



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

**The ascetics of Mount Aṭṭhāvaya become Jain monks:
approaches to the interpretation of an Āvaśyaka
Cūrṇi narrative**

Dundas, P.; Bisschop, P.C.

Citation

Dundas, P., & Bisschop, P. C. (2023). The ascetics of Mount Aṭṭhāvaya become Jain monks: approaches to the interpretation of an Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi narrative. *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 66(3), 203-289. doi:10.1163/15728536-06603002

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3640056>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

The Ascetics of Mount Atṭhāvaya Become Jain Monks

Approaches to the Interpretation of an Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi Narrative

Paul Dundas †

Edited by Peter C. Bisschop | ORCID: 0000-0002-6355-9800

Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands

p.c.bisschop@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Received 5 July 2023 | Accepted 3 August 2023 |

Published online 28 August 2023

Abstract

This study presents a detailed analysis of the narrative of Goyama and the ascetics of Mount Atṭhāvaya in the *Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi*, including text and translation. By identifying a range of themes, intertexts and allusions in the narrative, a variety of Jain perspectives on the nature of asceticism are uncovered. Topics covered include the *Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi* as “commentary”, the *Āvaśyaka Nirvyukti* background to the *Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi* narrative, some possible Śaiva allusions in the narrative, the significance of Goyama’s physical appearance, Goyama’s explanation of the canonical story of Puṇḍarīka, and Goyama’s power of bestowing limitless food. In addition to the narrative told in the *Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi*, its earliest metrical version in the *Uttarādhyayana Nirvyukti* is discussed and translated as well.

Keywords

Goyama – Jainism – Śvetāmbara āgama – asceticism – Āvaśyaka literature – Prakrit

A Introduction

The tenth chapter of the *Uttarādhyayana Sūtra* can be regarded as one of the oldest portions of the Śvetāmbara Jain āgama.¹ In this poem of thirty-seven verses entitled *Dumapattayaṃ*, “The Leaf on the Tree”, Mahāvīra repeatedly exhorts his senior disciple Goyama² with the celebrated words “Do not squander the opportunity” (*samayaṃ*, *Goyama*, *mā pamāyae*): that is, take advantage of the possibility of deliverance afforded by human birth and subsequent renunciation.³ At *Uttarādhyayana Sūtra* 10.28a Goyama is specifically instructed: “Shake away affection from yourself as the water lily does autumnal rain”.⁴ This affection may be of a generalised type since the following verse refers to the necessity of abandoning wealth and wife. However, the biography of Mahāvīra found in the *Jinacarita* section of the *Kalpa Sūtra*, one of the later texts of the āgama, describes how, immediately after the death of the Jina, Goyama gained omniscience only “when the tie of love (*pijjabaṃdhana*) for his master had disappeared”, apparently an actualisation of the advice given in the *Uttarādhyayana Sūtra*.⁵

- 1 For the text of the *Dumapattayaṃ* see Charpentier’s edition of the *Uttarādhyayana Sūtra* pp. 101–105 and for an English translation see Jacobi 1895: 41–46. Alsdorf 1974: 226–230 discusses the metrical background of the *Dumapattayaṃ* which is written in the old Vaitāliya Aupacchandāsaka metre, with the exception of vv. 5–15 which are interpolations. According to the commentarial tradition the *Dumapattayaṃ* poem represents a sermon by Mahāvīra prompted by Goyama lamenting his failure to gain omniscience. For manuscript illustrations see Brown 1941: 15.
- 2 Iṃḍabhūi Goyama, to give him his full Prakrit name. Throughout this contribution I refer to this figure as Goyama and by the name’s Sanskrit equivalent Gautama when it occurs in a quotation or a Sanskrit source which I have translated. Following broad Indian convention I refer to canonical Prakrit texts by their Sanskrit titles.
- 3 Cf. Alsdorf 1974: 228: “Do not squander your opportunity, Gautama”. For *samaya*, see Mette 1991: 76 who draws attention to the commentarial interpretation of *samayaṃ* as “for an instant” and also notes the possible relevance of the term *sāmāyika*, “mental and physical equanimity”.
- 4 *ucchinda siṇeham appaṇo kumuyaṃ sārāyaṃ pāṇiyaṃ*. The point of this verse line derives from word play: affection (*siṇeha*) should have no influence in the same way that moisture (*siṇeha*) does not adhere to the lily. I take *appaṇo* as ablative; cf. Jacobi 1895: 44: “cast aside from you ...”. However, compare the Pali parallel at *Dhammapada* 285a and b (285c = *Uttarādhyayana Sūtra* 10.36c): *ucchinda siṇeham attano / kumudaṃ sārādikam va pāṇinā*, rendered by Norman 2001: 42 as “Cut out the love of self, as you would an autumn lily by the hand.” Here *siṇeham attano* seems to have a more overtly Buddhist sense. In his note on this verse Norman 2001: 141 points to *pāṇinā* possibly being an old error for *pāṇiyaṃ*, “water”.
- 5 *Jinacarita* p. 65 para 127: *Nāyae pijjabaṃdhane vocchinne*. Cf. Mette 2010: 52 and 294. For the

The *Jinacarita*'s brief description of Goyama's belated gaining of omniscience subsequent to Mahāvīra's death does not seem to be repeated elsewhere in the Ardhamāgadhī canon, although those familiar with early Buddhist tradition might view it as akin to the account in the Pali *Mahāvagga* of Ānanda, the Buddha's close disciple, whose attainment of the state of *arhat* took place only after his master's decease.⁶ While there is an intriguing reference in the *Upāsakadaśāh Sūtra*, one of the later canonical texts, to Goyama being called upon by Mahāvīra to perform the ritual of repentance for doubting the advanced state of knowledge attained by a layman, this episode is not framed in terms of the disciple's lack of omniscience, and there is no sense of him being chided as a flawed or unfulfilled individual.⁷ Nonetheless, the story of the tardiness of Goyama's attainment of omniscience which will bring liberation from rebirth remained a significant subject for Śvetāmbara Jain writers as the biography of Mahāvīra and the renunciant teachers who followed him began to take more developed shape from around the middle of the first millennium CE.⁸

expression *pijja-* or *pejjabamdhana* used of unbroken (*avvachinna*) ties of affection towards relatives see *Bhagavati Sūtra* 8.5 (Amaramuni vol. 3 p. 104) and cf. Deleu 1970: 148. I take *nāyaa* to be the equivalent of Sanskrit *nāyaka*, "leader" rather than as connected with a supposed clan name Jñāta / Jñātṛ frequently assigned to Mahāvīra.

6 Anālayo 2016: 87 and 172; Shulman 2021: 113–118 and Silk 2020: 29–30.

7 The *Upāsakadaśāh Sūtra* describes how the Jain householder Āṇaṇḍa while following the vows of the advanced layman attained clairvoyant knowledge (*avadhijñāna*) of a significantly developed type. Goyama refused to accept that a layman could gain such a mode of knowledge, and insisted that for speaking falsely Āṇaṇḍa should repent and perform appropriate penance. Āṇaṇḍa appealed to Mahāvīra, who confirmed the validity of his attainment and called upon his disciple to repent, perform austerity and seek the layman's pardon, to which Goyama duly assented. See Hoernle, trans pp. 59–60 para 86, and Amaramuni pp. 83–87 paras 82–86, *Aṃgasuttāni* p. 414 para 66. Cf. Wiley 2012: 146. It might be possible to interpret the foregoing episode as reflecting a period when the laity was gaining a more pronounced and autonomous role within the Jain community. On the other hand, a Jain might regard the significance of the episode as lying in Goyama's deference and disciplined demeanour in the presence of his teacher Mahāvīra. See Vinayasāgar 1987.

8 In his *Cauppanamahāpurisacarīya* (pp. 334–335) Śīlāṅka (ninth century) expands this fleeting reference into an account of Goyama's introspective reflection about the nature of affection. Later vernacular poets were to further develop this narrative theme into a psychodrama indicative of Goyama's deep devotion, in which heartfelt lamentation for the passing of Mahāvīra leads him to apprehend that his immoderate feeling for the Jina had hindered his own attainment of omniscience. See Desāi 1974 for an illustration. Such a theme appears to be absent in Digambara literature. This may reflect the fact that in Digambara tradition the teacher lineage is regarded as descending directly from Mahāvīra himself, and accordingly his disciples have less emphasis placed on their role.

Descriptions of Goyama in the Śvetāmbara *āgama* are as idealised as those of Mahāvīra⁹ and it has to be accepted that as a historical figure he will remain elusive outside the restricted perspective afforded by textual analysis.¹⁰ This study will discuss one particular narrative involving Goyama which in its earliest prose form occurs in the *Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi* (= ĀvCū), a post-canonical text largely composed in Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit.¹¹ In this narrative we are told how Goyama, vexed by his inability to gain omniscience when others less advanced on the renunciant path were able to do so with ease, receives his master Mahāvīra's permission to go to Mount Aṭṭhāvaya in order to worship the shrines on its summit and thus guarantee liberation at a later point. He encounters on the lower slopes of Aṭṭhāvaya three ascetics and their respective bands of followers who despite their austerities have been unable to ascend the mountain. They express misgivings about what is to them Goyama's less than ascetic appearance, but to their astonishment he disappears, utilising the magic power of flight to reach the summit of Aṭṭhāvaya where he preaches a sermon to the god Vesamaṇa. The ascetics accept him as teacher when he descends the mountain and they become Jain monks. Goyama further displays his powers by feeding the new monks from a bowl whose contents never diminish. Subsequently

9 The standard description of Goyama in terms of idealised physical perfection and spiritual attainment is to be found at *Bhagavati Sūtra* 1.1. He has a substantial interlocutory presence throughout the *Bhagavati Sūtra* as regular instigator and auditor of a wide range of Mahāvīra's teachings, but little if any biographical context is provided. Modern accounts of Goyama by Jain authors have tended to produce a standardised composite biography by drawing on the few specific details from chronologically disparate canonical sources, along with commentarial descriptions of the disciple's previous existences and presenting this material in integrated historical terms. See for example Vinayasāgar 1987: 4–18. Such accounts of Goyama's life also regularly refer to the story of how he and his priestly brahman brothers became Mahāvīra's disciples after witnessing his miraculous preaching ceremony, and then having the unsatisfactory nature of their various brahmanical philosophical views decisively demonstrated to them by the Jina. However, the earliest source to record this tradition is Jinabhadraṇi's *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya*, which dates from the very end of the sixth century or the beginning of the seventh century CE.

10 Goyama is not associated by Śvetāmbara Jain tradition with any sort of disagreement within the renunciant community. In this respect he is different from Ānanda, the Buddha's closest disciple, about whom there is a wide and often thematically complex range of narratives owing to his status and also his advocacy of women being admitted to the *saṅgha* being of concern to various early Buddhist sectarian traditions. See Anālayo 2016: 160–161.

11 The ĀvCū also contains passages of Sanskrit. The earliest metrical version of the narrative occurs in the *Uttarādhyayana Niryukti*; see Appendix 1.

despondent when these monks quickly attain omniscience, he is reassured by Mahāvīra about his eventual success. The Jina's subsequent exhortation to his disciple to exert himself forms the repeated refrain of the poem entitled *Dumapattayaṃ*, referred to above.

This story has received little scholarly attention apart from a short study by the late professor Adelheid Mette, who argues for the possible influence of Buddhist teaching at the end of Goyama's sermon to Vesamaṇa.¹² While acknowledging the value of Mette's contribution, I will attempt to cast the interpretative net somewhat wider by identifying a range of themes, intertexts and allusions which combine to enrich a narrative revealing a variety of Jain perspectives on the nature of asceticism. In the following section I offer some orientation within the early stages of the Āvaśyaka literature to assist those who may not be entirely at home in this area.

B The Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi as "Commentary"

As the narrative is formally a commentary on a verse from the *Āvaśyaka Niryukti* (ĀvNiry), I will first offer some clarifying remarks about the ĀvCū's status within the domain of the Āvaśyaka literature. The point of origin of the Āvaśyaka literature is the *Āvaśyaka Sūtra* (ĀvSū), a short liturgical anthology containing the Prakrit formulae for the six component elements of Jain devotional and confessional procedure. Chronology is inevitably imprecise, but as the ĀvSū is composed largely in Mahārāṣṭrī it must be dated in its current form to around the fifth century.¹³ It is remarkable that this short work should over the centuries have attracted into its ambit such an extensive body of textual materials encompassing legendary history, philosophical theory and exemplary narrative.¹⁴ Unfortunately the complex and multilayered nature of the

12 See Mette 1987: 147 and also 2010: 182 and 381.

13 See Bruhn 1981: 21–25 and 1998: 120 and 124.

14 Cf. Bruhn 1998: 124. The attraction of the *Āvaśyaka Sūtra* may have lain in a simplicity redolent of ethical and devotional integrity. For the basic components and structure of the *Āvaśyaka* textual "cluster", see Bruhn 1981: 43–44 and also Balbir 1993a. Patel 2014: 4–5 uses the term "tradition" to describe the lengthy process of narrative reworkings of and commentarial engagements with a central literary work, specifically in this case Śrīharṣa's *Naiṣadhīyacarita*. While it might in that light be convenient to refer to the "Āvaśyaka tradition", the *Āvaśyaka Sūtra* has a much less substantial role in generating later readings in Jain literary culture than a large-scale *kāvya* such as the *Naiṣadhīyacarita*.

Āvaśyaka corpus has ensured that it has not yet been adequately assimilated into modern scholarly discussions of early Indian textual culture. Indicative of this is the fact that the most significant development in the study of this body of texts has been the publication of an English translation of Ernst Leumann's *Übersicht über die Āvaśyaka Literatur*, a monograph originally published in 1934 but incorporating research carried out as far back as the 1880s. It would not be too controversial to claim that the parameters of investigation established by Leumann in this philological field almost one hundred and fifty years ago have not radically altered since that time.¹⁵

While the ĀvSū has come to be identified, and in modern times published, as an independent component of the Śvetāmbara *āgama*, it is in fact embedded within the ĀvNiry, ostensibly a commentary upon it.¹⁶ This work, probably not too distant chronologically from the ĀvSū, is the most significant of the eight *niryuktis* (to use the Sanskrit equivalent of Prakrit *nijjutti*) which have survived, gaining a particular authority in its own right,¹⁷ and as Leumann saw long ago, it can be regarded as the truly foundational text of the Āvaśyaka literary corpus.¹⁸ Traditional Jain scholarship has viewed the main function of a *niryukti* as providing exegesis of a particular root *sūtra*,¹⁹ but as a genre the *niryuktis* are not reducible to mere procedures of textual elucidation as generally understood.²⁰ While hitherto etymologies of the term *niryukti* have generally been predicated on the term necessarily having a meaning corresponding to “expla-

15 Leumann 2010. Fundamental though Leumann's study remains, it will still strike most consulting it today as dauntingly technical in its formulation. Fortunately this new incarnation of *Übersicht* has the benefit of an important contextualising introduction by Nalini Balbir, whose own magisterial work is essential for understanding the Āvaśyaka literature. See Balbir 1993a.

16 Cf. Balbir 1993a: 34.

17 See Alsdorf 1998: 822 and Balbir 1993a. Scholarship has generally been content with a broad dating of the *niryuktis* between the first and fifth centuries CE. See for example Ollett 2017: 76. However, there seems little reason to dissent from the view of eminent Jain scholars such as Muni Puṇyavijaya and Dālsukh Malvāṇia that these works most likely originate in the late Gupta period. See Dhaky 2012: 124 n. 16.

18 Leumann identified four redactions of the *Āvaśyaka Niryukti*. The oldest he claimed to have originated with Bhadrabāhu in the first century CE, a judgement that seems to have been partly prompted by a consideration of the location of this teacher in the traditional lineage records. The three main commentaries, namely the ĀvCū and the *ṭīkā*s of Hari-bhadra and Malayagiri, are viewed by Leumann as deriving from a further three differing versions of the root text. See Leumann 2010: 80–84 and Wu 2017: 315 and cf. Gough 2021: 236 n. 68.

19 For a recent statement from this perspective, see Kusumaprajñā's introduction to ĀvNiryL.

20 See Jyväsjärvi 2010: 150–151.

nation”,²¹ Balbir has convincingly shown that “connection” or “link” are more plausible renderings, and that accordingly a *niryukti* should be regarded as an introduction or a grounding for a *sūtra* to which it is attached, a parallel text to it rather than a derivative exegetical examination of its constituent elements.²²

The eight examples of the Prakrit prose commentary (sporadically interspersed with Sanskrit) called in Sanskrit *cūrṇi* (the equivalent of Prakrit *cunṇi*) are traditionally ascribed to Jinadāsagaṇin, although the ĀvCū in fact makes no mention of this teacher’s authorial role, and on that basis can be located in the last quarter of the seventh century.²³ The standard Jain explanation understands the sense of *cūrṇi* as deriving from both the process of “grinding” (Sanskrit $\sqrt{cūrṇ}$) the text and the product of this, the “flour” (*cūrṇi*) of explication, powder-like yet still substantial. However, whatever the term’s semantic background, in practice it appears to designate little more than simple prose as distinct from the metrical *niryuktis*.²⁴ The ĀvCū is the most important example of the *cūrṇi* genre; regrettably, the sole edition, that published in Ratlām by the ŚrīRṣabhdevjī Keśarīmaḷjī Śvetāmbarsaṃsthā, is not based on any obvious critical principles, often seeming simply to reflect the transcription of a single manuscript, and is of only provisional value for any full evaluation.²⁵

21 See for example Norman 2001: 212.

22 See Balbir 2020: 59–60. Mahetā 1989: 57 states that the purpose of a *niryukti* is to establish the connection (*sambandh*) of meaning with the words of a *sūtra*.

23 See Sen 1975: 6–9 and also Balbir 1993a: 61, and Wu 2014: 162 nn. 40 and 41. The conclusion of the colophon of the Ratlām edition of the ĀvCū makes no reference to authorship but simply states that the copy of the work was given by Dīpavijayagaṇin to Panniyās Nyāyasāgaragaṇin in *saṃvat* 1774. For the likely order of composition of the *cūrṇis*, see Mahetā 1989: 266–267.

24 See von Hinüber 2019: 1183 n. 15. For the traditional explanation, see Alsdorf 1998: 817. For remarks on the *cūrṇi*’s commentarial procedures vis-à-vis *sūtra* and *niryukti* see Balbir 2022b: 403–404. Unfortunately analytical synopses and studies of the *cūrṇis* remain lacking; Sen 1975 is a notable exception.

25 Cf. Alsdorf 1998: 823. Although there is nothing in the Ratlām edition of the ĀvCū, whether by way of frontispiece information or an introduction, to suggest who was responsible for editing it, the likelihood is that the scholar involved was Sāgarānandasūri; see Tripathi 1981: 304 (where the name is imprecisely given as “Ānandasāgara sūri”). Cf. Malvania ViĀvBh Pt. 1 intro p. 4 for Ānandasāgara having edited Hemacandra Maladhārin’s *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya* for the ŚrīRṣabhdev Keśarīmaḷjī series in 1936. The version of the ĀvCū given in Muni Dīparatnasāgara’s edition would seem to reproduce the Ratlām edition. Muni Jambūvijaya’s edition of the *Anuyogadvāra Cūrṇi* which forms part of his larger edition of the *Anuyogadvāra Sūtra* and related commentarial material is the most significant recent edition of a *cūrṇi*.

In general, a *cūrṇi* is closely connected with its corresponding *niryukti* in terms of following the latter's verse order and topic of discussion.²⁶ However, while the *ĀvCū* does indeed largely follow the *ĀvNiry*, it does not always engage with the verses upon which it is ostensibly commenting in terms of offering a close gloss and thoroughgoing exegesis. Typically a catchword (*pratīka*), that is to say the opening word or compound cluster of an *ĀvNiry* verse, is cited, and that verse is then elaborated upon, often by means of incorporating the sense of the immediately succeeding verse(s) into a discursive prose treatment.²⁷ Catchwords in the *ĀvCū* arguably do not so much point to the portion of the *ĀvNiry* to be commented upon as they function as markers to orient the student within the framework of the *ĀvCū*'s argument or narrative.²⁸

There is one significant dimension of the relationship between the *ĀvCū* and the *ĀvNiry* which provides some relevant background to understanding the story examined below. Almost a century ago Charpentier speculated that the *niryuktis* "presuppose the existence of an earlier commentarial tradition, presumably oral, of which they are merely a summary."²⁹ Alsdorf sought to clarify further this claim by positing the original orality of the *cūrṇis* as a genre: "In the *Cūrṇi* we come for the first time to know the full text of the traditional exe-

26 See Mahetā 1989, opening of each chapter on *cūrṇis*, and p. 275 for the *ĀvNiry* and *ĀvCū*.

27 Koch 1990: 26 characterises the *ĀvCū*, which he regards as having been written by Jinadāsa, as commenting on a substantially shorter version of the *ĀvNiry* which has not survived (presumably one of the recensions identified by Leumann; see note 18), but which can be identified through inspecting the catchwords employed and the version commented on by Haribhadra. However, the author of the *ĀvCū* could have been deliberately selective about which verses he discussed and furthermore *ĀvNiry* verses are not always cited by catchwords when they can be readily dealt with in the *cūrṇi* proper. An example relevant to some of the textual material discussed below is *ĀvNiry* vv. 742–763, a group of verses which deals with scriptural transmission and interpretation as they relate to the Jina, Goyama and the teacher Vaira; only vv. 742, 744, 745, 749, 750, 756, 759, 760, 761, and 762 are specifically singled out by catchword by the *ĀvCū*, with the rest being paraphrased or expanded in the running commentarial prose.

28 While the *ĀvCū* is not solely a repository of exemplary narrative, it is this aspect of the work which has attracted most scholarly attention, as most notably Balbir's extensive work deriving from Leumann's 1897 edition *Die Āvaśyaka Erzählungen*; see Balbir 1993a. Koch 1991–1992 uses the *ĀvCū* in conjunction with other relevant commentaries to give an analysis of a selection of *Āvaśyaka*-related narratives; see also Koch 1995–1996, 1998 and 2009. Most recently, Wu 2017 has revealed the differing ways in which shared narrative themes are used in the *ĀvCū* and the Buddhist *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*.

29 *Uttarādhyaṇa Sūtra*, introduction, p. 50.

genesis, and it is clear that though the form of the text we now have before us may be centuries younger than the old mnemonic *gāthās* of the *Nijjuttī*, yet originally the *Nijjuttī* is but a secondary mnemonic aid for mastering the primary oral precursor of the written *Cūṇi*.³⁰

While speculating about unidentifiable oral precursors of written texts without providing any specific substantiating examples will be dubious to some, the possible existence of such versions at some point, as Charpentier and Alsdorf suggested, is nonetheless a hypothesis which can enhance understanding of the *ĀvCū* and its narratives. Traces of variants in respect to narrative details betokening an original orality are regularly found in the *cūṇis*;³¹ one such alternative, introduced by the phrase *keī bhaṇaṃti*, “some say”, occurs in section D11 of our *ĀvCū* story. Orality in the Indian context and elsewhere has generally been regarded as guaranteeing the fixity of a particular textual transmission. Yet in respect of the *ĀvCū* it might be held that the preexistence of one or more oral versions may have also been responsible for an evident degree of syntactic and structural untidiness verging on the disorderly to be found in the story below. The prose of the *ĀvCū* story is distinctly inelegant, and its clipped and largely unornate style, apart from an occasional lengthy compound formation,³² seems to indicate an original context where a degree of oral expansion and embellishment, now inaccessible, may have taken place. Indicative of this unsophisticated style is the manner in which the story continually and interchangeably repeats the honorifics *bhagavaṃ*, “blessed” and *sāmī*, “lord” to refer to both Goyama and his master Mahāvīra, often in such close proximity that it can be difficult to distinguish which of the two eminent figures is being designated.³³ Such unpolished usage may be an indicator of traces of an original version which have survived in the *ĀvCū* narrative, to be analysed below.

30 Alsdorf 1998: 817. Alsdorf goes on to refine this insight by explaining (p. 818) that “the *cūṇi*, that is in the form we have it now, has taken the form of a commentary on parts of the *nijjuttī* and of the *sutta*, thus reflecting the original oral instruction, of which only certain parts had been epitomized in the form of mnemonic verses.” For observations on orality in early Indic textuality, see Pollock 2018: 30–32.

31 See Balbir 1993a: 115 and 2020.

32 See section D6 and note 93. The *ĀvCū* as a whole evinces varying degrees of stylistic sophistication.

33 The term *sāmī* is used of Mahāvīra fifteen times, of Goyama fourteen times (according to Mette 2010: 184 this is a term peculiar to Goyama). The honorific *bhagavaṃ* (and the variants *bhayavaṃ* and *bhagava*) is used eight times of Mahāvīra and eight times of Goyama. For a discussion of the rendering of *bhagavaṃ* in the Buddhist context (“Lord” or “Blessed one”), see Shulman 2021: 15 n. 28.

This story takes its *pratīka* *Tuṃbavaṇasannivesāo* (“From a way station in Tuṃbavaṇa”) from ĀvNiry v. 764 which introduces a biography of the teacher Vairasāmī (Sanskrit Vajrasvāmin). I will discuss this verse and the likelihood of it being an interpolation in Appendix 2. The ĀvCū story to be analysed below should not be regarded in formal terms as a commentary generated by this verse. ĀvNiry v. 764 can better be viewed as part of a secondary summary of an underlying, probably oral version of the biography which, following Charpentier and Alsdorf, has assumed written form in the ĀvCū. The original version of the story, however it was framed, must predate (perhaps by several centuries) the seventh century, the floruit of whoever produced the version of the ĀvCū we have now.

C The Āvaśyaka Nirukti Background to the Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi Narrative

The overall background to the story of the ascetics of Mount Aṭṭhāvaya can be understood from the ĀvNiry’s summary account of the process of scriptural hermeneutics given in a sequence of verses (vv. 736–764).³⁴ ĀvNiry v. 742 poses the question “why” (*kiṃkāraṇaṃ*) the *titthakara* (Sanskrit *tīrthaṅkara*; the term is generic but here must be interpreted as referring specifically to Mahāvīra) “utters” (*bhāsaī*) the *Sāmāiya* (Sanskrit *sāmāyika*) chapter, which, as the first section of the *Āvaśyaka Sūtra* dealing with the principal mental and physical disciplinary performance to be performed by Jains, effectively represents by synecdoche the Jain scriptural tradition in toto.³⁵ This enunciation is effected through the agency of the particular types of karma which define the *titthakara* state (vv. 743–744).³⁶ Mahāvīra’s disciples, of whom Goyama is the main rep-

34 See Balbir 1993a: 64–68. This sequence has its origin in the list of 26 *dāra* (“topic”) words given at ĀvNiry vv. 140–141 (= *Anuyogadvāra Sūtra* sū. 604, for which Hanaki 1970: 208–210); for the 26 *dāra* words starting with v. 141 which constitute a programme developed as far as v. 879 and represent a form of exegetical framework, see Balbir 1993a: 55–56 and 64 and cf. Kusumaprajñā’s introduction to ĀvNiryL: 28–36.

35 See Williams 1959: 343: *sāmāyi’-āi-ekkārasa-aṅga*: the normal phrase in canonical legends to designate the *āgamas*.

36 *titthayaro kiṃkāraṇaṃ bhāsaī sāmāiyaṃ tu ajjhayaṇaṃ | titthayaraṇāmagottaṃ kammaṃ me veiyavvaṃ ti ||* 742 “Why does the *tīrthaṅkara* utter the *Sāmāyika* chapter (of the *Āvaśyaka Sūtra*)? Because (he knows that) he must experience the “name and clan” karma of all *tīrthaṅkaras* (which is the cause of uttering the chapter).” *taṃ ca kahaṃ veijjai agilāe dhammadesaṇāhiṃ | bajjhai taṃ tu bhagavao taīyabhavosaṃkattā ṇaṃ ||* 743 “So how is it experienced? Through actions like unwearied teaching of the doctrine. That

representative, are motivated to hear what the *titthakara* has uttered in order to gain knowledge of efficacious and negative (*maṅgula*) dispositions (v. 745).³⁷ There follows a condensed delineation of the Jain soteriological path to deliverance (vv. 746–748)³⁸ and an analysis of various terms relevant to the overall description (ĀvNiry vv. 749–753).³⁹ A sequence of six verses then surveys the seven *ṇaas*, “perspectives” (vv. 754–759), described as being ubiquitous in the scriptural tradition, which are to be mediated to a pupil according to his aptitude.⁴⁰

This stipulation entails a prescription about the context in which interpretive “application” (*samoyāro*) of the *ṇaas* to scriptural discourse should take place.⁴¹ ĀvNiry v. 762b accordingly states that the perspectives are applied when there is *apuhutta*, “non-separateness”, and are not applied when there is *puhutta*, “separateness”.⁴² These technical terms (whose Sanskrit equivalents are *apṛthaktva* and *pṛthaktva*) relate to the methodology employed in scriptural hermeneutics and the role of *aṇuoga* (Sanskrit *anuyoga*), “correlating”, “conjoining”—in effect “investigation” or “examination”—in understanding the *āgama*.⁴³ ĀvNiry v. 763 then explains that subsequent to the teacher Vaira there was a transition from what had originally been an integrated her-

karma is bound by the lord on the conclusion of (lit. having emerged from) his third previous existence.” For *osakkai* < *ava-* / *apa-* *śvaṣk*, see Bollée 1994: 167 and Bollée 1998 vol. 3: 57 and Oberlies 1993: 48 (quoting Pali *apasakkati*, go away). I discuss ĀvNiry v. 744 at section I.

