 222) introduces the two above-mentioned verses as follows: ‘Guṇaratna ... quotes further verses which he attributes to the *niyatīvādins*’.

As a matter of fact, the actual source of these two verses is the *Śāstra-vārttā-samuccaya*¹¹ of Haribhadra-sūri (c. 740–800), the encyclopaedist and author of the *Ṣaḍ-darśana-samuccaya*. The two verses occur in a *niyati-vāda* section consisting of altogether four verses.¹²

That brief passage forms a part of a larger section which collects a number of unorthodox views explaining the causality of the world and events and includes *kāla-vāda* (‘the doctrine of time’), *svabhāva-vāda* (‘the doctrine of intrinsic nature’), *niyati-vāda* (‘the doctrine of destiny’), *karma-vāda* (‘the doctrine of deeds’), *kālādī-sāmagrī-vāda* (‘the doctrine of causal complex consisting of time and other

¹⁰ TRD 1 § 23, p.18.6–19.14: *te hy evam āhuḥ— {A} niyatir nāma tattvāntaram asti yad-vaśād ete bhāvāḥ sarve ’pi niyatenāiva rūpeṇa prādur-bhāvam aśnūvate, nānyathā. tathā hi—yad yadā yato bhavati tat tadā tata eva niyatenāiva rūpeṇa bhavad upalabhyate, anyathā kārya-kāraṇa-vyavasthā pratīnyatārūpa-vyavasthā ca na bhavet, niyāmākābhāvāt. tata evam kārya-naiyatyaṭaḥ pratīyamānām enām niyatim ko nāma pramāṇa-patha-kuśalo bādhitum kṣamate. mā prāpad anyatrāpi pramāṇa-patha-vyāghāta-prasaṅgaḥ. tathā cōktam:*

{B} *niyatenāiva rūpeṇa sarve bhāvā bhavanti yat /
tato niyati-jā hy ete tat-svarūpānuvedhataḥ //
yad yadāiva yato yāvat tat tadāiva tatas tathā //
niyatam jāyate nyāyāt ka enām bādhitum kṣamaḥ //*

BASHAM (1951, p. 222, n. 4) notices that these verses are found in ‘Guṇaratna to *Ṣaḍ-darśana-samuccaya*, p. 12.’

¹¹ ŚVS₁ 2.173–174, p. 45–46.

¹² ŚVS₁ 2.173–176.

factors'). This whole section (ŚVS₁ 2.164–193, pp. 45–53), which deserves to be reproduced here *in extenso* primarily for the sake of stylistic analysis, reads as follows:

[*kāla-vāda*:]

*kālādīnām ca kartṛtvam manyante 'nye pravādinah /
kevalānām tad-anye tu mithaḥ sāmagry-apekṣayā // 2.164 //*
*na kāla-vyatirekeṇa garbha-bāla-śubhādikam /
yat kiñcij jāyate loka tad asau kāraṇam kila // 2.165 //*
*kālaḥ pacati bhūtāni kālaḥ saṁharati prajāḥ /
kālaḥ supteṣu jāgarti kālo hi duratikramaḥ // 2.166 //*
*kiñca kālād ṛte nāiva **mudga-paktir apīṣyate**¹³ /
sthāly-ādi-samnidhāne 'pi tataḥ kālād asau matā // 2.167 //*
*kālābhāve ca garbhādi sarvaṁ syād avyavasthayā /
parēṣṭa-hetu-sadbhāva-mātrād eva tad-udbhāvāt // 2.168 //*

[*svabhāva-vāda*]

*na svabhāvātirekeṇa garbha-bāla-śubhādikam /
yat kiñcij jāyate loka tad asau kāraṇam kila // 2.169 //*
*sarva-bhāvāḥ svabhāvena sva-svabhāve tathā tathā /
vartante 'tha nirvartante kāma-cāra-parān-mukhāḥ // 2.170 //*
*na vinēha svabhāvena **mudga-paktir apīṣyate** (see footnote 13) /
tathā-kālādi- **bhāve 'pi nāsva-māṣasya sāv yataḥ // 2.171 //***
*atas svabhāvāt tad-bhāve 'tipasaṅgo 'nivāritah /
tulye tatra mṛdaḥ kumbho na paṭādītya-yukti-mat // 2.172 //*

[*niyati-vāda*]

*niyatenāiva rūpeṇa sarve bhāvā bhavanti yat /
tato niyati-jā hy ete tat-svarūpānuvedhataḥ // 2.173 //*
*yad yadāiva yato yāvat tat tadāiva tatas tathā //
niyataṁ jāyate nyāyāt ka enām bādhitum kṣamaḥ // 2.174 //*
*na ca ṛte niyatim loka **mudga-paktir apīṣyate /
tat-svabhāvādi-bhāve 'pi nāsāv aniyatā yataḥ // 2.175 //***
*anyathāniyatatvena sarva-bhāvāḥ prasajate /
anyōnyātmakatāpatteḥ kriyā-vaiphalyam eva ca // 2.176 //*

[*karma-vāda*]

*na bhokṛ-vyatirekeṇa bhogyam jagati vidyate /
na cākṛtasya bhogaḥ syān muktānām bhoga-bhāvataḥ // 2.177 //*
*bhogyam ca viśvam sattvānām vidhinā tena yat /
dṛśyate 'dhyakṣam evēdam tasmāt tat karma-jam hi tat // 2.178 //*
*na ca tat karma-vaidhurye **mudga-paktir apīṣyate /
sthāly-ādi-bhaṅga-bhāvena yat kvacin nōpapadyate // 2.179 //***

[*kālādi-sāmagrī-vāda*]

citraṁ bhogyam tathā citrāt karmaṇo 'hetutānyathā /

¹³ Probably: *apīṣyate*, cf. ŚVS₁ 2.175, 179.

tasya yasmād vicitratvaṃ niyaty-āder na yujyate // 2.180 //
niyater niyatātmatvān niyatānām samanatā /
tathāniyata-bhāve ca balāt syāt tad-vicitratā // 2.181 //
na ca tan-mātra-bhāvāder yujyate 'syā vicitratā /
tad-anya-bhedakaṃ muktvā samyag nyāyāvirodhataḥ // 2.182 //
na jalasyâika-rūpasya viyat-ātād vicitratā /
ūṣarâdi-dharâbhedam antareṇôpajâyate // 2.183 //
tad-bhinna-bhedakatve ca tatra tasyā na kartṛtā /
*tat-kartṛtve*¹⁴ *citratvaṃ tad-vat tasyâpy asaṃgatam* // 2.184 //
tasyā eva tathâ-bhūtaḥ svabhāvo yadi cêṣyate /
tyaktaḥ niyati-vādaḥ syāt svabhāvâsrayaṇānn anu // 2.185 //
svo bhāvâs ca svabhāvo 'pi sva-sattâiva hi bhāvataḥ /
*tasyâpi bhakâbhāve vaicitryaṃ **nôpapadyate*** // 2.186 //
tatas tasyâviśiṣṭatvād yugapad viśva-sambhavaḥ /
na cāsāv iti sad-yuktyā tad-vado 'pi na saṅgataḥ // 2.187 //
tat-tat-kâlâdi-sâpekṣo viśva-hetuḥ sa cenn anu /
muktaḥ svabhāva-vādaḥ syāt kâla-vādâd aparigrahât // 2.188 //
kâlo 'pi samayâdir yat kevalam so 'pi kâraṇam /
*tata eva hy asaṃbhūteḥ kasyacin **nôpapadyate*** // 2.189 //
yataś ca kâle tulye 'pi sarvatrâiva na tat-phalam /
ato hetv-antarâpekṣam vijñeyam tat vicakṣaṇaiḥ // 2.190 //
ataḥ kâlâdayaḥ sarve samudâyena kâraṇam /
garbhâdeḥ kârya-jâtasya vijñeyâ nyâya-vâdibhiḥ // 2.191 //
*na câikâikata evêha kvacit kiñcid **apîkṣyate*** /
tasmât sarvasya kâryasya sâmagrî janikâ matâ // 2.192 //
svabhāvo niyatîś câiva karmaṇo 'nye pracakṣate /
dharmāv anye tu sarvasya sâmanenâiva vastunaḥ // 2.193 //

Interestingly, the *niyati* section contains no single other doctrinal element which could, at least theoretically, be linked to the Ājīvikas.

The natural question is whether Haribhadra himself composed these two verses (ŚVS₁ 2.173–174) quoted by Guṇaratna himself, along with a number of others, or merely collected verses from original sources in one section, or whether he composed some verses and interwove them with some genuinely original ones. It is highly unlikely, it seems, that these verses are a compilation from original sources. This is due to a number of reasons.

First, the exposition of the theories *kâla-vâda*, *svabhâva-vâda*, *niyati-vâda*, *kâlâdi-sâmagrî-vâda* has its own specific argumentative structure, e.g. ŚVS₁ 2.171 (exposition of the *svabhâva-vâda*) rejects the *kâla-vâda*, whereas ŚVS₁ 2.173 (exposition of the *niyati-vâda*) in turn discards the *svabhâva-vâda*, which is then rejected in ŚVS₁ 2.180.

Second, in the exposition of the four respective theories the same patterns occur as a kind of refrain. I have indicated the recurrent similar patterns in bold. For instance, the refrain phrase *mudga-paktir apîṣyate*, with a variant *apîkṣyate* (167b,

¹⁴ ŚVS₁ misprints: *tat-kartṛtve*.

171b, 175b, 179b), or merely *apīkṣyate* (192b), occurs in the exposition of each of the theories, and always in the same metrical pattern in *pāda* b; a range of verses of all the subsections end with *nōpapadyate* (179, 186, 189) in *pāda* b; the expositions of two theories contain the same phrase *garbha-bāla-śubhādikam* (165b, 169b), which is, in addition, in two cases (out of three) compounded with °*vyatirekeṇa* or °*ātirekeṇa* (165, 169, 177) always in the same position in *pāda* a; the *pāda* c of the exposition of two theories contains *sthāly-ādi*° (167c, 179c); the *pādas* cd of the exposition of two theories have the same pattern °*bhāve 'pi nā*° °*ā yataḥ* (171cd, 175cd); and a whole hemistich *yat kiñcij jāyate loke tad asau kāraṇam kila* (165cd, 169cd) appears twice. It is for all practical reasons impossible for these verses to be quotes from original sources, for it hard to imagine that the proponents of different theories would use the same phrases or even identical hemistiches or phrasal patters.

Third, in some arguments (e.g. ŚVS₁ 2.176) we have a clear use of the argument of *anyathānupapatti* ('inexplicability otherwise'), a specifically Jaina invention of later times:¹⁵ had Haribhadra quoted from earlier sources, it would imply that the opponents had known the Jaina argumentative structure before the Jainas!

Fourth, the structure of Haribhadra's work is to present 'a summary of the accounts of (or colloquies among) [various] systems of teaching' (*Śāstra-vārttā-samuccaya*), somehow along the lines of the doxographical text of his *Ṣaḍ-darśana-samuccaya*. Indeed the exposition of the theories of *kāla-vāda*, *svabhāva-vāda*, *niyati-vāda*, *karma-vāda*, *kālādi-sāmagrī-vāda* follows such a discursive pattern: each subsequent theory serves to refute the former. It seems most probable that it was Haribhadra's own design to juxtapose all the theories in a dialectical structure and explain them in his own words.

The question remains whether he had access to any original sources of the Ājīvikas (*svabhāva-vāda*?, see below p. 30 ff.; *niyati-vāda*) and the exponents of the other theories (*kāla-vāda*, *karma-vāda*, *kālādi-sāmagrī-vāda*), or whether he succumbed to, or delved on some hypothetical descriptions of certain theories which one might entertain by way of a mere theoretical exercise. If this were the case, Haribhadra's account would be of no descriptive character (i.e. it would present no description of actual views) and would have no actual value for our study of the system of the Ājīvikas. Last but not least, we know that his versified works, the most acclaimed being the *Ṣaḍ-darśana-samuccaya*, Haribhadra as a rule restricts himself to his own paraphrases of the views he discusses without quoting original sources. His *Śāstra-vārttā-samuccaya* does not appear to be an exception in containing no quotations from external sources. For the above reasons it is quite unlikely that the two verses are actual quotations from Ājīvika sources.

4. As the first of the list in BASHAM's (1951, pp. 220–223) survey of the few Sanskrit quotations from alleged Ājīvika sources, mention is made of the following verse:

¹⁵ See BALCEROWICZ (2003a).

V 2: Whatever thing is to be gained, it—whether happy or unhappy—happens to people in a necessary manner on account of the force of destiny. For even if living beings make great effort, that which is not to be does not happen, and there is no destruction of that which is to be.¹⁶

BASHAM (1951, p. 221, n. 1) traces the verse back to three sources: ‘Śīlānka to *Sū. kṛ*, i,1,2,2 and ii,1,29; Jñānavimala to *Praśna-vyākaraṇa*, 7; Abhayadeva to *Uv. Das*. vi,165.’ Let us examine these and other sources where these verses occur.

4.1. The first source mentioned by BASHAM is Śīlānka’s *Sūtra-kṛtāṅga-vṛtti* (*SūyVṛ* 1.1.2.30, pp. 38.41–42), a Śvetāmbara text belonging to 9th century. The verse is introduced there as follows:

The propounder of destiny [as the sole determining force] reveals his own intention: Predetermined concurrence of factors, i.e. destiny, is that whose course leads to a particular (*vat*) experience of happiness or unhappiness for a particular person (*yasya*), at a particular time (*yadā*), place (*yatra*) due to a particular transformation of righteousness (*samyaktva*)¹⁷; its condition is the state of being determined. Further, in this way that due to which happiness and unhappiness etc. are not caused by personal agency etc. is these living beings’ state of being determined, i.e. caused by destiny. So, accordingly, it is said...¹⁸

The above passage is, in fact, a part of the comment on two verses of the *Sūyagaḍaṃga*,¹⁹ which in themselves might at first glance be considered as genuine quotes from Ājīvikas:

¹⁶ BASHAM’S (1951, p. 221):

*prāptavyo niyati-balāśrayeṇa yo ’rthaḥ
so ’vaśyaṃ bhavati nṛṇāṃ śubho ’śubho vā |
bhūtānāṃ mahati kṛte ’pi hi prayatne
nābhāvyam bhavati na bhāvino ’sti nāśaḥ ||*

¹⁷ This is a typically Jaina understanding of the *samsāra* and its mechanism. However, we cannot exclude that the Ājīvikas maintained the same opinion, which is however rather unlikely.

¹⁸ *SūyVṛ* 1.1.2.30, p. 38.36 ff.: *niyati-vādī svābhīprāyam āviṣ-karoti—“saṃgaīyaṃtī” samyak-kha^a-pariṇāmena gati yasya yadā yatra yat sukha-duḥkhānubhāvanam sā saṃgati niyatis tasyām bhavam sāṃgatikam, yataś cāivam na puruṣa-kārādi-kṛtam sukha-duḥkhādi atas tat teṣāṃ prāṇinām niyati-kṛtam sāṃgatikam ity ucyate. tathā cōktam.*

^a Recte: *samyaktva*?

¹⁹ For an alternative translation of these two verses as well as for a discussion of this passage, alongside Śīlānka’s comments, see: BOLLÉE (1977, pp. 80–84).

V 3: But misery (and pleasure) is not caused by (the souls) themselves; how could it be caused by other (agents, as time, &c.)? Pleasure and misery, final beatitude and temporal (pleasure and pain) are not caused by (the souls) themselves, nor by others; but the individual souls experience them; it is the lot assigned them by destiny. This is what they (i.e. the fatalists) say. (2, 3).²⁰

However, despite the initial impression of being genuine quotes, these two Prakrit verses (V 3) are rather a paraphrase at most, not a direct quote. This is because of the reference to ‘those some [thinkers] who proclaim such [a theory]’ (*iham egesi āhiam*). The directly following verse of the *Sūya-gaḍamga*, critical of the fatalists, also confirms such a conclusion:

V 4: Those who proclaim these opinions, are fools who fancy themselves learned; they have no knowledge, and do not understand that things depend partly on fate, and partly on human exertion.²¹

This particular verse, critical of the straightforward fatalists—which is still not the view accepted by the Jainas, as the subsequent verse (Sūy₂ 1.1.2.32, JACOBI (1895, p. 240; § 1.1.2.6)) suggests—is further commented by Śīlāṅka:

These, i.e. the above mentioned **opinions** based on the doctrine of destiny ... [They are] those **who have no knowledge**, i.e. are ignorant ... because [they do not understand that] **things depend partly on fate, and partly on human exertion**, i.e. some things such as happiness etc. are determined by destiny, i.e. their occurrence is caused as something necessary, similarly some things are not determined, i.e. their occurrence is caused by the agency of the soul, person etc.; i.e. they onesidedly conceive existence as caused by destiny. For this reason not knowing the [real] cause of happiness and unhappiness they become those **who have no knowledge** (*abuddhiyā*), i.e. they become devoid of knowledge. For it is as follows: certain happiness and unhappiness etc. of the followers is strictly determined.

It is said [by them] that *karman* is caused by destiny on certain occasions inasmuch as its coming into being occurs necessarily. Similarly [there are] some [things which] are not caused by destiny: they are caused by personal agency, time, god, intrinsic nature, *karman* etc. In such cases, certain instrumentality of

²⁰ Sūy₂ 1.1.2.29–30:

*na taṃ sayam-kaḍam dukkham kao anna-kaḍam ca ṇam /
suham vā jai vā dukkham sehiyam vā asehiyam // 29 //
na sayam kaḍam na annehim vedayanti puḍho jiyā /
saṅgatiyam taṃ tahā tesim tham egesi āhiam // 30 //*

Cf. the translation of JACOBI (1895, pp. 239–240; § 1.1.2.2–3).

²¹ Sūy₂ 1.1.2.31:

*evam eyāni jampamitā bālā pamḍya-māṇiṇo /
niyayāniyayam samtam ayānamitā abuddhiyā //*

Cf. the translation of JACOBI (1895, p. 240; § 1.1.2.4).

personal agency with respect to happiness and unhappiness etc. is the basis. That one is struck dead is the fruit on account of an action, but the action proceeds as dependent on the agency of the person. So, accordingly, it is said:

V 5: “Thinking that [things are caused by] fate, one does not renounce his own exertion. How could one get sesamum oil from sesamum seeds without exertion?”²²

On the one hand, this view of ‘compromised determinism’—viz. some things are determined by destiny, whereas some are not—seems to be principally in agreement with what we think we may actually know of Ājīvikas.²³ On the other hand, the verse quoted by Śīlāṅka serves as an illustration of a view which modifies the theory of strict determinism generally ascribed to the Ājīvikas; it is the view attributed to those who claim that things are determined by destiny with the participation of other factors, such as the soul, personal agency²⁴, god etc. (*ātma-puruṣa-kārēśvarādi-prāpitaṃ sat niyati-kṛtaṃ ekāntenāśriyanti*). It seems, therefore, that Śīlāṅka himself did not take the verse to stem from an Ājīvika source: neither the authors of the *Sūya-gaḍaṃga* nor Śīlāṅka himself establish any connection between the views expressed in V 4 and V 5 to the Ājīvikas and do not use the ‘key word’ *niyati-vāda*, generally associated with the Ājīvikas in Indian tradition, in the context of the ‘compromised determinism’.

It seems that the description of the ‘compromised determinism’, which in some ways may indeed better correspond to what the Ājīvikas really claimed, cannot be attributed to Śīlāṅka (and of the authors of the *Sūya-gaḍaṃga*) having real

²² SūyVṛ 1.1.2.31, p. 39.3 ff.: *etāni pūrvōktāni niyati-vādāśritāni vacanāni ... bālā ajñāḥ ... yato niyayānīyayaṃ saṃtam iti sukhādīkam kiṃcin niyati-kṛtaṃ—avaśyaṃ-bhāvya-udaya-prāpitaṃ tathā aniyatam—ātma-puruṣa-kārēśvarādi-prāpitaṃ sat niyati-kṛtaṃ eva-kāntenāśriyanti^a, ato ‘jānānāḥ sukha-duḥkhādi-kāraṇam abuddhikā buddhi-rahitā bhavantīti, tathā hi arhatānāṃ kiñcit sukha-duḥkhādi niyatīta eva bhavati.*

tat-karaṇasya karmaṇaḥ kasmiṃścid avasare ‘vaśyaṃ-bhāvya-udaya-sadbhāvān niyati-kṛtaṃ ity ucyate, tathā kiñcid aniyati-kṛtaṃ ca—puruṣa-kāra-kālēśvara-svabhāva-karmādi-kṛtaṃ, tatra kathañcit sukha-duḥkhādeḥ puruṣa-kāra-sādhyatvam āśrīyate, hataḥ kriyātaḥ phalaṃ bhavati, kriyā ca puruṣa-kārāyattā pravartate, tathā cōktam:

*na daivam iti saṃcintya tyajed udyamam ātmanaḥ |
anudyamena kas tailam tilebhyaḥ prāptum arhati? ||*

^a Recte: *niyati-kṛtaṃ ekāntenāśriyanti* (not *evāikāntenāśriyanti*, another option).