37 *Goyamāmāi Sāmāiyaṇi tu kiṃkāraṇaṇi nisāminti | ṇāṇassa taṇi tu suṇḍaramaṅgula-bhāvāṇaṇi uvaladdhī ||* 745, with translation following Haribhadra and Malayagiri. For *maṅgula* see Oberlies 1995: 131 s.v. *maṅgura*, “hässlich”, and Norman 1992: 262–263. Sanskrit *maṅgula*, for which see Monier-Williams s.v. (the word is not found in PWB), would appear to be a Prakritism.

38 See note 229.

39 These *dāra* words (*kāraṇa*, *paccaya*, and *lakkhaṇa*) represent elements 9–11 of the programme identified by Balbir 1993a; see note 34. For *kāraṇa*, see section I.

40 ĀvNiry v. 144 mentions only five main *ṇaas* with the first, *negama*, and the fifth, *sadda*, subdivided; cf. Ohira 1982: 16. Traces of perspectivism in the Śvetāmbara *āgama* are infrequent and undeveloped; see Deleu 1970: 24 and cf. Ohira 1994: 229.

41 The *dāra* word is *somoāraṇa*; cf. Hanaki 1970: 209 and 227 and also Balbir 1993b: 67 and Krümpelmann 2021: 217 (translating *samavatāra* as “Inhärenz”).

42 *apuhutte samoyāro natthi puhutte samoyāro*. My translation of *apuhutta* and *puhutta* is literal. Cf. Schubring 1935: 26 where *apuhatta* is rendered by “Häufung”. In the English version *apuhatta* is rendered by “accumulation” and *puhatta* by “isolation”; see Schubring 1978: 119 n. 1. See also Balbir 2020: 59 and Krümpelmann 2021: 214 n. 88.

43 The *aṇuyogas* consist of four broad generic categories of exegetical analysis falling under the rubrics of “behaviour” (*caraṇa*), “doctrine” (*dharma*), “enumeration” (*saṃkhyā*) and “substance” (*dravya*) which are to be regarded as encompassing the meaning of the *su-tas*. Cf. Schubring 1977: 299 and Krümpelmann 2021: 192 and 208.

meneutical procedure involving simultaneous application of the four *aṇuogas* to their less rigorous separate application.⁴⁴

After paraphrasing and expanding ĀvNiry vv. 762–763, ĀvCū then poses the following questions: “Who was the noble Vaira who brought about (*jaṃmi*) that there was non-separateness of the *aṇuogas*? For what reason was separateness introduced?”⁴⁵ I want to hear about the birth and subsequent career of the noble Vaira. How did separateness of the *aṇuogas* come about?”⁴⁶ The narrative which ensues is not mentioned in the ĀvNiry, but serves as an extended prologue to the ĀvCū’s account of Vaira’s career.

D The Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi Narrative of Goyama and the Ascetics of Mount Aṭṭhāvaya

I have segmented into sections the Prakrit text (ĀvCū pp. 381–390) and my accompanying translation; while broadly reflecting narrative units, these are intended to facilitate cross-reference and discussion. In translating, throughout I generally mirror the pared-down style of the Prakrit and have deliberately not attempted to produce a “smooth” rendering. The spelling of the ĀvCū edition is reproduced, including forms containing intervocalic *-ta-*, although these are most likely scribal hypercorrections. I retain the bulk of editorial punctuation of the text, although I have adjusted this where clarity is required. Particles have been separated from preceding forms. I regularly cite in the notes the version of the narrative found in Haribhadra’s *ṭikā* on the *Āvaśyaka Nirvyukti*

44 *jāvaṃṭa AjjaVairā apuhattaṃ kāliyaṇuyogassa / tenāreṇa puhattaṃ kāliyasūya Dīṭṭhi-vāde* // 763 “Up to the time of the noble Vaira there was non-separateness of the *aṇuyogas* with regard to *kāliya* texts. After him there was separateness with regard to the *kāliya* textual tradition and the *Drṣṭivāda*.” ĀvNiry and the AvCū give Vaira (c. 1st century CE) the honorific *ajja* (Sanskrit *ārya*). He is also known also known in Prakrit as Vairasāmī (Sanskrit Vajrasvāmin). Tatia, in the introduction to Hanaki 1970: vii, explains the *kāliya* (Sanskrit *kālīka*) scriptures in this context as those whose “study required a monk to be of a definite standing in respect of the period of his monkhood.” The *Drṣṭivāda* is the twelfth *aṅga* of the Ardhamaṅgadhī scriptural canon which from relatively early times came to be accepted as having been lost.

45 According to ĀvNiry v. 774 the change in exegetical procedure was introduced by Vaira’s pupil Rakkhiya who wished to assist pupils who were deficient in intellectual ability.

46 ĀvCū p. 381 ll. 4–9: *ko puṇṇo ajjaVairo jaṃmi apuhuttaṃ āsi? jeṇa* [read *keṇa*] *ya kāraṇeṇa puhuttaṃ kataṃ iti icchāmi tesin ajjaVatirāṇaṃ utṭhānapārīṇāmiyaṃ sotuṃ, kiha puhuttaṃ jātaṃ*. Henceforth citations from the ĀvCū text are taken from the first volume of the Ratlām edition.

(H)⁴⁷ where this clarifies or supplements the ĀvCū, and I also occasionally refer to the commentaries on the *Uttarādhyayana Nirvyukti* by the eleventh century Śāntisūri (Ś) and on chapter ten of the *Uttarādhyayana Sūtra* by Devendra (D).⁴⁸

The narrative commences with a brief reference to the teacher Vaira's previous existence as a deity.

D1 *ĀvCū p. 381 l. 11*

*puvvaḥhave*⁴⁹ *Sakkassa devaranno Vesamaṇassa sāmāṇio āsi,*

In his previous existence he was a *sāmānika* deity attendant upon Vesamaṇa, one of the guardians of the directions in the entourage of Sakka, the king of the gods.⁵⁰

D2 *ĀvCū pp. 381–382 l. 3*

*ito ya Vaddhamāṇasāmī, teṇaṃ kāleṇaṃ teṇaṃ samaeṇaṃ Piṭṭhicaṃ-
pāṇāma nagarī,⁵¹ tattho Sālo rāyā, Mahāsālo juvarāyā, tesim SālaMa-
hāsālāṇaṃ bhagiṇī Jasavatī, tīse Piḍharo⁵² bhattāro, Jasavatīe attao Piḍha-
raputto Gāgalī ṇāma kumāro, sāmī samosaḍḍho subhūmibhāge, Sālo ni-*

47 Āryarakṣitavijaya's edition vol. 3: 102–109.

48 D's version of the story is also found in the Prakrit commentary entitled *Sukhabodhā* on the *Uttarādhyayana Sūtra* by Devendra (on becoming ācārya, Nemicandrasūri) composed in saṃvat 1129 which was an adaptation of Ś.

49 H: *Vairasāmī puvvaḥhave*.

50 The translation makes more explicit Vesamaṇa's status in respect to Sakka and that of the *sāmāṇia* god, to be reborn as Vaira, in respect to Vesamaṇa. For Vesamaṇa (Sanskrit Vaiśravaṇa, commonly known in Hindu tradition as Kubera) as guardian of the northern region see Deleu 1976: 246 and cf. Kirfel 1967: 265 and 305. For *sāmānika* as a generic term for a type of god of a status comparable to that of a prince, see Kirfel 1967: 262. The designation may denote that such gods are "equivalent" (*samāna*) to Indra in terms of powers; see *Abhidhānarājendrakōśa* s.v. *sāmāṇiya-sāmānika: samānatayā Indratulyatayā ṛddhyā carantīti sāmānikāḥ* and cf. Lalwani 1973–1985 vol. 2: 319.

51 H: *ito ya bhagavaṃ Vaddhamāṇasāmī Piṭṭhicaṃpāe nayaṇīe subhūmibhāge ujjāṇe samosaḍḍho* ("And at that time the venerable Lord Vaddhamāṇa had arrived to preach in a garden in a pleasant part of the city of Piṭṭhicaṃpā"). For Piṭṭhicaṃpā see Stein 1948: 50 and Stein 1967: 187: "not the suburb, but a certain part of the town of Campa: something like 'High-Campa' or the Acropolis of Campa". This is questionable. Mehta and Chandra 1970: 455, s.v. Piṭṭha-Campā: "to the west of Campā on way to Rāyagrha."

52 Correcting *Piḍharo*; H: *Piṭharo*.

*ggato, dhammaṃ soccā jaṃ navaraṃ Mahāsālaṃ rajje thāvēmi,*⁵³ *so atigato, teṇa āpucchito Mahāsālo 'vi bhaṇati-ahaṃ pi saṃsārabhatuvviggo jahā tubbhe ihaṃ meḍhīpamāṇaṃ tahā pavvatīyassa vi,*⁵⁴ *tāhe Gāgalīṃ Kāṃpillāo saddāvēuṇa paṭṭo baddho, abhisitto,*⁵⁵ *rāyā jāyo, tassa māyā Kāṃpillapure ṇagare dinnayā Piḍharassa, teṇa tato saddāvīto, so puṇa tesīṃ do sīvīyāo kārei, jāva te pavvatīyā,*⁵⁶ *sā bhagiṇī samaṇovāsīyā jātā. tae ṇaṃ te samaṇā hoṃtagā ekkārassa aṃgā ahijittā.*⁵⁷

And lord Vaddhamāṇa was flourishing then. At that time, at that period there was a city called Piṭṭhicāṃpā. Sāla was king there and Mahāsāla the crown prince; their sister was Jasavatī and her husband was Piḍhara. Jasavatī's offspring, the son of Piḍhara, was a prince named Gāgali. The lord arrived to preach in a pleasant location. Sāla went out to listen to him and having heard the *dhamma* ... "I will first establish Mahāsāla as ruler"; he approached him. He took his leave of Mahāsāla who said, "I also am disturbed by fear of rebirth. Just as you have represented a measuring post for me in the world, so you will also be for me even when I have renounced the world." Then Gāgali was summoned from Kāṃpilla, the royal insignium was tied on him, he was consecrated and became king. His mother had been given in marriage to Piḍhara in the city of Kāṃpilla so he had been summoned from there. He got prepared two palanquins for them ... They renounced and their sister became an advanced laywoman.⁵⁸ Then on becoming ascetics they studied the eleven *aṅga* scriptures.

53 This appears to be an abbreviated passage. The expression *jaṃ navaraṃ* is usually picked up in the main clause of a sentence by an expression such as *tato, tao* or *tao ṇaṃ*. For *jaṃ navaraṃ* see Roth 1983: 158 and Schubring 1978: 70. H conveys the sense more clearly: *tato Sālo bhagavato samīve dhammaṃ soṇa bhaṇai—jaṃ navaraṃ Mahāsālaṃ rajje abhisimcāmi, tato tuṇhaṃ pādāmūle pavvayāmi* ("Then Sāla having heard the doctrine from the blessed one said, "I will first consecrate Mahāsāla as ruler over the kingdom, then renounce the world in your presence").

54 H: *so bhaṇai-ahaṃ pi pavvayāmi, jahā tubbhe iha amhāṇaṃ meḍhīpamāṇaṃ tahā pavvatīyassa vi tti*. For *meḍhi* see Turner 1966: 10317 s.v. *methi*, "pillar in threshing floor to which oxen are fastened, prop for supporting carriage shafts"; Roth 1983: 125 (p. 124 for *meḍhīpamāṇaṃ*: Maßstab, i.e. standard).

55 H: *tāhe Gāgalī Kāṃpillapurāto āṇeum rajje abhisimcīto*.

56 This phrase appears to be an abbreviated description of a royal renunciation of the sort found in e.g. the *Jñātādharma-kathāḥ Sūtra*; see Roth 1983: 159–163. For a list of *jāva* occurrences with their textual correlates which occur in the *Nirayāvālyāo*, see Deleu 1996: 31–36.

57 Absolutive used as finite verb? See Bollée 2010: 159 n. 594.

58 For the status of the *samaṇovāsīya*, see More 2020: 428–429.

D3 *ĀvCū p. 382 ll. 3–9*

tate naṃ samaṇe bhagavaṃ Mahāvīre bahitā janavayavihāraṃ viharati. teṇaṃ kāleṇaṃ⁵⁹ Rāyagihaṃ ṇagaraṃ, Rāyagihe samosaḍho, tāhe sāmī puṇo niggao Caṃpaṃ padhāvito, tāhe SālaMahāsālā sāmīṃ āpucchamti⁶⁰—amhe Piṭṭhicaṃpaṃ⁶¹ vaccāmo, jati ṇāma tāṇa ko 'pi bujjejjā, sammattaṃ labhejjā,⁶² sāmī vi jāṇati jahā tāṇi saṃbujjhīhiṃti, tāhe sāmī ṇā Goyamasāmī se bitijjao dinno, sāmī Caṃpaṃ gato, tattha samosaraṇaṃ,⁶³ Gāgalī Piḍharo Jasavatīya niggayāṇi, bhagavaṃ dhammaṃ kaheti, tāṇi dhammaṃ soṇṇa saṃviggāṇi, tāhe Gāgalī bhaṇati—jaṃ ṇavaraṃ ammāpiyaro āpucchāmi jetṭhaputtaṃ ca rajje ṭhavemi, tāṇi āpucchitāṇi bhaṇamti—jadi tumaṃ saṃsārabhayuvvigo amhe' vi, tāhe se puttaṃ rajje ṭhāvēttā ammāpitihīṃ saha pavvatito.

Then the ascetic, the blessed Mahāvīra wandered abroad through the region. At that time, at that moment there was a city called Rāyagiha.⁶⁴ He arrived at Rāyagiha to preach. Then the lord went out on his wanderings once more and proceeded⁶⁵ to Campā. Then Sāla and Mahāsālā asked the lord for permission: “Let us go to Piṭṭhicampā, in case one of them might be awakened or gain correct religious disposition.”⁶⁶ The lord knew that they would in fact be awakened and so the lord assigned lord Goyama to be their companion. The lord reached Campā and held his preaching

59 An abbreviation of the expression *teṇaṃ kāleṇaṃ teṇaṃ samaṇaṃ*.

60 Correcting the edition's *āpucchati*; H: *sāmīṃ pucchamti*.

61 Correcting the edition's *Piṭṭhicaṃpaṃ*.

62 H: *pavvaejja sammattaṃ vā labhejja*. This gives slightly better sense. I omit the edition's inserted question mark.

63 H: *sāmī Caṃpaṃ gato, Goyamasāmī 'vi Piṭṭhicaṃpaṃ gato, tattha samosaraṇaṃ*. While it does not have any significant impact on interpreting the narrative, there is a slight lack of clarity at this juncture concerning the itinerary of the protagonists. H seems to be clarifying by introducing a clause specifying that Mahāvīra went to Campā and Goyama went to Piṭṭhicampā, but the statement in the following clause that “a preaching assembly (took place) there” is awkward since it can only refer to the Jina, as is clear from the *ĀvCū* text.

64 Sanskrit Rājagṛha.

65 Jain monks today can move at an impressive pace as they journey between the various destinations on their mendicant itinerary, and given that the Sanskrit root *√dhāv* frequently means “run”, it is possible that *padhāvita* signifies “proceeded briskly” (cf. Mette: “eilen”). However, the context here and later in the story suggests that “proceeded” (“or proceeded confidently”) is a more appropriate rendering. See Bodewitz 1974 for *dhāv* as meaning “move” and also Harzer 2015: 216–230.

66 That is, through seeing them.

assembly there. Gāgali, Piḍhara and Jasavaī came out to listen to him. The lord preached the doctrine. They heard the doctrine and felt anxiety about worldly things.⁶⁷ Then Gāgali said, “I will straight away take my leave of my mother and father and install my eldest son on the throne.” Then when he had taken leave of his parents, they said, “If you are disturbed by fear of rebirth, we are also.” So after installing his son on the throne, he renounced the world with his parents.

D4 *ĀvCū p. 382 ll. 9–13*

Goyamasāmī tāṇi ghattūṇaṃ Caṃpaṃ vaccati, tesiṃ SālaMahāsālāṇaṃ paṃthaṃ vaccaṃtāṇaṃ hariso jāto—jahā⁶⁸ saṃsāraṃ uttāriyāṇi, evaṃ tesiṃ subheṇaṃ aṃjhasāṇeṇaṃ kevalaṇāṇaṃ uppannaṃ, itaresiṃ pi ciṃtā jātā jahā amhe eteḥiṃ rajje ṭhavitāṇi saṃsārā moitāṇi,⁶⁹ evaṃ ciṃteṃtāṇaṃ subheṇaṃ aṃjhasāṇeṇaṃ tiṇha vi kevalaṇāṇaṃ uppannaṃ, evaṃ tāṇi uppannaṇāṇāṇi Caṃpaṃ gayāṇi, sāmīpayāhiṇaṃ kare-māṇāṇi titthaṃ ṇamiūṇa kevalipariṣaṃ⁷⁰ padhāvitāṇi, Goyamasāmī vi bhagavaṃ vaṇḍiūṇa tikkhutto⁷¹ pādesu paḍito utṭhito bhaṇati—kahīṃ vaccaha? eha titthakaraṃ vaṇḍaha, tāhe sāmī bhaṇati—mā Goyamā! kevalī āsāehi, tāhe āuṭṭo khāmeti, saṃvegaṃ ca gato, tattha Goyamasā-missa saṃkā jātā⁷²—mā 'haṃ ṇa sījhijjāmi tti,

Lord Goyama proceeded to Campā with them.⁷³ Sāla and Mahāsāla experienced joy as they proceeded along the road, thinking that they had escaped from rebirth; and so because of their morally positive attitude⁷⁴ they attained omniscience. The others thought, “We who had been appointed to rule by them have become freed from rebirth.” As they reflected on this, the three attained omniscience because of their morally pos-

67 That is, they experienced *saṃvega*. For observations on *saṃvega* in Jainism, see Aciri 2015: 204–205. Cf. Walker 2018: 277–279. See also Detige 2020: 101.

68 I follow the editorial bracketed insertion.

69 H: *jahā amhe eteḥiṃ rajje ṭhāvīyāṇi punar avi dhamme ṭhāvīyāṇi saṃsārāto moiyāṇi*.

70 Correcting the edition's *kevalapariṣaṃ*.

71 For *tikkhutto* see Marciniak 2020: 22 n. 14.

72 D p. 154a l. 13: *tattha Goyamasāmissa sammattamohaṇīyakammodayavaseṇa ciṃtā jāyā*.

73 As observed in note 63, there is some slight uncertainty here. As the *ĀvCū* description stands, Goyama journeys from Piṭṭhicampā to Campā with Sāla and Mahāsāla who gain omniscience on the road, while Piḍhara, Jasavatī and Gāgali gain omniscience in Campā. However, the narrative seems to be implying that all five journey to Campā with Goyama.

74 For *subha* see Jaini 2000 and for *aṃjhasā* see Wiley 2012.

itive attitude. So having attained omniscience they arrived at Campā. After circumambulating the lord and saluting the Jain community,⁷⁵ they approached the gathering of omniscient ones. Lord Goyama paid homage to the blessed one, fell at his feet three times and then said on standing up, “Where are you going? Go, pay homage to the *titthakara*.” Then the lord said, “Do not, Goyama, disrespect the omniscient ones.”⁷⁶ Then in contrition⁷⁷ he asked pardon and felt anxiety about wordly things.⁷⁸ At that moment apprehension arose in lord Goyama that he might never gain liberation.

D5 *ĀvCū p. 382 l. 13–p. 383 l. 3*

evaṃ ca Goyamasāmī cīṃteti,⁷⁹ ito ya devāṇa saṃlāvo vaṭṭati—jo Aṭṭhāvayaṃ vilaggati cetiyāṇi ya vaṃdati dharanigoyaro sa teṇeva bhavagga-haneṇaṃ sijjhati,⁸⁰ tāhe sāmī tassa cittaṃ jāṇati tāvasāṇa ya saṃbohaṇayaṃ, eyassa vi thiratā bhavissati tti do vi katāṇi,⁸¹ eyassa vi paccato,⁸² te vi saṃbujjhissanti tti, so vi sāmīṃ āpucchati Aṭṭhāvayaṃ jāmi tti,

75 Mette 1987 takes *tittha* as “der heiligen Stätte”, possibly because this links up with the imminent reference to the shrines on Mount Aṭṭhāvaya. I understand the term here to denote the fourfold Jain community, present to hear Mahāvīra’s preaching. For this sense of *tittha*, see *Bhagavatī Sūtra* 20.8 (cf. Deleu 1970: 257). For *tittha* as the scriptures, see *Senaprasāna* 27.1.

76 I take *āsāhehi* as equivalent of the Sanskrit imperative *āsātaya*. However, the form might also be taken as equivalent to *āsādaya*, with Mahāvīra telling the non-omniscient Goyama not to “join” or “approach” the *kevalins* since he does not belong among the enlightened. Both forms would normally contain the phonetic development *-t- / -d- > -y-*.

77 The expression *āutṭa*, “turned”, which is common in *ĀvCū*, denotes a change of attitude or, occasionally, physical state (cf. section D12). See Ghatage 2004: 927 s.v. *āutṭa* “turned over (to one’s side), won over (to one’s views), made favourable”; also “turned back (from some mistake or from a wrong view)” and “turned towards, determined”. Cf. Mette 1987 “respektvoll um Verzeihung”.

78 According to D Goyama was under the influence of that type of deluding (*mohaṇijja*) karma which undermines correct religious attitude (*sammatta*).

79 I have omitted the edition’s *daṇḍa* at the end of this phrase, which suggests that it is to be taken with the previous phrase about Goyama’s apprehension. However, I interpret the phrase as representing Goyama’s awareness of what the gods say about Mount Aṭṭhāvaya (see Mette 1987 and 2010).

80 For the phrase *ten’ eva bhava-ggahaneṇa sijjhejjā / sijjhittae* at *Āyāradasāo* 10 para. 72 see Schubring 1966: 26.

81 D p. 154 ll. 15–16: *tāhe sāmī tassa cittaṃ jāṇai—tāvasāṇa ca saṃbohaṇayaṃ, eyassa thirayā bhavissai tti do vi kayāṇi bhavissanti*.

82 The phrase *eyassa vi paccato* seems awkward and is reflected in my tentative translation; *eyassa vi* in the previous clause refers to Goyama, while as dependent on *paccato*, the

*tattha bhagavatā bhaṇito—vacca Aṭṭhāvayaṃ cetiyāṇaṃ vaṃdao,⁸³ tae
ṇaṃ bhagavam⁸⁴ haṭṭhatuṭṭho vaṃdittā gato,*

And lord Goyama thought thus: “In this world the gods are saying among themselves that any mortal who scales Mount Aṭṭhāvaya⁸⁵ and pays homage to its shrines⁸⁶ can attain liberation in that same existence.”⁸⁷ Then

equivalent of *paccayo* (= Sanskrit *pratyayaḥ* with *-t-* as intervocalic), it seems to refer to Mahāvīra. Cf. Mette 1987: “Und weil er schon wusste”. The phrase is not reproduced by H.

- 83 H provides broader context and smooths away some but not all of the syntactic awkwardness of ĀvCū: *ito ya sāmīṇā purvaṃ vāgariyaṃ aṇāgae Goyamasāmmi-jahā jo Aṭṭhāpadaṃ [sic] vilaggai cetiyāṇi ya vaṃdai dharanīgoyaro so teṇeva bhavaggahaṇeṇa sijjhati, taṃ ca devā annamannassa kahimti, jahā kira dharanīgoyaro Aṭṭhāvayaṃ jo vilaggati so teṇeva bhavaṇe sijjhai, tato Goyamasāmi cimtāi-jaha Aṭṭhāvayaṃ vaccejā, tato sāmī tassa hiyaṇakūtaṃ jāṇiṇa* [absolutive as finite verb? see Bollée 2010: 159 n. 594] *tāvāsā ya saṃbujjhihinti ti bhagavayā bhaṇito vacca Goyama Aṭṭhāvayaṃ cetiyaṃ vaṃdeuṃ.*

“And at this time the lord had previously predicted in lord Goyama’s absence that any mortal who ascends Aṭṭhāvaya and worships the shrines there attains deliverance in that same existence. And the gods talk about that to one another, namely that it is said (*kira*) that a mortal who climbs Aṭṭhāvaya attains liberation in that existence. Then lord Goyama thought that he should go to Aṭṭhāvaya. Then the lord knew his inner disposition and that ascetics would be awakened. The blessed one told him, “Go to Aṭṭhāvaya, Goyama, to worship the shrine.” Cf. Devendra p. 154 l. 14: *io ya devāṇa saṃlāvo vaṭṭai—ajja bhagavayā vāgariyaṃ—jo Aṭṭhāvayamma vilaggai ...*

- 84 I take *bhagavam* as the accusative of the vowel stem *bhagava*; if it is nominative then it refers to Goyama.

- 85 See ĀvNiry v. 307 for Aṭṭhāvaya as one of a group of locations associated with deliverance of Jinas and vv. 433–444 for the Jina Rṣabha gaining liberation there; see also *Kalpa Sūtra* p. 76 l. 16 and Vimalasūri, *Paumacariya* 5.88. For the name Aṭṭhāvaya (Sanskrit Aṣṭāpada) see section F.

- 86 The shrines on Mount Aṭṭhāvaya were erected by the emperor Bharata who was accepted as being the son of the Jina Rṣabha by the time of the composition of the ĀvNiry. However, *Hiraprasnottara* no. 214 refers to the “middle” of the *Śatruñjaya mahātmya* for the images being installed (*pratimāpratiṣṭhā*) on the mountain by a pupil of Rṣabha. See *Hiraprasnottara* 2.13 for the *Vasudevahiṇḍi* being the source for the *caityas* on Aṣṭāpada lasting through the *avasarpinī* and the last question in the *Hiraprasnottara* which relates to the eternity of the temples on Mount Aṣṭāpada compared to those on Śatruñjaya. *Hiraprasnottara* 7.5 refers to the *vṛtti* on the *Aupapātika Sūtra* (Amaḍa section) glossing *ceiāṇi caityāni* by *arhatpratimāḥ*. *Hiraprasnottara* 38.4 asks: why are the shrines erected by Bharata on Aṣṭāpada still standing while those he erected on Śatruñjaya have experienced numerous vicissitudes and restorations? How is there such a difference when they are so near to each other? In answer it states that those on Aṣṭāpada are immune because they are inviolable (*nirapāyatvāt*) owing to the proximity of the gods. The *Vasudevahiṇḍi* states that they will last into the next *utsarpinī*.

- 87 Hiravijayasūri (1526–1595) states that while no explicit statement can be found, the supposition is that only those who are in possession of superhuman power gained through

the lord knew what he was thinking, and that two things had been brought about—the future awakening of ascetics and the establishing of Goyama's confidence; he knew full well that they would all be awakened. The other sought leave from the lord to go to Mount Aṭṭhāvaya. The blessed one replied, "Go to Mount Aṭṭhāvaya and pay homage to the shrines." Then having paid homage in delight and satisfaction to the blessed one he went off.