²³ See BRONKHORST (2003, p. 163): ‘The Jaina ascetic, by practising immobility, aspired to bring about a twofold effect: the annihilation of former actions, and the non-performing of new actions. The inactivity of the Jaina ascetic was not only meant to avoid producing karmic effects in the future, but also to destroy actions carried out in the past. The Ājīvika denied that present inactivity can destroy actions carried out in the past. For him these former actions will carry fruit whatever one does. However, there is no reason to believe that he rejected the possibility of non-performance of new actions. We may therefore formulate the hypothesis that both Jainism and Ājīvikism interpreted the doctrine of *karman* in the same way, believing that bodily and mental movements were responsible for rebirth. But whereas the Jainas believed that motionlessness might destroy past *karman*, the Ājīvikas did not think so.’

²⁴ I deliberately stray from taking the term *puruṣa* in the standard Sāṅkhya way ‘the conscious principle’ because although often Sāṅkhya view is implied in the discussions on the prime cause of the world, this is not necessarily always the case.

knowledge of or first-hand acquaintance with the tradition of the Ājīvikas but is merely a result dictated by a dialectical structure of the argument along the lines of typically Jaina strategy of the Anekānta-vāda: we first analyse the pure *niyati* position, then the ‘compromised’ version of *niyati-anīyati*, then the *anīyati* position etc.

The only thinkable link of verse V 5 to the Ājīvika tradition could perhaps be the mention of the production of sesamum oil (*taila*) from sesamum seeds (*tila*). It is the precisely the story of the sesamum shrub (*tila-thambha*)²⁵ that provides the legendary setting for Gośāla to formulate an obscure theory of ‘discontinuance / stoppage [of a subsequent birth in a new body] through / due to continuation [in the same re-animated body]’ (*pauṭṭa-parihāra*)²⁶ in defiance of Vardhamāna Mahāvīra’ prediction of the future fate of the sesamum shrub, which had been uprooted by Gośāla to prevent the future birth of its flowers and seeds. However, just as not every mention of fire and smoke in India has to be treated as a direct hint to the classical model of inference, so should the innocuous mention of sesamum not necessarily be understood as a reference to Ājīvikism. Furthermore, in the story of the sesamum shrub there is not mention of the sesamum oil or of its production from the seeds. The story exemplifies a belief that one-sensed living beings will necessarily be reborn.

Now, the question arises as regards Śīlānka’s reliability as the source on the Ājīvikas with respect to verse V 2 (*prāptavyo niyati-balāśrayeṇa...*). We may verify his credibility, reliability or accuracy by comparing what he writes about the Ājīvikas, or actually the propounders of determinism, with how he describes systems better known to us. In his commentary (SūyVṛ 1.1.2.28, p. 37) he provides a short account of other *śrāmaṇas*, including the Ājīvikas and the Buddhists. This is what he has to say about the former:

In the opinion of the propounders of destiny there exists no bondage of the sort that one would reflect on it and would destroy it.²⁷

For the propounders of the fourfold diminution of the *karman* through the knowledge of those ignorant of destiny (?) the very same desire for [a new] birth in the transmigration in the cycle of rebirths is established, [as for the Buddhists].²⁸

The compound *niyaty-ajñāni-jñāna-catur-vidha-karmāpacaya-vādin* clearly is an extension of the typical phrase *niyati-vādin* (‘the propounder of the doctrine of destiny’), especially in view of the fact that the whole passage is an introduction to

²⁵ See Vyī 15.46–47, 55–56; pp. 698–470, 702–703; for the translation, see: BALCEROWICZ (2016, pp. 23–26); for the discussion of the passage, see: BASHAM (1951, pp. 47–49) and BALCEROWICZ (2016: 27 ff., 80–82).

²⁶ See: BASHAM (1951, pp. 48–49, 57–58, 250–252), SCHUBRING (1954, p. 258) = (1977, p. 470), BALCEROWICZ (2016, pp. 23–28, 45–46).

²⁷ SūyVṛ 1.1.2.28, p. 37.5–6: ‘bandhanam buddhyeta tac ca troṭayed’ iti tad eva ca bandhanam niyati-vādy-abhiprāyeṇa na vidyate...

²⁸ SūyVṛ 1.1.2.28, p. 37.13–14: *niyaty-ajñāni-jñāna-catur-vidha-karmāpacaya-vādinām tad eva saṃsāra-cakra-vāla-bhramaṇa-garbhānveṣaṇam pratipādyate.*

the *niyati-vāda* (‘the doctrine of destiny’). This extended phrase may contain a clue to some doctrinal elements of the Ājīvikas, but the actual resolution of the compound cannot be conclusive, for it allows for other interpretations as well. However, if we suppose that it is a credible reflection of an authentic belief, the compound would suggest that the Ājīvikas may have accepted four kinds of decrease of *karman* (of which other sources, e.g. the *Sāmañña-phala-sutta*, are silent) through which one could somehow mitigate the influence of destiny. Now, this is what Śīlāṅka has to say about the Buddhists:

The propounders of the five aggregates (*skandha*) of elements (*bhūta*), with their inner self obstructed by a false view of reality (*mithyātva*)—being attached to unreal apprehension [and entertaining] a concept of an awakening to ultimate reality, go to high and low states in the cycle of rebirths characterised by a multitude of disease, death and old age—desire or seek a [new] birth innumerable times.²⁹

The terminology in the above passage is certainly not quite Buddhistic, but does not contain anything which goes directly counter the Buddhist doctrine either, except for a strange claim the Buddhists desire new birth (*garbham eṣyanti*). The passage does contain some typically Buddhist expressions, e.g. ‘disease, death, old age’ (*vyādhi-mṛtu-jarā*), or echoes certain Buddhist expressions (*pañca-bhūta-skandha*, *paramāṛthāvabodha*), but are not identical with those used in Buddhist texts (**pañca-skandha*; **yathā-bhūtārthāvabodha* (ABhK, *Naiṣkarmya-siddhi*)). However, the passage could hardly be maintained to faithfully represent what the Buddhists said. In addition, it contains some typically Jaina terms, e.g. *mithyātva*. The author does not refer to Buddhists directly but as the exponents of a particular doctrine (*pañca-bhūta-skandhādi-vādinah*). Further, both accounts, of the Ājīvikas and of the Buddhists, contain similar expressions (*saṃsāra-cakra-vāla-bhramaṇa / saṃsāra-cakra-vāle ... gacchanto, garbhānveṣaṇam / garbham ... anveṣayanti*), which may imply what Śīlāṅka thinks of both these groups: despite their beliefs and practices, what they actually achieve is in effect a continuous circle of rebirth. In view of the above comparison, it would not be too wise to grant Śīlāṅka much credibility with regard to accuracy as a source of information, and we cannot rely on what he says about the *niyati-vādins*, i.e. most probably the Ājīvikas.

4.2. The second source for BASHAM’s (1951, p. 221, n. 1) identification of verse V 2 is Jñānavimāla and his *Praśna-vyākaraṇa* 7. Since the work dates from the time around 1688 (?), we may safely assume, that the author no longer had any first-hand acquaintance of the Ājīvikas, and he merely reproduced a verse from earlier sources without probably any knowledge of who the Ājīvikas actually were.

For the same reason we can safely dismiss the usefulness of another source of the verse,

²⁹ SūyVṛ 1.1.2.28, p. 37.11–13: *pañca-bhūta-skandhādi-vādino mithyāvôpapatântarâtmano ‘sad-grahābhiniviṣṭhāḥ paramāṛthāvabodha-vikalpāḥ santaḥ saṃsāra-cakra-vāle vyādhi-mṛtu-jarā-kule uccāvacāni sthānāni gacchanto garbham eṣyanti anveṣayanti vānantaśa iti.*

i.e. Yaśovijaya-gaṇi's *Śāstra-vārttā-samuccaya-ṭīkā* (ŚVSV ad ŚVS₂ 2.62, vol. 2, p. 79.7–8 = ŚVS₁ 2.174), for the author belongs to the same late period of 17th century. Both Jñānavimāla and Yaśovijaya-gaṇi postdate Śīlāṅka by eight centuries. For similar reasons we can also disregard the testimony of Abhayadeva-sūri (11th century) who quotes verse V 2 at least twice: in his commentary on the *Uvāsagadāsāo* (UvDVi 166, p. 57) and in his *Tattva-bodha-vidhāyinī* (TBV 3.53 ad *niyati*, p. 714.11–27), as well as the testimony of another very late commentator Vijaya Darśana-sūri, who quotes the verse in his *Sammati-tarka-mahārṇavāvatārikā* (STPMAA, p. 352).

4.3. All other sources for verse V 2 postdate Śīlāṅka, and there seems to be just one which predates him. It is Haribhadra-sūri (8th century), who mentions the verse in his auto-commentary *Yoga-bindu-ṭīkā* (YBiṭ 313, p. 130.7–10). The verse is introduced, and rounded up, as follows:

And similar is the view of the doctrine of destiny [which stipulates]: “If [something must happen at time] *t*, then [it happens at time] *t*; if [something must happen at place] *p*, then [it happens at place] *p*; if [something must happen] due to [factor] *f*, then [it happens] due to [factor] *f*; if [some thing] *y* must occur, then [that thing] *y* occurs; if [some thing] *y* must not occur, then [that thing] *y* does not occur.” Accordingly:

“Whatever thing is to be gained...”

Also [the world's] being determined by destiny is nothing but dubious. In order to show that, it is said...³⁰

The context of verse V 2 mentioned in the *Yoga-bindu* (YBi 313) is the discussion of the causality of god (*īśvara*), primordial factor (*prakṛti*), souls (*ātman*) etc. Except for this passage, the term *niyati* otherwise does not occur in the text of Haribhadra's *Yoga-bindu-ṭīkā*.

The term is paraphrased in YBi 313 as *niyata-bhāvatva* (*anye niyata-bhāvatvād*), or ‘being determined by destiny’, which is further explained as follows:

[Thus speak] **others**, i.e. the propounders [of a theory that] the cause of the world is only destiny **because** [the world] **is determined by destiny**; those ford-makers (religious leaders) etc. whose nature, i.e. existence is due to destiny, i.e. is strictly conditioned by the determinants such as substance, place, time and condition are such [as described in verse 312].³¹

³⁰ YBiṭ 313, p. 130.3–6: *tathā ca niyati-vāda-matam. yad yadā tat tadā, yady atra tat tatra, yad yena tat tena, yad asya tat tasya, yad bhavati tat bhavati, yan na bhavati tan na bhavati. tathā:*

prāptavyo niyati-balāśrayeṇa yo 'rthaḥ ...
and p. 130.11: *iti. niyata-bhāvatvam api saṃsiddhikam evēti darśayann āhā...*

³¹ YBiṭ 313, p. 129.26–130.2: **anye** *niyati-mātra-jagat-kāraṇa-vādināḥ* **niyata-bhāvatvāt** *niyatito dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva-niyamena pratīnyamavān bhāvaḥ sattā yeṣāṃ tīrtha-kārādīnāṃ te tathā, tad-bhāvas tattvaṃ, tasmāt.*

What is striking in the description of determinism associated with the Ājīvikas is the quadruplet of substance (*dravya*), place (*kṣetra*), time (*kāla*) and condition (*bhāva*), which are known to be standard parameters used by the Jainas, mostly in the context of *sapta-bhāṅgī*.³² Therefore, it is rather unlikely that the paraphrase of determinist doctrine actually rests on genuine Ājīvika terminology. It is equally unlikely that the one who reproduces Ājīvika ideas does it both faithfully and with full knowledge of them.

Further, as a rule, in the *Yoga-bindu* and the *Yoga-bindu-ṭīkā*, Haribhadra does not quote from non-Jaina sources. In those rare cases where he apparently does, he seems to quote quite consistently by specifically introducing the verses which he draws from other sources.³³ In addition, the principle seems to be that Haribhadra does not specifically introduce his own verses, i.e. composed by him, in any particular way, except for occasional (but not obligatory) *tathā* or *iti* at the end.

A similar case to the one currently discussed (V 2 quoted by Haribhadra) is *Yoga-bindu-ṭīkā* 290, in which a *pratīka* of *Yoga-bindu* (YBi 290a: *saṁvignaḥ*) is directly followed by (Haribhadra's own?) verse.³⁴ There is still one more very similar case (YBiṭ 78, *vide infra*, p. 50, n.73) of the same structure (a *pratīka* followed by a verse, with no *iti*), which however moderates our findings: that verse is an attested quotation from an earlier source.

Nevertheless, considering all the above, it would seem quite likely that verse V 2 found in the *Yoga-bindu-ṭīkā* is not a genuine quotation from a lost Ājīvika source but rather Haribhadra's own paraphrase of deterministic ideas entertained by the Ājīvikas the way he understood them.

4.4. There is, however, one difficulty with this conclusion, which in view of it would seem now too hasty, namely that the verse is also quoted by Mallavādin Kṣamāśramaṇa in his *Dvādaśāra-naya-cakra*, a pre-Dharmakīrti text (most probably 2nd half of the 6th century), a definitely pre-Haribhadra text. It is introduced there as follows:

...[Consider the following objection:] “This very claim that it is inconsistent to maintain that the [conscious principle (*puruṣa*)] is the knower etc. can easily be corroborated. But also in the case if one acknowledged that it is

³² E.g. in RVār 4.42 (p. 254.14 ff.), SVM 23.113 (p. 143.12), JTBh₁ 1.22 § 63 (p. 19) / JTBh₂ 1.22 (p. 19); see BALCEROWICZ (2015), n. 70).

³³ E.g. YBiṭ 108, p. 48.1–2 (... *sāṁkhyā-samaya-prasiddhaḥ. tathā ca te paṭhanti*...—this introduces SK 53), YBiṭ 119, p. 42.4 (*mato 'bhiprāhaḥ*), YBiṭ 197, p. 83.16–17, 26 (*yataḥ paṭhyate*), YBiṭ 205, p. 88.4 (*yataḥ paṭhyate*), YBiṭ 213, p. 91.5 (*yathōktam*), YBiṭ 217, p. 93.2 (*yataḥ paṭhyate*), YBiṭ 426, p. 171.5 (*tathā ca te paṭhyanti*), YBiṭ 476, p. 190.11 (*tathā ca bhavat-siddhāntaḥ*—introduces Haribhadra's own ŚVS₁ 5.404) with reference to Buddhist Yogācāra, YBiṭ 476, p. 190.15–16 (*tathā ca paṭhanti*—introduces PV₁ 3.35, p. 160; PV₂ 3.35, p. 22.21), YBiṭ 516, p. 203.6–7 (*prāg-abhāvādī-lakṣaṇam cētītham avaseyam*—introduces MŚV *abhāva* 2–3). In other (very few) cases, he rounds up a verse with an 'extended' *iti*-phrase (i.e. a phrase which contains *iti* alongside other elements), e.g. YBiṭ 87, 40.14 (*ity-ādi vacanaih*), YBiṭ 250, p. 105.18 (*ity-ādinā granthena*).

³⁴ YBiṭ 290, p. 119.14–18: ... *saṁvignaḥ*

*tathye dharme dhvasta-himsā prabandhe deve rāga-dveṣa-mohādi-mukte /
sādhau sarva-grantha-saṁdarbha-hīne saṁvego 'sau niścalo yo 'nurāgaḥ //*

consistent [to maintain that the conscious principle (*puruṣa*) is the knower], there is still the exactly same constraint which necessitates the need for the existence of another agent [different from the conscious principle (*puruṣa*)]. [Suppose] there is an agent ..., but it [again] is unconscious. The cause necessarily has to put into effect this constraint, because these [causes (?)] are either such or otherwise; therefore there is only one agent, namely destiny, for occasional and random diversity of its aims is not a defeating argument against the singularity of this [destiny as a single cause]. And it is said in support: “Whatever thing is to be gained...”.³⁵

The introduction to the verse is phrased in the context of a discussion on causality in the world and contains a reference, cryptic in many ways (perhaps also due to insufficiencies of the available text of the *Dvādaśāra-naya-cakra* restored on the basis of the commentary, from which its portions were extracted), to destiny as the only cause of world events. It is used as an argument against the causality exercised by the conscious principle (*puruṣa*).

It is well known that Mallavādin Kṣamāsramaṇa copiously availed himself of various works which he criticised but also quoted. the best known case is his use of large portions of Dinnāga’s *Pramāṇa-samuccaya*. It is very unlikely that the verse in question was a product of Mallavādin who, in his prose text, normally refrains himself from composing his own verses, and the verses found in his work are generally taken from other sources.

Interestingly, in all the above references verse V 2 is quoted without any modification or variant. In a number of other cases which are analysed in this paper the alleged Ājīvika references are often found with some variants. It would, therefore, seem plausible that verse V 2 could be a genuine Ājīvika verse due to the lack of any contrary evidence (I have not traced the verse in any other earlier work, e.g. of Jaina authorship).

However, it is most probably not the case. The source of the verse seems to be fable tradition, from which the *Pañca-tatra* derives or a version of the *Pañca-tatra* itself. The whole complete verse is found in one of the editions of the *Pañca-tatra* with a slight modification (in bold), whereby the verse is adopted to the contents of a story:

Whatever thing is to be gained, **even a person who is unconscious lying in bed will obtain it** on account of the force of destiny. For even if living beings make great effort, that which is not to be does not happen, and there is no destruction of that which is to be.³⁶

³⁵ DNC, p. 193.3–4: *namu taj-jñatvādy-ayuktatāivaiṣā samarthyate, yuktatvābhimatatve 'pi cāyam eva niyamaḥ kartr-antaratvāpādanāya. bhavati kartā ***** acetano 'pi bhavati. tan-niyama-kāriṇā kāraṇenaśāyam bhavitavyam, teṣām tathā-bhāvānyathā-bhāvād iti niyatir evaikā kartrī. na hi tasyām kadācīt kathañcīt tad-arthānyarūpyam ekatva-vyāghāti. anvāha ca:*

*prāptavyo niyati-balāśrayeṇa yo 'rthaḥ so 'vaśyam bhavati nṛṇām śubho 'śubho vā |
bhūtānām mahati kṛte 'pi hi prayatne nābhāvyam bhavati na bhāvino 'sti nāśaḥ ||*

³⁶ PañcT₁ 2.7, verse 2.152, p. 163:

*prāptavyo niyati-balāśrayeṇa yo 'rtho niśceṣṭaḥ śayana-gato 'py upāśnute tam |
bhūtānām mahati kṛte 'pi hi prayatne nābhāvyam bhavati na bhāvino 'sti nāśaḥ ||*

One may justifiably argue that the case is actually the other way round: a genuinely Ājīvika verse found its way into the narrative literature and fables, and a verse of originally philosophical pertinence was used and modified to serve fables. However, that counter-argument is somehow weakened (albeit not overturned) by the fact that portions of verse V 2 are found as parts of other verses of the *Pañca-tantra*.³⁷

It would rather seem more justified to assume that a repository of fable verses were freely used, recycled and modified as building blocks to serve the needs of a particular story, and such originally narrative verses were later used by philosophical authors, such as Mallavādin Kṣamāśramaṇa, Haribhadra-sūri and others, to illustrate certain points they wanted to make in their own philosophical works.

There are a number of verses found in the *Pañca-tantra* which are meant to illustrate ‘worldly wisdom’, often with a fatalistic turn, such as this one:

On the other hand, in the world the fruition—earned through one’s life—of the own deeds of humans, who always resort to each other, whose actions are sinful, one is randomly happy or unhappy. Whatever is to be happens, there is no reason to deliberate over it.³⁸

This and similar verses (*vide infra*) were to illustrate the idea that one cannot really influence the course of one’s life, that things are in a way predetermined; the poor will remain poor, if they manage a change in their lives, this does not happen through their work or effort but only by chance. In a way, such a pessimistic view is ‘common-sense wisdom’ that is encountered not only in India. It cannot in any way be directly linked to a systematic deterministic thought of the Ājīvikas. Any resemblance such fable verses bear to real characters of the Ājīvikas is therefore purely coincidental.

That is why we should eventually dismiss verse V 2 as a genuine passage which stems from the Ājīvika philosophical or religious literature, but is just a verse taken from the Indian fable lore.

5. Let us examine the second of the passages that BASHAM (1951, p. 221) believes is a genuine quote from an Ājīvika author:

³⁷ PañcT₃ 2.1, verses 70, p. 324:

*nāivārtho vyasana-gatena śocitavyo harṣo vā sukham upalabhya na prajoyjah |
prāk-karma prati janito hi yo vipākaḥ so 'vaśya bhavati nr ṇā śubho 'śubho vā || 70 ||*

PañcT₁ 2.6, 2.160, p. 163 = PañcT₃ 2.1, verse 71, p. 324:

*kartavyaḥ pratidivasa prasanna-cittaiḥ svalpo 'pi vrata-niyamōpavāsa-dharmah |
praṇeṣu praharati nityam eva daiva^a bhūtānā mahati kr te 'pi hi prayatne || 71 ||*

^a PañcT₁: *daiva* ; PañcT₃: *mr tyur*.

³⁸ PañcT₂ 1.16, verse 1.403, p. 149 = PañcT₄ 1.16, verse 1.372, p. 98:

*loke 'thavā tanu-bhṛtām nija-karma-pākaṁ nityam samāśritavatām vihita-kriyāṇām |
bhāvārjitaṁ śubham athāpy aśubham nikāmaṁ yad bhāvi tad bhavati nātra vicāra-hetuḥ ||*

PañcT₂: *vihita-°*; PañcT₄ 1.16: *suhita-°*.

Some [people] say that that the world is brought to existence through destiny, adding that what has to be is more dominant in all cases, as [these verses will illustrate]:

- V 3: “A man obtains a thing that is to be obtained [by him]. What is the reason? That is the inescapable fate. Therefore I neither grieve nor wonder that what is my lot is not [the lot] of others.”
- V 4: “Fateful ordinance instantly produces a desired thing, as if [it is standing] in front [of the person], bringing it even from another continent, even from the midst of ocean, even from the end of any direction [of the world].”
- V 5: “Exactly such judgement materialises, and exactly such determination as well as one’s allies in the form as they must be.”³⁹

BASHAM (1951, p. 221, n. 2) traces the source: ‘Jñānavimāla to *Praśnavyākaraṇa sū 7*’ (Paṇ).

The first of these verses, i.e. V 3, can be easily found in the *Pañca-tantra*, with a minor variant (in bold):

- V 3*: “A man obtains a thing that is to be obtained [by him]. **Even god is not capable of preventing this.** Therefore I neither grieve nor wonder that what is my lot is not [the lot] of others.”⁴⁰

The way the verse is used confirms the conclusion of § 4.4. that we are dealing here with one of a pool of verses which were recycled and applied to various contexts in fables and narratives. As with verse V 2, it is hardly unlikely that the verse was taken from an Ājīvika source.

The second verse, i.e. V 4, quoted by Jñānavimāla is found in Harṣadeva’s *Ratnāvalī-nāṭikā*.⁴¹

³⁹ *kecin niyati-bhāvitaṃ jagad iti jalpanti, bhavitavyatāiva sarvatra baliyasīti, yathā:*

V 3: *prāptavyam arthaṃ labhate manuṣyaḥ kiṃ kāraṇam daivam alaṅghanīyam / tasmān na śocāmi na vismayāmi yad asmadīyaṃ na hi tat pareṣāṃ // 1 //*

V 4: *dvīpād anyasmād api madhyād api jala-nidher diśo ’py antāt / ānīya jhaṭ iti ghaṭayati vidhīr abhimatam abhimukhī-bhūtam // 2 //*

V 5: *sā sā sampadyate buddhīr vyavasāyaś ca tāḍṛśaḥ / sāhāyās^a tāḍṛśā jñeyā yādṛśī bhavitavyatā // 3 //*

^a Recte: *sahāyās*.

For an alternative translation see BASHAM (1951, p. 221).

⁴⁰ PañcT₁ 2.4, verse 4.3, p. 147 = PañcT₂ 2.3, verse 2.111 / 113, p. 206 / 207 (repeated) = PañcT₄ 2.3, verse 104 / 109, p. 22 / 26 (repeated):

prāptavyam arthaṃ labhate manuṣyo devo ’pi taṃ laṅghayituṃ na śaktaḥ / tasmān na śocāmi na vismayo me yad asmadīyaṃ na hi tat pareṣāṃ //

⁴¹ RAN 1.6:

dvīpād anyasmād api madhyād api jala-nidher diśo ’py antāt / ānīya jhaṭ iti ghaṭayati vidhīr abhimatam abhimukhī-bhūtam // 1.6 //

The third of these verses, i.e. V 5, is partly (*pādas* cd) found in at least two different sources, with various modifications adopted to different contexts. One of them is the alchemic *Rasârṇava*:

What happened, what is to happen now and what will happen in the whole triple world, this [apprehension] would tell. [These are] his allies in the form as they must be.⁴²

The other source is the Advaitic *Bhāmatī* (Bhām) of Vācaspatimiśra, who quotes a part of the verse (*pādas* cd) in a very different context:

But since this created world is fictional, there is its another ally made of illusion, as they say: “[Its] allies are precisely of such a form as they must be.”⁴³

We can observe here a case very similar to the one noticed in the instance of the *Pañca-tantra* and fables: the use and recycling of the same versified material in different contexts. Jñānavimala’s commentary to the canonical *Praśna-vyākaraṇa* is a patchwork in which various patterns are interlaced and adapted to serve his needs in order to illustrate the rather vague thesis that ‘some [people] say that that the world is brought to existence through destiny’. But this is not necessarily the same theoretical concept which was expressed by the Ājīvikas; it might equally be the ‘common-sense wisdom’ so frequently expressed in narrative tales and fables. In addition, these three verses in no way form a uniform whole, either in terms of contents or style, and the points of reference in each of them is quite different. As with verse V 2, there is therefore no reason to ascribe any of the verses quoted by Jñānavimala to the Ājīvikas. Jñānavimala apparently draws from fables and tales.

6. Let us now turn our attention to another verse alleged by BASHAM (1951, p. 222) to genuinely belong to Ājīvika literature.

V 6: ‘For that which is not to be does not happen, and that which is to be happens even without any effort. Even something contained in the palm of [our] hand disappears if it does not possess the necessity to exist.’⁴⁴

The source from which BASHAM (1951, p. 222, n. 2) takes the quote is: ‘Abhayadeva to *Uvāsaga-dasāo* 166 (= UV—P.B.)’ Indeed it is the well-known commentator

⁴² RasA 2.35:

*bhūtaṁ bhavyaṁ bhaviṣyaṁ ca trailokye kathayet tu sā /
sahāyās tādrśās tasya yādṛśī bhavitavyatā //*

⁴³ Bhām 2.2.1.2, p. 419.30–31: *kālpanikyām tu sṛṣṭāv asti kālpanikaṁ dvitīyaṁ sahāyaṁ māyā-mayam. yathāhuḥ:*

sahāyās tādrśā eva yādṛśī bhavitavyatā /

⁴⁴ *na hi bhavati yan na bhāvyaṁ bhavati ca bhāvyaṁ vināpi yatnena /
kara-tala-gatam api naśyati yasya tu bhavitavyatā nāsti //*

Abhayadeva, flourishing in 11th century, who avails himself of the verse in his commentary to the canonical work *Uvāsaga-dasāo* (UvDVi 166, p. 57).

However, precisely this verse in precisely the same reading is also found in the *Pañca-tantra*.⁴⁵ Again, as in similar cases discussed so far, there is no reason to believe that the original source was an Ājīvika text.

7. Another verse BASHAM (1951, p. 222) draws our attention to is the following, which is preceded with an introduction explicitly ascribing the view expressed in the verse to the Ājīvikas:

‘For instance, the followers of the Ājīvika theory say:

V 7: “The cognoscenti who are the makers of the passage (ford) to the moral law, having reached the highest destination, return again to existence on account of the abuse (maltreatment) of the pathway (ford).”⁴⁶

BASHAM (1951, p. 222, n. 5) describes his source as: ‘*Syād-vāda-mañjarī*, ed. Dhruva, p. 3.’⁴⁷

Indeed, this verse is quite peculiar in many ways, including the fact that it to any other text and is thus seemingly unique. Malliṣeṇa-sūri’s *Syād-vāda-mañjarī*, dating to 1229, is one of two works which refer to an idea of a return of Ājīvika (apparently) liberated saints to mundane existence. The verse is, however, ambiguous and somewhat eccentric, which might make it a bit doubtful whether Malliṣeṇa-sūri flourishing in the 13th century Gujarat (where there had been no community of Ājīvikas for centuries any longer) had any sound knowledge of the system of the Ājīvikas.

However, the obscure idea has its predecessor in a passage found in Haribhadra-sūri’s *Lalita-vistarā* (LV), a commentary on the *Caitya-vandana-sūtra*, belonging to the eighth century.⁴⁸ There we find the sentence, introduced as a reference to a source: *tīrtha-nikāra-darśanād āgacchanti*, and quoted with reference to the Ājīvikas, which conveys a very similar idea: ‘[Ājīvika cognoscenti] return [to existence] when [they] see the abuse (maltreatment) of the pathway (ford)’.⁴⁹ This is

⁴⁵ PañcT₁ 2.6, verse 134, p. 156.6–17 = PañcT₂ 2.5, verse 5.130, p. 215.

⁴⁶ SVM 1.57, p. 3: *tathā cāhur ājīvika-navānusāriṇaḥ*:

*jñānino dharma-tīrthasya kartāraḥ paramaṃ padam /
gatvāgacchanti bhūyo ’pi bhavaṃ tīrtha-nikārataḥ //*

⁴⁷ BASHAM (1951, p. 222) translates the verse as follows: ‘And thus say those who follow the Ājīvika school: “The knowers, the founders of the faith, having gone to the highest state, return again to existence, when the faith suffers injury”.’ Compare also the translation of F.W. THOMAS (1960, p. 11): ‘Knowers, makers of the ford of dharma, are the highest station: having gone, they come again into existence for the overthrow of heresies.’

⁴⁸ See e.g. DUNDAS (2003, p. 152): ‘the dating of Haribhadra, the likelihood is that the LV (i.e. *Lalita-vistarā*—P.B.) was written some time in the eighth century CE.’

⁴⁹ Cf. the translation in DUNDAS (2003, pp. 160–161): ‘they (i. e. the. teachers) come because they see the wickedness of heresy’.

mentioned by Haribhadra as a reason why the Ājīvikas allegedly maintained that their teachers would never become truly liberated:

Also these [Ājīvika omniscients] are obviously admitted by the disciples of Gośāla, followers of the doctrine of the Ājīvika [limited/partial] viewpoint, to be in reality persons who have not destroyed karmic obstruction, [and this is so] due to the statement: “[Ājīvika cognoscenti] return [to existence] when [they] see the abuse (maltreatment) of the pathway (ford)”.⁵⁰

In Haribhadra’s interpretation the idea of the return must imply that the Ājīvika liberated teachers are never liberated, inasmuch as they have never got rid of the binding *karman*. This is the idea taken further up by Malliṣeṇa.⁵¹ As with Malliṣeṇa’s verse, it is difficult to assess with certainty to what extent Haribhadra’s sentence is a genuine quote from Ājīvika sources.

The appellation ‘the makers of the passage (ford) to the moral law’ (*jñānino dharmatīrthasya kartāraḥ*), found in Malliṣeṇa’s verse (SVM), may seem at first atypical. From Buddhist and Jaina sources, if we can trust them, we know that the Ājīvikas apparently used the term *tīrtham-kāra* to refer to their founders and saints, in the very same way as the Jainas did. The Jainas themselves also used the appellation *dharmatīrtha-kāra* since canonical times⁵²; it is also found in their Sanskrit philosophical literature.⁵³ It would therefore not be particularly surprising to find the same term or idea—*dharmatīrthasya kartāraḥ*, *dharmatīrtha-kartṛ*, *dharmatīrtha-kāra*, etc.—being used by the Ājīvikas from early times, and being used in the sense of ‘a fully liberated religious founder’.

If *dharmatīrthasya kartāraḥ* refers to ‘fully liberated religious founders or teachers of the Ājīvikas’, at least two elements are ambiguous in the verse are. The first is the sentence: *āgacchanti bhūyo ’pi bhavaṃ* (‘they return again to existence’), which echoes Haribhadra’s earlier *tīrtha-nikāra-darśanād āgacchanti* (‘they return when [they] see the abuse of the pathway’), which—out of context—may denote at least two different things: (1) ‘they return to the mundane world temporarily and at their own will, without any new karmic bondage’, just like the *avatāras* of Viṣṇu, or somehow resemble the Buddhist ideal of the Bodhisattva, and by implication their highest destination (*paramaṃ padam*) remains the liberated state; (2) ‘they return to the cycle of rebirths (*saṃsāra*) and start the process of karmic retribution anew’, so by implication their highest destination (*paramaṃ padam*) was merely a temporary

⁵⁰ LV₁ p. 220 = LV₂ p. 189: *ete py ājīvika-naya-matānusāribhir gośāla-śiṣyais tattvataḥ khalv avyāvṛttacchadmāna evaśyante tīrtha-nikāra-darśanād āgacchantīti vacanāt*.

⁵¹ DUNDAS (2003, pp. 160–162) discusses both passages, SVM and LV, and the idea of the return.

⁵² See, e.g., Uttar 23.1d, 5b: *dharmatīrthayare jīṇe*.

⁵³ E.g., LT 1.1:

dharmatīrtha-karebhyo ’stu syād-vādibhyo namo-namaḥ |
ṛṣabhādi-mahāvīrāntarebhyaḥ svātmōpalabdhave || 1 ||

PMfV 1.1.1 (p. 1):

ananta-darśana-jñāna-vīryānanda-mayātmane |
namo ’rhatē kṛpā-kṛpta-dharma-tīrthāya tāyine || 1 ||

liberation, i.e. a kind of heaven. The latter interpretation is taken for granted by Haribhadra.

The second ambiguity is the expression *tīrtha-nikārataḥ* (following the earlier *tīrtha-nikāra-darśanād*), which could be understood in a variety of ways: (1) because there are obstacles to the pathway, or as BASHAM (1951, p. 222) translates: ‘when the faith suffers injury’; (2) ‘because the pathway (i.e. religious tradition) is diminished’, i.e. people themselves gradually neglect the pathway and it becomes obsolete and in need of revitalisation; (3) ‘because there is opposition to the pathway’, i.e. non-believers abuse, or maltreat pious followers and oppose the creed, etc.; (4) ‘because of the bringing down of the pathway [by the cognoscenti]’, i.e. they themselves depart from or bring down the pathway. In any case, the verse does not allow for the translation of F.W. THOMAS (1960, p. 11): ‘they come again into existence for the overthrow of heresies’, albeit this is what BASHAM’s understanding implies.

One of the interpretations of the compound *tīrtha-nikārataḥ* would suggest that the liberated beings would return as some sort of Bodhisattvas, who—untainted by *karman* and mundane world—reappear in the material world in order to rectify it and to show suffering humans the correct path anew. That such an interpretation of Ājīvika’s original idea behind these two reports (LV and SVM) could in fact be correct may be implied by the way Haribhadra later discusses the Mahāyāna idea of Bodhisattvas, and characterises them as ‘standing (suspended) by giving up both mundane existence and liberation’^{54,55}. It is rather unlikely that this was an ancient idea of the Ājīvikas; it is more probably a later development prompted by parallel developments in Buddhism and, perhaps, Viṣṇuism. Another interpretation could be that the Ājīvika *tīrtha-kāras* depart from the mundane world and attain liberation (*paramaṃ padam*), whereas new teachers reappear in the world to continue the mission; that would point in a direction of a series of *tīrtha-kāras*, one succeeded by another, well-known from Jainism or Buddhism. Still another possibility would be—even though at first much less likely, but still possible in view of our extremely limited knowledge of the Ājīvika doctrine—that even the liberated beings themselves could overstep certain limits and abuse the pathway, and in the end they would have to go through the whole cycle of *saṃsāra* anew, resulting in their having to go through the whole cycle of *saṃsāra* again. This interpretation would point to a ceaseless cycle of rebirths, at least in some cases. In fact, such an interpretation, or similar, may turn out to be most plausible in view of the context in which it occurs, namely the discussion of the qualities of a real *tīrtha-kāra*, who is of infinite knowledge (*ananta-vijñāna*) and whose faults have been eliminated (*atīta-doṣa*); Malliṣeṇa refers to a counter-argument, which incorporates Ājīvikas as an example and embeds the above-quoted verse V 7:

With regard to these [qualities of a *tīrtha-kāra* mentioned in the main text], an opponent says: “It is enough to say that [a real *tīrtha-kāra*] must be just someone of infinite knowledge, but not someone whose faults are eliminated”,

⁵⁴ LV₁ p. 394 = LV₁ p. 343: *ete ca saṃsāra-nīrvāṇābhaya-parityāgena shitavantaḥ kaiścid iṣyante*.

⁵⁵ This possibility is discussed by DUNDAS (2003, p. 162).

inasmuch as the meaning [of the latter] is included [in the former], because without a destruction of faults infinite knowledge is not possible.” We reply to this as follows: this [mentioning that a *tīrtha-kāra* must be, in addition, someone whose faults are eliminated] serves the purpose of excluding an authority conceived by followers of mistaken theories. For instance, the followers of the Ājīvika theory say:

V 7: “The cognoscenti who are the makers of the passage (ford) to the moral law, having reached the highest destination, return again to existence on account of the abuse (maltreatment) of the pathway (ford).

Therefore these [makers of the passage] are not those whose faults are eliminated. How could otherwise their descent (return) back to existence be possible, even if one sees the abuse of the pathway?”⁵⁶

The framework for the verse, perhaps authentic, is what Malliṣeṇa says; he indeed explains *tīrtha-nikārataḥ* as *tīrtha-nikāra-darśane 'pi*, which does not really fit grammatically into what we have in the verse. In any case, the idea which transpires, also supported by Haribhadra’s reading, is that the liberated teachers of the Ājīvikas fall back because their faults and karmic blemishes are never completely eliminated. That would ultimately render the whole idea of liberation meaningless, and would also contradict the image of a determined way to liberation, explicated in the *Sāmañña-phala-sutta* above:

Just like a ball of thread, when thrown, exhausts itself, [simply] unwinding, exactly in the same manner both the fool and the wise—having transmigrated, having gone through the cycle of rebirths—will put an end to unhappiness.

Had this ‘return’ theory really been maintained by the Ājīvikas, at least at some point of time, their opponents would not have hesitated to immediately point out the actual impossibility of liberation in their theory: the Ājīvikas would be an easy prey for sharp criticism from all sides. However, we do not find such evidence from their critics, except for Haribhadra and Malliṣeṇa. Of course, we deal here with two equally unreliable sources—an early Buddhist and a late Jaina—and without access to more reliable data it is impossible to decide what the Ājīvikas really believed in. Here is precisely the methodological vicious circle mentioned at the outset: as long as we do not have a reliable picture of reconstructed doctrine of the Ājīvikas, we cannot assess whether the above verse V 7 is compatible with what the Ājīvikas claimed, *ergo* can be admitted as genuinely Ājīvika, or whether it contradicts their doctrine, *ergo* has to be dismissed as inauthentic.

⁵⁶ SVM 1.43–50, p. 3: *atrāha paraḥ. ananta-vijñānam ity etāvad evāstu nātīta-doṣam iti. gatārthatvāt. doṣātyayaṁ vinātyanta-vijñānatvasyānupapatteḥ. atrōcyate. kunaya-matānusāri-parikalpitāpta-vyavacchedārtham idam. tathā cāhur ājīvika-nayānusāriṇaḥ:*

*jñānino dharmā-tīrthasya kartāraḥ paramaṁ padam |
gatvāgacchanti bhūyo 'pi bhavaṁ tīrtha-nikārataḥ ||*

iti. tan nūnaṁ na te 'tīta-doṣāḥ. katham anyathā teṣāṁ tīrtha-nikāra-darśane 'pi bhavāvatarāḥ.