D6 *ĀvCū p. 383 ll. 3–7*

*tattha ya Aṭṭhāpade jaṇavādaṃ soṭṭa tiṇṇi tāvasā paṃcapaṃcasayapari-vārā*⁸⁸ *patteyaṃ te Aṭṭhāvayaṃ vilaggāmo tti tattha kilassaṃti*,⁸⁹ *Koḍinno*⁹⁰ *Dinno Sevālo, jo Koḍinno so cautthaṃ*⁹¹ *kāūṇa pacchā mūlaṃ kaṃ-dāṇi*⁹² *āhāreti sacittāṇi, so paḍhamāṃ mehalāṃ vilaggo, Dinno chaṭṭhaṃ chaṭṭheṇaṃ*⁹³ *kāūṇaṃ parisadḍiapaṃḍupattāṇi*⁹⁴ *āhāreti, so bitiyaṃ mehalāṃ vilaggo, Sevālo aṭṭhamāṃ*⁹⁵ *kāūṇa jo sevālo sayāṃmatellao taṃ āhāreti, so satiyaṃ mehalāṃ vilaggo, evaṃ te 'vi tāva kilassaṃti*.⁹⁶

austerity and moral restraint can reach the summit of Mount Aṣṭāpada to gain liberation in that lifetime. Accordingly demons, monkeys and the category of flying monk known as *cāraṇa* must be excluded. See *Hīrapraśnottara* 3.11: *Aṣṭāpādagirau svakīya-labdhīyā ye jīnapratimāṃ vandante tadbhavasiddhigāminā ity akṣarāṇi santi. tathā ca sati ye vidyādharayamīnas tathā rākṣasavānaracāraṇabhedabhinṇā aneke ye tapasvīnas tatra gantuṃ śaktāḥ teṣāṃ sarveṣāṃ api tadbhavasiddhigāmitvaṃ āpadyate, tataḥ sā kā labdhir yayā tatra gamane Gautamādivat tadbhavasiddhigāmino bhavanti? iti praśno 'trottaram—Aṣṭāpādagirau ye tapaḥsaṃyamotthalabdhīyā yātrāṃ kurvanti te tadbhavasiddhigāminā iti saṃbhāvyate vyaktākṣarāṇulambhāt.*

88 H: *paṃcasayaparivārā*; Śīlāṅka, *Cauppannamahāpurīsayacariyaṃ* p. 222: *Koṇḍiṇṇasa-gottāṇaṃ tāvasāṇaṃ paṇṇarasa sayāṇi saṃbujjhaṃti*. The commentarial tradition on the *Uttarādhyāyana Sūtra* has *paṃcapaṃca*. See *Uttarādhyāyana Niryukti* v. 296: *ikkikkassa ya tesīṃ parivāro paṃca paṃca sayā* (see below) with Ś (p. 273) and D p. 154b l. 2: *tiṇṇi tāvasā paṃcapaṃcasayaparivārā patteyaṃ patteyaṃ te 'Aṭṭhāvayaṃ vilaggāmo' tti tattha kilassaṃti*. For discussion see Appendix 1.

89 H omits *tattha kilassaṃti*.

90 H: *Koṇḍiṇṇo*; UttNiry vv. 293 and 296, also Ś: *Koḍinna*; Śīlāṅka, *Cauppannamahāpurīsayacariya* p. 322: *Koṇḍiṇṇa*.

91 The edition has *cautthaṃ* 2. For fasts involving the fourth, sixth and eighth meals, that is 1^{1/2}, 2^{1/2} and 3^{1/2} meals see Roth 1983: 168–169.

92 H: *mūlakamāṇi*.

93 H: *chaṭṭhassa* 2. See note 91.

94 Cf. *Aupapātika Sūtra* para 74: *parisadḍiya-kanda-mūla-taya-patta-puppha-phal'-āhārā*.

95 H: *aṭṭhamāṃ aṭṭheṇa*.

96 H omits *evaṃ te 'vi tāva kilassaṃti*.

There at Aṭṭhāvaya were three ascetics,⁹⁷ each with five hundred followers⁹⁸ who had heard the rumour about the mountain. They had resolved to scale Aṭṭhāvaya but became exhausted on it. They were Koḍinna, Dinna and Sevāla.⁹⁹ Koḍinna performed a fast of one and a half day's duration and then ate roots and tubers with life forms in them. He had reached the first terrace of the mountain.¹⁰⁰ Dinna performed a fast of two and a half days' duration and then ate fallen and sere leaves.¹⁰¹ He had reached the second terrace. Sevāla performed a fast of three and a half days' duration, then if there was any withered pondweed he ate it.¹⁰² He had reached the third terrace. In this way they were simply exhausted.

D7 *ĀvCū p. 383 ll. 7–11*

*bhagavaṃ ca Goyamaṃ orālasarīraṃ hutavahataḍḍitataḍḍiyataruṇaraviki-
raṇasarisateyaṃ¹⁰³ ejaṃtaṃ pecchaṃti, te bhaṇaṃti—esa kira ettha
thullao samaṇo vilaggiḥiṭi? jaṃ amhe mahātavassī sukkhā bhukkhā¹⁰⁴ ṇa*

97 For *tāvasas* as one of five types of *samaṇa* who should not receive homage see *ĀvCū* Vol. 2 p. 20 ll. 4–5: *ime vi paṃca ṇa avaṃḍiyavvā samaṇasaddhe vi sati, jahā ājivagā tāvasā pāri-vvāyagā taccamṇiṇi, boḍḍiā*. See also Mahetā 1989: 278–279. For the generic category of *tāpasa* in the Pali Jātakas, see McGovern 2019: 114–115.

98 My translation follows H. As it stands the number *paṃcapaṃcasaya-* in the *ĀvCū* seems to mean “505”, but it may possibly signify “a full 500” with the repetition of *paṃca* being a form of *ānreḍḍita*. Cf. for earlier Prakrit Aśoka Rock Edict 3C: *paṃcasu paṃcasu vasesu*, “every five years” (Tieken 2023: 63). Elsewhere in the Śvetāmbara *āgama*, *paṃca sayā* is a standard round number; see Deleu 1996: 37 l. 4 and Roth 1983: 67. Cf. Anālayo 2016: 27 for Mahāpajāpati entering the Buddhist *saṅgha* with 500 nuns. The reference in this context by Mette 1987: 147 to the *pañcavargiṇa* monks converted by the Buddha is a component of an interpretation with Buddhist influence of the *ĀvCū* narrative. For further discussion see Appendix 1. For *parivāra* as a type of Jain monastic grouping, see Caillat 1965: 27.

99 For these names see section G.

100 For *meḥalā* as “terrace”, see Shah 1955: 116–117; he refers to Bharata who in order to protect the mountain erected eight “steps” in the form of terraces. Cf. Kālidāsa, *Kumārasambhava* 8.67 where the sense of *mekhalā* seems to be “slope of mountain”.

101 For *śīrṇaparnāśin* as a category of ascetic described in the *Mahābhārata*, see Hildebeitel 2016: 37–38. *Senaprasāna* 47.1 for the roots of a tuber (*kanda*) containing many life forms but not its leaves.

102 Cf. *Aupapātika Sūtra* para 74: *sevālabhakkhiṇo*.

103 Mette 1987: 140 n. 2 identifies this compound as a *veḍha* taken from the description of Mahāvīra at *Aupapātika Sūtra* para. 16. In fact, it has been adapted: in Leumann's edition p. 31 the reading is *huyavaha-niddhūma-jaliya-taḍḍi-taḍḍiya-taruṇa-ravi-kiraṇa-sarisa-tee*.

104 H: *sukkā lukkhā*; Ś p. 273 and D p. 154b: *sukkā bhukkhā*; cf. *Jñātādharmakathāḥ Sūtra* p. 14

*tarāmo vilaggituṃ, bhagavaṃ ca Goyame¹⁰⁵ jaṃghācaraṇaladdhīe taṃ-
tulūtāpuḍagaṃ¹⁰⁶ pi ṇīsāe uppayati, jāva te paloemti, esa āgato tti 2 eso
addaṃsaṇaṃ gato tti, tāhe te vimhitā jātā pasamaṃsaṃti, acchaṃti ya pa-
loemti jadi otarati tā eyassa vayaṃ sisā, evaṃ te¹⁰⁷ paḍicchaṃtā accha-
ṃti,*

They saw the venerable Goyama approaching, splendid in form,¹⁰⁸ reful-
gent as fire, lightning and the rays of the new risen sun. And they said,
“Will this stout¹⁰⁹ monk here actually climb the mountain? For we mighty
ascetics, dried up and famished, cannot do so.” The venerable Goyama
flew up by means of the magic power of “flying with the legs”, sitting
on a slender spider’s web¹¹⁰ while they watched in astonishment and

l. 4 (*sukkā bhukkhā* referring to the queen Dhāriṇī, with variant *sukkhā* attested in six manuscripts) and *Nirayāvalīyāsuyakkhandha* 1.7 and 8 for *sukka bhukkhā* (Deleu 1996: 40 and also 42 for the noun *bhukkhā*, “hunger” recorded in Hemacandra’s *Deśināmamālā*). For *sukka* as equivalent of Sanskrit *śuṣka* see Bollée 1994 s.v. The adjective *bhukkhā*, for which there is no obvious Sanskrit equivalent, would appear to have the sense of “famished”. Despite being listed as a headword in the *Ardhamāgadhī* dictionary, it occurs only in conjunction with *sukkhā*, less commonly *sukka*, rather than as a fully independent adjective which suggests that its function is partly connected with assonance. The occurrence of *lukkha* in some of the sources such as H and also *Nāyā* (p. 72 l. 19: *tavokammeṇaṃ sukke lukkhe nimmaṃse*) permits reference to an analogous Buddhist Sanskrit form *śuddhalūkha* in a verse occurring in the *Śarabhaṅga Jātaka* of the *Mahāvastu* (Marciniak 2019: 463); this describes five hundred root and fruit eating ascetics living on the slopes of Mount Himavat: *pañca śātāni Himavantapārśvena mūlaphalāhārā riṣayaḥ vasensuḥ / umṇchai ratā tāpasā śuddhalūkhā susaṃyatā ugratapā udārā* ||. Jones 1956: 363 renders the expression by “pure though poor”, citing the variant form *lūha* as meaning “poor” of bodily condition.

105 Nominative singular in -e.

106 H: *lūtāpuḍagaṃ*.

107 H: *te tiṇṇi vi*.

108 *orālasarīraṃ* is the equivalent of Sanskrit *udāraśarīraṃ*; cf. the *Mahāvastu* verse quoted in n. 104 where the Himavat ascetics are described as *udāra* (Jones op.cit. “sublime”).

109 For Goyama’s appearance see section H.

110 See Wiley 2012: 145 n. 1 for general remarks on *labdhi* and 179 for the attainment of flying with the legs; see *Bhagavatī* 20.9, for the contents of which see Leumann in Bollée 1997: 332–333; also Deleu 1970: 257 for *jaṃgha-cāraṇa-laddhi*. The *ĀvCū* seems to be amalgamating two kinds of *labdhi*: thigh flying and thread flying. For the Digambara perspective on yogic flying see Cort 2022: 29. Cf. Śilāṅka’s *Cauppannamamahāpurisacarīya* p. 323 v. 647b: *ravikiraṇakārālambaṇavaseṇa addaṃsaṇaṃ patto*. The early seventeenth century Sanskrit *mahākāvya*, the *Hīrasaubhāgya* of Devavīmala 4.9 has Gautama ascending Aṣṭāpada by clutching the rays of the sun as ropes. *Ṛṣimaṇḍalavṛtti* quoted by *Hīrasaubhāgya* 4.9 autocomm: *tapaḥkṛśāṅgās taṃ śailaṃ āroḍhuṃ vayaṃ na kṣamāḥ | caḍhiṣyati kathaṃ prauḍhadeho ’yaṃ gajarājavat || paśyatsu teṣu mārtāṇḍakarān ālambya Gautamaḥ | ga-*

said, “He came and then disappeared”. They praised him, waiting to see if he descended so that they could become his pupils. In this way they remained waiting.

D8 *ĀvCū p. 383 ll. 11–12*

*sāmī vi cetiyāiṃ vaṃdittā uttarapucchime*¹¹¹ *disibhāge puḍhavisilāpa-
ṭṭae*¹¹² *tuyaṭṭo*,¹¹³ *asogavarapāḍavassa ahe taṃ rayañiṃ vāsāe uvagato* ||

The Lord for his part paid homage to the shrines, went to the north-west region and took his rest on a stone slab on the ground, passing the night under a fine aśoka tree.

D9 *p. 383 l. 11–p. 384 l. 1*

*ito ya Sakkassa loyapālo Vesamaṇo, so vi Aṭṭhāpadaṃ cetiyavaṃdao eti, so
cetiyaṇi vaṃdittā Goyamasāmīṃ vaṃdati, tāhe so dhammam kaheti, bha-
gavaṃ anagāraguṇe parikahetuṃ pavatto, aṃtāhārā paṃtāhārā*¹¹⁴ *evaṃ*

nabhrn nijalabdhyaivāṣṭāpadordhvaṃ yayau dhruvam || Also *Vandāruvrtti: sūryasyāṃśūn
samāśritya teṣāṃ utpaśyatām* | *sa Gaurutmān ivodḍīya yayau maikṣu gireḥ śiraḥ* || *tathā
bhagavaṃ Goyamo jaṅghācāraṇaladdhīe lūtāpuḍagaṃmi nissāe uḍḍham uppayai java te
palāyanti ity Avasyakasāhasryām* | *Malayagirivṛttāv apy ayam eva pāṭhaḥ* |.

111 H: *uttarapuratthime*. Although the form *uttarapucchima* is not cited in Poddar 2009 or Sheth 1963 (also lacking *pucchima*), it could be the equivalent of Sanskrit *uttarapaścima*, “north-western”, with labialisation a > u in the second component of the compound, and I have so translated it. The connection of this region with the god Vāyu makes this interpretation apposite, given Goyama’s superhuman ascent of Aṭṭhāvaya. It is however possible that a syllable has dropped out of the *ĀvCū* form. Cf. *Municandrasūri on Upadeśapada* p. 118: *uttarapuricchimāe disāe*. Poddar cites *uttarapuracchima* s.v. as a wrong reading in the *Vasudevahiṇḍi* for *uttarapuratthima*, “north-eastern”, the reading in H p. 106 which may inform Mette 1987: 141 and 2010: 186, “nordöstlicher”. Cf. Ś on *Uttarādhyayana Nirukti* v. 305 p. 273 l. 13: *uttarapuracchime* and D p. 154 ll. 3–4: *uttarapuratthime*. The similarity between the ligatures *tth* / *cch* is well known; see Koch 2000: 377 and Roth 1983: 66 (and also p. 155 for *paccatthima* and *puratthima* which Pischel derives from *purastima*).

112 For the phrase *puḍhavisilāvaṭṭae* as part of a *jāva* insertion in *Āyāradasāo* 5.1, see Schubring 1966: 11. For the phrase *puḍhavisilāpaṭṭae* as a stereotyped expression from *Aupapātika Sūtra* para 10 found in the *Nirayāvaliyāo*, see Deleu 1996: 31.

113 H omits *tuyaṭṭo*.

114 For *anta-panta* as a stereotyped phrase see Mette 1974: 74 n. 126. *ĀvCū* p. 386 l. 5: the exiguous food brings about a feverish illness in *Kaṃḍarīya* (see section D10c) as with *Selaga* (*annayā tassa Kaṃḍarīyassa antehi* (sic) *ya paṃtehi ya jahā Selagassa jāva dāhavakkantīe yāvi viharati*) = *Nāyā* p. 350 para. 143 ll. 5–6 (for *jāva* n. 6: pp. 124 and 125, referring to the

*vanneti jahā Dasannabhaddakakahāṇage aṇagāravannage,*¹¹⁵ *Vesamaṇo cimteti—esa bhagavaṃ erise sādhuḡe vanneti, appaṇo ya sā imā sarīra-sukumārātā, erisā devāṇa vi ṇatthi, tattha bhagavaṃ tassa ākūtaṃ ṇāuṃ Puṃḍarīyaṃ ṇāmaṃ ajjhayaṇaṃ pannaveti, jahā [...]*

At that time Vesamaṇa, the god Sakka's guardian of the directions,¹¹⁶ came to Aṭṭhāvaya to pay homage to the shrines. Having paid homage to the shrines, he paid homage to Lord Goyama. Then he spoke about the Jain doctrine, whereupon the venerable one began to describe the qualities of homeless renunciants, depicting how their food is exiguous and base according to the account of homeless renunciants in the story of Dasannabhaddaka.¹¹⁷ Vesamaṇa thought, "The venerable one here describes the qualities of monks in such terms, but look at how delicate his own body is, of a type that even the gods do not possess!" Then the venerable one, understanding what was preoccupying him, expounded the chapter entitled "Puṃḍarīya". To wit

The *Puṃḍarīka ajjhayaṇa* is the nineteenth chapter of the *Jñātādharmakathāḥ Sūtra*, the sixth *aṅga* text of the *Ardhamāgadhī āgama*. As the ĀvCū's version of this story is lengthy, I restrict myself to a summary. In appendix 2 I will draw attention to significant aspects of this narrative, and subsequently discuss passages which differ from the canonical version in the *Jñātādharmakathāḥ Sūtra*.¹¹⁸

D10 *ĀvCū p. 383 l. 2–p. 389 l. 7*

- a. After Mahāpauma, the king of Pokkhalāvaī, has renounced, his son Puṃḍarīya succeeds him, taking the lay vows, while his brother Kaṃḍarīya becomes the crown-prince.

story of Selaga at *Nāyā* 5; Ś p. 274 ll. 31–32: *aṇtehi ya paṇtehi ya jāva rogāyaṇke pāubbhūe jāva dāhavakkantīe yāvi viharati*).

115 H: *tato se bhagavaṃ dhammakahāvasare aṇagāraguṇe parikaheī, jahā bhagavaṃto sāha-vo aṇtāhārā evamādi*. D p. 155b ll. 6–8: *tā aṇtāhārā aṇtāhārā iccāpariūvaṇāe viṣaṇ-vāiṇaṃ ceṭṭhaṃ imassa sarīrāgū sūei, taṇ ca tassa ākūyaṃ nāṇeṇa nāūna bhayavaṃ 'mā aṇeṇa kusalapariṇāmeṇa esa dullahabohio havau' tti aṇusāsaṇanimittaṃ savvasattahi-yarao Puṃḍarīyaṃ nāma 'jjhayaṇaṃ pariūvei*.

116 See section D1.

117 Not referred to by H. See note 197. Mette 1987: 141 refers without explanation to the story of "Dhannabhadda"; however, see Mette 2010: 383.

118 See the Jaina Āgama series edition of Muni Jambūvijaya, p. 348–354. Mette 1987: 141 n. 3 and 142 n. 4 and Schubring 1978 provide some textual background. The ĀvCū p. 384 gives the

- b. Kaṇḍarīya asks Puṇḍarīya for permission to renounce the world and become a monk. He remains silent in the face of his brother's lengthy accounts of the difficulties of the renunciant life. Puṇḍarīya describes various types of food of unappetising or forbidden nature which, as a mendicant, Kaṇḍarīya will have to accept or reject.
- c. Despite Puṇḍarīya pointing out to his brother that he is habituated to comfort and should therefore postpone renunciation, Kaṇḍarīya replies that while the Jain ascetic path is difficult for inferior people, it is not so for heroes. Puṇḍarīya accordingly gives Kaṇḍarīya permission to renounce. On becoming a monk Kaṇḍarīya suffers because of the inadequate diet and becomes ill with a fever. When his monastic companions' wandering takes them to the capital city of Pokkhalāvāi, Puṇḍarīya cures his brother of his illness through giving him normal food. He expresses his admiration for Kaṇḍarīya as one who has become fulfilled by entering the renunciant path as opposed to enduring the transient vicissitudes of kingship.
- d. Kaṇḍarīya resumes his ascetic wanderings in shame and arrogance until eventually disillusioned with the ascetic life and withdrawing from his fellow monks, Kaṇḍarīya returns to the capital and sits brooding near Puṇḍarīya's palace.
- e. Puṇḍarīya, alerted to Kaṇḍarīya's presence, confirms with his brother that his addiction to pleasures has inhibited his renunciant career and that he is not suited to being a monk. He installs Kaṇḍarīya on the throne, takes renunciation himself, assuming his brother's ascetic accoutrements, and enters upon the wandering life.
- f. Kaṇḍarīya, now installed as king in the palace, quickly dies in agony because of a surfeit of food and sexual indulgence, and is reborn in hell.
- g. The ascetic Puṇḍarīya is tormented by his obligatory exiguous diet, and experiences the same sort of terminal indigestion as his brother. However, he dies in a controlled manner, to be reborn as a god and eventually attain liberation in the continent of Mahāvideha.

Goyama then explains to Vesamaṇa the point of the story he has just told.

title of the chapter as *Poṇḍarīya* which might be the equivalent of Sanskrit *Paṇḍarika*, "relating to Puṇḍarika." Throughout the ĀvCū version the name is Puṇḍarīa or Poṇḍarīa. ĀvCū pp. 387–388 l. 1 (translation Mette 2010: 66–67 but not with reference to the story of Goyama). Mette 2010: 186, also 1987: 142 n. 4, adds verses from the commentarial tradition summing up the story.

D11 *ĀvCū p. 389 l. 7–10*

*taṃ mā tumam dubballattaṃ baliyattaṃ vā geṇhehi. jahā so Kaṃḍarīto teṇaṃ dubbaleṇaṃ aṭṭaduhaṭṭavasatto*¹¹⁹ *sattamāe uvavanno, Puṃḍario paḍipunnagalakavolo Savvaṭṭhasiddhe uvavanno evaṃ devānuppitā balio dubbalo vā akāraṇaṃ, ettha jhāṇaniggaho kātavvo, jhāṇaniggaho paramaṃ pamāṇaṃ. tatha Vesamaṇo aho bhagavatā ākūtaṃ ṇātaṃ ti ettha atīvasaṃvegamaṇvanno*¹²⁰ *vaṃdittā paḍigato.*

“So do not think in terms of weakness or strength. For just as Kaṃḍarīya who because of his frailty became anguished, in an agony of suffering and wretchedly in thrall to his senses, and was reborn in the seventh hell, so Puṃḍarīya, whose neck and cheeks were full, was reborn in the Savvaṭṭhasiddhi heaven.¹²¹ Therefore, beloved of the gods,¹²² being either strong or weak is not a cause.¹²³ In this respect one should control mental preoccupation; the best standard is control of mental preoccupation.”¹²⁴ Then Vesamaṇa, knowing that the Lord had understood his inner thoughts, feeling great aversion to worldly things, paid homage and left.

D12 *ĀvCū p. 389 ll. 10–11*

*tattha Vesamaṇassa ego sāmāṇito teṇa taṃ Puṃḍarīyajjhayaṇaṃ ogāhitaṃ paṃca satāṇi, saṃmattaṃ ca paḍivanno, keti bhaṇaṃti a—jaṃbhago so.*¹²⁵

119 H: *aṭṭaduhaṭṭo kālagato ahe sattamāe uvavanno*. The compound *aṭṭaduhaṭṭavasatto* is canonical; see *Jñātādharmakathāḥ Sūtra* 1.8 (Muni Jambūvijaya's edition p. 158 l. 12, with note 11 giving Abhayadevasūri's interpretation; cf. Roth 1983: 93: “gequält, vom Leid bedrängt, und in qualvoller Abhängigkeit.”). While it might seem a generalised expression of anguish (cf. Mette 2010: 186: “auf das äußerste gepeinigt”), the assonant repetition of *aṭṭa* connects in the *ĀvCū* with the type of psychologically unhealthy preoccupation against which Goyama is counselling Vesamaṇa. It is also possible that *aṭṭa* might be taken as “emaciated” (see Ghatage 2004 s.v.), which would give further point to the contrast between Kaṃḍarīya and Puṃḍarīya.

120 H: *āuṭṭo saṃvegamaṇvanno*.

121 For the Savvaṭṭhasiddhi heaven see Kirfel 1967: 294 and 298.

122 The tone here may be slightly sarcastic; see Deshpande 2009: 31–33.

123 See section I (i).

124 See section I (ii).

125 H: *tattha Vesamaṇassa ego sāmāṇio devo jaṃbhago, tena taṃ Puṃḍarīyajjhayaṇaṃ uggaḥiyaṃ paṃcasayāṇi, sammattaṃ ca paḍivanno*.

A *sāmānīa* god was attendant on Vesamaṇa there.¹²⁶ He absorbed himself in the story of Puṃḍarīya five hundred times¹²⁷ and gained correct religious attitude. Some say that he was a *jaṃbhaga* deity.¹²⁸

D13 *ĀvCū pp. 389 l. 11–p. 390 l. 1*

tāhe bhagavaṃ kallaṃ cetitāṇi vaṃdittā paccoruhati, te tāvasā bhaṇaṃti—tubbhe amhaṃ āyariyā amhe tubbhaṃ sisā, sāmī bhaṇaṃti—tujja ya amha tiloyagurū āyariyā, te bhaṇaṃti—tubbha vi anno āyariyo? tāhe sāmī bhagavato guṇasaṃthavaṃ kareti,¹²⁹ te pavvāvitā, devatāe liṃgāṇi uvaṇī-tāṇi, tāhe te bhagavayā saddhiṃ vaccaṃti, bhikkhāvelā ya jātā, bhagavaṃ bhaṇaṃti—kiṃ āñijjatu?¹³⁰ te bhaṇaṃti—pāyaso, bhagavaṃ ca savvala-ddhisampanno paḍiggahaṃ ghayamadhusaṃjuttassa bharettā¹³¹ āgato, tāhe bhaṇitā parivādīe thāha, te thitā, bhagavaṃ ca akkhīnamahāṇasio, te dhātā, tāhe suṭṭhutarāṃ āuttā, tāhe sayāṃ āhāreti.¹³²

126 See section D1.

127 The meaning is uncertain and my translation is accordingly provisional. The version of this story given by Mūnicandrasūri in his commentary on Haribhadra's *Upadeśapada* (p. 119 v. 114–115) describes the *jaṃbhaga* deity studying the Puṃḍarīya chapter which is “five hundred *granthas* in length” and so gaining perfect *samyaktva* (*vaṃdittā bhagavaṃtaṃ gao tao tattha jaṃbhago devo | ego Vesamaṇasamo Puṃḍarīyājijhayaṇaṃ uccariyaṃ || Nāyādhammakahāsūṃ sīṭṭhaṃ paṃcasayagaṃdhaparimāṇaṃ | avadhārei lahei ya suddhaṃ sammattam aha eso ||*). For the expression *granthaparimāṇa* as designating the extent of a work see Balbir 2022a: 122 n. 16. The next verse describes how a little less than five hundred years after Mahāvīra's death the god fell from heaven (*paṃcasu saesu varisāṇaṃ aigaesum jīṇāo Vīrāo / kiṃcūnesu sa jaṃbhagadevo caviūṇa suralogā ||*). Mette 1987: 142 and 2010: 187 omits the reference to the god studying the Puṃḍarīya story in both her translations no doubt because its linkage to the broader story of the teacher Vaira is not germane to her discussion.

128 Balbir 1993a: 115 regards the phrase *keī bhaṇaṃti* as indicative of an alternative version reflecting an oral unfixed background to a story; see section B. According to the *Jinacarita* of the *Kalpa Sūtra* p. 54 paragraph 89 and p. 57 para 98 the *jaṃbhaya* (Sanskrit *jṛmbhaka*) gods are servants of Vesamaṇa. See also note 329.

129 D p. 158 ll. 10–14: *tāhe sāmī bhagavao guṇasaṃthavaṇaṃ kareī—jahā savvannū savva-damī rūvasaṃpayāe aharikayabhuvano kiṃkarikayasayalasurāsuro suravīraiyaraya-ṇamaya-siṃhāsaṇovavīṭṭho suravaracalijjamāṇacāmarajuyalo uvaridhariyavalachatta-ttao rayāṇa-kaṇaya-kalahoyamayapāyāratiyaparivalaio samaṇo bhayavaṃ Mahāvīro bhavvasattāṇaṃ hammaṃ vāgaramto sampayaṃ Caṃpāe viharai so amha gurū imaṃ ca soṇa jāo tāṇa mahaṃto parioso, viyalio kammagaṃthī, pāviyaṃ sammaddaṃsaṇaṃ, jāo caraṇaparīṇāmo, gahiyā Goyamasamīve pavvajjā.*

130 H: *kiṃ āñijjau pāraṇaṃ iti.*

131 H: *paḍiggahaṃ ghatamadhusaṃjuttassa pāyasassa bharettā.*

132 H: *te bhagavatā akkhīnamahāṇasieṇa savve uvatthiyā, pacchā appaṇā jimito, tato te suṭṭhutarāṃ āuttā.*

Then the blessed one paid homage to the shrines the next day and descended. The ascetics said, “You are our teacher and we are your pupils.” The lord replied, “The guru of the universe is the teacher of you and me”. The ascetics said, “Is there anyone other than you who can be our teacher?” Then the lord praised the qualities of the blessed one.¹³³ They were given renunciant initiation; the deity brought them the necessary monastic accoutrements.¹³⁴ Then they moved off with the blessed one. The time for seeking alms food came. The blessed one said, “What should be brought?” They said, “Rice cooked in milk.”¹³⁵ The blessed one, who was possessed of all the superhuman powers,¹³⁶ returned carrying a bowl containing a mixture of ghee and honey. He then said to them, “Stand in a line”. They did so and the blessed one produced food which did not diminish. They were fed and as a result they took a turn for the better. Then he himself ate.