In addition, we must also take into account that the doctrine of the Ājīvikas certainly evolved. It is possible that they did admit an everlasting liberation in the beginning, but in the course of time they (or some of their adherents) adopted another idea, namely that the liberation is never permanent.

Of course, an idea of transitory liberation is a contradiction in terms, because such a picture relegates ‘the highest goal’ to being merely to one of heavenly abodes from which one falls back to earth. Thus it is never liberation. Further, such an idea is incompatible with the determinism according to which the cycle of rebirths ends at a fixed moment after the lapse of a particular, though myriad, number of births and deaths. If we accept that one falls back from such ‘limited liberation’, there is no need to speak of a path to it determined by destiny, because ‘limited liberation’ becomes merely one of innumerable existences. Its only difference might be that it would be incorporeal, which would not be logical. But of course logic is hardly ever at work when it comes to religion and belief.

However, such a position of the Ājīvikas would be so peculiar—even more peculiar than the idea of strict determinism—that it would certainly lead a number of critical comments and ridicules from other schools. That was however not the case: we do not hear such reports that the Ājīvikas admitted of a fallible and temporarily ‘limited liberation’.

For precisely these reasons I would be tempted to reject the above verse V 7 as not genuinely Ājīvika, but merely a hearsay reference to their doctrine, which does not faithfully reproduce it.

8. In the search for data on the Ājīvikas, BASHAM (1951, p. 226) refers to the following passage, reported by Jñānavimāla:

Some [people] maintain that the world is brought to existence through [its] intrinsic nature and that everything originates only through [its] intrinsic nature.⁵⁷

In the first place, since the passage is introduced as *kecit ... manyante*, it can only be a paraphrase of an idea. In fact, it is quite likely that it is not even a genuine report but—due to the standard, almost mechanical phrase which Jñānavimāla uses (n. 50)—a rephrasing of one of possible views about the origins of the world:

kecit svabhāva-bhāvitaṃ jagad manyante, svabhāvenāiva sarvaḥ sampadyate.
kecin niyati-bhāvitaṃ jagad iti jalpanti, bhavitavyatāiva sarvatra bahīyasīti.

We therefore cannot attach any value to such and similar references because their informational value is actually tautological, and they certainly say nothing about the Ājīvikas.

9. In fact, in many sources where the idea of determinism and destiny (*niyati*)—closely related to the Ājīvikas—occurs, a range of similar causal factors are discussed (either

⁵⁷ BASHAM (1951, p. 226, n. 1): *kecit svabhāva-bhāvitaṃ jagad manyante, svabhāvenāiva sarvaḥ sampadyate.* To *Praśna-vyākaraṇa* 7, fol. 29. V[ide] also Śīlāṅka to *Sū. kṛ.* i,1,2,2, fol. 30.’ BASHAM (1951, p. 226) translates the verse: ‘Some believe that the universe was produced by *Svabhāva*, and that everything comes about by *Svabhāva* only.’

all or most of them): (1) time (*kāla*), (2) intrinsic nature (*svabhāva*), (3) primordial factor (*prakṛti*), (4) destiny (*niyati*), (5) personal agency (*puruṣa*), (6) former deeds (*pūrva-kṛta*), i.e. karmic retribution (*karmaṇ*) and (7) god (*īśvara*), etc.⁵⁸

Since this list covers some of the factors sometimes associated with the Ājīvikas, one may, it seems, justifiably entertain a suspicion that the list systematically reflects a set of causes which includes also causes which, at a certain point in the evolution of their doctrine to explain the causality of the world and auxiliary factors assisting the main force of destiny (*niyati*). Especially two would seem, at least in theory, good candidates to complement *niyati*, i.e. *kāla* (time) and *svabhāva* (intrinsic nature). At the same time we can safely exclude *puruṣa* (personal agency) and *īśvara* (god, creator) as causal complements of *niyati*: clearly the doctrine of destiny the way it was conceived in India did not allow for either god or creator as an external factor over and above destiny. The same was also the case with former deeds (*pūrva-kṛta*), because that would contradict the force of destiny, or with *puruṣa*, understood either as human agency, or as the active soul (*ātman*) or conscious inactive principle of the Sāṃkhya, since in both these meanings *puruṣa* was either incompatible with or, respectively, contrary to *niyati*.

One of such standard enumerations is found in the *Saṃmati-tarka-prakaraṇa*, a late fifth-century Jaina work of Siddhasena Divākara:

The causes [of everything], such as time (*kāla*), inherent nature (*svabhāva*), destiny (*niyati*), former deeds (*pūrva-kṛta*) and personal agency (*puruṣa*), all taken in the absolute sense, [constitute] false belief. However, all these taken jointly are the correct belief.⁵⁹

This verse immediately reminds us of a *Śvetāśvatara-upaniṣad* verse, and even the sequence of a number of causal factors is the same:

Suppose [the cause of everything] is time (*kāla*), inherent nature (*svabhāva*), destiny (*niyati*), chance (*yadṛcchā*), material elements (*mahā-bhūta*), the womb (*yonī*) or conscious principle (*puruṣa*), or a combination of these? However, [none] is the case, because there is the self. [Still,] even the self is powerless, because it has as its causal factors pleasure and pain.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ Some of such doctrines (*svabhāva-vāda*, *niyati-vāda*, *kāla-vāda*) are discussed, alongside *yadṛcchā-vāda*, in: KAVIRAJ (1966: 45–71, ‘Theism In Ancient India’), and two of them (*svabhāva-vāda* and *kāla-vāda*) by BHATTACHARYA (2012). BHATTACHARYA (2001) and (2012: ‘Appendix’, 610–611) lists a number of such causal factors, and claims to have found as many as 28 (2012, p. 594).

⁵⁹ STP 3.53:

*kālo saḥāva ṇiyāi puvva-kayaṃ purisa kāraṇēgamitā /
micchattam te cēva samāso hoṃti sammattam //*

⁶⁰ ŚvU 1.2:

*kālāḥ svabhāvo niyatir yadṛcchā bhūtāni yoniḥ puruṣa iti cintyam /
samyoga eṣāṃ na tv ātma-bhāvād ātmāpy anīśaḥ sukha-duḥkha-hetoḥ //*

Interestingly, commenting on this verse, Rāmānuja no longer knows who the proponents of *niyati* were, see his PSBh *ad loc.*, p. 3.5: *mīmāṃsākās tu niyati-lakṣaṇam karmāiva hetum manyante*. ‘Inherent nature’ is here clearly identified with materialists, PSBh *ad loc.*, p. 3.4–5: *lokāyatikās tu svabhāvam eva hetum ācakṣate*.

If *niyati-vāda* can indeed be taken as a ‘indicator’ reference to the Ājīvikas, and we know of no other system so strongly associated with this notion, the *Śvetāśvatara-upaniṣad* is the earliest Sanskrit reference to the doctrine of *niyati*, ergo to the Ājīvikas.

Since both time and intrinsic nature are not necessarily incompatible with destiny, and may be conceived of as complementary to or supplementing the power of *niyati*, in the sense that they merely emphasise two aspects of destiny over which no one has any control and which override all individual actions and decisions, we should also consider whether they could be used as ‘Ājīvika indicators’, i.e. whether we have any evidence that they were indeed conceived as corollaries of destiny and whether there are any verses referring to time and intrinsic nature that can be classified as genuinely Ājīvika.

The Buddhist author Aśvaghōṣa, in his *Saundarānanda*, enumerates other causes: time (*kāla*), inherent nature (*svabhāva*), chance (*yadṛcchā*), primordial factor (*prakṛti*), god (*īśvara*) and *vidhi* (fateful ordinance), some of which we know are associated or synonymous with *niyati* (see § 4.1. and verse V 4):

So, in this world the causal factor for this suffering [bound to] activity is the conglomeration of defects, such as desire etc. It is not god, it is not primordial factor, neither time nor intrinsic nature, neither fateful ordinance nor chance.⁶¹

The same author follows a similar pattern in his *Buddha-carita*: BC 9.38 concerns time (*kāla*), BC 9.58–62 deals with intrinsic nature (*svabhāva*), BC 9.57 discusses primordial factor (*prakṛti*), BC 9.63ab pertains to god (*īśvara*), BC 9.63cd seems to speak of destiny (*niyati*) (?),⁶² BC 9.64–65 touches on personal agency (*puruṣa*), here referred to as ‘soul’ (*ātman*) or ‘man’ (*nara*).

Another good example of such a list, dated slightly later, is that provided by the Jaina commentator Śīlāṅka. In his discussion of various causes of the world and of happiness and unhappiness (SūyVṛ 1.1.2.28–34, p. 37–40), Śīlāṅka mentions four causes: destiny (*niyati*), personal agency (*puruṣa*), time (*kāla*) and god (*īśvara*).

⁶¹ Sau 16.17:

pravṛtti-duḥkhasya ca tasya loke tṛṣṇādayo doṣa-gaṇā nimittam |
nāivēśvaro na prakṛtir na kālo nāpi svabhāvo na vidhir yadṛcchā ||

⁶² Despite the fact that BC 9.63cd does not seem to be related to BC 9.63ad, still BC 9.63 allows for some ambiguity, for it says:

sargam vadantiśvaratas tathānye tatra prayatne puruṣasya ko ’rthaḥ |*
ya eva hetur jagataḥ pravṛtttau hetur nivṛtttau niyataḥ sa eva || 9.63 ||

‘Similarly others claim that the world* is due to god, and as far as this [world] is concerned, what would be the purpose of any effort on the part the human being? Only that which is the cause of any activity in the world is also determined to stop it.’

* In the particular context of the discussion on how to achieve liberation and what is the driving force in the world, *sarga* cannot mean ‘creation [of the universe]’ but rather ‘the world’ or ‘what happens in the world’.

Śīlānka explicates the doctrine of destiny, normally associated with the Ājīvikas, but does not ascribe it to them in the passage:

[The world is caused] only by destiny. This is what is said at the end of the second verse, namely that time is not the agent either, because—since this [time] is uniform—it would not be possible to explain the manifoldness of results (forms) in the world. For [the rule is that] there are a variety of effects if there are a variety of causes, but not if there are no variety of causes....⁶³

The list does not, however, include intrinsic nature (*svabhāva*), which may indicate, that time and intrinsic nature were not, in fact, corollaries of destiny (*niyati*) as associated with the Ājīvikas, but were independent causal factors postulated by schools other than the Ājīvikas.

The rejoinder to the above verse does not represent Śīlānka's own view but a tentative objection or *uttara-pakṣa*, which—in a complex argumentative structure—might be considered, perhaps, representing a genuinely Ājīvika response:

It has been criticised: “Since time is uniform, the manifoldness of the world is not be possible.” This is not a [proper] criticism for us, because we do not accept time as the only one agent, but also *karman*. Therefore [the argument based on] the manifoldness of the world is not a [proper criticism]. Similarly, god is an agent as well...⁶⁴

After the discussion, when speaking of ‘the doctrine of destiny (*niyati-vāda*) and other [doctrines]’⁶⁵, Śīlānka explicitly keeps destiny separate from the other causal theories discussed (time, god etc.) making it clear that the propounders of destiny (the Ājīvikas?) did not combine it with other explanatory factors responsible for the change and causality in the world. Therefore it is extremely unlikely that the Ājīvikas integrated in their belief a complex of causal factors, such as destiny, time, human agency and god taken jointly as a variegated whole. What actually remains as an ‘Ājīvika indicator’ of later period (after approx. 1 century CE) and Sanskrit literature is *niyati* only.

10. Much earlier Mallavādin Kṣamāśramaṇa (6th century) opens a discussion on the prime causal factor of events in the world in his *Dvādaśāra-naya-cakra*. Here various possibilities are discussed, e.g. personal agency (*puruṣa*), that is, the agency of a conscious subject (DNC 189.3–191.2). Then (DNC 191.3 ff.), Mallavādin discusses three stereotypic factors jointly: time (*kāla*), primordial factor (*prakṛti*), destiny (*niyati*) and intrinsic nature (*svabhāva*), beginning likewise conventionally:

⁶³ SūyVṛ 1.1.2.29–30, p. 38.8–9: *niyater evēti. etaṃ ca dvitīya-slokānte 'bhīdhāsyate nāpi kālaḥ kārtā, taśāika-rūpatvāj jagati phala-vaicitryānupapatteḥ, kāraṇa-bhede hi kārya-bhede bhavati nābhede...*

⁶⁴ SūyVṛ 1.1.2.31, p. 39.19–23: *yac cōcyate “kālasyaika-rūpetvāj jagad-vaicitryaṃ na ghaṭata” iti, tad asmān prati, yato 'smābhīr na kāla evāikaḥ kartṛtenābhūpagaṃyate api tu karmāpi, tato jagad-vaicitryaṃ ity adoṣaḥ tathēśvaro 'pi kartā...*

⁶⁵ SūyVṛ 1.1.2.34, p. 40.26: *niyati-vādādy-ekāntājñāna-vādin...*

‘This determining force] is nothing but (1) time because it reckons [everything], (2) nature because it gives form [to everything], (3) destiny because it destines the way [everything] is formed etc., (4) intrinsic nature because [everything] exists through its own form.’⁶⁶

The verse is also quoted in Abhayadeva-sūri’s *Tattva-bodha-vidhāyini* (TBV 3.53, p. 712.1–2). It is the commentator Simha-sūri who, in his *Nyāyāgamānusārīṇī* (NĀA), identifies some of these doctrines. Time (*kāla*) is associated with the Sāṃkhya system⁶⁷, and a part of a verse is quoted in support: ‘Time brings living beings to maturity’.⁶⁸ Similarly, primordial factor (*prakṛti*) is associated with Sāṃkhya and described as related to the three qualities (*guṇa*: *sattva*, *rajas*, *tamas*).⁶⁹ That Simha-sūri identifies two separate driving forces of the universe with one and the same system is in itself rather curious. On the other hand, he does not relate the two other causality doctrines (*niyati* and *svabhāva*) to any particular school. Of *niyati*—which here no longer means ‘destiny’ but rather ‘necessity’ or ‘necessary correlation’—he merely says:

Destiny (necessity) because of determination of the following sort: the datum for the eyes is colour because of [it] colouring [the eye], not taste etc.; taste is

⁶⁶ DNC, p. 191.3–4: *sa eva kalanāt kālah. prakaraṇāt prakṛtiḥ. rūpanādi-niyamanān niyatiḥ. svena rūpeṇa bhavanāt svabhāvaḥ.*

⁶⁷ Notice the pun on the name of the Sāṃkhya system in NĀA 191.13: *kala[h] saṃkhyāne kalanam jñānam saṃkhyānam ity arthaḥ.*—‘Time is used in the sense of counting, “reckoning” means cognition, i. e. counting—such is the meaning.’

⁶⁸ NĀA 191.14–15: *kālah pacati bhūtāni iti ślokaḥ.* The verse must be associated with one current of the Sāṃkhya tradition, but does not belong to the later mainstream classical Sāṃkhya of Īśvarakṛṣṇa and Gauḍapāda. It is a fragment of a longer verse, quoted and ultimately rejected in Gauḍapāda’s *Bhāṣya* (GBh 61, p. 153.6–8): *tathā keśāncit kālah karaṇam iti, uktaṃ ca:*

*kālah pacati bhūtāni kālah saṃharate jagat |
kālah supteṣu jāgarti kālo hi duratikramaḥ ||*

See also: MaiU₁ 6.15, p. 123.5–6 = MaiU₂, p. 341.20–21:

*kālah pacati bhūtāni sarvāṇy mahātmani |
yasmīc tu pacyate kālo yas taṃ veda sa vedavit ||*

In fact, the verse occurs in different variants in the *Mahā-bhārata*, e.g. MBh 1.1.188:

*kālah pacati bhūtāni kālah saṃharati prajāḥ |
nirdahantaṃ prajāḥ kālāṃ kālah śamayate punaḥ ||*

It is also quoted in a variant by Guṇaratna-sūri and ascribed to some ‘propounders of time’ (*kāla-vādīn*), TRD 1 § 19, p.16.13–14:

*kālah pacati bhūtāni kālah saṃharate prajāḥ |
kālah supteṣu jāgarti kālo hi duratikramaḥ ||*

⁶⁹ NĀA 191.15–18, **prakṛti**: *sattva-rajas-tamaḥ-svatattvān prakāśa-prakṛti-niyamārthān guṇān ātma-svatattva-vikalpān eva bhoktā prakurute iti prakṛtiḥ, yathāhur eke:*

*ajām ekāṃ lohita-śukla-kṛṣṇāṃ buddhīḥ prajāḥ sṛjamānāṃ sarūpāḥ |
ajo hy eko juṣamāno ’nuśete jahāty enām bhukta-bhogām ajo ’nyaḥ || [ŚVU 4.5]*

the datum for the sense of taste because of [it] giving taste [to the sense of taste], not colour etc.⁷⁰

He also does not have much to say about intrinsic nature (*svabhāva*):

Intrinsic nature because [everything] exists through its own form, i.e. its existence is all by itself. As some people say:

V 8: “What makes the sharpness of thorns and multiform appearance of beasts and birds? All that is driven by intrinsic nature. There is no independent act. Wherefrom [should] any effort [come if not from intrinsic nature]?”⁷¹

As aptly noticed by BASHAM (1951, p. 226),⁷² the verse is cited also by Guṇaratna-sūri (TRD 1 § 24, p.20.1–2). It is also quoted in Haribhadra-sūri’s *Yoga-bindu-ṭīkā*,⁷³ and elsewhere, i.e. Bhaṭṭa Utpala’s *Bṛhat-saṃhitā* 1.7, Ḍallana’s commentary on the *Suśruta-saṃhitā* (*Śarīra*, chapter 1) of 13th century.⁷⁴ In these texts, its role is to illustrate *svabhāva-vāda*, and it is coupled with another verse of a similar ‘thorny’ image:

Of [numerous] thorns of a jujube tree, one thorn is sharp, another is straight, still another is crooked, but its fruit is round. Say what has fashioned [these forms of one and the same tree]?⁷⁵

In his commentary to the *Dvādaśāra-naya-cakra* Simha-sūri merely repeats just one of two verses quoted later by Mallavādin (DNC, p. 222.6–9), who apparently identifies the idea of intrinsic nature (*svabhāva*) with materialists, not with the propounders of the doctrine of destiny (*niyati-vādin*). The other verse reads as follows:

⁷⁰ NĀA 191.18–20: *rūpanāc cakṣuṣo viṣayo rūpam eva na rasādayaḥ, rasanād raso rasana-viṣayo na rūpādaya ity-ādī niyamanān niyatīḥ.*

Nowhere in the section on *niyati* beginning at NĀA 192.25–205.11 do we find the name of a particular school; the discussion is abstract, with no reference to any existing thinker or philosophical current.

⁷¹ NĀA 191.20–22: *svo bhāva ātmanāiva svena rūpeṇa bhavanāt svabhāvaḥ. yathāhur eke: kaḥ kaṅṭakānām prakaroti taikṣṇyaṃ vicitra-bhāvaṃ mṛga-pakṣiṇām vā / svabhāvataḥ sarvam idaṃ pravṛttaṃ na kāma-cāro 'sti kutaḥ prayatnaḥ //*

⁷² BASHAM translates the verse as follows: ‘What makes the sharpness of thorns and the varied nature of beasts and birds? All this comes about by *Svabhāva*. There is nothing which acts at will. What is the use of effort?’ and traces the source: ‘Tarka-rahasya-dīpikā to *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya*, p. 13. V. also *Abh. Rāj.* s.v.’ (BASHAM (1951, p. 226, n. 2)).

⁷³ YBīT 78, p. 36.21–24, where it is introduced with the phrase: *svabhāva-vādāpattiḥ: kaḥ kaṅṭakānām...*, the phrase being merely a *pratīka* of YBī 78a. Apparently, while composing YBī 78, Haribhadra had in mind the original verse V 8 on which he makes a pun.

⁷⁴ See KAVIRAJ (1966: 52–53).