D14 *ĀvCū p. 390 ll. 1–4*

tāhe punar avi paṭṭhito,¹³⁷ tesim ca sevālabhakkhāṇaṃ jemintāṇaṃ ceva nāṇaṃ uppannaṃ, Dinnassa vagge chattādicchattaṃ peccaṃtāṇaṃ, Koḍinnassa vagge sāmūṇi daṭṭhūṇaṃ uppannaṃ,¹³⁸ Goyamasāmi purato

133 D provides more detail about the manner in which the ascetics become Jain monks. After Goyama has confirmed the glorious nature of his teacher Mahāvīra currently preaching in his *samavasaraṇa* at Campā, the ascetics in delight have the knot of their karma broken and attain correct view, thus bringing to an end their previous ascetic regime.

134 It is not actually specified that this is the *sāmāṇia* deity mentioned at D1 and D11.

135 For *pāyasa* as rice cooked in milk and mixed with sugar, the equivalent of Hindi *khīr*, see Prakash 1961: 290 with reference to the *Gṛhya Sūtras*.

136 For the superhuman powers including the ability to produce inexhaustible food (*akkhiṇamahāṇasia*), see section J. The scenario depicted here by the *ĀvCū* narrative was at a later period regarded as possibly controversial by some members of the Jain community. So Hiravijayasūri, the de facto leader of the Śvetāmbara renunciant community in north India at the end of the sixteenth century, is recorded in the *Hīrapraśnottarāṇi* (“Questions to Hiravijayasūri and his Responses”) compiled by Kīrtivijayaḡaṇin as having been asked whether the giving of miraculously generated food (*paramāṇṇa*) to bring the ascetics’ fasting to an end (*pāraṇā*) infringes correct procedure for the receiving of alms by monks. Hiravijaya’s response is slightly evasive: a single bowl (*patadgraha*) served the purpose of all of them and nothing about the food can lead to it being adjudged to have been improperly given (*adatta*).

137 H omits.

138 H: *tesim ca sevālabhakkhāṇaṃ paṃcaṇha vi sayāṇaṃ Gotamasāmiṇo taṃ laddhiṃ pāsi-*

*kaḍḍhemāṇo*¹³⁹ *sāmīṃ payāhiṇīkareti, te vi kevalīparisaṃ padhāvitā*,¹⁴⁰ *Goyamasāmī bhaṇati—eha sāmīṃ vaṇḍaha, sāmī bhaṇati-Goyama, mā kevalī āsāehi.*

Then he set out again. For those consuming pondweed knowledge arose as they ate;¹⁴¹ in Dinna's group knowledge arose as they saw the double parasol;¹⁴² and in Koḍinna's group it arose as they actually saw the lord. Then lord Goyama, who led them, performed circumambulation of the lord. They for their part headed towards the assembly of the omniscient ones. Lord Goyama said, "Go, pay homage to the lord." The lord said, "Goyama, don't disrespect the omniscient ones."¹⁴³

D15 *ĀvCū p. 390 ll. 4–7*

*Goyamasāmī āuṭṭo micchādukkakaḍḍhaṃ*¹⁴⁴ *kareti, tato Goyamasāmiṃ suṭṭhutaṃ addhiṭi jātā*,¹⁴⁵ *tāhe sāmī Gotamaṃ bhaṇati—kiṃ devāṇaṃ vayaṇaṃ gejjhaṃ āu*¹⁴⁶ *jiṇāṇaṃ?, Goyamo bhaṇati—jinavarāṇaṃ, to kīsa addhiṭiṃ karesi, tāhe sāmī cattāri kaḍḍhaṃ pannaveti, taṃ jahā-suṃbakaḍḍhaṃ vidala- camma- kaṃbalakaḍḍhaṃ evaṃ sīsā vi*,¹⁴⁷ *Goyamasāmī ya kaṃba-*

ūṇa kevalanāṇaṃ uppaṇṇaṃ, Diṇṇassa puṇo saparivārassa bhagavato chattāticchattaṃ pāsīṇa kevalanāṇaṃ uppaṇṇa, Koḍiṇṇassa vi sāmīṃ datṭhūṇa kevalanāṇaṃ uppaṇṇaṃ. D p. 158b ll. 1–6: tesīṃ ca sevālabhakkagāṇaṃ jemaṇṭāṇaṃ ceva jāo suhapariṇāmo, ciṇṭiṃ ca pavattā,—aho! amha kusalakammodao jaṃ jāo aṇabbhavuṭṭhisariso samatthasuyamahoyahinā aṇurattagaṇanihiṇā siddhipurisatthavāheṇa Goyamasāmiṇā saddhiṃ samāgamo ... l. 5: evamāsaṃvegabhāvaṇovagayāṇa apuvvakaraṇāikameṇa addhabhutte ceva tesīṃ uppannam kevalanāṇaṃ.

139 *ĀvCū kaddhemāṇo*; for *kaḍḍhai* see Karashima 2012: 3.

140 *ĀvCū pahāvitā.*

141 That is, as they witnessed Goyama's powers.

142 That is, they saw from a distance the double parasol, the royal emblem floating over the head of the Jina as he sat in his *samavasaraṇa*, before they saw Mahāvira himself.

143 Cf. section D4.

144 H: *bhagavaṃ āuṭṭo micchāmidukkaḍḍhaṃ ti karei.*

145 For this phrase see also *ĀvCū p. 172 l. 6*; H: *tato bhagavaṃ suṭṭhutaṃ addhiṭi.*

146 For *āu* see Bollée 1998: vol. 3 s.v. and also Poddar 2009: 924.

147 H: *evaṃ sīsā vi suṃbakaḍḍhasamāne 4, tumaṃ ca Goyamā mama kaṃbalakaḍḍhasamāno, aviya-cirasasiṭṭho 'si me Goyama.* This relates to *Sthānāṅga Sūtra sū. 350 p. 463: cattāri kaḍḍhaṃ pannattā taṃ jahā—suṃṭhakaḍḍha, vidalakaḍḍha, cammakakaḍḍha, kaṃbalakaḍḍha*; p. 67: *Abhayadevasūri: tatra suṃṭhakaḍḍha tti tṭṭaviṣeṣaṇiṣpannaḥ.*

*lakaḍasāmāṇo,*¹⁴⁸ *kiṃ ca ciraśaṃsaṭṭhe*¹⁴⁹ *si Goyamā jāva avisesamaṇā-*
*nattā bhaviṣṣāmo,*¹⁵⁰ *tāhe sāmī Dumapattayaṃ nāma ajjhayaṇaṃ pa-*
nnaveti ||

Lord Goyama in contrition recited the formula of repentance.¹⁵¹ Then lord Goyama became all the more insecure. So the lord said to Goyama, “Is the word of the gods to be accepted, or that of the Jinas?”¹⁵² Goyama said, “That of the excellent Jinas.” “Why then are you insecure?” Then the Lord described four mats, namely cord, bamboo, hide, and wool. “Pupils are similar. Lord Goyama is like a wool mat. Moreover, Goyama, you have been long associated with me ... and we will not have any distinction and difference between us.” Then the Lord recited the chapter of the *Uttarā-dhyayana Sūtra* called “The Leaf of the Tree”.¹⁵³

E The Main Structural and Thematic Aspects of the Story

Two salient structural features of this story are readily identifiable, albeit they do not necessarily define any overall narrative “meaning”.

Firstly, Mahāvīra’s repeated admonition to Goyama not to denigrate *kevalins*, or by an alternative interpretation not to count himself among them (D4 and D13), anchors and shapes the story by pointing a contrast both humorous and poignant (resolved in D14) between two groups of recent renunciants who

148 For *sāmāṇa* as equivalent of *samāna* see Sheth 1963 s.v.

149 Nominative singular in -e. However, this may be a misprint; Mette 1987: 144 n. 6 has *cira-saṃsaṭṭho si. Goyamā* exemplifies prolated final vowel in the vocative.

150 H: *Paṇṇattīlāvagā bhāṇīyavvā jāva avisesamaṇānattā aṃte*. The required textual insertion signalled by *jāva* derives from *Bhagavatī Sūtra* 14.7 ed. Dīparatnasāgara pp. 148–149 (slightly altered): *Rāyagihe jāva evaṃ vayāsī parisā padigayā, Goyamādi same bhagavaṇ Mahāvīre bhagavaṇ Goyamaṇ āmaṇtettā evaṃ vayāsī ciraśaṃsaṭṭho’ si me Goyamā! ciraśaṃthuo si me Goyamā! ciraparicio si me Goyamā! cirajusio si me Goyamā! cirāṇugao si me Goyamā! cirāṇuvattisi me Goyamā! anaṇtaraṇ devaloe anaṇtaraṇ māṇussae bhave kiṃ paraṇ? maraṇā* [Deleu 1970: 209: *kiṃ paraṇ maraṇā*] *kāyassa bhedā io cuttā dovi tullā egaṭṭhā avisesamaṇānattā bhaviṣṣāmo*.

151 For the formula of repentance *micchā mi dukkaḍam* as it occurs in the text of the *paḍikka-maṇa* ritual, see *Āvaśyakasūtra* pp. 337–341 (sū. 15–25) and cf. Williams 1963: 204.

152 According to Mette 1987: 143 n. 5 Goyama has already received Mahāvīra’s assurance that they will both be equal after death, referring to *Uttarādhyayana Nirukti* vv. 303–305. Without discussing textual priority at this stage, I would suggest that here the word of the Jinas could relate to what Mahāvīra is about to tell Goyama.

153 See note 1.

achieve omniscience with ease, and the Jina's close disciple who twice experiences anguish at his own inability to do the same.

Secondly, the *sāmānika* god to be reborn as the teacher Vaira, who is mentioned briefly at the beginning of the story (D1), reappears fleetingly in the middle (D11) to connect with the account of Puṃḍarīa at D11. The occurrence of the adjective *sāmāṇa* occurring at the end of the story with reference to Mahāvīra's comparison of Goyama to a wool mat (D14) can be regarded as representing by assonance a link to the narrative's background. A connection across time is thereby made between Goyama, who starts the process of scriptural transmission, and the teacher Vaira, the last of those familiar with the ten (now lost) Pūrva scriptures, after whom the process of decline in scriptural knowledge ensues.

In what follows I will concentrate on a variety of thematic aspects, treated in order of their occurrence in the story, and assess their function within the overall emplotment. I first discuss some possible Śaiva allusions.

F Mount Aṭṭhāvaya

Since the time of the *Kalpa Sūtra* the Jains have regarded Mount Aṭṭhāvaya—the Prakrit name being more commonly encountered in its Sanskrit form Aṣṭāpada—as the site of the first Jina Ṛṣabha's liberation.¹⁵⁴ This *tīrtha* has been identified by Jain tradition with Kailāsa (Kailash) in the Himalayas, and Jain devotees tend to subscribe to this view today.¹⁵⁵ An explanation of the name Aṭṭhāvaya / Aṣṭāpada, a designation of the mountain found only in Jain tradition, was not forthcoming until Hemacandra, who describes in his *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita* how Ṛṣabha's son Bharata when erecting shrines there constructed eight steps or levels (*pada*), impassable by humans and so serving as a kind of protection from possible depredation; each of these was separated from the others by a distance of one *yojana*.¹⁵⁶ Jinaprabha-

¹⁵⁴ See note 85.

¹⁵⁵ With regard to Prakrit nomenclature the mountain is called both Kailāsa and Aṭṭhāvaya at *Paumacarīya* 9.57 and 71. Devavimala, *Hīrasaubbhāgya* 4.9 auto commentary glosses Aṣṭāpada as Kailāsa. See also Luithle-Hardenberg 2012–2013. For Mount Aṭṭhāvaya being frequently taken as Mount Kailāsa, see Luithle-Hardenberg 2011: 71. See *Senaprasāna* notes p. 69 (very last question) for the rumour (*praghoṣa*; cf. *Hīraprasānottara* 29.4) that Mount Aṣṭāpada is twelve *yojanas* from Vinītā, that is Ayodhyā (clearly wishing to associate Ṛṣabha's "capital" with a conveniently located site nearby). Also *Hīrasaubbhāgya* 13.13 for Aṣṭāpada's proximity to Sāketa (Ayodhyā).

¹⁵⁶ Shah 1987: 20–21 referring to Hemacandra *Triṣaṣṭi* 1 (GOS pp. 358–370).

sūri's (thirteenth-fourteenth c. CE) account of major Jain pilgrimage places, the *Vividhatīrthakalpa*, contains two chapters (eighteen, composed by Dharmaghoṣasūri, and forty-nine) of elaborate descriptions of Aṣṭāpada.¹⁵⁷ Chapter eighteen does not make any clear explanatory reference to the eight levels of the mountain, although it adduces alternative meanings of *aṣṭāpada* as “gold” and the mythical eightfooted *śarabha* beast.¹⁵⁸ Chapter forty-nine follows Hemacandra in referring to the mountain's name being derived from Bharata's construction of eight levels.¹⁵⁹

The understanding of Aṣṭāpada as a mountain with eight levels has continued to define perceptions of the mountain, and such a configuration can be seen reproduced in stylised representations of the *tīrtha* frequently to be found in Jain temples.¹⁶⁰ However, given the relative lateness of this explanation and the fact that no reference is made to it in the ĀvCū, it might be worth considering a different explanation. This relates to the first attested meaning of the word *aṣṭāpada* which occurs as early as Pāṇini, namely “gaming board, gambling board”.¹⁶¹ Such a board would have eight times eight squares, with *pada* corresponding to something like “position”. This seems to have represented an early example of a chess board, but also served as a surface on which dice were thrown.¹⁶² The Prakrit form *aṭṭhāvaya* can have the sense of the actual game of dice.¹⁶³

157 See Chojnacki 1995: 93–112 and Cort 1990: 260–263 and 269–273.

158 VTK 18.12: *Bharatena mohasiṃhaṃ hantum ivāṣṭāpadaḥ kṛtāṣṭāpadaḥ / śuśubhe 'ṣṭayojano yo sa jayaty Aṣṭāpadaḡirīśaḥ* ||. For the *śarabha* see Slaje 2019: 772–776.

159 VTK p. 92 ll. 20–21: *joaṇamtarāṇi a aṭṭhapayāṇi mehalārīvāṇi māṇusaalamghañijjāṇi kāriāṇi. ao ceva Aṭṭhāvao tti nāmaṃ pasiddham*. VTK 49 p. 92 29–p. 93 l. 4 gives an abbreviated version of our story.

160 See for example Hegewald 2012: 64–65 and the Aṣṭāpada temple at Hastināpura.

161 According to Goldman 2007: 289 n. 16 “The term *aṣṭāpada* apparently refers to an eight-rowed gaming board. The word is known to Pāṇini as a technical term (6.3.125)”.

162 Thieme 1971: 417: “*aṣṭāpada*, board of eight [times eight] squares. There is clear evidence that it could serve also [that is as well as for chess] as the board on which the dice were thrown in gambling”; 408 n. 11: “Pali form *aṭṭhapada* (not *aṭṭhā-*)”. Thieme would seem to regard the primary sense of *aṣṭāpada* as “chess board”.

163 Ghatage 2004 s.v. *aṭṭhāvaya* 1. a game of dice played on a board with 8 × 8 places: *Sūya* 1.9.17, *Samavāyaṃga* 72, *Nāyā* 1.1.85, *Rāyapaseṇājja* 806, *Dasaveyāliya* 3.4, *Nisīthabhāṣya* 4280. Bollée 2002: 196 quoting Thieme 1971: 421 for *aṣṭāpada* “as the board on which dice are thrown as well as a game in which dice are thrown and pieces are moved”. Hemacandra records the meaning “gambling board” for *aṣṭāpada* in his Sanskrit dictionary. See *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* v. 487a: *aṣṭāpadaḥ śārīphalam* (comm. *phalam phalakam*; for *phalaka* as another word for gambling board, see Thieme 1971: 20–21). However, he does not link the expression with the mountain.

The name Aṣṭāpada for a mountain is peculiar to Jainism, and while it is possible that the designation relates to a superficial resemblance to a gaming board,¹⁶⁴ a more specific explanation presents itself. *Mahābhārata* 1.189.14 describes how Indra, who has been led by a goddess, “sees close at hand a handsome youth seated on a throne in the company of young women playing at dice on the peak of the king of mountains.”¹⁶⁵ This youth is revealed to be none other than Śiva, and the “king of mountains” surely designates Kailāsa, throughout Hindu mythology understood to be the home of that particular deity. In the context of the *Mahābhārata* Śiva’s dicing represents his continuing involvement in the cosmic process.¹⁶⁶ For Jainism, however, dicing and gambling were, unsurprisingly, disreputable pursuits and hardly to be associated with any form of religious authority.¹⁶⁷ Nonetheless, I would suggest, when Jain litterateurs came to appropriate Kailāsa imaginatively in the early common era, they did not disavow awareness of the mountain’s indisputable association with Śiva, but instead turned this to their own legendary tradition’s advantage by means of a knowingly mocking but also partly conciliatory gesture to the location’s connection with the dicing deity. The ĀvCū story’s description of the presence on Aṭṭhāvaya of Vesamaṇa, a close associate of Śiva and guardian of the northern region, underlines this.¹⁶⁸ This allusion to “Mount Gaming Board” seems to have been unrecognised at a later period, no doubt understandably since Śiva’s association with dicing ceased relatively early to be a significant component of his mythological personality.

164 Cf. Douglas 2020: 19 for the mountain Bhagirathi 111 looking like “the fragment of a colossal chessboard, black on white.”

165 The full verse is *tām gacchantīm āvagacchat tadānīm so 'paśyad ārād taruṇaṃ darśanīyam / śiṃhāsanaṣṭhaṃ yuvatisahāyaṃ kṛdantam akṣair girirājamūrdhni*. Handelman & Shulman 1997: 75 refers to *Ādiparvan* 1.189 for Indra seeing a young man who turned out to be Śiva “playing at dice on a Himalayan peak”.

166 See Handelman and Shulman 1997.

167 While the *Ardhamāgadhi* suttas have little specific to say on the subject of dicing and gambling, the *śrāvakācāra* literature was quick to put them at the head of a list of seven vices (*vyasana*); see Williams 1963: 247–248. For broader perspectives on gambling in ancient India see Szántó 2022: 341–349.

168 For Vesamaṇa’s connection with Śiva (Śiva) see *Aṅgavijjā* ch. 51 for Vesamaṇa paired with Śiva, “an archaic feature” found first in *Mahābhāṣya* 6.3.26; see Sanderson 2012: 8–10 and *Rāyapaseṇāijja* for festivals of Śiva and Vesamaṇa (Bollée 2002: 55). *Anuyogadvāra Sūtra* sū. 21 refers to worship of various gods including Rudra, Śiva and Vesamaṇa.

G The Three Ascetic Leaders and Their Followers

Obvious references to the deity Śiva, whether relating to his name¹⁶⁹ or to some dimension of his mythological persona within Hindu tradition,¹⁷⁰ are rare in early Jain literature. Furthermore, while recent research has emphasised the prominence of Pāśupata Śaivism and its renunciant followers in the religious landscape of north and west India during the early centuries of the first millennium CE,¹⁷¹ it has proved difficult to identify any clear reaction within Jainism's early textual tradition to the existence of a movement which must have been for several centuries in direct competition with Jain ascetics for access to religious resources and space.¹⁷² In that light I would like to offer some suggestions about the ascetic troops and their leaders described in the ĀvCū narrative.

169 A "royal seer" called Siva is the protagonist of a narrative found at *Bhagavatī Sūtra* 11.9. This describes how Siva, after considering the many modes of asceticism available, resolves to become a *disāpokkhiya* ascetic, whose regime requires making water libations at the four cardinal directions and thereafter concluding periods of fasting by consuming fruits, root vegetables, flowers, leaves and seeds. By this practice Siva gains the advanced but soteriologically deficient type of knowledge called *ohi* (Jās ed. p. 522 ll. 11–12: *vibbhaṃge nāmaṃ annāṇe samuppanne*. For this type of non-knowledge, see Tatia 1951: 71 and 147 and cf. Deleu 1970: 175. Note that the recent Lāḍnūṃ edition p. 396 has the reading *nāṇe*). This leads him to make a flawed judgement about the number of continents and oceans to be found in the world. Eventually realising the inadequacy of his knowledge by comparison with that of the omniscient Mahāvira, Siva takes initiation as a Jain monk. While this account of the career of the *rājarisī* Siva has been seldom noticed by scholarship, and its interpretation is not straightforward, there is little in the story which might support making a connection with the god Śiva as portrayed in the Sanskrit epic and the early Hindu purāṇas.

170 The name Īsāṇa, the equivalent of Īśāna which is used of Rudra-Śiva in Vedic, epic and early *kāvya* texts and was also the name of the pupil of the teacher Kuśika according to Pāśupata Śaiva tradition, occurs in Jain scriptures as the designation of the lord of the northern region and also of a category of gods who dwell in the eponymous heaven. One canonical reference to the god Īsāṇa is at first sight reminiscent of a Śaiva mythological theme, the fire emitting forehead-eye of Śiva. *Bhagavatī Sūtra* 3.1 (Jās ed vol. 1 p. 136) describes how Īsāṇa totally incinerates the city of Balicaṃcā (Deleu 1970, 97: Camara-cācā) with one frowning glance. However, this theme is unparalleled in early Jain textual tradition and does not seem to involve any significant allusion to a Śaiva narrative prototype. Note that in the following section of the *Bhagavatī Sūtra* the god Sakka is stated to be Īsāṇa's superior.

171 See in particular Bakker 2019: 527–539; 553–565, Bisschop 2010, and Davidson 2002: 183–186.

172 The well-known inscription of Candragupta II at Mathurā points to the presence of Pāśupatas alongside Jains in a major site of north Indian religious interaction. See most recently Bakker 2019:494 and Saxena 2021: 1887–1891. Bhatt 2012 is commendably aware

Three names are assigned by the ĀvCū story to the ascetic leaders encountered by Goyama at Mount Aṭṭhāvaya: Koḍinna, Dinna and Sevāla. These individuals are presented in the form of a mini-hierarchy: while all three are vegetarian, Dinna's dietary restraint is more intense than that of Koḍinna, while that of the third of these leaders, Sevāla, is still more demanding. Sevāla is obviously named after the foodstuff he is described as exclusively consuming. The plant whose Sanskrit name is *śaivala* or *śaivāla* has a variety of botanical identifications but characteristically grows in water and can be rendered as "duckweed".¹⁷³ The *Mahābhārata* and the purāṇas frequently refer to *śaivāla* as being a type of food regularly consumed by brahman ascetics,¹⁷⁴ while the typical forest *āśrama* described in *kāvya* is frequently portrayed as containing ponds covered in this vegetation.¹⁷⁵ The *Aupapātika Sūtra* identifies a category of non-Jain ascetic which habitually eats *sevāla*,¹⁷⁶ and a later Jain Sanskrit philosophical text identifies consuming *śaivāla* along with bulbs, fruits and roots as a characteristic of wrong understanding (*mithyātva*).¹⁷⁷ The nature of the appellation "Sevāla", a comical exemplification of the principle that "you are what you eat", suggests that a degree of satirical intent may also be at work in the names of at least one of the other two ascetic leaders, Koḍinna and Dinna.

Mette has argued that the ĀvCū story can be interpreted as an attempt to incorporate an element of Buddhist teaching into Jainism. She regards Goyama's name and the occurrences of the expression *bhagavaṃ* in connection with him in the story as deliberate allusions to Gautama Buddha. In that light the name Koḍinna is, she proposes, to be identified as a direct reminis-

of the relevance of the issue of possible Jain familiarity with early Śaiva renunciants, but the evidence he adduces is too ill defined (aspects of the behavioral regime of Pāśupata ascetics are treated as characteristic of defective Jain monks; a correlation between *Pāśupatasūtra* 1.8 and *Anuyogadvāra Sūtra* sū. 27 is only approximate), over-interpreted (the *rāyariśi* Siva described by *Bhagavatī Sūtra* 11.9—see note 169 above—is said to be "a Śaiva monk") and chronologically diffuse (e.g. the references made to the ninth century canonical commentator Śilāṅka) to be fully useful.

173 See Bakker 2019: 436 note 8. For duckweed, see Hildebeitel 2016: 41, translating MBh 13.129.52.

174 See, e.g., MBh 12.292.18ab: *śaivālabhojanaś caiva tathācāmena vartayan*; 13.129.52ab: *phalamūlāśanaṃ vāyur āpaḥ śaivalabhakṣaṇam*; 13.130.11ab: *abhakṣair vāyubhakṣaiś ca śaivā-lottarabhojanaiḥ*; 13.130.41ab: *śaivālaṃ śīṇaparṇaṃ vā tadvrato yo niṣevate*.

175 See, for example, Kālidāsa, *Abhijñānaśākuntalam* 1.19.

176 See note 102.

177 See Devasūri, *Pramāṇanayattattvāṇkara* 7.56, *Śyādvādaratnākara* autocommentary p. 106 for *kandaphalamūlāśaivālakavalana* as a feature of *mithyātva*. The *bhāṣya* on *Tattvārtha Sūtra* 2.13 states that the category of *vanaspati* begins with *śivala*. See den Boer 2020: 145 n. 431.

cence of Aññāta-Koṇḍañña (elsewhere in the Pali Canon simply called Koṇḍañña, in the Buddhist Sanskrit tradition Ājñāta-Kauṇḍinya) who according to the Pali *Mahāvagga* was the first individual converted by the Buddha. Rather more vaguely Dinna is adjudged by Mette to represent a common personal name in Buddhist sources.¹⁷⁸ No attempt is made by Mette to locate Sevāla in any Buddhist context.

Undoubtedly there are connections between some stories in the ĀvCū and the major Buddhist repository of narratives in the early centuries of the common era, the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya.¹⁷⁹ However, *bhagavaṃ* is a term of respect employed frequently in early Jain texts of eminent monks in general, and certainly does not have any marked Buddhist resonance.¹⁸⁰ The participial form *dinna* occurs as the second component of personal names in Buddhist texts, but is hardly found at all as an uncompounded appellation.¹⁸¹ As for Aññāta-Koṇḍiñña / Ājñāta-Kauṇḍinya, he and the four ascetics who were converted by the Buddha do not play a particularly significant role in Buddhist tradition.¹⁸² Overall it is difficult to see how the ĀvCū description of Goyama's encounter with the three ascetics striving in vain to ascend Mount Aṭṭhāvaya, which fits into a specifically Jain narrative structure, can be understood other than in the most vague terms as presenting a reframing of an event in the Buddha's biography.

An alternative interpretation of Koḍinna, I propose, is that the name is to be understood in conjunction with the name Dinna as a kind of Prakrit word-play. On the basis of the well-attested phonetic alternations *-u-* / *-o-* and *-ḍ-* / *-d-* Koḍinna can be taken as the equivalent of Ku-ḍinna / Ku-Dinna, with *ku-* being a prefix with negative or pejorative significance.¹⁸³ This is to be situated in sardonic juxtaposition with the name Dinna. Koḍinna with his reprehensible (in Jain terms) diet of roots containing life forms is to be understood as the “bad”

178 See Mette 2010: 382 with note 299 for the *Mahāvagga* reference. In partial support of Mette there is a very approximate parallel between the ĀvCū story and the *Mahāvagga*'s description of the five erstwhile ascetic companions of the Buddha expressing reservations about his sincerity when they see him approaching in the distance after having left the forest; his altered physical demeanour causes them to realise that he has effected some sort of significant transformation. However, this parallel should not be drawn too far, since in the ĀvCū story Goyama had not previously encountered the ascetics.