⁷⁵ TRD 1 § 23, p. 20:

kaḥ kaṅṭakānām prakaroti taikṣṇyaṃ vicitra-bhāvaṃ mṛga-pakṣiṇām vā / svabhāvataḥ sarvam idaṃ pravṛttaṃ na kāma-cāro 'sti kutaḥ prayatnaḥ //
badaryāḥ kaṅṭakas tīkṣṇa jṛur ekaś ca kuñcitāḥ /
phalaṃ ca vartulaṃ tasyā vada kena vinirmītam //

V 9: Who beautified the eyes of does? And who endowed peacocks with so radiant tail plumage? Who makes the buds of petals in blue lotuses? Or who establishes good conduct among well-born men?⁷⁶

The verse strikes a familiar note with a range of similar verses found for instance in the *Tattva-saṅgraha*:

What makes the diversity of filaments of a lotus flower? What has fashioned the variegated eyes in a peacock's tail?⁷⁷

or in the *Sarva-siddhānta-saṅgraha*,

What would colour peacocks? What would make cuckoos coo? In these cases, there is no other cause except intrinsic nature.⁷⁸

These views and verses are ascribed to the Lokāyatas / Cārvākas.⁷⁹ Also Śīlānka combines the two images—that of sharp thorns and that of colourful tail plumage of peacocks—and explicitly establishes a connection with the materialists:

Thus arises the multiform appearance of the world due to intrinsic nature, as it has been said:

“The sharpness of thorns, colourful appearance of peacock, the colours of pheasants all occur indeed due to intrinsic nature.”

Thus the view of those who say that the soul is the same as the body (sc. materialists) has been described.⁸⁰

In the very same spirit Simha-sūri links the image of ‘thorny things’ and intrinsic nature to the materialists:

As they say: One sees that the origin [of consciousness] depends solely on a complex configuration of material substances such as earth etc., so since [consciousness] is seen to originate in dependence on these [material elements] and because there is no deviance from intrinsic nature (i.e.

⁷⁶ DNC, p. 222.8–9:

*kenāñjīṭāni nayanāni mṛgāṅganānām ko vā karoti rucirāṅga-ruhān mayūrān /
kaś cōtpaleṣu dala-sannicayaṃ karoti ko vā karoti vinayaṃ kulajeṣu puṃsu //*

⁷⁷ TSa 111:

*rājīva-kesarādīnām vaicitryaṃ kaḥ karoti hi /
mayūra-candrakādir vā vicitraḥ kena nirmitaḥ //*

⁷⁸ SSS 2.5:

*śikhināś citrayet ko cā kokilān kaḥ prakūjayet /
svabhāva-vyatirekeṇa vidyate nātra kāraṇam //*

⁷⁹ For more examples see BHATTACHARYA (2012: 596–7, 604).

⁸⁰ SūyVṛ 1.1.1.12, p. 27.13–17: *evaṃ svabhāvāj jagad-vaicitryaṃ, tathā cōktaṃ:*

*kaṅṭhakasya ca tīkṣṇatvaṃ mayūrasya vicitratā /
varṇāś ca tāmra-cūḍānām svabhāvena bhavanti hi //*

iti taj-jīva-tac-charīra-vādi-mataṃ gatam...

because these developments are consistently related to intrinsic nature with no exception), one should maintain that [the only cause in the world] is intrinsic nature. For it is as follows: in certain cases of disfigurement, etc., one can see some [trees] with thorns among [particular species of] trees etc. [naturally] without thorns, and some [trees] without thorns among [particular species of] trees etc. [naturally] with thorns as inferential signs of such a particular arrangement [of material elements], as it has been said:

“Some things [normally] without thorns are seen the other way round, i.e. being with thorns, and other things [normally] with thorns are seen the other way round, i.e. being without thorns. [That is why people] speak of [such cases as] defining feature of a particular arrangement [of material elements].”⁸¹

As the above examples which consistently link the queries for the cause of the beauty of nature and animals to the materialists,⁸² also verse V 9 can be easily dismissed as non-Ājīvika. Since the sectarian source of V 9 is connected with that of V 8, we can be justified in also dismissing V 8 as a verse of Ājīvika origin.

And there are more reasons to dismiss this verse as authentically Ājīvika. Again Bhattacharya (2012, p. 602) draws our attention to three other variants of verse V 8. In fact, there is yet another variant quoted by Vijaya Darśana-sūri in his *Sammatitarka-mahārṇavātārikā*.⁸³ All of these cases are associated with *svabhāva-vāda* and none of these cases is related to the Ājīvikas in any way whatsoever.

The sources for both verses V 8 and V 9 are quite clear: V 8 (*kaḥ kaṅṭakānām prakaroti...*) is from Aśvaghōṣa's *Buddha-carita* (BC 9.62), whereas V 9 (*badaryāḥ kaṅṭakas tikṣṇa...*) from Haribhadra-sūri's *Loka-tattva-nirṇaya* (LTN 2.22). Both passages are associated with the doctrine of intrinsic nature (*svabhāva-vāda*). In fact, all of the above-mentioned cases when V 8 is quoted are associated solely with *svabhāva-vāda*; in none do the authors mention the Ājīvikas. On the contrary, usually—albeit not always—the context makes it clear that the Cārvākas / Lokāyatās are meant. This confirms the observation of Gopinath Kaviraj (1966, pp. 46–54) who considers the *svabhāva-vādin*s in some contexts as a branch of the Lokāyatikas.

Nowhere do find any reference to the Ājīvikas, and it seems that the authors—Mallavādin and his commentator Siṃha-sūri as well as others who refer to the *svabhāva-vāda*—do not establish any (either explicit or indirect) link between

⁸¹ NĀA 223.10–14: *yad ucyate bhūmy-ādi-dravya-vinirvṛtyi-apekṣāivôtpattir dṛṣṭā ity etat tad-apekṣôtpatti-darśanāt svabhāvavyabhicārāc ca svabhāva evēti mantavyam. tad yathā—utpādādiṣu akaṅṭakānām vṛkṣādīnām kaṅṭakāḥ kaṅṭakinām cākaṅṭakā nidhy-ādi-liṅgatvena dṛṣṭāḥ. yathôktam:*

*akaṅṭakāḥ kaṅṭakināḥ kaṅṭakās cāpy akaṅṭakāḥ /
viparyayeṇa dṛśyante vadanti nidhi-lakṣaṇam //*

⁸² See also BHATTACHARYA (2012).

⁸³ STPMAA, p. 352:

*kaḥ kaṅṭakānām prakaroti taikṣṇyam vicitra-bhāvaṃ mṛga-pakṣiṇām ca /
svabhāvataḥ sarvam idaṃ pravṛttaṃ na kāma-cāro 'sti kutah prasaṅgaḥ //*

iti-vacanāt kaiś cic ca svabhāvo hetutvenābhyupagamyate.

svabhāva and the Ājīvikas. They also make no link between *svabhāva* and *niyati*, seemingly being unaware of this possibility.

Still, the lack of any established links between *svabhāva-vāda* and *niyati-vāda* does not provide sufficient ground to criticise BASHAM (1951, p. 226) for maintaining that ‘[t]hese ideas have much in common’ or for suggesting that *svabhāva-vāda* was ‘a small sub-sect of Ājīvikism’, as does BHATTACHARYA (2012, p. 598), who adds:

Basham’s total involvement with the Ājīvikas led him to include every heretical view as a part of Ājīvikism. There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that the doctrine of *svabhāva* was adopted by any community, religious or secular. If the evidence of the *ŚvUp* (i.e. ŚvU—P.B.) and the *Sau* (i.e. *Aśvagoṣa’s Saundarānanda*—P.B.) is to be believed, *svabhāva*, along with but distinct from the doctrines of time, destiny, etc., was proposed by a set of philosophers whom the author/s of the *ŚvUp* did not approve of. *Svabhāva* is mentioned there only in connection with the origin of the universe, “the first cause”, so to say.

First, contrary to BHATTACHARYA’S claim, there is some evidence to suggest that the doctrine of *svabhāva* was adopted by some community/ies, in exactly the same way as *niyati-vāda*, *karma-vāda*, *īśvara-vāda*, *puruṣa-vāda*, etc., were. *Svabhāva* did not have to be a term that was linked to a particular religious community in one-to-one relationship, as e.g. *anekānta-vāda* is connected to Jainism and Jainism to *anekānta-vāda*, or as Buddhism and *kṣaṇika-vāda* are so connected. One and the same term, through its different shades, could relate to various schools of thought at the same time. This was noted by Indian thinkers themselves, one of them saying that ‘there are five kinds of the propounders of the doctrine of intrinsic nature.’⁸⁴ The proven connection of *svabhāva-vāda* to the materialists or to the Sāṃkhya⁸⁵ does not exclude its being related also to the Ājīvikas, albeit we would require more solid prove to substantiate this link.

Second, ‘a community’ does not have to be a strictly religious community with a well-established social structure and interlinking network to be a community. Indeed, when we deal with certain ideas and doctrines in Indian tradition, they are professed by some philosophical schools, philosophical-religious sub-currents, sub-sects, etc. Adopting Bhattacharya’s understanding, we could equally dismiss the ideas of, say, *sat-kārya-vāda* or *īśvara-vāda*, because it is neither strictly related to a particular religious group, being primarily upheld by philosophers and theoreticians, nor to religious followers, these being generally quite unconcerned about such debates.

Third, contrary to BHATTACHARYA’S claim, there is no doubt some evidence to suggest that of the communities that possibly had some representatives subscribing to *svabhāva-vāda*, one could have been the Ājīvikas. The idea of *svabhāva* is apparently present as early as the *Sāmañña-phala-sutta*, found as the third element

⁸⁴ See e.g. Namṅ ad NamS₂ 88, p. 78.6: *pañcama-vikalpaḥ svabhāva-vādinah*.

⁸⁵ ŚvU 1.2 mentions inherent nature (*svabhāva*) and the material elements (*mahā-bhūta*) side by side, which indicates that these cannot be both references to the Lokāyata / Cārvāka, and apparently *svabhāva* is in this case a reference to Sāṃkhya. On the other hand, *svabhāva* is clearly identified with materialists in some other cases, e.g., in PSBh ad loc., p. 3.4–5: *lokāyatikās tu svabhāvam eva hetum ācakṣate*.

(*bhāva*) in the compound: *niyati-saṅgati-bhāva-pariṇatā* ('they are developed by destiny, predetermined concurrence of factors and [own] nature'). The term *svabhāva* also features in the *Niyati-dvātrimśikā* (NiDv 1, 10, 26, see below), which provides an account of the Ājīvikas.

Having said that, V 8 and V 9 as candidates for a genuine survivors of Ājīvikas' verses must both be rejected as being clearly related to materialists.

11. There is also some evidence that fate (*daiva*) as a determining cause was a concept associated with the Ājīvikas and that at least sometimes was identified with *niyati*. In the section on 'the refutation of absolute admission of fate and human causality' (*daiva-puruṣa-kārāikānta-nirāsaḥ*) in his *Aṣṭa-sahasrī-tātparya-vivaraṇa*, Yaśovijaya-gaṇi cites two verses and provides a commentary establishing the link between *daiva* and *niyati* and the Ājīvikas. A Prakrit verse illustrating his longer discourse on fate (AṣṬV 90, p. 913.21 ff.) runs as follows:

V 10: 'Former deeds (*pūrva-kṛta*), karmic retribution (*karman*), diverse fruition [of past deeds] is called fate (*daiva*), and so is the influence on this [karmic fruition] on the part of time etc. as well as human effort (*puruṣa-kāra*).'⁸⁶

In the interpretation of the verse I follow the context set by Yaśovijaya-gaṇi, who explains that 'everything is caused by fate' (*sarvaṃ daiva-kṛtam*), 'because it has been established that even human effort, in the form of a transformation of the fruition of *karman* under the influence of time etc., is in fact an operation of fate' (*kālādi-kṛta-karma-vipāka-pariṇāma-rūpasya puruṣa-kārasya tattvato daiva-vyāpāratva-siddheḥ*). The verse understood in this way could in theory be taken as originating from a Prakrit work by an Ājīvika author. Such interpretation would, however, be too hasty.

Without knowing the original context, the verse allows for at least two more interpretations, both of which are more plausible, and can be taken either (1) as an enumeration of six causes of the world:

[The primary cause] is called: former deeds (*pūrva-kṛta*), karmic retribution (*karman*), diverse fruition [of past deeds], fate (*daiva*), the influence on this [karmic fruition] on the part of time etc. and human effort;

or (2) as three separate definitions of *karman*, *daiva* and *puruṣa-kāra*:

Former deeds (*pūrva-kṛta*) are called karmic retribution (*karman*); diverse fruition [of past deeds] is called fate (*daiva*); human effort (*puruṣa-kāra*) is the influence on this [karmic fruition] alongside time etc.

⁸⁶ AṣṬV 90, p. 613.21–23:

*puvva-kayaṃ kammaṃ cīya citta-vivāgam iya bhannai divvaṃ /
kālāiehiṃ tappāyaṇaṃ tu taha purisa-gāru tti //*

We may be well justified in suspecting that the context set by Yaśovijaya-gaṇi is not the original one, and that one should rather subscribe to either of the two alternative interpretations, none of which could be regarded as advancing the Ājīvika claim that fate (*daiva*), or destiny (*niyati*), is the ruling factor in all that befalls the man.

What is important, however, is that *daiva* (fate) is explicitly related to the Ājīvikas by name and associated with the idea of *niyati* (destiny) after its initial exposition (*ājīvika-samaya-prasiddham niyati-janyatvam*).⁸⁷ In addition, in the conclusion of his comments Yaśovijaya reproduces a verse to illustrate the Ājīvikas' position on destiny/fate, and mentions the source of the verse by name as the *Niyati-dvātrimśikā*:

As it is said in the *Thirty-two Verses on Destiny*:

V 11: “If [true] knowledge of the Victorious (liberated Jinas) is non-deviation (non-deviant or certain / inevitable?), then one should not make any exertion. Also if in the case [of the Victorious Jinas, their true knowledge] is multiplex (sc. they are omniscient from one point of view, and not omniscient from another), then these [Victorious Jinas in fact] are already vanquished (not victorious, i.e. liberated). But where is then the Lord [of yours as authority on liberation, if the Jinas' omniscience cannot be established]?”⁸⁸

The second hemistich sounds apparently like a (superficial, but common) critique of Jaina doctrine of multiplexity of reality (*anekānta-vāda*): if one accepts that various, apparently even contradictory qualities could be predicated of one and the same object, then a Jina, being omniscient from one point of view, must be non-omniscient from another point of view as well. But since for the Jainas complete omniscience is not possible, neither is complete liberation. What is, however, problematic with (the interpretation of) the verse is the first hemistich, beginning with the actual meaning of the term *avyabhicāram*. The term AṣṬV could hardly mean: ‘non-deviation’, in the sense of non-deviant, i.e. true knowledge, because the

⁸⁷ The whole passage commenting on the verse, AṣṬV 90–91, p. 613.21–615.21, reads: *śrī-haribhadrācāryōkta-rītyā kālādi-kṛta-karma-vipāka-pariṇāma-rūpasya puruṣa-kārasya tattvato daiva-vyāpāratva-siddher vyāpāreṇa vyāpāriṇo 'nyathā-siddhatvānanyathā-siddhatvayor vyavahāra-nīscayād-hīnatvāt tad-vivakṣā-kṛtāḥ syāt sarvaṃ daiva-kṛtam ity-ādayaḥ sapta-bhaṅgī draṣṭavyāḥ. mokṣe jñāna-janyatva-kriyā-janyatva-sapta-bhaṅgī-karaṇe 'syā evōpāyāt vāt. ata eva paramārthataḥ sarvatra niyatāniyate 'pi vastuṃ ājīvika-samaya-prasiddham niyati-janyatvam upamyāya puruṣa-kāra-janyatvaṃ bhagavad-vaco 'nusāribhir vyavasthāpyate, matāntara-hetor nayasya nayāntareṇa khaṇḍanasyāpi śāstrārthatvāt, niyatāniyata-sapta-bhaṅgī-pravyṭtau tu niyati-janyatā-grāhako 'pi naya āśrīyate eva, dāhako 'pi nahnir iva pākādāv iti tatra vyavasthitam. athavā daiva-śabdena kālādi-catuṣṭayam grhyate, pauraśa-śabdena cātma-prayatnaḥ, tat-kṛtvaṃ ca tad-avyavahitōttara-kṣaṇōtpatikatvaṃ tac-chabdārthaś ca sāmagrī-prativiṣṭo vācyo iti, tattvāvinirgamāt syād daiva-kṛtam sarvaṃ ity-ādi-sapta-bhaṅgī-pravyṭtir aviruddhā, īdṛśa-vivakṣā-mahimnā syād danḍa-janyo ghaṭaḥ syāc cakra-janya ity-ādi sapta-bhaṅgī-pravyṭter api sambhavād eka-svabhāvenōbhaya-janyatva-vivakṣāyām avaktavyatva-tad-ghaṭita-bhaṅgānām api sāvakāśatvād iti yuktam utpaśyamāḥ.*

⁸⁸ AṣṬV 91, p. 615.16–18: *yac ca niyati-dvātrimśikāyām:*

*jñānam avyabhicāram cej jinānām mā śramaṃ kṛthāḥ |
atha tatrāpy anekānto jītāḥ smaḥ kin nu^a ko bhavān ||*

^a NiDv 16d: *kiṃ tu.*

For an alternative translation see below n. 88.

link between true knowledge of the Jinās and dispensability of any exertion seems very unclear to me in an argument which would run: ‘If the knowledge of the Victorious (liberated Jinās) is true, then one should not make any exertion’. If we take *avyabhicāram* as ‘inevitability’, then the argument makes better sense: ‘If the knowledge of the Victorious (liberated Jinās) is inevitable, then one should not make any exertion’, i.e. one will sooner or later achieve omniscience without any effort. The problem with the latter interpretation is that it would perhaps sound like a criticism of determinism (*niyati*) of the Ājīvikas, which cannot escape the paradox that the Ājīvikas must have faced: if we are bound to attain liberation (and become omniscient), what is the use of any penance practised by the Ājīvikas? If the second interpretation is nevertheless correct (*avyabhicāram* = ‘inevitability’) and it does express criticism, then the verse can hardly be classified as a genuinely Ājīvika verse. While this conclusion would rest on my inability to correctly understand both the meaning of *avyabhicāra* in the verse and the gist of the argument, nonetheless, perhaps, precisely such a conclusion is correct, as we shall see below (p. 50).

Whatever the case may be, the information provided by this 17th-century author appears to be quite enlightening in being apparently the first tangible information about the Ājīvikas. Thus we might hail the first success: what we have here at last is both a direct quotation as well as a title of an unidentifiable Ājīvika work.

12. What is disturbing about the above seemingly successful conclusion is that the source of the verse is a work ascribed to a Jaina Śvetāmbara author, Siddhasena-sūri: it is verse 16 of his *Niyati-dvātrīṃśikā*. And that itself raises a range of questions.

Olle Qvarnström, in a paper ‘Siddhasena Divākara on Ājīvika’ presented during 11th Jaina Studies Workshop at SOAS on 12th March 2009 devoted primarily to the *Niyati-dvātrīṃśikā*,

believes this hymn is of great historical importance because he thinks it may be an original Ājīvika text that was edited by the compiler of the *Dvātrīṃśikā* and thus is an impartial account of their philosophy.⁸⁹

For various reasons—including structural, conceptual, terminological, thematic, vocabulary, lack of any overlap—one can not only endorse Qvarnström’s claim that ‘it is highly probable that the different hymns neither have a common authorship nor are composed by Siddhasena Divākara’⁹⁰, but it may justify venturing much further and maintaining that a range of works ascribed to Siddhasena Divākara do not stem

⁸⁹ *Jaina Studies, Newsletter of the Centre of Jaina Studies* 5 (2010) 12.

⁹⁰ *Jaina Studies, Newsletter of the Centre of Jaina Studies* 4 (2009) 9; see also QVARNSTRÖM (2015): ‘In fact, internal and external criteria also negate the assumption that the *Dvātrīṃśikā* and its doxographical texts were written by a single author.’

from one and the same author. Indeed, the two best known—*Sammati-tarka-prakarana* and *Nyāyāvatāra*—are separated by about 250 years.⁹¹

In his paper ‘The Niyativādadvātrīṃśikā ascribed to Siddhasena Divākara’, into which his original London paper developed and in which he provides a collated reproduction of the text based on three editions and two manuscripts (not really present in the actual apparatus found in the manuscript of QVARNSTRÖM’s paper), QVARNSTRÖM gives a closer look at *The Hymn on Destiny in 32 Stanzas (Niyati-dvātrīṃśikā)*, which he incorrectly titles *Niyati-vāda-dvātrīṃśikā*,⁹² and maintains that

The *Niyatidvātrīṃśikā* may turn out to be such an Ājīvika Sanskrit text, i.e. an emic portrayal of Ājīvika doctrine—including certain polemical elements—reflecting a fully elaborated doctrinal system whose logic and epistemology resembled that of the Jains.