179 See Wu 2017.

180 For *bhagavaṃ* in this story see note 33.

181 Malalasekara 1937–1938 gives one Pali example.

182 For Koṇḍañña see Wynne 2019: 123–125.

183 For *ku-* see Burrow 1955: 190. In his twelfth century Sanskrit version of this story Hemacandra, *Triṣaṣṭi* 6 obscures any possibility of wordplay by turning Dinna into Datta.

or “inferior” Dinna by contrast with Dinna himself, whose dietary regimen of fallen and withered leaves is more rigorous, albeit still flawed.¹⁸⁴

Koḍinna of course also represents a Prakrit equivalent of the celebrated brahman *gotra* name Kauṇḍinya.¹⁸⁵ But rather than interpret its occurrence here as simply signalling a generalised brahman background for the first ascetic leader, I would like to extend the significance of the name Koḍinna and point to its possible denotation of one specific Kauṇḍinya, thus giving added point to the narrative context of this episode. The Kauṇḍinya in question is to be dated between the fourth to sixth centuries CE and is the author of the *Pañcārthabhāṣya* commentary on the *Pāśupatasūtras*, the basic text of the early Śaiva Pāśupata movement.¹⁸⁶ As well as elaborating on the *Pāśupatasūtra*’s theological teachings, Kauṇḍinya’s commentary develops discussion of a practical regime for renunciant and lay Śaiva adherents which assigns a marked importance to non-violence (*ahiṃsā*) as a foundational principle and the attendant issue of diet and permitted food substances.¹⁸⁷ The *Pāśupatas*, by engaging with issues of morality which Jainism regarded from its beginnings as strongly defining its own ideological perspective and identity, must have become major rivals of the Jains by the middle of the first millennium around the time of the ĀvCū’s composition or that of the oral version which preceded it (and was presumably nearer to Kauṇḍinya’s time).¹⁸⁸

Now the commentator Kauṇḍinya prescribes that the Pāśupata ascetic should avoid eating vegetables, sprouting tuberous plants and prepared seeds,¹⁸⁹ while Koḍinna is portrayed in the ĀvCū narrative as eating roots and

184 Dinna’s diet of fallen leaves corresponds to at least one dietary regime of the Vedic forest-dweller; for ascetics following such a regime who are mentioned in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, see Brockington 2020: 87. See *Aupapātika Sūtra* para. 74 p. 69 ed. Leumann for non-Jain ascetics who consume a variety of vegetable and plant substances which have “fallen on the ground” (*parisaḍḍiya*) and are presumably in a state of decay (*parisaḍḍiya-kanda-mūla-taya-patta-puppha-phal’-āhārā*).

185 Alternative Prakrit versions of the name have the nasalised form Koṇḍinna; see note 90. The alternation -oḍ- / -oṇḍ- is to be seen in the forms *soḍḍira* / *soṇḍḍira*, “bravery”; see Dundas 2022: 89–90.

186 See Bakker 2019: 602, Bisschop 2010: 486–487, and Davidson 2002: 183–186 for Pāśupata monasticism as response to the *śramaṇa* orders.

187 See Kafle 2020: 84 for the Pāśupata concept of *ahiṃsā*.

188 See section B. The expression *kevalijñāna*, “the knowledge of the omniscient ones”, used as a synonym for Pāśupata teaching in several sources, is one that Jains also used of their own doctrine; see Bisschop 2020: 25 for the Pāśupata usage. For *kevalijñāna*, admittedly less common in Jain usage than *kevalajñāna*, “omniscience”, see for example the inscription in Jain 1978: 186 (Gujarat).

189 Kauṇḍinya on *Pāśupatasūtra* 1.9 (p. 18: *kandāni yāni grhyante kandās caiva prarohiṇaḥ* /

tubers containing life forms (*sacitta*). However, we need not expect an accurate account of Pāśupata practice by a Jain author, for the ĀvCū is not offering an “objective” doxography of the sort which Śvetāmbara intellectuals were to compose several centuries later. Rather there is here, I would suggest, a sly misrepresentation of a rival tradition as a polemical strategy to devalorise the apparent proximity of important Pāśupata teachings to those of Jainism by presenting Kauṇḍinya to a Jain audience as in reality breaching proper dietary behaviour. In fact, the *Pāśupatasūtra* allows for meat to be taken by the Pāśupāta ascetic if it has been put in his alms bowl or not specifically prepared for him. Kauṇḍinya in his commentary manipulates this and states that meat-eating is a forbidden activity.¹⁹⁰ This may have suggested to a Jain author that Pāśupata teaching on food consumption was inconsistent and justified a pejorative reimagining of Kauṇḍinya the commentator on the *Pāśupatasūtra* as “Ku-Dinna”, an inferior version of the teacher Dinna.

It is possible to identify other Jain sources whose mention of *tāvasas* may signify awareness of Pāśupata renunciants.¹⁹¹ Unfortunately the ĀvCū narrative itself does not provide a sufficiently detailed description of any of the *tāvasa* groups to enable a confident identification of them as Pāśupata renunciants,¹⁹²

bījāni caiva pakvāni sarvāṇy etāni varjayet). Cf. Bronkhorst 2017: 582 for roots and fruits being characteristic of brahmans living in forest āśramas. For worship carried out by the Śaiva forest dweller with bulbs and roots see *Śivadharmottara* 12. 207: *śivāśramavanasthaṃ yaḥ kandamūlādibhiryajet / sa divyān prāpnuyād bhogan īśvarasya pure sthitaḥ* || (quoted in Bisschop, Kafle & Lubin 2021: 38).

190 Hara 2002: 72. Hara does not explain precisely how Kauṇḍinya twists the *Pāśupata Sūtra*'s endorsement of meat-eating so that non-meat-eating becomes the normative Pāśupata stance. *Pāśupata Sūtra* 5.16 *māṃsam aduṣyaṃ lavaṇena vā* following on from 5.14 *bhāikṣyam* and 5.15 *pātrāgatam*. See also Kauṇḍinya's comment on p. 119: *māṃsena vā lavaṇena vā ubhābhyām api sākṣād vā aduṣyam ity arthaḥ*.

191 Vimalasūri's *Paumacarīya* (late fifth century) refers to a *tāvasa* presence at Vārāṇasī at around the same time as the Pāśupatas were becoming prominent in that city. See Dundas 2022: 59.

192 For modern representation of the ascetics of Mount Aṭṭhāvaya as stereotypical Hindu yogins (some with long Śaiva-style hair), see the front cover of *Jaina Studies: Newsletter of the Centre of Jaina Studies SOAS*, 5, 2010 and the rear cover of Devluk 1995. The list of *tāvasas* given in *Aupapātika Sūtra* para. 74 is not preoccupied with clothing or outward appearance (mentioning only *vākavāsi*, bark-wearing *tāvasas*) but rather with the locus of activity and the diet followed. Although the *Pāśupata Sūtra* does not prescribe any clothing for initiates other than loin cloth and garland, the *Nāṭyaśāstra* 2.125–127 differentiates between Tāpasas who should be dressed in tatters, bark, and hide from Pāśupatas for whom many clothes of various colours are required. See Acharya 2013: 103. However, the *Nāṭyaśāstra* description may not necessarily provide a precise version of the actuality of Pāśupata external garb and instead be offering a prescription for theatrical representation.

and only incidental details encourage such an inference. So the three groups of *tāvasas* are presented as vainly striving to gain *siddhi* in that same existence through ascending the mountain, as described in section D4 (... *sa teṇeva bhavaggahaneṇaṃ sijjhati*). The reasonable assumption might be that since this is a Jain story *siddhi* is to be envisaged in Jain terms as the attainment of final freedom from rebirth. It may be significant, however, that *siddhi* is viewed in the *Pāsupatasūtras* not as emancipation from birth but as the attainment of superhuman powers, and that in the ĀvCū narrative the motivation behind the desire of the *tāvasas* and their leaders to follow Goyama is the Jain monk's display of his ability to disappear by flying through the air.¹⁹³ Also circumstantial may be the fact that while the ĀvCū narrative does not reveal to whom the shrines on the summit of Mount Aṭṭhāvaya are dedicated, the mountain has assumed in the Jain imagination from an early period a connection with the Jina Rṣabha, "Bull", who is regarded as having attained deliverance there. As is well known, the god Śiva whose abode was on Mount Kailāsa had long been closely associated with that animal, and Pāsupata ascetics were enjoined by the *Pāsupatasūtras* to imitate as part of their praxis the behaviour of the bull.¹⁹⁴

H Goyama's Physical Appearance

The ĀvCū recounts how the ascetics on the lower slopes of Aṭṭhāvaya, while acknowledging that Goyama is a *samaṇa*, express incredulity about his intention to ascend the mountain given his physical appearance.¹⁹⁵ They make reference to their own inability to do so despite their status as advanced ascetics. Their judgment is clearly based on the general ideology of ancient Indian asceticism that only an external physique remoulded to the point of emaciation by a near starvation diet can provide the internal locus for the energy required to attain an advanced goal.

193 For the Pāsupata view of *siddhi*, see Hara 2002: 35.

194 This stipulation seems to have been modified by the commentator Kauṇḍīnya's time. For the Pāsupata *govrata* or *godharma*, see Acharya 2013, Bakker 2019: 545, Kafle 2020: 81–82, 255–256 and 276 and Selva 2019: 322–325 with literature. The feminine form *aṣṭāpadī*, "eight-footed", can designate a pregnant cow (Monier-Williams 1872 s.v. *aṣṭāpad*; cf. Slaje 2019: 775 n. 89 and p. 247 for the Vedic term meaning a "pregnant cow"), in which case *aṣṭāpada*, the Jain name for Kailāsa (see F), could by extrapolation possibly have the sense of "bull". However, there seems to be no evidence of such a usage. No doubt it is only by chance that the Prakrit name Goyama can be construed as Sanskrit *go-yama*, "bull-restraint", equivalent to the Pāsupata *govrata*.

195 See D7.

Subsequently the god Vesamaṇa when on the summit of the mountain also expresses reservations about the apparent discrepancy between Goyama's appearance and the monks who consume food of wretched quality described in the story of Dasannabhadda recounted to him by Mahāvīra's disciple.¹⁹⁶ This story, which is only referred to by title at this juncture, occurs in full at a later point in the ĀvCū.¹⁹⁷ It is not an obvious exemplary narrative to invoke when seeking to draw attention to ascetic attainments, since it does not contain any actual description of renunciants, let alone of their austere appearance.¹⁹⁸ Rather, the point of the story is the spectacular lesson given to the wealthy king Dasannabhadda by the god Sakka. The former's regal magnificence (*rāi-ḍḍhi*) while vast is shown to be insignificant compared to the divine splendour (*deviḍḍhi*) of Sakka, and yet the Jinas are offered homage by the gods.¹⁹⁹ What may have prompted the mention of this story at this stage of our narrative is the fact that it is linked to ĀvNiry v. 845b²⁰⁰ which provides the ĀvCū's catchword *iḍḍhi*. As well as meaning "splendour" *iḍḍhi* can also signify "supranormal power", effectively the equivalent of *labdhi*, one type of which Goyama has already employed to ascend Mount Aṭṭhāvaya and another of which he will later employ to feed the ascetics.²⁰¹

196 See Dg.

197 See ĀvCū pp. 475–484 and cf. Schubring 1918: 45 for the story of Dasannabhadda. This would appear to be the first recorded example of what is not a particularly important exemplary narrative in Jain tradition. In the ĀvCū's version of the story descriptions of the city of Dasannapura and its environs, king Dasannabhadda, his queen and Mahāvīra reproduced much of the wording and phraseology of the heavily compounded *vaṇṇaya* style found in the later quasi-*kaṇva* canonical suttas such as the *Aupapātika Sūtra* which only occurs sporadically in the ĀvCū. Balbir 1993a: 151 refers to the passing mention of Dasannabhadda at *Uttarādhyaṇa Sūtra* 18.44 as a king who abandoned the world to follow Mahāvīra and speculates that this may signify the existence of a canonical model for the story. Mention of this example of royal renunciation who is humbled by the god Sakka about the nature of riches but is otherwise not a particularly significant figure in Jain narrative appears to serve here as a prelude to Goyama's lengthy account of another royal renunciant, Puṇḍariya. Immediately after its version of the story of Goyama's visit to Aṭṭhāvaya the *Cauppannamahāpurisacarīya* introduces (pp. 328–331) the story of Dasannabhadda.

198 Descriptions of emaciated Jain ascetics are rare in the Ardhamaṅgadhi scriptural tradition. However, see the detailed account of the monk Dhaṇṇa in the *Anuttaraupapātika Sūtra* (Barnett 1907: 115–118).

199 ĀvCū pp. 483 l. 10–484 l. 10. Cf. Mette 2010: 383 who following Balbir describes Daśārṇabhadrā as an example of the greater value of the spiritual as opposed to the material honouring of the Jina by the laity.

200 *saṃjoggavippayoge vasaṇūsavaḍḍhisakkāre*.

201 See D13. See Wiley 2012: 151 for *labdhi* and *ṛddhi*.

I turn now to the manner in which the ĀvCū depicts Goyama's physical appearance and the implications of the adjective *thullaa* which the ascetics use of Goyama when they first see him. The primary canonical representation of Mahāvīra's main disciple portrays him as a strong and vigorous monk.²⁰² However, the ascetics on the lower reaches of Aṭṭhāvaya are suspicious of Goyama who is unemaciated by comparison with themselves, and the god Vesamaṇa also concludes that Goyama might not be deemed to conform to the expected appearance of Jain monks of which he has been given narrative example. The ascetics apparently disparage Goyama by describing him as *thullaa*, and indeed *sthūla*, the Sanskrit equivalent of *thullaa*, often occurs in a binary relationship with *kṛśa*, "thin",²⁰³ which suggest a simple translation of "fat", "corpulent" for the Prakrit adjective.²⁰⁴ However, if one was attuned to possible humour in this episode, it might be adjudged that just about anybody would likely appear *thullaa* compared to the ascetics, and a consideration of Śīlāṅka's *Cauppannamahāpurisacariya* which contains the longest Prakrit version of our narrative subsequent to the ĀvCū has accordingly led me to translate *thullaa* ambiguously as "stout", which in English usage can mean both "sturdy" and "corpulent".

In Śīlāṅka's version²⁰⁵ the ascetics are depicted as observing Goyama climbing to the second level of the mountain evincing "a bodily complexion like blazing gold and not resembling a mortal person".²⁰⁶ And when he had reached the third level the ascetics, astonished at the sight of "his extraordinary physical strength" (*accabbhuyasarīrasāmattham*), reflected: "Surely he is some god in the form of an ascetic, otherwise how could this mountain be ascended by one who has a large body in mortal shape? Even excellent monks who have particular powers gained by intense austerity make the ascent with difficulty".²⁰⁷ In the *Cauppannamahāpurisacariya* it is a *vijjāhara* called Gandhavvaraī and not the god Vesamaṇa who encounters Goyama on the summit of Aṭṭhāvaya. Seeing

202 See *Aupapātika Sūtra* para. 62 p. 66.

203 See e.g. MBh 9.44.83ab: *sthulodarāḥ kṛśāṅgās ca sthulāṅgās ca kṛśodarāḥ*; note also 13.95.2cd: *parivrajantaṃ sthulāṅgaṃ parivrajaṃ śunaḥ sakham*.

204 Cf. Mette 2010: 140: *thullao*, "feiste". The Prakrit form's Sanskrit equivalent *sthūla* can encompass meanings such as "large", "thick" and "bulky". See Monier-Williams s.v. and cf. s.v. *sthūra*.

205 *Cauppannamahāpurisacariya* pp. 322 l. 26–327.

206 *Cauppannamahāpurisacariya* p. 323 l. 7: *kaṇayaujjalasarisadehacchavī amāṇusasarisa-sarūvo*.

207 *Cauppannamahāpurisacariya* p. 323 ll. 8–10: *nūṇam esa jairūvo ko vi divvo, kaham aṇṇahā manussarūviṇā pīṇataṇuṇā eso samāroḍḍhum tīrai, eso khu muṇivarehiṃ pi tivvatavova-jjīyaladdhivisehiṃ dukkham āruhiḥjati*.

Goyama, “large bodied and powerful”,²⁰⁸ Gandhavvaraī reflected: “This mountain is certainly not accessible to mortals without miraculous power. Miraculous power depends on particularly intense asceticism. Ascetics are characterised by lean bodies. This one does not appear in an appropriate guise²⁰⁹ but is of a firm, glossy, corpulent physical appearance. This mountain here cannot be ascended by a mortal other than ascetics in possession of a miraculous power (*atisaa*).”²¹⁰ Later when the ascetics see Goyama descending the mountain, they compare him to a “brave lion with a broad and hard expanse of chest”²¹¹ and subsequently address him as being “some god of inconceivable power in mortal guise”.²¹²

In these passages the *Cauppannamahāpurisacariya*, rather than portraying Goyama as simply and crudely corpulent, presents him in rather more nuanced fashion as possessing a robust and conspicuous physicality which renders him manifestly different from the half-starved ascetics, his strength being such that he can only be compared to a deity in human form. This perspective can also be found in Muncandrasūri’s version of this story given in his commentary on Haribhadra’s *Upadeśapada* where Goyama on being seen by the ascetics is described as *samuddhurasarīro*.²¹³ Judging from the standard dictionaries *samuddhura* is not a common adjective in Prakrit or Sanskrit, but the meanings *dr̥ḍh*, *majbūt* assigned by the *Pāisaddamahaṇṇavo* would suggest that Muncandrasūri understands Goyama to be sturdy in appearance.²¹⁴

However, the picture of Goyama / Gautama that has become prevalent among Śvetāmbara Jains is of a chubby, jolly monk who is associated with

208 *pīṇataṇuvihāyaṇ*. Sanskrit *vihāyas*: Monier-Williams 1872: 953 “vigorous, active, mighty” (sources Vedic).

209 *veṣa* may mean “clothing”, but the ascetics do not seem to be referring to Goyama’s lack of the birch-bark apparel characteristic of brahman forest asceticism. I prefer to take *veṣa-dhārīn* in the sense of “having the outward appearance”. cf. below: *acintasattī māṇusavesa-dhārī ko vi divvo tumaṇ*.

210 Śīlāṅka, *Cauppannamahāpurisacariya* pp. 324 ll. 2–5: *ṇa hu eso mahaiharo māṇusāṇa samahigammo aisayaṇ viṇā, aisao ya tivvatavovisesovalambho, tavassino kisaṃgalimṅgino havanti, eso ya nāṇurivavesadhārī ghaṇasīṇiddhapīvaratanucchavī ya lakkhijjai, ṇa ya ettha sāisyatavassīyaṇaṇ vajjiya iha māṇusassa samāroho*. The term *aisaa* (Sanskrit *atiśaya*) here appears to be the equivalent of *laddhi* / *labdhi*.

211 Śīlāṅka, *Cauppannamahāpurisacariya* p. 226 v. 679b: *dhīramaindaṇ va visālakaḍhiṇava-cchatthalābhoyaṇ*.

212 Śīlāṅka, *Cauppannamahāpurisacariya* p. 226 ll. 22–23: *acintasattī māṇusavesadhārī ko vi divvo tumaṇ*.

213 Muncandra on *Upadeśapada* p. 117b v. 59: *diṭṭho ya tehiṇ bhayavaṇ Goyamasāmī samuddhurasarīro / kaha eso iyarūvo girimmi eyammi laggihihi*.

214 Sheth 1963 s.v. *samuddhura*: *dr̥ḍh*, *majbūt*. Cf. Monier-Williams s.v. *samuddhura*: “lifted up, stretched out” (only one attestation).

providing sweet delicacies (an obvious allusion to the feeding of the ascetics) and more general material welfare. John Cort has described how images and paintings depict him as “rather corpulent”, with this physical feature and his more general association with worldly wellbeing suggesting that he is a transformation of the Hindu deity Gaṇeśa whose functions overlap with those of Mahāvīra’s chief disciple.²¹⁵ Cort refers to a portion of Johnson’s translation of Hemacandra’s Sanskrit *Triṣaṣṭīśālākāpuruṣacarita* which describes Gautama’s visit to Mount Aṣṭāpada where he is mocked because of “the incongruity of a chubby monk lecturing on fasting”.²¹⁶

Hemacandra seems to have been drawing directly on the ĀvCū narrative, albeit without fully understanding its context,²¹⁷ and he clearly envisages Gautama as a corpulent monk. Thus in his version Gautama appears to the ascetics at first sight as “of golden complexion and corpulent build”²¹⁸ whereupon they wonder why thin (*kṛśa*) people such as themselves cannot climb the mountain while one who is *sthūla* (the Sanskrit equivalent of the ĀvCū’s *thullaa*) is able to do so.²¹⁹ When in the ĀvCū Goyama concludes the story of Puṇḍarīa and Kaṃḍarīa by telling Vesamaṇa to pay no heed to strength or weakness (section D11), in Hemacandra’s version the monk states unambiguously that fatness and thinness are not the standard for ascetics.²²⁰ A provisional con-

215 See Cort 1995: 88–90. Devluk 1995 contains around one hundred representations of Goyama (images of various sorts, stylised depictions in tantric diagrams and examples from popular art) from the medieval period and after. It is difficult to generalise about the manner in which he is portrayed; while many of the popular representations do convey a sense of a robust and benign humanity, there is little direct sense that he is being consistently represented as corpulent. A canonical formula associating Goyama with receiving an abundance of food can hardly be regarded as defining his appearance. See *Antagaḍadasāo*. Barnett 1907: 94 describes Queen Siri bestowing on Goyama “abundant food, [drink, sweetmeats, and dainties]”. See text edition p. 23 a: *viulenam asaṇa 4 paḍivisaḷjeti*. Cf. *Nāyā* p. 84 l. 3–4: *taheva jāva vipulaṃ asaṇaṃ 4 uvakkhaḍāveti*.

216 Cort 1995 with a slight misrepresentation of the narrative scenario. *Triṣaṣṭīśālākāpuruṣacarita* 10.9.166–261 (translation Johnson 1962). Cf. Wiley 2012: 146.

217 Hemacandra, *Triṣaṣṭīśālākāpuruṣacarita* 10.9.239 which gives a Sanskrit version of the ĀvCū narrative mentions how “the god, Vaiśramaṇa’s attendant deity, accordingly mastered by close attention the *Puṇḍarīka* chapter enunciated by Gautama” (*etadarthaṃ Puṇḍarīkādhyaṇaṃ Gautamoditaṃ | jagrāhaikasamsthayāpi Śrīdasāmānikah suraḥ*; mistranslated by Johnson 1962: 245). This reference is otherwise incomprehensible in the context of Hemacandra’s narrative which lacks any account of the deity’s rebirth as the teacher Vajrasvāmin and suggests that the ĀvCū narrative was here utilised carelessly.

218 *Triṣaṣṭīśālākāpuruṣacarita* 10.9.189b: *svaṇḍābhaṃ pīvarākṛtim*.

219 *Triṣaṣṭīśālākāpuruṣacarita* 10.9.190: *te mithaḥ procire śailaṃ vāyam etaṃ kṛśā api | na roḍhum īśmahe sthūla āroksyaty eṣa tat katham*.

220 *Triṣaṣṭīśālākāpuruṣacarita* 10.9.238a: *tat pīnatvaṃ kṛśatvaṃ vā na pramāṇaṃ tapasvinām*.

clusion might be that it was the influential Hemacandra's description in his *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita* which proved decisive in confirming the image of the *gaṇadhara* as the chubby monk which is recognisable in iconic form to this day.

I Goyama's Explanation of the Story of Puṇḍarīka

Goyama's recounting of the story of Puṇḍarīka and Kaṇḍarīka to Vesamaṇa is intended as a specific scripture-derived riposte to the god's scepticism about his physical credentials as a monk. Vesamaṇa has claimed that Goyama evinces *sarīrasukumārātā*, "refined softness, delicacy of appearance", a term appropriate to those habituated to the easy and undemanding life of a royal court, as was the case with Puṇḍarīka and Kaṇḍarīka who are both described by the adjective *sukumāla*.²²¹ Goyama regards the god's dubiety about his attributes as specifically relating to his possible lack of strength or toughness (*dubbalattaṇaṃ*) in coping with the ascetic regime. The story of the royal brothers Puṇḍarīka and Kaṇḍarīka describes how one of them on becoming a monk experienced physical debility and mental turmoil because of the exiguous diet and lacked the strength to continue on the ascetic path, subsequently becoming addicted to the pleasures of eating and ultimately being reborn in hell, while the other suffered from the same diet but died the controlled death of the true monk and so was reborn in heaven. This canonical story is in part focused upon food and the dangers ensuing from inappropriate consumption of it.²²² Although no specific mention is made of Puṇḍarīka's physical appearance, Goyama refers to him as "full in the face" (*paḍipunṇagalakavola*) in his gloss on the story to Vesamaṇa, which may be taken as a reference to his own ostensible lack of ascetic gauntness.

However, there is, so Goyama argues by means of the story of Puṇḍarīka, no necessary correlation between physicality and capacity to advance on the path to deliverance. He sums this up with two statements: (i) "being strong or weak is a "non-cause" (*akāraṇa*); (ii) "in this respect one must perform suppression of *jhāṇa*".

(i) The first of these statements seems straightforward enough, but the expression *akāraṇa* is arguably elliptical in that it is inexplicit about what is

221 ĀvCū p. 384 l. 3. In the ĀvCū story of Dasannabhadda p. 479 l. 10 Dasannabhadda's queen is described as *sukumālapāṇipādā*. Puṇḍarīka is described as *pīṇāṅga* at *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita* 10.9.237b. Johnson 1962: 245 for Puṇḍarīka as "fat". Cf. Fynes 1998: 272.

222 See Appendix 3.

not being caused, as can be seen from the fact that later versions of the story feel the need to rework or expand it.²²³ While the term *kāraṇa* is of course hardly unusual in itself, I would suggest that it can here be located in a more specific context on the basis of a consideration of a portion of the section of the *ĀvNiry* on scriptural transmission which informs the *ĀvCū* narrative, thus reminding us of the linkage between the verse and prose commentarial texts.

ĀvNiry v. 737 deploys *kāraṇa* as “introductory” (*dāra*) word to eleven verses which relate to causality (vv. 738–748) (see section C). The standard preliminary analysis (*nikkheva*) of *kāraṇa* identifies the internal dimension (*bhāva*) of the word in terms of the causes of rebirth from a morally negative (*apasattha*) perspective and of deliverance from a morally positive perspective (*pasattha*).²²⁴ The relevant verse here is *ĀvNiry* v. 744:

niyamā maṇuyagatī itthī puriseyaro vva suhaleso /
āseviyabahulehiṃ vīsāe aṇṇayaraehiṃ //

“(The binding of *tīrthaṅkaranāmagotrakarma* occurs) of necessity in the human state.²²⁵ (It can be effected by) a woman, man or *napuṃsaka* with positive *lesās*²²⁶ through various (components of the list) of the twenty practised in many ways.”²²⁷

The mention of “twenty” in the second line of *ĀvNiry* v. 744 is to be understood by reference to *ĀvNiry* v. 178a-81 which lists the twenty “categories” (*thāna*), that is the modes of practice—devotional, moral, ascetic and contemplative—which enable the *jīva*, the soul or life monad, to attain the state of being a

223 Śīlāṅka, *Cauppannamahāpurisacariya* p. 324 ll. 6–7 introduces his retelling of the story of Puṃḍarīka thus: “In respect to this (i.e. Goyama’s healthy physique) weakness is not a cause of the calm of deliverance nor is strength a non-cause” (*na ettha dubbalayā kāraṇaṃ kallāṇasaṃtī, na ya akāraṇaṃ baliyayā*). Muncandrasūri (eleventh century) in a version of this story given in his commentary on Haribhadra, *Upadeśapada* v. 110 expands: *baliyattaṃ abaliyattaṃ na kāraṇaṃ suddhasamaṇabhāvassa*. Mette 2010: 187: renders *akāraṇa* as “bedeutungslos”.

224 See Balbir 2020 for these terms. Cf. *ĀvNiry* v. 741: *hoi pasatthaṃ mokkhassa kāraṇaṃ ...*

225 For this type of karma, see Wiley 1999.

226 For *napuṃsaka* as belonging to the third sex, see Zwilling & Sweet 1996 and for the *lesā* (Sanskrit *leśyā*), see Wiley 2000.

227 H on *ĀvNir* v. 184 takes *āseviyabahula* as a Prakritic reverse compound: *bahulāsevitaiḥ -anekadhāsevitair ity arthaḥ, prākṛtaśailīyā pūrvāparanipāto 'tantram, viṃśatyā anyata-raiḥ sthānair badhnātīti gāthārthaḥ*.

tīrthaṅkara.²²⁸ These categories are described by the ĀvNiry as being *kāraṇa*. Goyama can accordingly be regarded as telling Vesamaṇa that neither physical strength nor weakness are found in this list of categories and on that authoritative basis corporeal appearance has no bearing on the ability to advance on the spiritual path.²²⁹

(ii) Goyama's advice to Vesamaṇa that there must be control or suppression of *jhāṇa* (*jhāṇaṇiggaha*) has been understood by Mette as reflecting Buddhist teaching. In support of this she refers to an interpretation posited by Klaus Bruhn that the ĀvCū narrative parallels the story, found in some Buddhist traditions, of the conversion of the *pañcavargīya* monks soon after the Buddha's attainment of enlightenment.²³⁰ Certainly Mette is correct in pointing

228 ĀvNiry vv. 178a-81 (cf. 451–453 Āryarakṣitavijaya abbreviated; L vv. 271.1–3) give the twenty *sthānas*, described as *kāraṇa*:

*paḍhamo titthayarattaṃ vīsahi thāṇehi kāsī ya || arihaṃta siddha pavayaṇa guru
thera bahussue tavassīsu | vacchallayā eesiṃ abhikkhaṇāṇovaoge ya || daṃsaṇa viṇae
āvassae ya silavvāe nirāyāro | khaṇalavo tavacciyāe veyāvacce samāhī ya || appuvvanāṇa-
gahaṇe suyabhattī pavayaṇe pabhāvaṇayā | ehiṃ kāraṇehiṃ titthayarattaṃ lahai
jīvo ||*

229 After describing (v. 745) how “Goyama and the other disciples listen to the *Sāmāyika* section to gain knowledge and the understanding of good and bad dispositions” (*Goyamamāī sāmāyikaṃ tu kiṇkāraṇaṃ nisāminti | ṇāṇassa taṇ tu suṇḍaramaṇigulabhāvāṇa uvala-
ddhī*), ĀvNiry then provides (vv. 746–748) a condensed and rather unusual delineation of the Jain soteriological path to deliverance as stemming from the attainments described in v. 745.

hoi pavittinivittī saṇjamatava pāvakammaaggahaṇaṃ

kammavivego ya tahā kāraṇaṃ asarīrayā ceva || 746

“There comes about (thereby) engagement (in moral actions) and cessation (from immoral actions). (This brings about) restraint and austerity (and through these) non-accrual of evil karma; discriminating understanding of karma is brought about and then bodilessness.”

kammavivego asarīrayāya asarīrayā aṇābāhā[hāe] |

hoṇābāhanimittaṇ aveyaṇaṃ aṇāulo nīruo || 747

“Discriminating understanding of karma is the cause of bodilessness; bodilessness (means) absence of negative influence; non-sensory experience is brought about by absence of negative influence; (through this the *jīva*) is undisturbed and without physical weakness.”

nīruyattāe ayalō ayalattāe ya sāsao hoi |

sāsavyabhāvam uvagao avvābāhaṇi suhaṇ lahai || 748

“Through being without physical weakness (the *jīva*) is stationary, and through being stationary it is eternal. Having reached eternal existence it obtains untrammelled happiness.”

Although it was early established in Jainism that liberated souls lack any form of physical embodiment, the term *asarīratā*, “bodilessness”, is nonetheless unusual.

230 See Mette 1987: 147 and cf. Mette 2010: 184–188 and 381–382.

out that the expression *jhāṇaniggaho* (= Sanskrit *dhyānanigraha*) is not common in the Jain dogmatic tradition, as opposed to *imḍīyaniggaho*, “restraint of the senses”, and that *jhāṇa* (Sanskrit *dhyāna*) has negative psychological connotations in the early tradition. However, it seems unwarranted to seek possible extraneous Buddhist influence here. Rather Goyama’s advice to Vesamaṇa can be more immediately interpreted as an allusion to a significant transitional episode in the story with which the god has just been regaled, namely the description of Kaṃḍarīya who, disillusioned with the ascetic life, gives way to melancholy when he revisits the royal capital of his brother Puṃḍarīya.²³¹ Kaṃḍarīya’s betaking himself to a slab of stone under an *aśoka* tree is described in approximately the same quasi-formulaic terms as Goyama’s nocturnal withdrawal on the summit of Mount Aṭṭhāvaya. However, while Goyama is simply described as sitting on that spot,²³² Kaṃḍarīya’s brooding psychological state is clearly defined: “with mental resolve gone he simply engaged in *jhāṇa* (*ohaya-maṇa jāva jhiyāti*)”.²³³ This expression finds a parallel in the first chapter of the *Jñātādharmakathāḥ Sūtra* which describes the melancholy of queen Dhāriṇī owing to the yearning she experiences during pregnancy not being fulfilled.²³⁴ In this light an appropriate interpretation of the purport of the phrases *ettha jhāṇaniggaho kātavvo* and *jhāṇaniggaho paramaṃ pamāṇam* is that Goyama is advising against unproductive brooding about the unsatisfactory nature of one’s situation; suppression of this negative psychological state is the basis of advancing on the ascetic path to liberation.²³⁵ This of course not only refers to Kaṃḍarīya’s inadequacy with regard to the renunciant life as described in Goyama’s sermon to Vesamaṇa but can also be taken as an ironic (authorial) comment on one of the main themes of the story under discussion: Goyama’s own anxious fretting about his failure to gain omniscience.

231 See section D9d.

232 See D7. *Cauppanna* p. 324 l. 1 describes Goyama paying homage to Rṣabha and then “meditating on the blessed one” (*bhayaṇṇaṃ jhāyamaṇo*). Here *jhā* has the less specialised sense of early Jain psychological teaching.

233 I do not here interpret *jāva* as an insertion marker. The phrase *ohayamaṇa* is most likely an abbreviation of *ohayamaṇasaṃkappo*; see note 234. *ĀvCū* = *Jñātādharmakathāḥ Sūtra*. The full text is: *jeṇeva asogavaṇiṇā jeṇeva asogavarapāyave jeṇeva puḍhavisilāpaṭṭage teṇeva uvāgacchati uvāgacchettā jāva silāpaṭṭayaṃ ohayamaṇa jāva jhiyāti*.

234 *Jñātādharmakathāḥ Sūtra* p. 24 l. 8: *ohayamaṇasaṃkappā jāva jhiyāti*. In the third appendix of his edition Muni Jambūvijaya quotes (p. 523) the *ṭīkā* on this passage; *yāvat karaṇāt karatalapalhatthamunī aṭṭajhāṇovagayā jāva jhiyāi ti ārtadhyānaṃ dhyāyātīti*. For *aṭṭajhāṇa* / *ārtadhyāna* see Hooper 2020: 551–552.

235 Cf. Mette 2010: 383–384.

J Goyama's Power of Bestowing Limitless Food

The supranormal power (*laddhi*) called *akkhīṇamahāṇasiya* through which access to a limitless supply of food (*mahāṇasiya*) was provided,²³⁶ is mentioned for the first time in a canonical source in the *Aupapātika Sūtra*. It is located among a large number of descriptive epithets relating to varieties of magical power possessed by ascetics attendant on Mahāvīra.²³⁷ These powers were included over the following centuries in lists of varying length and patterned groupings,²³⁸ with understanding of the efficacy of the *akkhīṇamahāṇasiyaladdhi* being clarified by introducing a reference to the bowl of food from which thousands could gain sustenance only becoming empty when the monk who has attained the magic power in question finally takes his turn to eat. The ĀvCū

236 A derivative from *mahāṇasa*, “kitchen” (for further on this term see below). Ghatage 2004 quotes *Pañhāvagaraṇāṃ* 6.6: *akkhīṇamahāṇasiehiṇi cāraṇehiṇi (ahiṃsā samaṇuciṇṇā); Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama* 4.1.42: *ṇamo akkhīṇamahāṇasāṇaṇi*; etc.

237 *Aupapātika Sūtra* para. 24 ll. 7–8 and 15: *eṇaṇi kāleṇaṇi teṇaṇi samayeṇaṇi samaṇassa bhagavaṇo Mahāvīrassa aṇteṇvāsī bahave niggamaṇthā bhagavaṇito ... appegaiyā akkhīṇamahāṇasiyā ... Abhayadevasūri* comments thus: *mahāṇasam annapākasthānaṇi tadāsritatvād vānnaṇi api mahāṇasam ucyate, tataś cākṣiṇaṇi—puruṣaśatasahasrebhyaḥ pi dīya-mānaṇi svayam abhuktaṇi sat tathāvidhalabdhiviśeṣād atruṭitaṇi tac ca tan mahāṇasam—bhikṣālabdhabhojanam akṣiṇamahāṇasaṇi tad asti teṣāṇi te tathā*. Cf. Leumann's edition s.v. *akkhīṇa* and notes to *Aupapātika Sūtra*; see Bollée 1997: 331 for a list of superhuman attributes including *akkhīṇamahāṇasiya* given in the *Praśnavyākaraṇāṇi Sūtra*. See also Amaramuni ed. p. 61: “When an ascetic endowed with this power collects alms from a kitchen, the remaining food in that kitchen would not exhaust even if hundreds of thousands of people were fed from it. The food in this kitchen would exhaust only when either the donor himself has eaten or that ascetic has eaten the alms he collected.” The *akkhīṇamahāṇasiyaladdhi* is mentioned at ĀvNiry v. 766 which describes its use by Vairasāmī, the subsequent birth of the god who has heard Goyama preach on the summit of Mount Aṭṭhāvaya.

238 Wiley 2012: 145–146 refers to Hemacandra's *Triṣaṣṭi* version of this story; p. 165: *labdhi* no. 27: “*akṣiṇa-mahāṇasī* (Śvetāmbara: *Pravacanasāroddhāra*). With a small amount of food placed in the bowl [of a mendicant] hundreds and thousands of mendicants are satisfied; nevertheless, the bowl remains full. It becomes empty only when consumed by a mendicant having this attainment. Hemacandra associates this with the *gaṇadhara* Gautama.” pp. 175–176: *labdhi* no. 41 (Digambara: *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama*): “*akṣiṇa-mahāṇasa*. Just one substance from among the assortment of leftover food in the middle of a *thāli* (a plate from which food that is fed to a muni is taken) after the muni has eaten is not diminished, although it was eaten by the entire army of a Cakavartin on this day” (*Trilokaprajñāpti*, dated by Wiley to c. 500 CE). Vimalasūri, *Paumacarīya* 14.81–85 lists monks of advanced attainments such as exuding (*savīn*) honey, milk and ghee (see Wiley 2012: 175), but does not include *akkhīṇamahāṇasa*. Chapter 8 of the *Paumacarīya* gives a list of 54 magic powers gained through austerity by Rāvaṇa and his brothers, but *akkhīṇamahāṇasa* is not among them.

is the first text to emphasise Goyama's possession of the *akkhīnamahānasiya-laddhi*, an aspect of his identity which was to prove particularly significant as Jain tantra and attendant modes of esoteric monastic initiation developed in the early centuries of the second millennium CE.²³⁹ Description of his conspicuous supranormal attainments in the ĀvCū narrative may of course be simply intended to point out an implicit contrast with Mahāvīra's disciple's inadequacy concerning the more serious goal of gaining omniscience, and indeed the feeding of the ascetics might be viewed as no more than a passing episode in the story.²⁴⁰ Certainly the scenario described in the narrative is hardly conventional in that Jain monks should never seek specific types of food, but this should not be allowed to inhibit appreciation of a striking story of wonderworking.²⁴¹ However, I would argue that by reading this episode in conjunction with material from a brahmanical background there can be gained a greater insight into its thematic purpose.

Sections D7 and 13 of the ĀvCū describe how Goyama on first encountering the ascetics of Mount Aṭṭhāvaya confirmed his advanced status to them by manifesting the power of flight through his possession of the *jaṅghācaraṇala-*

239 In Śvetāmbara tantra mastering this power was held to be the result of the ritual centring on the *sūrimantra* performed by a monk who had newly attained the rank of *ācārya* and was thus required to recreate himself as a version of Goyama, Mahāvīra's chief disciple and source of the monastic lineage. See Dundas 1998 and Gough 2021: 169–174. Devavimala, *Hirasaubhāgya* 4.7 autocomm. understands Gautama's status as first of the disciples as deriving either from his possession of *labdhis* or through having received *dīkṣā* before the others.

240 Mette 2010 makes no significant comment on this passage. Balbir 1993a does not mention it in her summary of the verses relating to Vairasāmī. The standard procedure for a Jain renunciant who has just received renunciant initiation is to set out to receive food from a lay donor. It would be unwise, however, to regard this formal mode of signalling new status as being formally established during the middle centuries of the first millennium, which is the approximate time when the ĀvCū or its oral precursor was composed.

241 This issue was addressed in the late sixteenth century *Hiraprasaṇnatarāṇī* (30.20) which records how Hīravijayasūri was asked by a certain Paṇḍit Velarṣigaṇin how the miraculous food conjured up by Gautama to break the ascetics' fast could be appropriate for monks since it had not actually been given by anybody (*tatra labdhiparamāṇnam adattam iti sādḥūnām katham kalpate*). This question seems to imply the understanding that the food has not actually been given by a donor but has been produced by Mahāvīra's disciple. Hīravijayasūri's reply is not immediately to the point: because just a single receptacle (*patadgraha*) serves the purpose (*prāpta*) of all the ascetics through the power of *akṣīnamahānasalabdhī*, it must be considered that in this respect nothing which has not been given is understood as involved in this respect (*atrādattam kim api jñātam nāstīti bodhyam iti*).

ddhi and thus inspired them to follow him as a teacher. Goyama's deployment of the *akkhīṇamahāṇasiyaladdhi* takes place after the ascetics have become Jain monks, with the necessary monastic accoutrements (*liṃga*) being supplied by a god. They require to be refreshed on ending their long regime of fasting. Asked by Goyama what they wish to eat they request *pāyasa*, rice boiled in milk, and he duly returns from the alms round with a bowl (*paḍiggaha*) of food for the group²⁴² which he has acquired from an unspecified source.²⁴³ The bowl contains a mixture of honey and clarified butter, or possibly *pāyasa* mixed with these two substances,²⁴⁴ which, continually reproduced through Goyama's *laddhi*, fortifies the entire troop. This nourishment is markedly unsuitable for Jains, with honey and ghee being regularly stigmatised by monastic authorities,²⁴⁵ and in fact this food presented by Goyama to the ascetics is strongly reminiscent of the *madhuparka* or guest offering of brahmanical ritual, which takes the form of a mixed drink of yoghurt (*dadhi*), clarified butter (ghee) and honey.²⁴⁶ Vimalasūri's *Paumacariya* (c. 5th century), the first Jain text to

242 *Hiraprasānottarāṇi* 3.42 posits the general question of whether Gautama went on the food collecting round alone or with a group of monks (*Gautamasvāmī gocaryām ekāky eva gatavān atha vā sasaṅghātakaḥ*). The response is that according to scriptural texts such as the *Bhagavati Sūtra* he as a rule (*prāyaḥ*) went on his own, but discussion of whether this is right or wrong is not appropriate since he belonged to the category of *āgamavihārin*, that is the six varieties of monks who were in possession of the three types of advanced knowledge or were familiar with fourteen, ten or nine Pūrva scriptures.

243 According to *Cauppannamahāpurisacariya* p. 327 l. 1 Goyama asked the new Jain monks what food they wanted when they were in a *saṅṇīvesa* (*ekammi saṅṇīvese*). See *Aupapātika Sūtra* para. 69 for *sannīvesa* as the last and least impressive of a stereotyped list of centres of habitation. Cf. Mette 1974: 43: "Niederlassung". However, see Hoernle's translation of the *Upāsakadaśāḥ Sūtra* p. 54 for Goyama going to the city (*nayara*) of Vāṇiyagāma for alms and then to the "suburb" (*sannīvesa*) of Kollāga (Pkt. Kollāya). Cf. Amaramuni, *Illustrated Upāsakadashā and Anuttaraupapātikadashā Sūtra* pp. 80–81. However, Stein 1948: 13 quotes commentarial explanations which suggest the interpretation of a stopping place for shepherds, cow-herds and traders; see Schubring 1977: 53: "Karawanen-Rastorte". Bollée 2002: 15: "halting place for a procession" is not clarified. It is likely that a *sannīvesa* (Sanskrit *saṁniveśa*) is a liminal location, an appropriate place for former ascetics leaving the wilderness to reenter the inhabited world.

244 See note 131.

245 See *Senaprasāna* 13.19 for two-sensed creatures arising in wine, honey and curd. *Senaprasāna* 27.20 (21?; notes p. 26): Vijayasenasūri states that the food conjured by Goyama is not *vaikriya* but is a specific product of the *labdhi*.

246 For honey in the *madhuparka*, see Oberlies 2007: 141–171; p. 145: the *madhuparka* is mixed in a *kaṃsa/kaṃsya* pot (cf. p. 156 n. 106) and p. 153: the use of honey signifies entry into a group.

attempt to rationalise the existence of non-Jain cultural and religious phenomena, identifies a brahman origin for the *tāpasa* ascetics who live in the forest wilderness,²⁴⁷ and Goyama's feeding of the new monks in the wilderness has the look of an induction ceremony framed as a form of guest offering to ex-brahmans entering a new community.

A parallel narrative situation in the *Āraṇyakaparvan* of the *Mahābhārata* provides a further degree of focus to the ĀvCū's emplotment. The context is as follows. Yudhiṣṭhira and the other Pāṇḍava brothers have entered the forest in accordance with the terms of the twelve years period of exile imposed upon them by their Kaurava relatives and rivals. A troop of brahmans has followed them in order to perform various forms of ritual on their behalf and to divert them with storytelling. Although the brahmans, who have been described as "eating what has been begged" (*bhikṣābhujāḥ*),²⁴⁸ have already assured Yudhiṣṭhira that they will obtain their own food, the Pāṇḍava leader realises that he himself is obliged to feed them since it will be impossible to get alms in the forest wilderness. However, to his frustration he lacks the necessary provisions with which to prepare a meal for the brahmans.²⁴⁹ So Yudhiṣṭhira propitiates Sūrya, the sun-god, who is pleased with him and appears "shining in his own form, like a blazing fire".²⁵⁰ He then addresses the Pāṇḍava leader: "You shall obtain all that you wish, king. I will give you food for seven and then five years—fruit, tubers, meat, green vegetables which have been prepared in the *mahānasa*. Those four types of food will be inexhaustible (*akṣayyam*) for you."²⁵¹

After Sūrya has disappeared, "Yudhiṣṭhira joined Draupadī, the brothers' wife; watched by her he went and prepared that food in the *mahānasa*. The four types of forest food increased when prepared; that food grew to inexhaustible (*akṣayyam*) proportions and with it he fed the brahmans. When they had eaten he fed his brothers. Then Yudhiṣṭhira ate the remains of the food called "leftover" (*vighasa*). Having fed Yudhiṣṭhira, Draupadī ate the remains.

247 Vimalasūri, *Paumacariya* 4.80–86. Kauṇḍinya makes clear that only brahmans could be initiated as Pāśupata ascetics: see *Pāśupatasūtra* 1.7–9 with the commentary of Kauṇḍinya.

248 MBh 3.2.1ab: *vanam yiyāsataṃ viprās tasthur bhikṣābhujō 'grataḥ*. Cf. Bronkhorst 2017: 582 on brahman mendicants being unable to feed themselves in the forest.

249 MBh 3.2.10–11 and 13.

250 MBh 3.4.1ab: *dīpyamānaḥ svavapuṣā jvalann iva svavapuṣā*.

251 MBh 3.4.2–3d: *yat te 'bhilaṣitaṃ rājan sarvaṃ etad avāpsyasi / aham annaṃ pradāsyāmi sapta pañca ca te samāḥ || phalamūlamiṣaṃ śākaṃ saṃskṛtaṃ yan mahānase / caturvidhaṃ tad annādyam akṣayyaṃ te bhaviṣyati ||*.

So after obtaining the miraculous food from the sun, Yudhiṣṭhira refulgent as the sun gave the brahmans the desires of their heart.”²⁵²

This passage occurs at a transitional moment in the plot of the *Mahābhārata* (the entry of the Pāṇḍavas into the forest), but only a few scholars of the *Mahābhārata* seem to have considered it as a narrative unit, and not at any great length.²⁵³ Feller has discussed the alimentary issues involved in Yudhiṣṭhira’s feeding of the brahmans, which she connects with a later episode in the *Āraṇyakaparvan* where the Pāṇḍavas are described as taking to hunting and thereafter feeding the brahmans with meat. She points in passing to uncertainty about the *mahānasa*, the “kitchen” where Yudhiṣṭhira produces food, in terms of its provenance, appearance and functioning.²⁵⁴ Biardeau interprets

252 MBh 3.4.5–8:

Draupadyā saha saṅgamyā paśyamāno ’bhyayāt prabhuḥ |
mahānase tadānnaṃ tu sādhyām āsa Pāṇḍavaḥ || 5
saṃskṛtaṃ prasavaṃ yāti vanyam annaṃ caturvidhaṃ |
akṣayyaṃ vardhate cānnaṃ tena bhojayate dvijān || 6
bhuktavatsu ca vipreṣu bhojayitvānujān api |
śeṣaṃ vighasasaṃjñāṃ tu paścād bhuṅkte Yudhiṣṭhiraḥ |
Yudhiṣṭhiraṃ bhojayitvā śeṣaṃ aśnāti Pārṣatī || 7
evaṃ divākarāt prāpya divākarasamadyutiḥ |
kāmān manobhilaṣitān brāhmaṇebhyo dadau prabhuḥ || 8

The translation is mine, following van Buitenen 1975: 229.

253 Smith’s abridged rendering of the *Mahābhārata* refers to the episode only in passing without translating any of it. See Smith 2009: 164.

254 See Feller 2016: 61: “the kitchen (*mahānasa*) is not further described, nor is its mode of functioning clearly explained. It is also not clear whether the kitchen was gifted by Sūrya or whether it was already in the Pāṇḍavas’ possession”. As for the *mahānasa*, the nature of which is undescribed in the *Mahābhārata* passage, this is understood by Feller as being “kitchen”, the rendering also given by van Buitenen; for Biardeau it designates some sort of cooking pot (“marmite”). The “kitchen” interpretation no doubt reflects the sense of *mahānasa* in standard Sanskrit and Prakrit.; for the latter see Hāla’s *Sattasāi* (household kitchen) and *Nāyā* 1.8 (palace). However, such a domestic establishment is not entirely probable in terms of the wilderness situation in which the Pāṇḍavas and the brahmans find themselves. There is of course no reason to assume that in an imaginative text there should be precise conformity to realia, and magic cooking pots and food bowls are a staple of popular lore and legend both in India and throughout the world. See for example *Kathāsaritsāgara tarāṅga* 3 vv. 46–50 (Tawney 1924: 22) for two asuras fighting over shoes which give the power of flight and a receptacle (*bhājana*) which produces whatever food is thought of. See also Ravishankar 2018: 266 (for a comical allusion to an *akṣayapatra* in the nineteenth century) and cf. Higham 2018: 106 for an Arthurian example. Some manuscripts of the *Mahābhārata* include a verse after 3.4.2, possibly intended to clarify the meaning or context of *mahānasa*, in which Sūrya instructs Yudhiṣṭhira to take a copper pot he has given him which will remain full until Draupadi has eaten (*grhīṣva pīṭharaṃ tāmraṃ mayā dattaṃ narādhipa / yāvad vāñchati Pāñcālī pātreṇānena suvrata*).

the episode as referring to sacrifice and the consumption of the residue of the offering. She is specifically interested in the cosmic role of Sūrya as it relates to the *bhakti* shown by Yudhiṣṭhira, and says virtually nothing about the food supplied by the god which enables the senior Pāṇḍava to feed the brahmins.²⁵⁵

The ĀvCū account of Goyama magically feeding the ascetics appears to be a reworking or transmuting of thematic material from this *Mahābhārata* episode (there is no need to argue for the Jain text's priority or derivation from some common narrative source).²⁵⁶ In the *Mahābhārata* the feeding of the brahmins is effected by Sūrya, whose description finds a parallel in that of Goyama appearing "as refulgent as fire, lightning and the rays of the new risen sun" when first seen by the ascetics of Mount Aṭṭhāvaya.²⁵⁷ The food provided by Sūrya to Yudhiṣṭhira is described as *akṣayyam*, "inexhaustible, undiminishing", equivalent to the Prakrit adjective *akkhīṇa* (Sanskrit *akṣīṇa*), "unfailing", the first component of *akkhīṇamahāṇasia*. However, whereas Yudhiṣṭhira is providing alimentary support for brahmins who are about to enter the wilderness, Goyama is producing food as a form of welcome for newly initiated Jain monks (whether or not originally brahmins) who are about to leave it, at least symbolically.

When the brahmins have finished eating, Yudhiṣṭhira, followed by the Pāṇḍavas' wife Draupadī, consumes the remains of the food and so becomes an eater of "residue" (*vighasa*). Later in the same chapter of the *Mahābhārata* Yudhiṣṭhira affirms that one should always be an eater of leftovers (*vighasa*) and a consumer of ambrosia (*amṛta*), the former being the remains of what has been eaten and the latter the remains of the sacrifice.²⁵⁸ In eating from the

See *Āraṇyakaparvan* edition part 1 (Sukthankar 1942), p. 17 note 3. It may also be that the Pāṇḍavas and their entourage are being envisaged by the *Mahābhārata* as a nomadic group redolent of the Vedic period. In Vedic literature, the term *mahānasa* denotes the 'heavily loaded wagon' in which the nomadic bands transported their cooking equipment and perhaps prepared their food, and it is this perhaps deliberately archaic sense of the term which has to be born in mind in relation to the Pāṇḍavas' food preparation while wandering in the wilderness. See Sadovski 2009: 122–123.

255 See Biarreau 2002: 417–418.

256 For small scale links between the *Mahābhārata* and a Jain text, see Dundas 2014 and cf. Dundas 2012: 565–567.

257 See section D6.

258 MBh 3.2.58 (= *Mānavadharmasāstra* 3.285): *vighasāsī bhavet tasmān nityam cāmṛtabhojanah / vighasaṃ bhuktaśeṣaṃ tu yajñaśeṣaṃ tathāmṛtam*; Olivelle 2005: 123 translates: "He should become a man who always eats 'residue' and who always partakes of 'ambrosia'." "Residue" is what remains after people have eaten, and "ambrosia" is the leftovers of a sacrifice." The term *vighasa* can specifically refer to food eaten by ascetics. See Wezler 1978 and for *śeṣa* in general, see Malamoud 1996: 7–22.

same bowl after the monks have finished their helping of the magically perpetuated food, Goyama is effectively consuming leftovers, but the ĀvCū does not reproduce Yudhiṣṭhira's equation of the worldly and the ritual, which would not be meaningful in this Jain context. However, it may be noted that at some later point, perhaps around the beginning of the second millennium, Goyama came to be regarded as being able to effect the magical filling of the almsbowl through having ambrosia in his thumb.²⁵⁹

K Some Concluding Remarks

In the introduction to his notes to his edition of chapter ten of the *Uttarādhyaṇa Sūtra* Charpentier refers to a “very long story” by the commentator Devendra about Goyama (Gotama) being instructed by Mahāvīra.²⁶⁰ Charpentier does not give any details of this story—it does not in fact diverge from the main features of the plot of the ĀvCū narrative which has been the subject of this study—but justifies his lack of discussion on the grounds that “this legend entirely lacks any real interest”. No doubt the story was dismissed by Charpentier because it was fanciful and did not provide anything corresponding to historical facts which could cast light on early Jain teachings and specifically the contents of *Uttarādhyaṇa Sūtra* 10.

I am conscious that the late Steven Collins cautioned against the propensity of modern scholarship to read Pali stories as “religious” literature at the expense of their status as “elite Literature that entertains (seriously or lightly) its readers or listeners”.²⁶¹ We might conclude with Collins that this story has no religious point as such but may have served to expand the Jain narrative archive and hence Jain self-perception. In these terms any attempt to assign a specific meaning to this Jain story, whether historical or religious, might seem somewhat pedestrian. However, in a phrase of Detige's, these are “not

259 See Vinayaprabha (Kharatara Gaccha 14th c. CE), *Gautam Rās* v. 29 (in Vinayasāgar 1987: 129):

*khīr khāṇḍ ghṛt āṇi, amiya vūṭhi aṇḡuṭh ṭhavaī, Goyama ekaṇ pātr, karāvai pāraṇau
savaī |
paṃc sayāṃ subh bhāv, ujjal bhariyau khīr misai sākā guru saṃyog, kaval te keval rūp
huā ||*

A Hindi comic book retelling of Goyama's career (*Divākar Citrakathā* no. 32) identifies this as his defining feature in its title *Amṛt Puruṣ Gautam* (“Gautama the Ambrosia-Man”).

260 *Uttarādhyaṇa Sūtra*, notes, p. 317; Charpentier reproduces the Sanskrit preamble to D's Prakrit narrative.