It is not clear to me what ‘emic portrayal’, or ‘insider’s perspective’, really means. Would be a genuine text written by Ājīvikas or not? And this is not a genuine text written by Ājīvikas, how would it differ in essence from a typical doxographical work written by an outsider, i.e. a Jaina author?

Before proceeding with further analysis, however, I will first reproduce the text of the tiny work in order to assess how far it may really be considered ‘an Ājīvika Sanskrit text, i.e. an emic portrayal of Ājīvika doctrine’.

nityānantaram^{1*} *avyakti-sukha-duḥkhābhijāyah /*
svabhāvaḥ sarva-sattvānām payaḥ kṣīrāṅkarādivat // 1 //
dharmādharmaṃmakatve tu śarīrēndriya-saṃvidām /
katham puruṣa-kāraḥ syād idam evēti nēti vā // 2 //
śarīrēndriya-niṣpattau yo nāma svayam aprabhuḥ /
tasya kaḥ karṭṛ-vādo 'stu tad-āyattāsu vṛttiṣu // 3 //
dharmādharmau tadānyonya-nirodhātīśaya-kriyau /
deśādy-apekṣau ca tayoh katham kaḥ karṭṛ-sambhavaḥ // 4 //
yat pravṛttyōpamardena vṛttam sad-asad-ātmakam /
tad vētara-nimittam vēty ubhayaṃ pakṣa-ghātakam // 5 //
na dṛṣṭāntākṛtāśakteḥ svāntaryam pratiśidhyate /
animittam nimittāni nimittānīty avāritam // 6 //
viśva-prāyām pṛthivy-ādi-pariṇāmo 'prayatnataḥ /
viśayas tat-prabodhas te tulye^{2*} *yasyēti manyate // 7 //*

⁹¹ See BALCEROWICZ (2001a), (2001b), (2003b) and (2004), i.e. evidence which QVARNSTRÖM (2015) apparently overlooks.

⁹² If this is a genuinely Ājīvikan text, it is highly unlikely that an Ājīvika author would refer to *niyati-vāda*^o in a work describing his own system (one would rather expect *niyati*^o alone). If that is not an Ājīvikan text, but rather a Jaina text providing a report on the Ājīvikas, the title of this particular *dvātrīṃśikā* as given by QVARNSTRÖM would be the odd one out in a whole series, because *vāda*^o features in no other work title in the doxographical range of 32-stanza texts from nos. 12 to 17 *vāda*^o in just one of them would be very peculiar. That is why, unless we have some other very strong evidence, we would have to accept *Niyati-dvātrīṃśikā* as the real title solely on the basis of the internal evidence of the *dvātrīṃśikā*s ascribed to Siddhasena. However, the final argument against QVARNSTRÖM’s title *Niyati-vāda-dvātrīṃśikā* is the one provided by Yaśovijaya who himself provides the correct title (*vide supra* n. 88, AṣSTV 91, p. 615.16: *yac ca niyati-dvātrīṃśikāyām*).

nōktābhyaṃ saha nārambhāt samam adhyakṣa-sāmpadi /
 vināśānupapattē ca bhojya-bhakṣya-vikalpataḥ // 8 //
 pṛthvyā nāvarudhyeta yathā vā rājata-kriyāḥ /
 guṇānāṃ puruṣe tad-vad ahaṃ kartēty adah-kṛteḥ^{3*} // 9 //
 sudūram api te gatvā hetu-vādo nivartsyati /
 na hi svabhāvān adhyakṣo loka-dharmo 'sti kaścana // 10 //
 pravartitavyam evēti pravartante yadā guṇāḥ /
 atha kiṃ saṃpramugdho 'si jñāna-vairāgya-siddhiṣu // 11 //
 karmād aṣṭāṅgatā buddher na virodha-kṛte ca yaiḥ /
 vaktur adya-nimittatvādivat atatha-pratyayād api // 12 //
 asato hetuto vēti pratisaṃdhau ca vighrahaḥ /
 asaṃs tu hetur dhī-mātraṃ kartēti ca viśiṣyate // 13 //
 bhāṅgara-śravaṇādy-artha-saṃvin-mātre nirātmake /
 rāgādi-śāntau yatnas te kathaṃ kasya kiṃ ity ayam // 14 //
 karma-jaḥ pratyayo nāma karma ca pratyayātmakam /
 tat-phalaṃ nirayādyas ca na ca sarvatra viśmṛtaḥ // 15 //
 jñānam avyabhicāraṃ cej jinānāṃ mā śramaṃ kṛthāḥ /
 atha tatrāpy anekānto jītāḥ smaḥ kiṃ tu ko bhavān // 16 //
ekēndriyāṇāṃ avyakter ajāty-antara-saṃgatau /
 vyaktānāṃ ca tadādau kā rāgādi-pravibhaktayaḥ // 17 //
 na saṃsaraty atah kaścit sva-parōbhaya-hetukam /
abhijāti-viśeṣāt tu mithyā-vāda-mukho janaḥ // 18 //
 caitanayam api naḥ sattvo mohādi-jñāna-lakṣaṇaḥ /
 tad-ādi tad-vat saṃkalpo mithyā-rāsiḥ pravartate // 19 //
 tulya-prasaṅgo nānāte tulyenāikena bādhyate /
 akasmāt-kāraṇāveśau hetu-dharmāviśeṣataḥ // 20 //
 sparśanādīmano 'ntāni bhūta-sāmānya-jātimān /
 mano 'haṃ niyataṃ^{4*} dravyaṃ pariṇāmy anumūrti ca // 21 //
 sparśāika-viśayatvādis tattvāntāḥ krama-jātayaḥ /
 arūpād anabhivyakta-bhedāḥ krṣṇābhijātayaḥ // 22 //
 yathā duḥkhādi nirayas tiryakṣu^{5*} puruṣōttamāḥ /
 raktāyāṃ ajanāyāṃ tu sukha-jā na guṇōttarāḥ // 23 //
 hiṃsāvidyābhicārthaḥ pūrvānte madhyamaḥ śamaḥ /
samyag-darśana-bhāvāntāḥ pratibuddhas tv ayojitaḥ // 24 //
 na cōpadeśo buddheḥ syād ravi-panka-ja-yogavat /
 tattvaṃ ca pratibuddhyante tebhyaḥ pratyabhijātayaḥ // 25 //
 samānābhijaneṣv eva guru-gaurava-māninaḥ /
 svabhāvam abhigacchanti na hy agniḥ samam adhyati // 26 //
 pravṛtty-antarikāvyāja-vibhaṅga-svapna-saṃbhavat /
 na jātyaḥ saṃsṛter uktaṃ saṃkaro 'ntarikāntajāḥ // 27 //
 surādi-krāma ekeṣāṃ mānasā hy utkrama-kramāt /
 sukha-duḥkha-vikalpāc ca khaṇḍir yā no '**bhijātayaḥ** // 28 //
 vyomāvakaśo nānyeṣāṃ kālo dravyaṃ kriyā vidhiḥ /
 sukha-duḥkha-rajo dhātu^{6*} jīvājīva-nabhāmsi ca // 29 //
 anumānaṃ mano-vṛttir anvaya-niścayātmikā /

traikālyāngādi-vṛttāntā hetur avyabhicārataḥ // 30 //
saṃjñā-sāmānya-paryāya-śabda-dravya-guṇa-kriyāḥ /
etenôktāḥ pṛthak cēti vyavahāra-viniścayaḥ // 31 //
*na nāma tattvam evāitan **mīthyātvāpara-buddhayaḥ /***
na cārtha-pratiśedhena na siddhārthaś ca kathyate // 32 //
iti niyata-dvātrīṃśikā^{7} ṣoḍśī // 16 //*

^{1*} NiDv₁: *niyatāntaram*; NiDv₃: *nityānantaram*.

^{2*} NiDv₁: *tau tulyau*.

^{3*} NiDv_Q = NiDv₁: *adaḥ kṛte*.

^{4*} NiDv_Q: *mano 'ham niyatam*; NiDv₂: *mano-han-niyatam*.

^{5*} NiDv_Q, NiDv₁: *tiryakṣi*.

^{6*} NiDv_Q: *sukha-duḥkha-rajo-dhātur*.

^{7*} NiDv₂: *niyata-dvātrīṃśikā*.

[Since only NiDv₂ (Upadhye) is available to me, in the above list of the *variae lectiones* I rely on Qvarnström (2015).]

In any preliminary analysis of this short work, we must take into account the present textual context in which the *Niyati-dvātrīṃśikā* features. These 32 verses follow a few other *dvātrīṃśikās* that stylistically consistently recapitulate the views of some other schools:

—*Dvātrīṃśikā* 12 recapitulates the views of the Nyāya school, but no single verse seems to be a quote from genuine Nyāya sources. The text is most likely a paraphrase. Even the expressions used seem to be foreign to Nyāya sources, as for example in verse 1:

daiva-khātam ca vadanam ātmāyattam vān-mayam /
śrotāraḥ santi cōktasya nirlajjaḥ ho na pañḍitaḥ // 1 //

Even in cases when mostly genuine Nyāya terminology is used, the passages are interwoven either with odd expressions or with a rather eccentric recapitulation of Nyāya ideas that seems to confuse orders of entities, as for example in verse 9 (the order of *pañcāvayava* and that of the *tattvas* are mixed):

pratijñā nirṇayo hetur dṛṣṭāntam buddhi-kāraṇam /
pramāṇa-hetu-dṛṣṭānta-jāti-tarkās tad-uktayaḥ // 9 //

—*Dvātrīṃśikā* 13 recapitulates the views of the Sāṃkhya but again, no verse seems to be a quote from a genuine Sāṃkhya source. Also this text is most likely a paraphrase. As before, expressions used seem to be even foreign to Sāṃkhya sources in terms of vocabulary, but not necessarily in spirit, as for example in verse 32:

caḥsurvat puruṣo bhoktā bandha-mokṣa-vilakṣaṇaḥ /
kṛtārthaiḥ sa prayukto pi śūnya eva guṇair iti // 32 //

—*Dvātrimśikā* 14 recapitulates the views of the Vaiśeṣika. Again, no verse seems to be a quote from genuine Vaiśeṣika sources, and often the recapitulation of Vaiśeṣika ideas is rather unusual, right from the very first verse or verse 3:

*dharmādharmaśvarā loka-siddhy-apāya-pravṛttiṣu /
dravyādi-sādhanāv etau dravyād yā vā parasparam // 1 //
saṁsāreṇa tad-āpekṣyam eka-dravya-kṣaṇa-sthitiḥ /
karma kārya-virodhi syād ubhayōbhayathā guṇaḥ // 3 //*

—*Dvātrimśikā* 15 recapitulates the views of the Buddhists. Again, no verse seems to be a quote from genuine Buddhist sources, and the text is most likely a paraphrase. Expressions used seem to be even foreign to Buddhist sources, as for example in verse 1:

*nāhaṁ-kṛtasya nirvāṇaṁ na setsyaty anahaṁ-kṛtaḥ /
na vā vidyā vivekāya na vidyā bhava-gāminī // 1 //*

There are also expressions which are not Buddhistic, but rather smack of Jain accounts, e.g. *naya* or *avaktavya*:

*avaktavyam asabhāvāt praśnārthasya kha-puṣpavat /
saṁtānaṁ bhāvanārthaṁ vā sarit-protā-pradīpavat // 6 //
mahā-bhūtoccchrayo rūpaṁ vijñānaṁ viśayo nayaḥ /
deva-nāṭya-pṛthag-bhāvo nṛ-jāty-ādi-vikalpavat // 7 //
ahetu-pratyaya-nayaṁ pūrvāpara-samābhavam /
vijñānaṁ tat-samutthaṁ kaḥ saṁvyavasyed vicakṣaṇaḥ // 21 //*

—*Dvātrimśikā* 17 apparently recapitulates the views close to those of a nihilist / materialist (?), see the beginning verses. However the whole terminology is Jainistic:

*na duḥkhena virudhyete dharmādharmaḥ sukheṇa vā /
pratyayāvyaabhicāritvāt sva-parōbhaya-vṛttiṣu // 1 //
deśa-kāla-nimittāni nimittāny anyogataḥ /
niyogato vā tat-siddhau na vādhyātma-viśeṣataḥ // 2 //
na mithyā-darśanāt pāpaṁ na samyag-darśanāt chubham /
na ca nēti kaṣāyāṇāṁ tad-vṛtty-avyatirekataḥ // 6 //*

There is nothing, it seems, which would speak against a common authorship or source of these five works (*Dvātrimśikā* 12–15, 17). On the contrary, they are all quite uniform in structure, approach and style; indeed, a close reading reveals a number of close lexical and stylistic similarities between them. And all of them are slightly off-the-mark in their portrayal of the systems under discussion.

In addition, if we only focus on the *Niyati-dvātrimśikā* (NiDv), in this work there are some expressions that are identical (or almost identical) to those used in the other texts of the group, and these identical expressions are in metrically exactly (or almost exactly) the same positions:

- (1) NiDv 6cd: *animittam nimittāni nimittānīty avāritam // 6 //*
Dvātrimśikā 17.1ab: *deśa-kāla- nimittāni nimittāny anyogataḥ /*

- (2) NiDv 8d: *bhojya-bhakṣya-vikalpataḥ* //
Dvātrimśikā 17.7d: *tad-ādy astu vikalpataḥ* //
- (3) NiDv 18b: *sva-parōbhaya-hetukam* /
Dvātrimśikā 17.1d: *sva-parōbhaya-vṛttiṣu* //
- (4) NiDv 19d: *mithyā-rāśiḥ pravartate* //
Dvātrimśikā 17.5d: *mithyā-dṛṣṭir nivāryate* //
- (5) NiDv 20d: *hetu-dharmāviśeṣataḥ* //
Dvātrimśikā 14.8c: *janma-dharma-viśeṣataḥ* /
Dvātrimśikā 15.8d: *bhāvo bhāva-viśeṣataḥ* //
Dvātrimśikā 17.2d: *na vādhyātma-viśeṣataḥ* //
- (6) NiDv 24a: *samyag-darśana-bhāvāntāḥ*
Dvātrimśikā 13.25c: *na samyag-darśanōpāyī*
- (7) NiDv 28b: *mānasā hy utkrama-kramāt* /
Dvātrimśikā 17.32b: *manaś cōpa kramaḥ kramaḥ* /
- (8) NiDv 30a: *anumānam mano-vṛttir*
Dvātrimśikā 13.14a: *śrotṛādīnām mano-vṛttih*

The above speaks, in my opinion, strongly against an independent, allegedly Ājīvika origin of the *Niyati-dvātrimśikā*, and instead supports a thesis of this and the other four short versified texts having a common author. This does not preclude, however, a possibility that the author (pseudo-Siddhasena Divākara) was sufficiently well informed about the school and his information is reliable. However, as long as we do not have a clear picture of what the Ājīvikas actually maintained, we are not able to fully assess the faithfulness of the account found in the *Niyati-dvātrimśikā* or to judge how far the account is that of a reflection in a distorting mirror. What is important in this context is that none of the verses of the *Niyati-dvātrimśikā* is found to be quoted or referred to anywhere else, other than the very late quote by Yaśovijaya. If the work was indeed penned by an Ājīvika author and was preserved as such by the Jains, being then incorporated with some changes into a doxographical collection of short versified texts, one would expect to find the text quoted also in other sources as an illustration of the Ājīvika doctrine, at least by Jaina authors.

Another problem is the actual dating of this selection of the *dvātrimśikās*, alongside the *Niyati-dvātrimśikā*, and whether they indeed come from around 6th century. It must also be asked whether they can be ascribed to Siddhasena Divākara. However, there is a strong evidence that Siddhasena Divākara composed his *Sammati-tarka-prakarāṇa* before Diñnāga, i.e. before ca. 480.⁹³ A close analysis of the textual material is necessary to determine the probable date of the *dvātrimśikās* and their relation to *Sammati-tarka-prakarāṇa*.

Examining the vocabulary found in the *Niyati-dvātrimśikā* also does not help us much to determine the work's authenticity. We can distinguish three lexicographic categories:

⁹³ See BALCEROWICZ (2001a), (2001b), (2003b) and (2004).

(1) Some terms (in bold, dotted underline) are known to be shared by the Jainas and the Ājīvikas:

NiDv 5b: **sad-asad-ātmakam**—this expression is a part of Jaina *Anekāntavāda* and also it consists the method of the Trairāśikas, identified with the Ājīvikas.⁹⁴

NiDv 29d: **jīvājīva**—this is a basic division of all ontology of both the Jainas and the Ājīvikas.

NiDv 17a: **ekēndriyānām**—as BARUA (1921, pp. 306–307) has shown, one-sensed beings probably opened Ājīvika’s classification of living beings based on the number of sense organs possessed by them, in some ways similar to that of the Jainas.

NiDv 10b: **hetu-vādo**—the doctrine of causation (the cause of things) was shared by both the Ājīvikas and the Jainas, but was not restricted to them.

(2) Other expressions (bold, no underline) are known only to be specific to the Jainas, and it is not known whether the Ājīvikas used them as technical terms. We have no information which would preclude a possibility that they may have used them too:

NiDv 24a: **samyag-darśana-bhāvāntāḥ**,

NiDv 32b: **mīthyāvāpara-buddhayāḥ**.

(3) Some expressions (in bold, underlined) are known only to be specific to the Ājīvikas, and are not used by the Jainas as technical terms:

(a) *abhijāti* (‘classes of existence’):

—NiDv 1b: **avyakti-sukha-duḥkḥābhijātayah**,

—NiDv 22d: **kṛṣṇābhijātayah**,

—NiDv 25d: **pratyabhijātayah**,

—NiDv 28d: *yā no* **’bhijātayah**,

—NiDv 28c: **abhijāti** -viśeṣāt tu.

(b) *svabhāva* (‘intrinsic nature’):

—NiDv 1c: **svabhāvaḥ** sarva-tattvānām

—NiDv 10c: *na hi* **svabhāvān** adhyakṣo

(c) *vidhi* (‘fateful ordinance’):

—NiDv 29b: **vidhiḥ** (‘fateful ordinance’)

(d) **pravṛtṭy-upamarda* (‘suppression through action?’):

—NiDv 5a: **pravṛtṭyōpamardena**, which is perhaps reminiscent of the idea of *pauṭṭa-parihāra*⁹⁵.

⁹⁴ See e.g. *Nandi-sutra* (p. 78 ff., 86 ff.).

⁹⁵ ‘Discontinuance / stoppage [of a subsequent birth in a new body] through / due to continuation [in the same reanimated body]’; alternatively ‘reanimation without transmigration’ (BASHAM) or ‘die Beschränkung (der Neuverkörperung) durch Weitergelten’ (SCHUBRING), see BASHAM (1951, pp. 48–49, 57–58, 250–252) and, esp. for the formation (*pravṛtṭya-parihāra*), SCHUBRING (1954, p. 258) = (1977, p. 470). The term is found esp. in Viy 15, and explained in BhCū 15, p. 53.19–21: ...*pauṭṭa-parihāro. pāravṛtṭya vānaspatyās tatrāiva jāyate. bhagavatā kathitam itara-sarva-jīvas tathā-dṛṣṭah, pauṭṭha¹-parihāra-dīṭṭhī jāto* [¹ Recte: *pauṭṭa-^o.*].

What conclusions can be drawn for this comparison? The presence of specifically Jaina terms (category 2), provided they were indeed not shared by the Ājīvikas (and that we cannot know with certainty, given the extant material) would rather speak against genuinely Ājīvika origin of the text, whereas the presence of typically Ājīvika technical terms (category 3) would support a thesis that the *Niyati-dvātrīṃśikā* is actually based on Ājīvika texts and recapitulates their doctrine second-handedly using the Ājīvika lexicographic material. If it is indeed the case—that the text is a recapitulation, albeit not necessarily an objective and non-partisan one—then the above supposition (§ 11, p. 33) that verse NiDv 16, quoted by Yaśovijaya (AṣSTV 91, p. 615.17–18) as V 11, must be interpreted as authentic criticism against the Ājīvikas.⁹⁶ Nonetheless, the whole text of the *Niyati-dvātrīṃśikā* can be treated as a highly useful source, albeit biased, of information on the Ājīvikas, their doctrine, certain concepts and terminology, especially when compounded with other similarly weak evidences.

13. There are some more stray references to *niyati* (destiny) and its propounders.

13.1 One is found in Ḍallana's commentary on the *Suśruta-saṃhitā* of 13th century:⁹⁷

The propounders of destiny [claim] that “Destiny is [operative] with respect to righteousness and unrighteousness, which are earned through previous births, and only this [destiny] is the cause of everything”.

It is most unlikely that it is an independent statement deriving from an authentic Ājīvika work, because it almost identical in wording with the view expressed in Bhaṭṭotpala's commentary on Varāhamihira's *Bṛhat-saṃhitā* 1.7:

The same *karman* which is earned through previous births and which is people's fortune and misfortune is also the cause of origination and destruction of all living beings.⁹⁸

There the view is ascribed to the Mīmāṃsakas. Further, to take the third person (*iti niyati-vādinah*) as an auto-reference of the Ājīvikas is impossible.

⁹⁶ The translation of the verse could be more precise: ‘If [true] knowledge of the [Ājīvikan] Victorious (liberated Jinas) is tantamount to inevitability, then one should not make any exertion, [which the Ājīvikas however do undertake]. Also if in the case [of the Ājīvikan Jinas, their true knowledge] is multiplex (sc. they are omniscient from one point of view, and not omniscient from another), then these [Jinas in fact] are already vanquished (they are never victorious / liberated). If that is so, where is the Lord [of the Ājīvikas as authority on liberation, if the Jinas' omniscience cannot be established]?’

⁹⁷ *Suśruta-saṃhitā*, *Śarīra*, chapter 1; I quote after KAVIRAJ (1966: 54–55), as the edition is not available to me: *pūrva-janmārjītau dharmādharmau niyatīḥ, sāiva sarvasya kāraṇam iti niyati-vādinah*.

⁹⁸ Quoted after KAVIRAJ (1966: 54–55), as the edition is not available to me: *pūrva-janmārjītam yac ca karma puṃsām śubhāśubham | tad eva sarva-jantūnām sṛṣṭi-saṃhāra-kāraṇam ||*

13.2. There are a number of references to *niyati* found in the *Yoga-vāsiṣṭha* (YVā).⁹⁹ Metrically and stylistically speaking, the verses belong to the texture of *Yoga-vāsiṣṭha*, of which they are an integral part. Further, the expressions, terms and names used and the ideas (e.g. the beginning of the world or its creation, which presupposes a creator) found in the verses make it highly unlikely that the verses are either quotations from Ājīvika sources or even faithful paraphrases, and they can safely be dismissed as candidates for quotes from Ājīvika sources or even as reports or references to genuine Ājīvika ideas.

14. Last but not least, another Jaina author, Samantabhadra (c. 580–640) refers to fate (*daiva*) in his *Āpta-mīmāṃsā*:

[88] If the attainment of desired goals is due to fate, then how is it possible that [karmic] fate is due to human perseverance? If it is due to [still another] fate, then no liberation is [possible, and] human perseverance would be futile.

[89] If the attainment [of desired goals] is due to human perseverance, then how is it possible that human perseverance is due to fate? If it is due to [still

⁹⁹ YVā 2.10.1:

*yathā-sṭhitam brahma-tattva tattā niyatir ucyate /
sā vinetur vineyatvam sā vineya-vineyatā // 2.10.1 //*

YVā 3.54.22:

*sargādau yā yathā rūḍhā samvit-kacana-santatiḥ /
sādyāpy acalitā 'nyena sṭhitā niyatir ucyate //*

YVā 3.54.22:

*sargādau yā yathā-rūḍhā samvikta-cana-santatiḥ /
sādyāpy acalitānyena sṭhitā niyatir ucyate // 3.54.22 //*

YVā 3.62.9–11:

*ādi-sarge hi niyatir bhāva-vacitryam akṣayam /
anenētham sadā bhāvvyam iti saṃpadyate param // 3.62.9 //*
*mahā-sattēti kṭhitā mahā-citir ita smr tā /
mahā-śaktir iti khyātā mahā-dr ṣṭir iti sṭhitā // 3.62.10 //*
*mahā-kriyēti gaditā mahōdbhava iti smr tā /
mahā-spanda iti prau hā mahātmāikatayōditā // 3.62.11 //*

YVā 3.62.26:

*avaśyam-bhavitavyāṣā tv idam ittham iti sṭhitāḥ /
na śakyate laṅghayitum api rudrādi-buddhibhiḥ // 3.62.26 //*

YVā 5.89.26:

*sarva-jño 'pi bahu-jño 'pi mādhave 'pi haro 'pi ca /
anyathā niyatim martum na śaktaḥ kaścid eva hi // 5.89.26 //*

YVā 6.36.21:

*ā-mahā-rudra-paryantam idam ittham iti sṭhitēḥ /
ā-ṛṇa-padma-mahā-spandam niyatamān niyatīḥ smṛtā // 6.36.21 //*

YVā 6.37.23:

*niyatir nityam udvega-varjitā 'parimārjitā /
eṣā ṛṇyati vai ṛṇyam jagaj-jālaka-nāṭakam // 6.37.23 //*

another] human perseverance, then the perseverance of all living beings should consistently be [successful].¹⁰⁰

These verses somehow echo a criticism against the idea of *niyati*, but they do not really refer to any concrete system, it seems. In Samantabhadra's work they are merely a rhetorical and argumentative device: fate is mentioned only as a vague idea in order to establish the overwhelming influence of *karman*, which must be eliminated through the path proffered by the Jinās. In addition, these verses seem to be genuine creations of Samantabhadra, who does not quote from other works in his *Āpta-mīmāṃsā*. They are also found nowhere else.

15. To conclude, of the verses and passages that have been previously identified by BASHAM and other scholars as most probably genuinely Ājīvika, none turns out to be derived from an Ājīvika source. New material brought to our attention in the paper has produced some passages that at first seemed possible to qualify as genuinely Ājīvika, however after some analysis they must also be dismissed. All the verses previously considered genuinely Ājīvika have been composed by non-Ājīvika authors and usually derive either from Jaina works or from fables or narrative literature. In other words, there is no single genuinely Ājīvika verse or passage to be found.

Even those few that at first seemed uncontested after a preliminary analysis have also been shown to be spurious for a couple of reasons, primarily because until now they have been found to be quoted only in a single work, whereas generally alleged Ājīvika verses are found in several works. That is why they have to be considered the product of later non-Ājīvika authors.

Further, there is no proof that the Ājīvikas developed their own Sanskrit literature, much less philosophical literature in Sanskrit. On the other hand, there is no evidence disproving their having such a body of texts.

Conspicuously, references to the Ājīvikas and possible quotes from Ājīvika sources in Sanskrit seem to be found almost exclusively in Jaina sources, with only a few suspicious exceptions (e.g. *Yoga-vāsiṣṭha*). Apparently it was mostly Jaina authors who engaged in discussions of the doctrinal elements of the Ājīvikas. This may in itself be quite puzzling.

A probable explanation for that is that both religious groups shared the same historical origins. Perhaps when the Jaina authors composing in Sanskrit were still commenting on selected philosophical ideas of the Ājīvikas, the religious movement had already lost its philosophical impact and become extremely marginal, to the extent that it was generally ignored by all, except for the Jainas who had had direct sectarian affiliation with them. That would further suggest that while the Jaina authors were referring to the ideas of the Ājīvikas, there were no more any Sanskrit

¹⁰⁰ ĀMī 88–89:

*daivād evārtha-siddhaś ced daivaṃ pauṛuṣataḥ katham |
daivataś ced anirmokṣaḥ pauṛuṣaṃ niṣphalaṃ bhavet || 88 ||
pauṛuṣād eva siddhiś cet pauṛuṣaṃ daivataḥ katham |
pauṛuṣāc ced amoghaṃ syāt sarva-prāṇiṣu pauṛuṣam || 89 ||*

sources. The Jains thus had to compose all such verses, pretending that they were authentic.

Last but not least, the faithfulness and reliability of reports of the Ājīvikas and paraphrases of their views cannot be assessed with any certainty due to the vicious circle mentioned at the outset. Still, the stray fragments that we do have at our disposal, regardless of their actual reliability and accuracy, is all we have to reconstruct the doctrine of the Ājīvikas.

It is also very difficult, if at all possible, to develop any consistent methodology to assess which of the material at our disposal relies on genuine knowledge of the Ājīvikas' doctrine on the part of the reporter, which is solely based on hearsay and second- or third-hand knowledge, and which is merely imagining what would it be like if one assumed a deterministic theory of the world. My fear is that in many cases it is the third case, which is the least interesting option for a historian of ideas.

BASHAM'S (1951) reconstruction of the doctrine of the Ājīvikas, notwithstanding its merits, seems overoptimistic: in fact, it seems we know much less of that tradition than BASHAM thought we did.

Funding Funding was supported by Narodowe Centrum Nauki (Grant No. 2011/01/B/HS1/04014).

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

References

- AIYASVAMI SASTRI 1941 = Aiyasvami Sastri, N. (1941). Ājīvikas (from Tamil sources). *Journal of the Sri Venkatesvara Rao Institute*, 2, 403–422.
- ĀMĪ = Samantabhadra: *Āpta-mīmāṃsā*. Pannālāl Jain (Ed.). (1914). *Ācārya-śrī-samantabhadra-svāmi-viracitā Āpta-mīmāṃsā syād-vāda-vidyāpati-śrī-vidyānanda-svāmi-viracitā pramāṇa-parikṣā ca*. Sanātana Jaina Granthamālā 7, 8, Kāśī (Benares).
- AṢ = Vidyānanda Pātrakesarisvāmin: *Aṣṭa-sahasrī*. (1) Vamśīdhar (Ed.). *Aṣṭa-sahasrī tārīkika-cakra-cūḍā-maṇi-syādvāda-vidyāpatinā śrī-Vidyānanda-svāminā nirākṛta*. Nirṇaya-sāgara Press, Bombay 1915. (2) Darbārī Lāl Koṭhiyā; Brahmacārī Sandīpa Jain (eds.): *Tārīkika-śiromaṇi ācārya vidyānanda-kr̥tra Aṣṭa-sahasrī*. Jaina-vidyā Saṁsthāna, Digambara Jaina Atīśaya Kṣetra, Śrīmahāvīrajī (Rājasthān) 1997. (3) See: AṢSTV.
- AṢSTV = Yaśovijaya-gaṇi: *Aṣṭa-sahasrī-tātparya-vivaraṇa*. Muni Vairāgyarati Vijaya (Ed.). (2004). *Śrī-Yaśovijaya-gaṇi-viracitam Aṣṭa-sahasrī-tātparya-vivaraṇam*. [A Commentary on Vidyānanda Pātrakesarisvāmin's *Aṣṭa-sahasrī*]. 2 Vols., Pravacana Prakāśa.
- AŚ = Kauṭīlya: *Artha-śāstra*. (1) R.P. Kangle (ed., tr.): *The Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra*. Part I: *A Critical Edition with a Glossary*. Part II: *An English Translation with Critical and Explanatory Notes*. Part III: *A Study*. University of Bombay 1960, 1963, 1965 [reprinted: Delhi 1986–1988].
- BALCEROWICZ 2015 = Balcerowicz, Piotr. (2015). Do attempts to formalise the *syād-vāda* make sense? In: Peter Flügel and Olle Qvarnström (Eds.): *Jaina Scriptures and Philosophy* (pp. 181–248). Routledge.

- BALCEROWICZ 2001a = Balcerowicz, Piotr. (2009). *Jaina Epistemology In Historical And Comparative Perspective. A Critical Edition And An Annotated Translation Of Siddhasena Mahāmāti's Nyāyāvātāra, Siddharsiganin's Nyāyāvātāra-vivṛti And Devabhadrasūri's Nyāyāvātāra-ṭippaṇa*. Volume I & II. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 53,1 & 53,2. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2001 [Second revised edition: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 2009].
- BALCEROWICZ 2001b = Balcerowicz, Piotr. (2001). Two Siddhasenas and the Authorship of the *Nyāyāvātāra* and the *Saṃmatī-tarka-prakaraṇa*. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 29/3, 351–578.
- BALCEROWICZ 2003a = Balcerowicz, Piotr. (2003). Is “Inexplicability Otherwise” (*anyathānupapatti*) Otherwise Inexplicable?. In: Piotr Balcerowicz (Ed.): *Proceedings of the International Seminar 'Argument and Reason in Indian Logic' 20–24 June, 2001 — Kazimierz Dolny, Poland = Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 31/1–3, 343–380.
- BALCEROWICZ 2003b = Balcerowicz, Piotr. (2003). On the relationship of the *Nyāyāvātāra* and the *Saṃmatī-tarka-prakaraṇa*. In *Proceedings of the XIth World Sanskrit Conference (Turin, April, 3rd–8th, 2000)*, *Indologica Taurinensia* 29: 31–83.
- BALCEROWICZ 2004 = Balcerowicz, Piotr. (2004). On the Date of the *Nyāyāvātāra*. In: Piotr Balcerowicz; Marek Mejer (Eds.): *Essays in Indian Philosophy, Religion and Literature*. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, pp. 323–362.
- BALCEROWICZ 2016 = Balcerowicz, Piotr. (2016). *Early Asceticism in India. Ājīvikism and Jainism*. Routledge.
- BANERJI SASTRI 1926 = Banerji Sastri, A. (1926). The Ajivikas. *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 12, 53–62.
- BARUA 1920 = Barua, Benimadhab: *The Ajivikas* (p. 1920). University of Calcutta, Calcutta.
- BARUA 1921 = Barua, Benimadhab: *A History of Pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy* (p. 1921). University of Calcutta.
- BARUA 1926–1927 = Barua, Benimadhab: ‘Ajivika—what it means’, *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 8 (1926–1927)183–188.
- BASHAM 1951 = Basham, Arthur Llewellyn: *History and Doctrines of the Ājīvikas. A Vanished Indian Religion*. Luzac and Co. Ltd., London 1951 [reprinted: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1981].
- BASHAM 1971 = Basham, Arthur Llewellyn: ‘Ajivikism: A Vanished Indian Religion.’ *Bulletin of the Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture*, 22(1971), 107–117.
- BC = Aśvaghoṣa: *Buddha-carita*. E.H. Johnston (Ed.): *The Buddhacarita or Acts of the Buddha*. Part I—Sanskrit Text. University of the Punjab, Lahore 1936 [reprinted: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, New Delhi 1972].
- Bhām = Vācaspatimīśra: *Bhāmāṭī* [a commentary on Śaṅkara's *Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya*]. Śāstrī Bākre; Wāsudev Laxmaṇ Ś'āstrī Paṅs'īkar (eds.): *The Brāhmasūtra-Shāṅkarabhāṣyam with the Commentaries Bhāṣhya-Ratnaprabhā, Bhāmāṭī and Nyāyanirnaya of Shṛīgovindānanda, Vāchaspati and Anandagiri*. Third edition, Nirṇaya-Sāgar Press, Bombay 1934.
- BHANDARKAR 1912 = Bhandarkar, D. R. (1912). Ajivikas. *Indian Antiquity*, 41, 286–290.
- BHATTACHARYA 2001 = Ramakrishna Bhattacharya. (2001). The first cause: Rivals of god in ancient Indian thought. *Indian Skeptic*, 14/11, 19–23.
- BHATTACHARYA 2012 = Bhattacharya, Ramkrishna: ‘Svabhāvavāda and the Cārvāka/Lokāyata: A Historical Overview.’ *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 40(2012), 593–614.
- BhCū = *Bhagavatī-cūrṇi*. Rupendra Kumar Pagariya (Ed.): *Bhagavatīcūrṇi*. L.D. Series 130, L.D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad 2002.
- BLOCH 1950 = Bloch, Jules. (1950). *Les inscriptions d'Asoka, traduites et commentées par...* Société d'Édition «Les Belles Lettres», Paris.
- BOLLÉE 1977 = Bollée, Willem B. (1977). *Studien zum Sūyagada*. Teil I: *Dei Jainas und die Anderen Weltanschauungen vor der Zeitenwende. Textteile, Nijjuti, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*. Franz Steiner Verlag.
- BRONKHORST 2000 = Bronkhorst, Johannes. (2000). The riddle of the Jainas and Ājīvikas in early Buddhist literature. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 28, 511–529.
- BRONKHORST 2003 = Bronkhorst, Johannes. (2003). Ājīvika doctrine reconsidered. In: Piotr Balcerowicz (Ed.): *Essays in Jaina Philosophy and Religion*. Motilal Banarsidass, pp. 153–178.
- BRONKHORST 2007 = Bronkhorst, Johannes. (2007). Echoes of Ājīvikism in medieval Indian philosophy. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*, 60, 239–248.
- CHAKRABORTI 1973 = Chakraborti, Haripada. (1973). *Asceticism in Ancient India in Brahminical, Buddhist, Jaina and Ajivika Societies*. Punthi Pustak, Calcutta 1973.

- CHARPENTIER 1913 = Charpentier, Jarl. (1913). Ajivika. *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, 45, 669–674.
- DN = *Dīgha-nikāya*. T.W. Rhys Davids; C.A.F. Rhys Davids; J.E. Carpenter (Eds.). *The Dīgha Nikāya*. 3 Vols., Pali Text Society, Luzac & Company, London I: 1890, II: 1903, III: 1911.
- DNC = Mallavādin Kṣamāśramaṇa: *Dvādaśāra-naya-cakra*. Muni Jambūvijayajī (Ed.): *Dvādaśāraṃ Nayacakram of Ācārya Śrī Mallavādī Kṣamāśramaṇa. With the commentary Nyāyāgamānusāriṇī of Ācārya Śrī Sīnhasīri Gaṇi Vādī Kṣamāśramaṇa*. Ed. with critical notes by.... Pt. I (1–4 Aras): Bhavnagar 1966 [reprint: Bhāvnagar 2000]; Pt. II (5–8 Aras): Bhavnagar 1976; Pt. III (9–12 Aras): Bhavnagar 1988.
- DUNDAS 2003 = Dundas, Paul. (2003). ‘Haribhadra’s Lalitavistara and the Legend of Siddharṣi’s Conversion to Buddhism’. In: Olle Qvarnstrom (Ed.): *Jainism and Early Buddhism: Essays in Honor of Padmanabh S. Jaini*. Asian Humanities Press, pp. 151–166.
- GBh = Gaudapāda: *Gaudapāda-bhāṣya*. T.G. Mainkar (ed., transl.): *Sāṃkhya-kārikā of Īśvarakṛṣṇa with the commentary of Gaudapāda translated into English with Notes*. 2nd Revised and Enlarged Edition, Oriental Book Agency, Poona 1972 [1. ed.: 1964].
- GHOSAL 1979 = Ghosal, S.N. (1979). The attitude of the Nirgranthas towards other religious sects gleaned from the Uvasagadasao. *Journal of the Asiatic Society*, 21, 49–53.
- GHOSHAL 1980 = Ghoshal, S.N. (1980). Kundakoṭīya in defense of the nirgrantha doctrine. *Journal of the Ganganath Jha Research Institute*, 36, 37–44.
- RUDOLF HOERNLE 1926 = Hoernle, A.F. (1926). Ajivikas. *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, 1: 259–268.
- JACOBI 1880 = Jacobi, Hermann: ‘On Mahāvīra and his predecessors.’ *The Indian Antiquary*, 9(1880), 158–161.
- JACOBI 1895 = Jacobi, Hermann. (1999). *Jaina Sūtras, Part II: Uttarādhyayana Sūtra and Sūtrakṛtāṅga*. Sacred Books of the East 45, Oxford University Press 1895 [reprinted: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1999].
- JASH 1982a = Jash, Pranabananda: ‘Doctrines of an obsolete sect.’ *Jain Journal*, 17(1982), 135–139.
- JACOBI 1982b = Jash, Pranabananda: ‘An obsolete heretical sect: Early history and distribution in eastern India.’ *Jain Journal*, 19(1985), 75–83.
- JTBh = Yaśovijaya: *Jaina-tarka-bhāṣā*. (1) Dayanand Bhargava (ed., tr.): *Mahopādhyāya Yaśovijaya’s Jaina Tarka Bhāṣā With Translation and Critical Notes*. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi–Varanasi–Patna 1973. (2) Sukhlālji Saṅghavi; Mahendra Kumār; Dalsukh Mālvanīyā (eds.): *Mahopādhyāya-Śrī-Yaśovijayagaṇi-racitā Jaina-tarka-bhāṣā*. Sarasvatī Pustak Bhaṇḍār, Ahmedabad 1993 [first ed.: 1938].
- KAVIRAJ 1966 = Kaviraj, Gopinath: *Aspects of Indian Thought* (p. 1966). The University of Burdwan.
- LEUMANN 1884 = Leumann, Ernst: ‘Appendix I. Extract from Bhagavati XV on the Intercourse Between Mahāvīra (i.e. Nigantha Nataputta) and Gosāla Mankhaliputta’, [in:] Woodville Rockhill: *The life of the Buddha and the Early History of his Order*. Trübner & Co. London, 1884, 249–255.
- LT = Akalaṅka: *Laghīyas-traya*. Mahendra Kumār Śāstri (Ed.): *Śrīmad-Bhaṭṭākalāṅka-deva-viracitam Akalaṅka-grantha-trayam [Svōpajñā-vivṛti-sahitam Laghīyas-trayam, Nyāya-viniścayaḥ, Pramāna-saṅgrahaś ca]*. Sarasvatī Pustak Bhaṇḍār, Ahmadābād (Ahmedabad) 1996. [1. ed.: Ahmedabad–Calcutta 1939].
- LTN = Haribhadra: *Loka-tattva-nirṇaya*. Suali L. (Ed.): *II Lokatattvanirṇaya di Haribhadra*. Libreria Oreste Gozzini snc., Firenze 1905.
- LV = Haribhadra-sūri: *Lalita-vistarā [Caitya-vandana-sūtra-vṛtti]*. (1) Bhānuvijaya Gaṇin (Ed., Hindi transl.): *Haribhadra-sūriśvaraḥ ... racita Caitya-vandana-sūtra-vṛtti Lalita-vistarā, ... Mūnicandra-sūriśvaraḥ viracita ... Pañjikā Ṭikā, ... Hindī-vivecanā ‘Prakāśa’* [by Bhānuvijaya Gaṇin]. Divyadarśan Sāhitya Samiti, Ahmedabad 1963. (2) Reprinted (with new pagination): Divyadarśan Trast, Ahmedabad 1998.
- MaiU = *Maitrāyaṇīyōpaniṣad [Maitrī / Maitreya / Maitrāyaṇa / Maitrāyaṇī / Maitrāyaṇīya]*. (1) E.B. Cowell (ed., transl.): *The Maitri Upanishad with the Commentary of Ra’mati’rtha*. Bibliotheca Indica New Series 85, Calcutta 1962. (2) V.P. Limaye; R.D. Vadekar (Eds.): *Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads*. Vol. I, Vaidika Saṁśodhana Maṇḍala, Poona 1958: 325–357.
- MBh = *Mahā-bhārata*. Vishnu S. Sukthankar; S.K. Belvalkar; et al. (Ed.): *The Mahābhārata for the First Time Critically Edited*. 19 Vols., Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona 1933–1966.
- MŚV = Kumārila Bhaṭṭa: *Mīmāṃsā-śloka-vārtika*. Dvārikādāsa Śāstrin (Ed.): *Śloka-vārtika of Śrī Kumārila Bhaṭṭa with the Commentary Nyāya-ratnākara of Śrī Pārthasarāthi Mīra*. Prāchyabhāratī Series 3, Tārā Publications, Varanasi 1978.
- NĀA = Simha-sūri: *Nyāyāgamānusāriṇī*. See: DNC.