261 Collins 2020: 81–82.

just stories".²⁶² For all the comic and fairy tale-like elements in this story—the great monk Goyama being twice overtaken in the gaining of omniscience by novice renunciants, magical flight and an inexhaustible food bowl—there is also a vein of seriousness running through it. It is undoubtedly *mokṣamārga*-oriented and not “for lay edification”, as Jain stories have been frequently described.²⁶³

The bulk of my discussion has largely foregrounded Goyama's interaction with the ascetics he encountered on Mount Aṭṭhāvaya, and this is reflected in the title I have given to this study. On that basis a simple conclusion might be that it is a “conversion story” describing how the exercise of magic power by a Jain monk convinced some non-Jains to abandon their previous mode of life and follow a new source of authority. But whether the acceptance of non-Jain ascetics into the Jain order is the main theme of the story is debatable. The *Cauppannamahāpurisacariya* makes no reference to the ascetics being initiated as Jain monks. Instead it describes how the ascetics through Goyama's power (*tappahāvao*) climbed the mountain, worshipped the image of Rṣabha with full devotion and rejoined Mahāvira's disciple, saying that their effort has borne fruit through seeing him.²⁶⁴

It must also be asked how the meaning of the story might be gauged if it is not detached from its moorings in the nexus of the Āvaśyaka literature as a component of the biography of Vairasāmī: that is as part of the cumulative process by which the Jains built up a picture of their tradition's legendary past whose protagonists were inspiring, intriguing and diverting.²⁶⁵ And to what extent does the emphasis of the story shift when it is viewed from the perspective of the *Uttarādhyayana Sūtra* tradition? Here the story of Goyama and the ascetics is about the *gaṇadhara*'s difficulties with attaining omniscience and Mahāvira's encouragement of him.

More broadly the story might be interpreted as being preoccupied with food and ascetic diet. The story of Goyama and the ascetics demonstrates how Jain monks possess superhuman powers of a sort, in the case of *jaṅghācaraṇa-laddhi*, which causes astonishment in the *tāpasas* and can also take care of the basic quotidian need of supplying food. The role of wonderworker is here

262 Detige 2020.

263 Cort 2001 and cf. Detige 2020.

264 Śīlaṅka, *Cauppannamahāpurisacariya* p. 326: *tao te tāvasagaṇā tappahāvao samārūḍhā Aṭṭhāvayagiriṇaraṇa. vaṃdiūṇ bhattibharanibbharamāṇasa Usabhasāmim samāgayā gaṇaharino samīvaṇ. 'saphalo amha esa parissamo jaṇ tumehiṇ samaṇ daṇsaṇaṇ jāyaṇ'.*

265 *Cauppannamahāpurisacariya* has a connection with the Āvaśyaka textual corpus and evinces no interest in the biography of Vairasāmī.

presented as a prominent feature of the Jain monk who stands at the head of the Śvetāmbara teacher lineage and in certain respects may be regarded as epitomising some of the positive and negative features characteristic of the actualities of Jain renunciant life. The historical model of Śvetāmbara renunciants in the first millennium CE being perpetually wandering mendicants is difficult to disprove and no doubt partially true. However, the fact that at the beginning of the second millennium teachers advocating a return to scriptural injunction as the basis for renunciant practice presented themselves as an embattled minority in the face of a majority constituted by sedentary monks permanently based in temples suggests that the latter mode of life had become embedded in the Śvetāmbara community during the previous centuries.

Dharmasāgara writing at the end of the fifteenth century asserted baldly that the practice of monks living in temples arose in the year 882 after Mahāvīra's death, that is in 325 CE.²⁶⁶ There is no way of corroborating this judgment and relevant textual and epigraphical witnesses are lacking, but there seems little doubt that such a mode of monastic life was prevalent at the time the ĀvCū was composed. In such a context of permanent dwelling a constant provision of food must have been a significant concern, implying some equivalent to the institution of *dhruvabhikṣā*, "permanent alms food", found in Buddhist texts of roughly the same period.²⁶⁷ Our story might give a fleeting glimpse of an attempted rationalisation of the existence of monks who were regular recipients of food from the same sources(s) by describing how leading members of the renunciant community could when necessary feed their followers through supra-normal means and so guarantee a permanent source of alimentary support.²⁶⁸

Appendix 1: The Earliest Metrical Version of the Story: Uttarādhyayana Nirukti vv. 284–306

The earliest prose version of the story of Goyama and the ascetics of Mount Aṭṭhāvaya is that given by the ĀvCū. Another version in verse, that of the

266 Quoted by Premī 1942: 352. Premī refers to Muni Kalyāṇavijaya's view that this practice was in fact universally that diet.

267 Silk 2008: 215–217.

268 The ĀvNiry describes how Vairasāmī was in possession of the *akkhīṇamahāṇasiya laddhi* which he deployed to feed the lay community.

Uttarādhyayana Nirvyūkti (UttNiry), is undoubtedly also early,²⁶⁹ albeit it is very condensed. To facilitate some conclusions about the relationship between the two versions, I translate below UttNiry vv. 284–306, following the text of Bollée's edition and enumeration with punctuation removed or amended, while also referring to the Ladnum edition (UttNiryL) and its Hindi rendering.²⁷⁰ Ś is cited where relevant and I occasionally refer to D.²⁷¹ I then give at the end of this appendix some analytical remarks.

UttNiry v. 283 introduces the *Dumapattayam ajjhayaṇaṃ* of the *Uttarādhyayana Sūtra*.²⁷² The background to Mahāvīra's preaching of this poem is then given.

Magahāpurāṇayārāo Vīreṇa visajjaṇaṃ tu sīsāṇaṃ /
SālaMahāsālāṇaṃ Piṭṭhacāṇaṃ ca āgamaṇaṃ || 284

Mahāvīra dispatches his pupils Sāla and Mahāsāla from the city (of Rājagṛha) which is the capital of Magadha,²⁷³ and they come to Piṭṭhacāṇa.

269 Dhaky 2004: 116 dates the *Uttarādhyayana Nirvyūkti* to c. 525 CE. Dhaky's dating (which according to note 14 follows Vijayajinendra's *Nirvyūkti-saṃgrahaḥ*) seems to imply that any exegetical texts must be subsequent to the "canonical councils". On the other hand, Ollett 2017: 76 refers to 'leading authorities' for Bhadrabāhu the author of the *nirvyūktis* as 1st century CE, with his explanations setting in motion a process of commentary which lasted for several centuries. Ollett's perspective would imply commentary on the earliest *āgama* texts perhaps in proximity to their formulation. Further uncertainty about dating can be seen from the presence in UttNiry vv. 289 and 293 of two examples of the past tense with the indeclinable suffix *-ī(y)a* (see notes 288 and 292). According to Esposito 2011: 44–45, the *Vasudevahīṇḍī* which she dates to c. 400 AD (p. 29) gives the first examples of this form. Cf. Ollett 2018: 149 for the form being taught in the *Prākṛtaprakāśa*. It is unclear whether the presence of this type of past tense in the UttNiry confirms a latish date for the UttNiry of the sort advocated by Dhaky or a pre-*Vasudevahīṇḍī* date for the text on the grounds that the two examples therein are the earliest identifiable.

270 ĀvNiryL's verse enumeration is 277–299 (with Hindi trans pp. 211 ff.). See Mahetā 1989: 96–100 for the overall number of UttNiry verses given as 607 as against Bollée's 557.

271 Ś (pp. 270 l. 34–272 l. 1.7) truncates discussion of the *nirvyūkti* verses, omitting any reference to verses 296b–298 while filling out explanation of the others with details deriving from the subsequent Prakrit narrative (p. 272 l. 8–277 l. 10) which replicates that of the ĀvCū. D (pp. 153a–158b) gives the full story of Goyama and the ascetics at the beginning of *Uttarādhyayanasūtra* chapter ten (*Dumapattayam*). No reference is made to UttNiry. Cf. Alsdorf 1998: 816: the *nijjuttis* are included in the oldest *ṭikās* such as Śāntisūri's on the *Uttarādhyayana* but not in the younger ones such as Devendra's on the *Uttarādhyayana*, which reflects a dwindling of interest in these texts.

272 See note 1.

273 Ś: *Magahāpurāṇagaram Rājagṛham*.

*pavajā Gāḡilissa*²⁷⁴ *ya nāṇassa ca uppayā u tiṇhaṃ pi /*
āgamaṇaṃ Campapurīṇ Vīrassa avamdaṇaṃ tesīṇ // 285

Gāḡili²⁷⁵ renounces and omniscience comes about for the three.²⁷⁶ They reach the city of Campā; they do not pay homage to Mahāvīra.

Campāi Puṇṇabhaddaṃmi ceie nāyao pahiakittī /
āmanteuṃ samaṇe kaheī bhayavaṃ Mahāvīro // 286

In the shrine of Puṇṇabhadda at Campā, the blessed Mahāvīra, the leader, the far-famed one,²⁷⁷ summoned the monks and spoke.

aṭṭhavihakammamaṇassa tassa pagaṇvisuddhalesassa /
*Aṭṭhāvae nagavare nisīhie*²⁷⁸ *niṭṭhiatṭhassa //* 287

‘He who has destroyed the eight types of karma,²⁷⁹ whose karmic colouration is naturally pure,²⁸⁰ who attained the goal²⁸¹ in the place of liberation²⁸² which is Aṭṭhāvaya,²⁸³ the excellent mountain—

274 UttNiryL: *pavajja Gāḡilissa*.

275 Bollée 1994 s.v. Gāḡili: “usually called Gāḡali”.

276 UttNiryL’s Hindi rendering (p. 212) understands this trio to consist of Gāḡili and his parents.

277 *pahiakittī* = Sanskrit *prathitakīrtiḥ*. Ś p. 271 ll. 1–3: *nāyao pahiakittī’ tti nāyakaḥ sakalajagatsvāmī jñāta eva vā jñātaka udāraḥ satriyaḥ, nyāyato vā prathimā-sakalajagatpratya-khyātā kīrtir yaśa sa tathā*.

278 UttNiryL: *nisīhiā* (presumably an endingless accusative and the object of *vandai* in the next verse). See note 282.

279 This verse links up syntactically with *Usabhassa Bharahapiṇṇo* in v. 288. For *aṭṭhavihakammagaṇṭhi* see *Uttarādhyayana Sūtra* 29.31.

280 *Uttarādhyayana Sūtra* chapter thirty-four gives a full exposition of the *lessā / leśyā* theory in which an earlier version of the teaching is couched in “old” *śloka* verses interspersed with *āryā* verses; see Dundas 2002: 100 and also Roth 1983: 137 n. 88.

281 Ś p. 271 ll. 5–7: *niṣṭhitārthasya samāptasakalakṛtasya yad vā niṣedhe sakalakarmānirākaraṇalakṣaṇe bhavā naiṣedhikī muktigatis tayā niṣṭhitārtho yas tasya Rṣabhasya*.

282 Ś p. 271 l. 4: *nisīhiya tti niṣidhyante nirākriyante asyāṃ karmāṇi naiṣedhikī nirvāṇabhūmiḥ*. Bollée 1994 s.v. *nisīhi(yā)* quotes Leumann 1934 (but this is absent from his bibliography; “Abkehr” = 2010 LD trans p. 25 n. 4, “withdrawal”) and Schubring 1935: para. 136 (“Weggang”). For later Digambara usages of the tem see Settar 1986.

283 There is a possible deliberate correlation here between the name of the mountain Aṭṭhāvaya and the eight (*aṭṭha*) types of karma. Cf. *AvNiry* v. 920 for *aṭṭhavihaṇ kammaṃ*.

*Usabhassa Bharahapiṇṇo telukkapayāsaniggayajasassa /
jo āroḍhuṃ vaṇḍai carimasarīro a so sāhū || 288*

Rṣabha, the father of Bharata, whose renown has shone out over the universe—whoever climbs the mountain and pays homage to him is a monk whose physical body is his final one.²⁸⁴

*sāhuṃ saṃvāsei ya asāhuṃ na kira saṃvasāveī /
aha siddhapavvaṃ so pāse Veaḍḍhasiharassa || 289*

Now that mountain of the liberated which is near Mount Veyaḍḍha can furnish a dwelling for a monk,²⁸⁵ but it can never, it is held,²⁸⁶ furnish a dwelling for one who is not a monk.²⁸⁷

*carimasarīro sāhū āruhai nagavaraṃ na anno tti /
eyaṃ tu udāharaṇaṃ kāsīa²⁸⁸ taḥiṃ jinavarimḍo || 290*

A monk in his last body can ascend²⁸⁹ that excellent mountain, no one else.' Thus the mighty Jina declared to them.²⁹⁰

*soṇa taṃ bhagavaṃ gacchai taḥiṃ Goamo pahiakittī /
āruhai taṃ nagavaraṃ paḍimāo vandai jīṇāṇaṃ || 291*

284 That is, he will attain liberation at the end of that existence.

285 Ś p. 271 l. 9: *rātriṃ divaṃ cāvasthāpayati, no 'sādhuṃ saṃharaṇādina' nītaṃ api* ("The mountain can accommodate a monk for a day and a night but not a non-monk, even though he has been brought there through means such as abduction"). The reference to Veyaḍḍha / Vaitāḍhya (on which see Alsdorf 1974: 77) might suggest abduction by *vijjāharas* / *vidyādhara*s who are strongly associated with that mountain range, although narrative examples generally involve women. The version of this story found in Śilāṅka's *Cauppaṇnamahāpurīṣacariya*, which does not contain the theme of Vairasāmi's previous birth, has a *vijjāhara* rather than *Vesamaṇa* listening to Goyama's sermon.

286 Ś p. 271 l. 9: *kila iti parokṣāptavādasūcaka*. However, *kira* could simply be emphatic here. For the literature on *kira* and its meaning see Tieken 2009.

287 The ascetics as non-Jain monks are by definition precluded from dwelling on the mountain summit.

288 The form *kāsīa* is an example of the past tense with the indeclinable suffix *-ī(y)a*; cf. note 269. For explanations of this verbal form, see Norman 2001: 224 and Oberlies 1997.

289 Ś p. 271 l. 12: *ārohatīty atra padapracāreṇeti gamyate*.

290 Ś describes this example given by Mahāvīra as the reason that the gods are familiar with a rumour about the mountain, although this is not mentioned in any verse; this commentary then goes on to refer to portions of vv. 294 and 295.

Having heard that from the blessed one, far-famed²⁹¹ Goyama went there. He ascended that excellent mountain and paid homage to the images of the Jina.

*aha āgao sapariso savviḍḍhīe tahiṃ Vesamaṇo /
vandittu ceiyāiṃ aha vandai Goamaṃ bhayavaṃ || 292*

Then Vesamaṇa in all his majesty came there with his retinue; having paid homage to the shrines he then paid homage to the blessed Goyama.

*aha Puṇḍarīyanāyaṃ kaheī tahiṃ Goyamo pahiyakittī /
dasamassa ya pāraṇae pavvāvesīya²⁹² Koḍinnam || 293*

Then far-famed Goyama told the story of Puṇḍarīka there, and he got Koḍinna to take renunciation at the end of a fast of ten meals.²⁹³

*tassa ya Vesamaṇassā parisāe suravaro payaraṇukammo²⁹⁴ /
taṃ Puṇḍarīyanāyaṃ Goyamakahiyaṃ nisāmei || 294*

And an excellent god in the entourage of Vesamaṇa, one whose karma was diminished, heard the story of Puṇḍarīka told by Goyama.

*ghittūṇa Puṇḍarīyaṃ Vagguvimāṇao so cuo saṃto /
Tuṃbavaṇe Dhaṇagiriṣṣa Ajjasunaṃdāsuo jāo || 295*

That god having understood the story about Puṇḍarīka fell from the Vaggu heaven²⁹⁵ to Tuṃbavaṇa and was born as the son²⁹⁶ of the lady Sunandā, the wife of Dhaṇagiri.

291 Compare v. 293. This epithet is also used of Mahāvīra in vv. 286 and 305.

292 Cf. note 269 and Bollée 1994 s.v. For *pavvāvesīya* as the indeclinable past tense of the causative of *pavvayai* = Sanskrit *pravrajati* see Bollée s.v. *pavvāvai*.

293 A fast of four days duration.

294 UttNiryL: *pataṇukammo* (Hindi: *alpkaṃā Indra*) which I follow in the translation. Bollée's reading *payar'āṇukammo* is most likely metri causa. However, *payara* is not listed in his glossary.

295 The ĀvCū describes the god's rebirth in its expansion of ĀvNiry v. 764. See Kirfel 1967: 293 and 305 for the Valgu heaven.

296 That is, the future teacher Vaira.

*Dinne Koḍinne ya Sevāle²⁹⁷ ceva hoi taie ya /
ikkikkassa ya tesim̐ parivāro panca panca sayā // 296*

There were Dinna and Koḍinna, with Sevāla the third. Each one of them had a following of five hundred.²⁹⁸

*heṭṭhillāṇa cauttam majjhillāṇam tu hoi chaṭṭham tu /
aṭṭhamam uvarillāṇam ahāro tesimo²⁹⁹ hoi // 297*

A fast of four, six and eight meals characterised the eating of those on the lower, middle and higher levels of the mountain.³⁰⁰

*kaṇḍāī saccitto³⁰¹ hiṭṭhillāṇam tu hoi āhāro /
biāṇam accitto taiāṇam sukkasevālo³⁰² // 298*

The food of those on the lower level was tubers with life forms, of those on the second level (the same) without life forms, and of those on the third level dried *sevāla*.

*taṃ pāsīuna iḍḍhiṃ Goyamarisiṇo tao tivaggā³⁰³ vi /
aṇagārā pavvaiā aparivārā vigayamohā // 299*

Then, having seen the magic power³⁰⁴ of the sage Goyama, the leaders of the three groups took renunciation as homeless monks without any retinues of followers, free from delusion.

*egassa khīrabhoyaṇaheū nāṇuppayā muṇeyavvā /
egassa paṛisādaṃsaṇeṇa egassa[ya] ya jīṇammi³⁰⁵ // 300*

297 Of the three ascetic names Bollée 1994 gives only Koḍinne with upper case (and in the glossary s.v. he refers to the occurrence of the name Koḍinna at Utt Nijj v. 170).

298 UttNiryL Hindi *pāṃc-pāṃc sau parivār*. For the difficulties of this expression see below.

299 Read *tesim̐ o?* Bollée describes -o as an emphatic suffix.

300 For fasts involving the fourth, sixth and eighth meals and their duration see Roth 1983: 168–169. This verse and v. 298 are not commented on by Ś.

301 The grammar of *saccitto* and *accitto* in the second line is uncertain: the forms apparently agree with *ahāro*.

302 For *sukka* used of the ascetics, see note 104.

303 Ś: *trayo vargāḥ yeṣāṃ te*.

304 Ś p. 271 l. 14–15: *tām iti pratitām eva bhagavati jaighācaraṇarūpalabdhirūpām*; this is inserted after a cursory reference to UttNiry v. 295. See v. 292 for Vesamaṇa's *iḍḍhi*.

305 UttNiryL: *egassa ya paṛisādaṃsaṇeṇa egassa ya jīṇammi*.

Knowledge³⁰⁶ arose for one brought about by milk-food,³⁰⁷ for one from witnessing the assembly of *kevalins*³⁰⁸ and for one from reflecting upon the Jina.

*kevaliparisaṃ tatto vaccaṃtā Goyamena bhaṇiā ya /
iu eva vandaha jīṇaṃ kayakicca jīṇeṇa so bhaṇio || 301*

Then as they are going towards the assembly of *kevalins* they were addressed by Goyama, 'Go, pay homage to the Jina'. He was told by the Jina that they had achieved their goal.

*soṷṇa taṃ arahao hiaeṇaṃ Goyamo vi ciṃṭei /
nāṇaṃ me na upajjai bhaṇio ya jīṇeṇa sa tāhe || 302*

Having heard that from the *arhat*, Goyama thought in his heart, 'Knowledge does not come about for me.' Then he was addressed by the Jina:

*ciraśaṃsaṭṭhaṃ cirapariciaṃ ciraṃ aṇugayaṃ ca me jāṇa /
dehassa ya bheyammi ya duṇṇi vi tullā bhavissāmo || 303*

'Understand that you have long been familiar, long known and long associated with me. On the disappearance of your body we two will be equal.'³⁰⁹

*jaha manne eam aṭṭhaṃ amhe jaṇāmu khīṇasaṃsārā /
taha manne eam aṭṭhaṃ vimānavāsī vi jāṇaṃti || 304*

Just as, in my opinion, we who have got rid of *saṃsāra* know about this goal, so, in my opinion, the gods also know about this goal.³¹⁰

306 That is, the perfect knowledge which is omniscience.

307 Ś p. 271 ll. 18–19: *kṣīrānnabhojanam eva viśuddhādhyavasāyaviśeṣotpattinibandhanatayā hetuḥ kāraṇaṃ kṣīrabhojanahetu*. *Khīra* is a synonym of *pāyasa* (see section D12), but there has been no mention in the UttNiry of this being supplied to the ascetics. The suggestion seems to be that they have reflected upon the miraculous provenance of this food. Ś does not explain the other two causes.

308 See v. 301a.

309 Ś pp. 271–272 devotes as much space to explaining vv. 303–306 as to the preceding verses.

310 See Mette 1987: 144 n. 7 for this verse being connected with *Bhagavatī Sūtra* 14.7.

*jāṇagapucchaṃ pucchai arahā kira Goyamaṃ pahiyakittī /
kiṃ devānaṃ vayaṇaṃ gijjhaṃ āo³¹¹ jñavarāṇaṃ || 305*

The far-famed *arhat* asked Goyama, it seems,³¹² who had posed a question to the one who knows,³¹³ 'Is the word of the gods to be accepted or that of the excellent Jinas?'³¹⁴

*soūṇa taṃ bhagavao micchāyārassa so uvaṭṭhāi /
tannisāe bhayaṇaṃ sīsāṇaṃ dei anusitṭhiṃ || 306*

Having heard the word of the revered one, Goyama was eager to perform *pratikramaṇa* for his incorrect behaviour.³¹⁵ The revered one instructed his pupils with reference to him.³¹⁶

There can be identified elements in the UttNiry version of the narrative which differentiate it from the ĀvCū and suggest an alternative provenance or transmission.³¹⁷

- (a) The abruptness of the overall narrative context in vv. 284 and 285: there is no mention of the members of a royal family.

³¹¹ Ś pp. 271–272: *āto tti āṛṣatvād āho svit*.

³¹² See note 286.

³¹³ UttNiryL: *tab kucch jānate huē bhī bhagavān Mahāvīr ne prathitkīrti Gautam se pucchā;* Ś p. 271 ll. 32–33: *jāṇagapucchaṃ' ti jñāyakapṛcchayā pṛcchati, na hi tasya bhagavataḥ samastavijñeyaviśayaviññānacakṣuṣaḥ, kva cid avijñānam asti, kintu Gautamaṃ pratibodhayann ittham upālabhate* (UttNiry v. 305 is not printed in Ś's *mūla*). For *jāṇaga*, see Bollée 2002: 96–97. He notes that Leumann refers to the terms *jānaka* and *pṛcchaka* as being used of Buddhas and the fact that they are not used of Mahāvīra in either Buddhist or Jain literature. Bollée (p. 97 note 676) also refers to his own *Studien zum Sūyagaḍa* Pt. 1 (Bollée 1997) p. 75 for *Sūyagaḍa* 1.1.1.18 where the term *jāṇayā* is taken as referring to Buddhists. However, see ĀvNiry v. 1616, quoted by Balbir 1993b: 74, where *jāṇaga* means simply "knower".

³¹⁴ The word of the gods must relate to the rumour about Mount Aṭṭhāvaya. Ś p. 272 ll. 3–4: *asmadvacanataḥ [= v. 303] śataśo 'pi śrūtān na viniścayam api vihitavān, devavacanāt tu sakṛd apy ākarnitāt tatheti pratipādyāṣṭāpadaṃ prati prayāta ity aho te mohavijrmbhitam ity uktaṃ bhavati*.

³¹⁵ Ś p. 272 ll. 6–7: *śrutvā tad upālabhāvaco bhagavataḥ ... mithyācārād ... pratikramitum upatiṣṭhati udyacchati. tannisrayeti Gautamaniśrayā anuśiṣṭiṃ śikṣām evad [sic] bhāvārthas tu sampradāyād avaseyah*.

³¹⁶ UttNiry vv. 307–309 describe how the Jina enunciates the verse about the leaf of the tree.

³¹⁷ The *Uttarādhyayana Cūrṇi* gives a highly abbreviated condensation of the UttNiry version of the story with the only noteworthy divergence being that the ascetics "end their fast with excellent food" (*pāraṇagaṃ paramanneṇaṃ*).

- (b) There is no parallel between Sāla, Mahāsāla etc. hurrying to join the *kevalins* and the converted *tāpasas* doing the same. The phrase *ma āsāehi kevalī* whose repetition structures the ĀvCū narrative is absent.
- (c) There is no reference to Goyama's failure to gain omniscience when travelling with Sāla, Mahāsāla etc.
- (d) Mahāvīra rather than the gods describes (vv. 287–290a) the qualities of Mount Aṭṭhāvaya, perhaps significant in a narrative which will provide the background to a famous sermon by the Jina.
- (e) The reference to Mount Aṭṭhāvaya's proximity to Mount Veyaḍḍha.
- (f) Goyama ascends Mount Aṭṭhāvaya before any encounter with the ascetics and without any recourse to the magical power of *jaṇighācaraṇa* (v. 291).
- (g) The three ascetic leaders and their dietary practices are not correlated in the same manner as in the ĀvCū.
- (h) There is no reference to Goyama feeding the ascetics through the supra-normal power of *akkhīṇamahāṇasiya*.³¹⁸

However, there are also aspects of the UttNiry version which might support the conclusion that it is a condensed and indeed occasionally inconsistent version of the ĀvCū story, either presupposing familiarity with it or some other version lying behind it.

- (a) The reference in v. 295 to Mahāvīra not receiving homage is unexplained by reference to Goyama's rebuke and the Jina's explanation.
- (b) vv. 293 and 296 are not in a fully coherent narrative context with reference to the renunciation of Koḍinna.
- (c) Goyama tells the story of Puṇḍarīa to Vesamaṇa without any explanation of its context.
- (d) The abbreviated description of the rebirth of the god in v. 295 makes no direct allusion to the Vairasāmī, only to his parents.³¹⁹
- (e) The phrase *pañcapaṇcasayā*: if the repetition of *pañca* is a scribal error (dittography) in the ĀvCū (perpetuated in a printed edition based on a single manuscript?), the UttNiry has taken this over, since metre would

³¹⁸ The UttNiry version of Goyama's visit to Aṭṭhāvaya with its lack of reference to the *akkhīṇamahāṇasiya* theme can be seen reflected in the *Vividhatīrthakalpa*. See Jinaprabhasūri, *Vividhatīrthakalpa* 49 (Chojnacki 1995: 101–102 and Cort 1990: 271–272 with errors) for an abbreviated version of the story: slightly incoherent in terms of the ĀvCū version (and as Chojnacki p. 102 n. 47 points out, slightly different from *Triṣaṣṭi* 10) and no reference made to the *tāpasas'* diet or their being magically fed by Goyama. See Vinayaprabha, *Gautam Rās* v. 25 (in Vinayasāgar 1987) for Goyama's pilgrimage to Aṣṭāpada; general reference is made to the ascetics and Goyama's possession of *labdhi*, but no specific reference is made to *akkhīṇamahāṇasiya*.

³¹⁹ Ś p. 277 ll. 16–17 states that the story of V is to be ascertained from the ĀvCū.

not have allowed this particular mistake. Ś and Devendra give *paṃcapaṃ-casayā*. The alternative is that in this respect both versions go back to a common original.

- (f) v. 299 refers to Goyama's *iddhi* without explanation; v. 292 has already referred to the god Vesamaṇa's *iddhi* where the term means "splendour" or "majesty".
- (g) The reference to milk-food in v. 300 implies awareness that the ascetics had requested *pāyasa* from Goyama.
- (h) The reference to the word of the gods in v. 305 does not make sense without knowledge of the "rumour" about Aṭṭhāvaya.

Ernst Leumann was of the opinion that the reference to Vairasāmī's previous existence as the *sāmāṇia* deity who heard Goyama preach and which provides the narrative framework for the ĀvCū narrative was taken into the Āvaśyaka commentarial corpus from the textual tradition which developed around the tenth chapter of the *Uttarādhyāyana Sūtra*. According to Leumann, the ĀvNiry is not familiar with the biography of Vairasāmī; however, after UttNiry v. 295 had established a relationship between Goyama and the biography it proved possible to insert it into the Āvaśyaka tradition for completeness.³²⁰ Leumann's judgment must be viewed with respect, not to say admiration, given that at the time of his research he largely had access only to manuscripts. However, as he does not mention the ĀvCū it is not clear if he is referring to the full story found in that text or merely the material relating to Vairasāmī. I would submit that at this juncture there is not enough clearcut evidence to support the priority of either of the early narrative versions or to posit a situation of mutual borrowing.