- NANJIO 1884 = Bunyiu, Nanjio (Nanjō Bunyū): 'Appendix II. The Doctrines of the Six Heretical Teachers According to Two Chinese Versions of the Samana-phala Sūtra', [in:] Woodville Rockhill: *The life of the Buddha and the Early History of his Order*. Trübner & Co. London, 1884, 255–259.
- NaṁCū = Jinadāsa-gaṇi Mahattara: *Nandī-sūtra-cūrṇī* [*Nandī-sutta-cunṇī*]. See NaṁS₁.
- NaṁS = *Nandī-sutta* / *Nandī-sutta* [*Nandī-sūtra* / *Nandī-sūtra*]. (1) Muni Puṇyavijaya (Ed.): *Nandisuttam by Devavācaka with the Cūrṇī by Jinadāsa Gaṇi Mahattara*. Prakrit Text Society Series 9, Prakrit Text Society, Vārāṇasī–Ahmedabad 1966. (2) Muni Puṇyavijaya (Ed.): *Nandisuttam by Devavācaka with the Vṛtti by Śrī Haribhadra-cārya and Durgapadavyākhyā on Vṛtti by Śrī Śrīcandrācārya and Viṣamapadaparyāya on Vṛtti*. Prakrit Text Society Series 10, Prakrit Text Society, Vārāṇasī–Ahmedabad 1966.
- NaṁVṛ = Haribhadra-sūri: *Nandī-vṛtti*. See: NaṁS₂.
- NīDv = [ascribed to Siddhasena Divākara]: *Niyatī-dvātrīṃśikā*. (1) Anandasagara (Ed.): *Śrī-Siddhasena-Divākara-kṛta-granthāmāla (Ekaviṃśati-Dvātrīṃśikā, Nyāyavātāra, Sammatisūtra Mūla)*. Śrī-jaina-dharma-prasāraka Sābha 10, Bhavnagar 1907 (VS 1965) [not available to me, references based on QVARNSTRÖM (2015)]. (2) A.N. Upadhye (Ed.): *Siddhasena Divākara's Nyāyavātāra (edited by the late S.C. Vidyabhūsan with English Translation, Notes etc.) and with the Vṛty of Siddharṣi as well as The Text of 21 Dvātrīṃśikās and the Sammāi-suttam; Vinayavijaya's Nayakarṇikā*, edited by... with an Introduction, Bibliographic Review, Indices etc. Jaina Sāhitya Vikāsa Maṇḍala, Bombay 1971. (3) Bhuvanacandra (Ed.): *Niyatī-dvātrīṃśikā Siddhasena-Divākara-viracitā; sampādaka-anuvādaka-vivaraṇa-kartā Muni Bhuvanacandrajī*. Jaina Sāhitya Akādāmī, Gāndhīdhāma-Kaccha 2002 [not available to me, references based on QVARNSTRÖM (2015)]. (Q) NīDvQ: As edited in footnotes of QVARNSTRÖM (2015).
- Paṇ = *Paṇhāvāyaraṇa* / *Paṇhāvāyaraṇāim* (*Praśna-vyākaraṇāni*).
- PañcT = *Pañca-tantra*. (1) Johannes Hertel (Ed.): *The Panchatantra. A Collection of Ancient Hindu Tales*. Harvard Oriental Series 11, Harvard University, Cambridge (Mass.) 1908. (2) Prasad Shastri (ed.): *Shri Bisnu Sharma's Panchatantra with the Commentary of Abhinavarajalaxmi*. 3rd Edition, Rajasthan Sanskrit College Granthmala 12, Bhargava Pustakalaya, Benares 1940. (3) Patrick Olivelle (ed., transl.): *Five Discourses on Wordly Wisdom by Vishnu.sharman*. Translated by... Clay Sanskrit Library, New York University Press – JJC Foundation, New York 2006 [Sanskrit edition based on: Franklin Edgerton: *The Panchatantra Reconstructed*. Vol. 1: *Text and Critical Apparatus*, Vol. 2: *Introduction and Translation*. American Oriental Series, New Haven (Connecticut) 1924.] (4) F. Kielhorn (I); Georg Bühler (II–V) (eds.): *Panchatantra*. Government Central Book Depot, Bombay 1869 (I), 1868 (II & III), 1868 (IV & V).
- PATHAK 1912 = Pathak, K. B. (1912). The Ājīvikas, a Sect of Buddhist Bhikkhus. *Indian Antiquity*, 41: 88–90.
- PMīV = Hemacandra-sūri: *Pramāṇa-mīmāṃsā-svopajña-vṛtti*. Sukhlalji Sanghavi, Mahendra Kumar and Dalsukh Malvaniya (Ed.): *Kavikālasarvajña-Śrī-Hemacandrācārya-viracitā svopajña-vṛtti-sahitā Pramāṇa Mīmāṃsā [with Bhāṣā Tippaṇa of Pandita Sukhlalji Sanghvi]*. Sarasvatī Pustak Bhaṇḍār, Ahmadābād (Ahmedabad) 1998.
- PSBh = Rāmānuja: *Śvetāśvatara-upaniṣat-prakāśikā*. See: ŚvU₁.
- PV = Dharmakīrti: *Pramāṇa-vārttika*. (1) Ram Chandra Pandeya (Ed.): *The Pramāṇa-vārttikam of Ācārya Dharmakīrti with Sub-commentaries: Svopajña-vṛtti of the Author and Pramāṇa-vārttika-vṛtti of Manorathanandin*. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1989. (2) Svāmī Dvārikādās Śāstri (ed.): *Pramāṇa-vārttika of Acharya Dharmakīrti with the Commentary 'Vṛtti' of Acharya Manorathanandin*. Bauddha Bharati Series (Bauddha Bhāratī Granthamālā) 3, Bauddha Bharatī, Vārāṇasī 1984.
- QVARNSTRÖM 2015 = Qvarnström, Olle: 'The *Niyativādadvātrīṃśikā* ascribed to Siddhasena Divākara', in: in: Peter Flügel and Olle Qvarnström (Eds.): *Jaina Scriptures and Philosophy*. Routledge 2015: 49–59. [Originally delivered as the paper 'Siddhasena Divākara on Ājīvika' at 11th Jaina Studies Workshop: Jaina Scriptures and Philosophy, SOAS, London, 12–13 March, 2009; a manuscript].
- RAN = Harṣadeva: *Ratnāvalī-nāṭikā*. Edited by Carl Cappeller in: Otto Böhtlingk: *Sanskrit-Chrestomathie*. 3. verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage, herausgegeben von Richard Garbe, Leipzig 1909: 326–382.
- RasA = *Rasārṇava*. Praphulla Chandra Ray (Ed.): *Rasārṇava*. Bibliotheca Indica 175, Asiatic Society, Calcutta 1908–1910.
- ROTH 1993 = Roth, Gustav: 'Gosāla Mankhaliputta's Birth in a Cowstall, including Notes on a Parallel in the Gospel of Luke 2', [in:] Rudy Smet; Kenji Watanabe (Eds.): *Jain Studies in Honour of Jozef Deleu*. Ho-No-Tomoshia, Tokyo 1993: 413–455.

- RVār = Akalaṅka: *Tattvārtha-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. Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Jaina Grantha-mālā: Sanskrit Grantha 10, 20, Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha Prakāśana, Delhi 1953–1957 [2. edition: Delhi 1982].
- Sau = Aśvaghōṣa: *Saundarānanda*. E.H. Johnston (Ed.): *The Saundarānanda of Aśvaghōṣa*. Oxford University Press 1928.
- SCHUBRING 1954 = Schubring, Walther: ‘A.L. BASHAM: *History and Doctrines of the Ājīvikas. A vanished Indian Religion*. With a foreword by L.D. BARNETT. London: Luzac 1951. XXXII, 304 S., 8. T., 2 K. 16 s.’, ZDMG 104,1 (1954) 256–263. [Reprinted in: Walther Schubring: *Kleine Schriften*. Ed. by Klaus Bruhn, Glasenap-Stiftung 13, Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden 1777: 468–475].
- ŚDSa = Haribhadra-sūri: *Ṣaḍ-darśana-samuccaya*. Mahendra Kumār Jain (ed.): *Śrī-Haribhadrasūri-viracita-Ṣaḍ-darśana-samuccaya Śrī-Guṇaratnasūri-kṛta-Tarka-rahasya-dīpikā Somatilaka-sūri-kṛta-Laghu-vṛtti tathā ajñāta-kartyka-Avacūrṇi*. With the Introduction of Pt. Dalsukh Malvania. Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Jaina Grantha-mālā 36 [*Sanskrit Grantha*], Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha Prakāśana, Vārāṇasī 1981 [first edition: 1969].
- SK = Īśvarakṛṣṇa: *Sāṃkhya-kārikā*. Nārāyaṇacarāṇa Śāstri and Śvetavaikuṅṭha Śāstri (Eds.): *Sāṃkhya-kārikā of Īśvarakṛṣṇa, With the Commentaries of Svāmīn Nārāyaṇa, Gauḍapādācārya and Tattva-kaumudī of Vācaspati Mīśra with Kīraṇāvalī of Kṛṣṇavallabhācārya Svāmīnārāyaṇa*. Banaras 1937 [Second Edition, Vyāsaprakāśan, Vārāṇasī 1989.]
- SSS = [Śaṅkarācārya (SCHUBRING 1954 = Schubring, Walther: ‘A.L. BASHAM: *History and Doctrines of the Ājīvikas. A vanished Indian Religion*. With a foreword by L.D. BARNETT. London: Luzac 1951. XXXII, 304 S., 8. T., 2 K. 16 s.’, ZDMG 104,1 (1954) 256–263. [Reprinted in: Walther Schubring: *Kleine Schriften*. Ed. by Klaus Bruhn, Glasenap-Stiftung 13, Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden 1777: 468–475]. ascribed:)] *Sarva-siddhānta-saṅgraha*. M. Raṅgācārya; Rao Bahadur (Eds.): *Sarva-siddhānta-saṅgraha of Śaṅkarācārya*. Government Press, Madras 1909.
- STP = Siddhasena Divākara: *Saṃmati-tarka-prakaraṇa*. Sukhlāl Saṅghavi; Becardās Doṣī (Ed.): *Saṃmatitarka-prakaraṇam by Siddhasena Divākara with Abhayadevasūri’s Tattva-bodha-vidhāyinī*. Gujarāt-purā-tattva-mandīr-granthāvalī 10, 16, 18, 19, 21, Gujarāt-purā-tattva-mandīr, Amdāvād 1924–1931 [reprinted: 2 Vols., Rinsen Buddhist Text Series VI–1, 2; Kyoto 1984].
- STPMAA = Vijaya Darśana-sūri: *Saṃmati-tarka-mahārṇāvātārikā*. Rīkhavadās Bhabutamāl (Ed.): *Śrīmad-Vijaya-Darśana-sūri-praṇīṭā Saṃmati-tarka-mahārṇāvātārikā*. Madrāsa-nagara-sthā Jaina-mārga-prabhāvaka Sabhā, Madras 1954 [Vikrama Saṃvat 2013].
- Sūy = *Sūya-gaḍāṅga [Sūtra-kṛtāṅga]*. (1) *Sūtrakṛtāṅgam with Śīlāṅka’s Tikā*. Āgamodaya-samiti, Bombay 1917. (2) See: SūyVṛ. (3) See: SūyVyā.
- SūyVṛ = Śīlāṅka: *Sūtra-kṛtāṅga-vṛtti*. Muni Dīparatnasāgar (ed.): *Āgama-suttāṇi (saṅgikāḥ)*. *Bhāgaḥ 2: Sūtra-kṛtāṅga-sūtram (mūlam + śrī-Bhadrabāhu-svāmī-kṛta-niryukti + śrī-Śīlāṅkācārya-racita-vṛttiyuktāḥ)*. Āgama Śruta Prakāśan, Ahamadābād 1998 [Ravivār 2056].
- SūyVyā = Sādhuraṅga-gaṇi: *Sūtra-kṛtāṅga-vyākhyā*. Mohan Lāl (Ed.): *Śrīmat-Sādhuraṅga-gaṇi-saṅkalitayā dīpikayā samalāṅkīyā śrī-Sūya-gaḍāṅga-sūtram*. 2 Vols., Surat-vāstavya Śreṣṭhī Devacandra Lalabhāī Jaina-pustakōddhāra-kośasya Kārya-vāhako Motīcarāṇda Maganabhāī Cokasī, Surat 1959, 1962 [Vikrama Saṃvat 2015, 2019].
- SVM = Mallīṣeṇa-sūri: *Syād-vāda-mañjarī*. A.B. Dhruva (Ed.): *Syād-vāda-mañjarī of Mallīṣeṇa with the Anya-yoga-vyavaccheda-dvātrīṃśikā of Hemacandra*. Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series 83, Bombay 1933.
- ŚVS = Haribhadra-sūri: *Śāstra-vārttā-samuccaya*. (1) K.K. Dixit (ed., Hindi transl.): *The Śāstravārttāsamuccaya of Ācārya Haribhadrasūri with Hindi Translation, Notes and Introduction*. L.D. Series 22, Lalbhāi Dalpatbhāi Bharatiya Sanskriti Vidyamandira, Ahmedabad 1969. (2) See: ŚVSV.
- ŚVSV = Yaśovijaya-gaṇi: *Syād-vāda-kalpalatā [= Śāstra-vārttā-samuccaya-vyākhyā]*. Badrīnāth Śūkla (ed., transl.): *Śāstra-vārttā-samuccaya aur uskī Vyākhyā Syād-vāda-kalpalatā aur Hindī-vivecana*. *Stambakas 1–11*. 7 Vols., Divya-darśan Trast, Caukhambhā Oriyaṅtalīyā, Vārāṇasī 1977–1989.
- ŚvU = Śvetāśvatara-upaṇiṣad. (1) Virarāghavācārya (Ed.): *Śvetāśvataraḍy-upaṇiṣat-puruṣa-sūktabhāṣyam*. Part I, Tirumala-tīrupati-devasthāna-mudraṅālaya, Tirumala-tīrupati 1955. (2) Olivelle, Patrick: *The Early Upaniṣads*. Annotated Text and Translation, Oxford University Press 1998: 413–433.
- TBV = Abhayadeva-sūri: *Tattva-bodha-vidhāyinī*. See: STP.

- THOMAS 1960 = Thomas, F.W. (transl.): *Śrī Malliṣeṇasūrisūri: Syād-vāda-mañjarī—The Flower-spray of the Quodammodo Doctrine*. Translated and annotated. Akademie-Verlag 1960 [reprinted: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1968].
- TRD = Guṇaratna-sūri: *Tarka-rahasya-dīpikā*. See: ṢDSa.
- TSa = Śāntarakṣita: *Tattva-saṅgraha*. Embar Krishnamacharya (ed.): *Tattvasaṅgraha of Śāntarakṣita with the commentary of Kamalaśīla*. 2 Vols., Gaekwad's Oriental Series 30–31, Oriental Institute, Baroda 1926 [reprinted: 1984, 1988].
- Uttar = *Uttarajhayaṇa-sutta* [*Uttarādhyāyana-sūtra*]. Muni Puṇyavijayaji and Pt. Amritlāl Mohanlāl Bhojak (Ed.): *Dasaveyāliyasuttaṃ, Uttarajhayaṇāṃ and Āvassayasuttaṃ*. Jaina-Āgama-Series 15, Śrī Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, Bombay 1977.
- UvD = *Uvāsaga-dasāo* [*Upāsaka-dasāḥ* / *Upāsakādhyāyana-dasāḥ*]. A.F. Rudolf Hoernle (Ed.): *The Uvāsagadasāo or the Religious Profession of an Avāsaga Expounded in Ten Lectures, being the Seventh Anga of the Jains edited in the Original Prakrit with the Sanskrit Commentary of Abhayadeva*. 2 Vols., Bibliotheca Indica 105, Calcutta 1890.
- UvDVi = Abhayadeva-sūri: *Saptamāṅga Upāsaka-dasā-vivaraṇa*. See: UvD.
- Viy = *Viyāha-pannatti* / *Viyāha-panṇatti* / *Bhagavāi-viyāha-panṇattī* [*Bhagavāi Vyākhyā-prajñapti* / *Bhagavāi-sūtra*]. Bechardas J. Doshi; Amritlāl Mohanlāl Bhojak (ed.): *Viyāhapaṇṇattisuttaṃ*. 3 parts, Jaina-Āgama-Series 4, Śrī Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, Bombay 1974–1982.
- YBi = Haribhadra-sūri: *Yoga-bindu*. Luigi Suali (Ed.) *Haribhadra Suri's Yogabindu with commentary*. Jain Dharma Prasaraka Sabha Bhavnagar, Mumbai 1911.
- YBiT = Haribhadra-sūri: *Yoga-bindu-ṭīkā* (*Yoga-bindu-prakaraṇa-ṛttī*). See: YBi.
- YVā = *Yoga-vāsiṣṭha*. Wāsudev Laxmaṅ Śāstrī Paṅśīkar (Ed.): *The Yssogavāsiṣṭha of Vālmīki With the Commentary Vāsiṣṭhamahārāmāyana-tātpāryaprakāśa*. Parts I and II, Third edition, Pāṇḍurang Jāvājī, Nirṇaya-sāgar Press, Bombay 1937.

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.