Appendix 2: Āvaśyaka Niryukti v. 764 as Catchword Verse for the Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi Narrative

The conclusion of students of the Jain commentarial tradition has generally been that the generic style of the *nijjuttis* is invariably telegraphic and occasionally ungrammatical and unsyntactic to the extent that the verses can only be interpreted with the aid of a commentary.³²¹ However, there can undoubtedly be identified verses in the ĀvNiry which form self-contained units of varying length and are intelligible on their own terms without commentarial aid. In the specific context of the above I would refer to the verse cluster ĀvNiry vv. 764–

³²⁰ See Leumann 2010: 77 n. 1.

³²¹ See for example, Leumann 2010: 85.

772 which represents a mini-biography of the teacher Vairasāmī who in his previous existence has been referred to twice in the ĀvCū narrative.³²² I will proceed by giving text and translation of ĀvNiry vv. 765–772 which describe Vairasāmī's career as remarkable child, great teacher and wonder worker.

*Tuṃbavaṇasaṃnivesāo niggaṃṇaṃ piṣagāsaṃ allīṇaṃ /
chammāsīyaṃ chasu jayaṃ māūyasamannīyaṃ vaṃde || 764*

I pay homage to the one who was reborn³²³ in a way station³²⁴ in Tuṃbavāna,³²⁵ joined his father when six months old,³²⁶ showed restraint with regard to the six forms of life³²⁷ and was accompanied by his mother.³²⁸

322 See sections D1 and D12 and also Leumann 2010: 77 n. 1.

323 Literally “emerged from ...” This is a slightly unusual expression to describe the rebirth process and the expected usage would probably involve *uvavaṇṇo*, “arisen (in the womb of the next mother)”. It may reflect the slightly contracted awkwardness of the opening ĀvCū phrase (p. 390 l. 8): ... *tao caittāṇaṃ Tuṃba[va]ṇasaṃnivese Dhanagiri nāma gāhāvati* (effectively reproduced by H vol. 3 pp. 109–110: *tato caūṇa Avamtiṇaṇavae Tuṃbavaṇasaṃnivese Dhanagiri nāma ibbhaputto*), whereby the locative may not refer to the rebirth destination of the future Vairasāmī but the habitation of Dhanagiri his father-to-be.

324 It is unclear what sort of location is meant here by *sannivesa*. Böhlingk & Roth 1852–1875 s.v. *saṃniveśa* renders it as “Niederlassung”; cf. Mette 1974: 43. Hoernle (*Upāsakadaśāḥ Sūtra*, translation p. 54) takes it in the sense of “suburb” in contrast to *naṃyara*, “city”. However, *Aupapātika Sūtra* paragraph 69 gives *sannivesa* as the last of a stereotyped list of centres of habitation in what is clearly descending order of significance and permanence. Stein 1948: 13 quotes commentarial explanations which suggest that the term designates a stopping place for shepherds, cow-herds and traders; cf. Barnett 1907: 45 n. 1: a traders’ or herdsmen’s settlement. Cf. also Schubring 1977: 53: “Karawanan-Rastorte”; Bollée 2002: 15: “halting place for a procession” is slightly less convincing. At any rate *sannivesa* seems here to designate a fairly inconsequential place such as a wayside inn.

325 For Tumbavāna as modern Tumain (eastern Malwa; H adds *Avamtiṇaṇavae*, ‘in Avantī’ i.e. Malwa;), see Bakker 2019: 310 and Flügel 2020: 24. While archaeological evidence suggests that Tumain was an ancient and significant site, Varāhamihira, *Brhatsaṃhitā* 14.16 does not seem to understand Tumbavāna to be a town or city but a region, undoubtedly afforested as its name would suggest. Hemacandra, *Sthavirāvalī* 12.3b: *tatra Tumbavanam iti vidyate sanniveśanam*. Fynes 1998: 216 translates Sanskrit *sanniveśana* as the “district” called Tumbavāna.

326 The Prakrit might be punctuated alternatively as *piṣagāsa-m-allīṇaṃ*. ĀvCū p. 390 ll. 13–391 l. 4 describes how the newly born Vaira realised that his father had renounced to become a monk. Wishing to emulate him he wailed aloud for six months to his mother’s dismay until she handed him over to his father. I take *allīṇa* in the standard Prakrit sense of “gone” rather than in the Ardhamāgadhī sense of “restrained” discussed by Yagi-Hohara 2018. See Leumann 2010: 77 fn. 1.

327 See ĀvCū p. 391 ll. 6–8 for the infant Vaira signalling to his nurses when he wished to urinate and defecate in order to avoid destroying life forms.

328 I translate *māūyasamannīyaṃ* in accord with H’s gloss *mātrā ca samanvitam*. ĀvCū p. 393

*jo Gujjahehiṃ bālo nimamṭio bhoyaṇeṇa vāsaṃte /
necchati viṇṭyaviṇao taṃ Vairarisiṃ ṇamaṃsāmi || 765*

I salute that sage Vaira who as a boy was invited to take food by the Guhyaka gods at the end of a downpour of rain and did not accept it because he was of intense discipline.³²⁹

*Ujjeṇe jo Jambhagehi āṇakkhiūṇa thuyamahio /
akkhiṇamahāṇasiyaṃ Sīhagiripasaṃsiyaṃ vaṃde || 766*

ll. 4–5 describes how the young Vaira's mother decided to take renunciation in the wake of both her husband and her son. However, this was not a particularly noteworthy event in Vaira's youthful career as summarised by ĀvNiry compared to his mother's dramatic but futile attempt in front of an adjudicating king to prevent her son following his father into the monk's life by calling out to him three times (ĀvCū p. 392 l. 2–3: *evaṃ tiṇṇi vāre vāharito ṇa eti ...*). While emendation may be unnecessary, I suggest a possible adjustment of the text to read *māṭyāsanniyam* (or *-saṇṇiyam*), “addressed by name by his mother”, with *sanniya* as the equivalent of Sanskrit *saṃjñita*. This form *sanniya* / *saṇṇiya* is admittedly not found in Sheth 1963, but the citation of *saṃjñita* in Böhlingk & Roth 1852–1875 s.v. *saṃjñita*, “genannt, heissend”, suggests that such a Prakrit form is feasible. The word *saṃjñita* occurs in the Jain Sanskrit text the *Upamitibhavadrapaṇcākathā* of Siddharṣi (*pīṭhabandha* v. 266 Motā vol. 1).

ĀvNiry v. 764 occurs as *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya* v. 2757 where Jinabhadra's reading is *mātīya samaṇṇitaṃ*. In the Ladnum edition of 2014 the Hindi translation of Sādhvī Muditaśā interprets *mātīya* as referring to the *mātrkā*, that is to say the Jain ontological triad of arising (*utpāda*), disappearance (*vyaya*) and stability (*dhrauvya*), understanding of which informed the young Vaira's restraint towards the six forms of life.

- 329 Cf. Balbir 1993a: 145. ĀvCū p. 392. ll. 7–12 describes how Vaira was with his teacher at Ujjain when there is a downpour of rain. When it was over (*teṇa aṃteṇa*; H explains *vāsaṃte* by *varṣati sati parjanya iti gamyate*, “while it was raining”) the Jambhaga (“yawning”) gods (see ĀvNiry v. 766) who have come to see Vaira decide to test him. Vaira does not take the alms they offer because this would breach monastic rules and he is accordingly rewarded with magic powers. For *nimamṭio* whose sense is very near “tempted”, cf. ĀvNiry v. 768a. For the possibility of a Jambhaga god earlier in the narrative see D12 and note 128. Yawning as a physical action has violent or disruptive implications in Hindu mythology; see Couture 2017: 167–184. ĀvNiry vv. 765–756 would appear to regard the Gujjahe (Sanskrit Guhyaka; also called Vināyaka) gods with the Jambhaya gods as interchangeable for the purposes of its biography of Vaira, no doubt because of their shared antinomian and demonic attributes. However, a noteworthy feature of the Guhyaka gods in Hindu ritual is that they should be propitiated with food offerings by kings setting out on military expeditions; see Geslani 2018: 136–145. Such expeditions typically commence at the end of the rainy season (Sanskrit *vāsānte*). ĀvNiry v. 765 seems to be reversing the Guhyaka gods' role in describing them making a food offering to a Jain monk when the rain has stopped (Prakrit *vāsaṃte*).

I pay homage to the one who possessed the power of bestowing unfailing food and was commended by Sīhagiri,³³⁰ he who was praised and lauded at Ujjain by the Jambhaga gods after testing him.³³¹

*jassa añunnāe vāyagattāṇe Dasapurammi nayarammi |
devehi kayā mahimā payānusāriṇ namaṃsāmi || 767*

I salute the possessor of the *padānusāri* attainment³³² who was worshipped by the gods when his attainment of the rank of *vācaka* had been approved in the city of Dasapura.³³³

*jo kannāi dhaṇeṇa a nimaṃtio juvvaṇammi gihavaiṇā |
nayarammi Kusumanāme taṃ Vairarisiṇ namaṃsāmi || 768*

I pay homage to that sage Vaira who in his youth was allured in the city of Kusumapura by a householder offering his daughter and wealth.³³⁴

*jeṇuddhariyā vijjā āgāsagamā Mahāparinnāo |
vaṃdāmi Ajjavairam apacchimo jo suaharāṇam || 769*

I pay homage to AjjaVaira who retrieved the spell for flying called *Mahā-parinnā*, he who was the last of those familiar with scriptural tradition.³³⁵

330 Cf. Balbir 1993a: 145. The first line of this verse recapitulates v. 765a; neither of these verses is identified by catchwords in the ĀvCū. H: *āṇakkhiūṇa ti pariṅṣya*. The form, explained as < *ālakṣya* by *Critical Prakrit Dictionary* (citing this verse and *Niśītha Cūrṇi* 1.8.19) must then involve l / n alternation. However, Bollée 1994: 139 s.v. *āṇakkheī* queries a derivation from *ālakṣ*.

331 For the superhuman attainment of *akkhānamahāṇasīya* see section J. Neither this nor Vaira's teacher Sīhagutta are mentioned by the ĀvCū prior to the section dealing with ĀvNiry v. 767. They are also not referred to by H.

332 ĀvCū p. 392 ll. 11–p. 393 l. 1 describes how Vaira by means of the *padānusāribuddhilabdhi* stabilised the text of the *aṅgas* and understood everything in the *pūrva* scriptures. For this superhuman attainment whereby hearing a single word generates knowledge of other words, see Gough 2021: 232 n. 30 and Wiley 2012: 163 and cf. Kapadia 2000: 74.

333 ĀvCū p. 394 ll. 11–12 has a catchword for this verse but says nothing of its content. The phrase *devehiṇ katā mahimā* occurs at ĀvCū p. 396 l. 11 where the context is the story alluded to in ĀvNiry v. 772. Dasapura referred to in the previous verse is in Malwa. Leumann 2010: 76 saw Dasapura as connecting a variety of early Jain figures including Vairasāmi's pupil AjjaRakkhiya. For the rank of *vācaka*, see Gough 2021: 75.

334 See ĀvCū pp. 395 l. 1–396 l. 1 preceded by *pratikas* for ĀvNiry vv. 770 and 771. Kusumapura is an alternative name of Pātāliputra.

335 According to ĀvCū p. 392 ll. 11–12 the Jambhaya gods gave Vaira a flying spell (*ṇabhaḡamīṇī*

*bhaṇai a āhiṇḍijjā Jambuddhayaṇ imāi vijjāe /
gaṇtuṇ ca māṇusanagaṇ vijjāe esa me visao || 770*

He said that he would wander over the continent of Jambūdvīpa by means of that spell. Having gone to the mountain beyond the mortal world (he would stand there thinking) 'This is my sphere because of the spell'.³³⁶

*bhaṇai a dhāreavvā na hu dāyavvā imā mae vijjā /
appaḍḍhiyā maṇuā hohiṇti ao paraṇ anne || 771*

He said that he must retain this spell and not transmit it to anyone, for after this time other men will be of scanty power.³³⁷

*Māhesariū sesā Puriyaṇ nā Huāsaṇagihāo /
gayaṇayalam aivaittā Vaireṇa mahāṇubhāgeṇa || 772*

Vaira of great power brought the remainder of an offering³³⁸ from the shrine of the fire god Agni flying through the sky from Maheśvarī to Purikā.³³⁹

The ĀvNiry then addresses the question posed by the ĀvCū concerning the reconfiguration of *aṇuooga*.

vijjā) after he rejected their efforts to tempt him with rich food. *Mahāparinṇā* is the name of the lost seventh chapter of the *Ācārāṅga Sūtra*; see Kapadia 2000: 72. For Vairasāmī as the last to know the ten surviving Pūrva scriptures see Kapadia 2000: 68.

336 Verse cited by Āv Cū p. 394 l. 14 which gives only the *pratika* for this verse. H: 'mānu-
ṣanagaṇ mānuṣottaraparvatam tiṣṭhed iti vākyaśeṣaḥ'.

337 The ĀvCū does not give a *pratika* from this verse nor, as with H, any version of its content.

338 H: *sesa ttī puṣpasamudāyalakṣaṇā*.

339 See ĀvCū pp. 396 ll. 5–397 l. 1 for Vairasāmī using his supernormal power to obtain flowers from the temple of a *vyantara* deity to confound a Buddhist (*taccanīya*) king who had been preventing the Jain community in the city of Puriya from performing worship. For *taccanīya* / *taccanīya*, "Buddhist", add ĀvCū p. 396 ll. 6, 7 and 13 to the references adduced by Bollée 1994: 227 s.v. *tac-caṇ[n]i(n)* (*sic*) and 1998 vol. 3 p. 112 s.v. *tac-caṇīya*. ĀvCū seems to identify at p. 96 l. 9 the name of the *vyantara* deity as *Hutāsanaḡiha* but at l. 12 refers to Vaira going to *Aggihara*, "Agni's temple". Cf. H: *Hutāsanaḡhāt'vyantaradevakulasamanvitodyānāt*. H gives the narrative of Vairasāmī's aerial journey in his commentary on v. 771.

*apahutte anuogo cattāri divvāra bhāsai ego /
puhatāṇuogakaraṇe te attha tao u vucchinā || 773*

When there is non-separation, a single hermeneutic examination expresses all four doors of access;³⁴⁰ but when one performs a hermeneutic investigation which involves separation, these meanings of the texts are thereby separated out.³⁴¹

*deviṃdavaṃdiehi mahāṇubhāgehi Rakkhiājjeḥiṃ /
jugam āsajja vibhatto aṇuogo to kao cauḥā || 335*

AjjaRakkhia of great power who had received homage from the mighty gods divided hermeneutic investigation into four parts having considered the prevailing temporal situation.³⁴²

In terms of the structure of the ĀvNiry's treatment of development of scriptural hermeneutics within the Jain community, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that vv. 773 and 774 follow on from v. 763³⁴³ and that vv. 764–772, which detail the main events in the teacher Vairasāmī's career, constitute an interruption, albeit coherent in its own term. ĀvNiry vv. 764–772 occur as vv. 2757–2765 in Jinabhadra's *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya* (beginning of seventh century) and similarly interrupt vv. 2755 and 2766 (= ĀvNiry v. 763 and v. 773–774).³⁴⁴ As if to confirm this incongruity, the twelfth century commentator Hemacandra Maladhārīn does not include vv. 2757–2765 in his recension of the *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya*. He claims that the "author" (*granthakāra*) of the ĀvNiry, that is to say Bhadrabāhu, impassioned by Vairasāmī's many attainments, had composed a hymn of praise (*stuti*) to him and that the overall purport of its straightforward (*sugama*) verses can be understood from H.³⁴⁵

340 That is, *caraṇa*, *dharma*, *saṃkhyā* and *dravya*. See section C.

341 ĀvCū does not give a *pratīka* from this verse.

342 ĀvCū pp. 410 l. 14–411 l. 1 cursorily describes AjjaRakkhia's division of the *aṇuoga* into four parts as a less demanding aid for intellectually weak pupils. For the decline in scriptural transmission setting in with the passing of Vaira, see Kapadia 2000: 68.

343 See note 44.

344 ViĀvBh v. 2756 is a versification of ĀvCū p. 381 ll. 7–11. Alsdorf 1998: 820 claims that the *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya* as a whole is a mere versification of the prose tradition represented by the *Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi*. This view is rejected by Balbir 1993a: 71. The *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya* was written between 593 CE and 609 CE; see Mahendra Kumar's intro to Anantavīrya, *Siddhivinīścayāṭikā* pp. 35–36, quoted by Franco 2018: 128 n. 33 (referring to the dating 609); Malvania (ViĀvBh Pt. 1 intro p. 3) regards 609 as the date of the manuscript's completion.

345 See ViĀvBh v. 2284 (Caturavijaya vol. 5 p. 929): *tāṃ cāryavairotpattim ananyasādhā-*

Hemacandra Maladhārin no doubt omitted these *niryukti* verses from his recension on the grounds that they did not conform to the learned and distinctly non-narrative subject matter of the *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya*; he would otherwise have had no problem to Bhadrabāhu being the overall author of ĀvNiry. Whatever the reason, his judgement has certainly influenced one recent editorial decision. It has been recognised since the time of the medieval commentators that the ĀvNiry contains different textual layers of diverse authorial provenance and that there have been gradual verse accretions and interpolations, often metrically identifiable, culminating in what can be called a “vulgate” version embedded in H.³⁴⁶ In her recent edition of the ĀvNiry, Samaṇī Kusumaprajñā is more radical than earlier Indian editors of the text in identifying verses or clusters of verses which are to be regarded as interpolations, and while not omitting them completely she nonetheless relegates them to secondary status.³⁴⁷

The extent to which Kusumaprajñā's version of the ĀvNiry, which is much shorter than the vulgate, corresponds to an original recension must be a matter for future debate; as so often the likelihood of such an “Urfassung” may prove to be a chimera.³⁴⁸ What is significant is that the nine verse unit containing the biography of Vaira is a casualty of Kusumaprajñā's reediting of the ĀvNiry, as can be seen from the new enumeration assigned to what is a sub-unit of verse: vv. 476¹⁻⁹, with v. 476 being vulgate v. 763 and v. 477 being vulgate v. 773. Kusumaprajñā points to the discursive adjacency of vv. 476 and 477 (her renumbering), and quotes Hemacandra Maladhārin's assessment of the Vaira biography as representing a different genre. Accordingly, her conclusion

raṇatadguṇarañjitaṃ māṇaso granthakāraḥ stutidvāreṇāha “Tuṃbavaṇa” ityādi etaccarita-gāthāś ca sugamāḥ, mūlāvaśyakaṭikātaś ca sabhāvārthāḥ samavaseyās tāvat ... See also Malvania ed. Pt. 2 p. 533 note 10.

346 See Balbir 1993a: 45 and 53.

347 See Kusumaprajñā's introduction to ĀvNiryL: 41 for the verses under discussion being added as the 24th of 29 examples of interpolations within the ĀvNiry verses. For Haribhadra's identification of interpolated verses in the ĀvNiry see Balbir 1993a: 45 n. 39. Some 257 *bhāṣya* verses from the *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya* of Jinabhadra have been inserted into the ĀvNiry as *mūlabhāṣya*. These *bhāṣya* verses, however, have been omitted from Kusumaprajñā's text edition and collected in a separate section; see the introduction to ĀvNiryL vol. 2: 181–188; vol. 1: 37–42.

348 Kusumaprajñā's edition consists of 1093 verses as opposed to the 1623 verses of the vulgate (see Balbir 1993a: 46 and 75); Āryarakṣitavijaya's edition of the vulgate contains 1625 verses (1099 Malayagiri?). Because the verses identified as interpolations by Kusumaprajñā are assigned superscript enumeration in the new edition, use of a concordance is required to identify verses in the vulgate and other recensions. Unfortunately Kusumaprajñā only provides the necessary concordance for the first 680 verses; see vol. 1: 269–307.

is that the nine verses do not conform to the overall style (*rūp*) of a *niryukti* and thereby a strong case for the Vaira unit being a secondary addition to the ĀvNiry can be made.³⁴⁹

These verses do indeed look like an insertion within the ĀvNiry from the *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya* on the basis of familiarity with the narrative of the ĀvCū, or, following Alsdorf, are possibly a summary of a lost oral version of the narrative which is given in written form in the ĀvCū. The insertion of this biography by some redactor may have been intended to foreground the pivotal role of Vairasāmī in channelling processes of scriptural transmission and hermeneutics from Mahāvīra's disciple Goyama, which reached a transitional watershed with his pupil AjjaRakkhiya and which had otherwise been referred to by the ĀvNiry only in abstract terms. For our purposes it presents the likelihood that ĀvNiry v. 764 which provides the catchword for the ĀvCū narrative is an interpolation.

Appendix 3: The Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi's Version of the Story of Puṃḍarīa

At first glance it might seem reasonable to conclude that the ĀvCū has incorporated verbatim the canonical story of Puṃḍarīa and his brother Kaṃḍarīa as found in the nineteenth "chapter" (*ajjhayaṇa*) of the *Jñātādharmakathāḥ Sūtra*. H, who largely follows the text of the ĀvCū, is content to abbreviate the story by means of a cursory reference to its setting and two main protagonists; his remark *jahā Nātesu* implies that he expects the reader to supply the text of the canonical version.³⁵⁰ However, the ĀvCū version of the story of Puṃḍarīa (section D9) is in fact not a precise reiteration of the text found in the *Jñātādharmakathāḥ Sūtra*, at least as established by Muni Jambūvijaya in his Jaina Āgama Series edition. Leaving aside abbreviations and relatively inconsequential rewordings of stereotyped passages,³⁵¹ there are to be iden-

349 See Kusumaprajñā's edition of ĀvNiryL: 113 n. 18. Leumann (1934: 31b; 2010: 85) noted that the *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya*'s language is much more correct and its style more intelligible than that of the old *Nijjuttis* and their *Bhāṣya* insertions.

350 H p. 1107 ll. 2–3: *Puṃḍarīgīṇī nagarī Puṃḍarīo rāyā Kaṃḍarīo juvarāyā jahā Nātesu*; cf. Mette 1987: 142 n. 4 and also Bruhn, introduction to *Cauppannamahāpurisacarīya* p. 15; see also Balbir 1993a: 145. H only has in common with ĀvCū the introduction and conclusion of the story, the only portions pertinent to its theme absent from the canonical model (*Nāyā* 19).

351 Mette 1987: 141 n. 3 describes the wording of the ĀvCū as being "fast identisch" referring, without giving specific examples, to the abbreviation of the stereotyped passages of the canonical version.

tified three textual deviations in the ĀvCū version which can be understood as bearing upon the various points that Goyama is making in his sermon to Vesamaṇa.

The first insertion occurs near the beginning of the ĀvCū's version, interrupting somewhat clumsily the following lines dealing with the renunciant career of Mahāpauma, the father of Puṇḍarīya and Kaṇḍarīya, and not otherwise making sense in context. The text of the canonical version is as follows:³⁵² *Mahāpaume rāyā ṇiggate, dhammam soccā Puṇḍarīyaṃ rajje ṭhavettā pavvatie, Puṇḍarīe rāyā jāte, Kaṇḍarīe juvarāyā | Mahāpaume aṇagāre coddasa purvāiṃ ahijjai* ("King Mahāpauma went forth; he heard the doctrine, established Puṇḍarīa as his successor and renounced the world. Puṇḍarīa became king and Kaṇḍarīa the crown prince. Mahāpauma as a monk studied the fourteen Pūrva scriptures"). The ĀvCū version is:³⁵³ *tae ṇaṃ se Mahāpaume rāyā Puṇḍarīyaṃ rāyaṃ*³⁵⁴ *āpucchatī, tae ṇaṃ se Puṇḍarīe evaṃ jahā Odāyano, ṇavaraṃ coddasa purvāiṃ ahijjati* ("Then king Mahāpauma took his leave of king Puṇḍarīa; then Puṇḍarīa as in the example of Udāyaṇa, in sum³⁵⁵ he studied the fourteen Pūrva scriptures").

In the foregoing passage *jahā* has a function similar to *jāva*, the standard word used in the Ardhamāgadhī sūtras to signal that "ready-made" canonical descriptions are to be inserted in a textual gap.³⁵⁶ The story of Udāyaṇa in its canonical form at *Bhagavatī Sūtra* 13.6 commences with the renunciation of the aforementioned king who resolves to give his kingdom to his nephew rather than his son. The description of Udāyaṇa's entry into the Jain monastic order is not a conventional textual template of renunciation compared to that of, for example, prince Meha, which represents a much more common insertion.³⁵⁷ I would suggest that the significance of Udāyaṇa for this particular story lies in the fact that according to the expansion of the *Bhagavatī Sūtra* narrative found later in the ĀvCū, this particular king died from the effects of eating illicit alms, specifically curds, which had been poisoned by his nephew who was unable to abandon his negative feelings towards his uncle.³⁵⁸

352 *Nāyā* p. 348 l. 14–16.

353 ĀvCū p. 384 ll. 5–6.

354 This perhaps is an abbreviation of *juvarāyā*.

355 For *ṇavaraṃ* see note 53 (*jaṇṇaṃ ṇavaraṃ*) and Tieken 1983: 211–212; for earlier discussion see Bollée 1994: 255 s.v. *navaraṃ* and Schubring 1978: 70 s.v. *jaṇṇaṃ na-varaṃ*. The expression here seems to signal abbreviation.

356 See *Nāyā* pp. 527–557 for a list of *jāva* texts.

357 For Meha's renunciation see Gough 2021: 240 n. 20.

358 For the story of Udāyaṇa see ĀvCū vol. 2 pp. 36–37; and also Wu 2017.

The second textual insertion, also not found in the version of the *Jñātādharmakathāḥ Sūtra*, occurs at the beginning of the description of Kaṃḍarīa's renunciation when he mounts a processional chariot to convey him to the ceremony. At this point the ĀvCū inserts the account given at *Bhagavatī Sūtra* 9.33 of the renunciation of Jamāli who, according to tradition, was to become the first heretical teacher in Jainism.³⁵⁹ The description in the *Bhagavatī Sūtra* of Jamāli's procession in a richly caparisoned chariot to his place of renunciation is a regularly used template³⁶⁰ and in these terms there is nothing untoward about its occurrence here in the ĀvCū. However, as with Udāyaṇa, Jamāli is associated with the consumption of inappropriate food which leads to illness.

These inserted references to two figures of Jain history who met an unhappy end through consumption of inappropriate food suggest a pointed allusion to the conclusion of this narrative in which both protagonists succumb to the ill effects of diet, excessively rich in one case and exiguous and harsh on the other, and seem intended to intensify Goyama's version of the story of Puṃḍarīa.³⁶¹ The consumption of food may also be regarded as a significant theme in the ĀvCū narrative: the ascetics' self mortification, Goyama's apparent (to the ascetics and Vesamaṇa) bulkiness and his feeding of the ascetics through supranormal means.

The third modification of the canonical story by the ĀvCū occurs in the course of Puṃḍarīa's attempt to dissuade his brother from becoming a Jain monk.³⁶² Here the ĀvCū incorporates almost verbatim a passage from the first chapter of the *Jñātādharmakathāḥ Sūtra* in which the parents of prince Meha describe the difficulties of the ascetic life to their son who has resolved to renounce.³⁶³ The passage takes the form of an account couched in similes of the harsh nature of the ascetic practices incumbent on a monk,³⁶⁴ and a delin-
 eation of the types of alms food of exiguous or forbidden nature which a monk

359 *Bhagavatī Sūtra* 9.33 for Jamāli (Amaramuni vol. 3, text pp. 462–463; trans pp. 464–465), Deleu 1970: 164 and Dundas 2006: 35 and cf. Roth 1983: 133 n. 82. See ĀvCū p. 386 l. 4 for Kaṃḍarīa's renunciation. Note that the ĀvCū version of the story does not describe Puṃḍarīa handing over his brother to the Jain monks as *śisabhikkha* as does *Nāyā* p. 350 l. 1.

360 See Roth 1983: 133 n. 82, including *Nāyā* reference.

361 See Dge–f. Kaṃḍarīa went to hell because of falling ill due to a surfeit of rich food, whereas Puṃḍarīa who fell ill in the same way because of the poor quality of food went to heaven.

362 Section D9b; ĀvCū pp. 384 l. 13–386 l. 3 = *Nāyā* p. 349 ll. 15–16.

363 ĀvCū p. 385 ll. 2–12 = *Nāyā* pp. 47 l. 11–49 l. 8.

364 ĀvCū p. 385 l. 5–l. 7 = *Nāyā* p. 47 ll. 17–19: *ahī vā egaṃtaditṭhīe khuro iva egaṃtadhārāe lohamayā vā javā carveyavvā vāluṃyākavale iva nirassāe gaṃgā vā mahāṇadī paḍissotaṃ gamaṇatāe mahāsamudde iva bhuyāhiṃ duttare tikkhaṃ kamiṃyavvaṃ garuṃyāṃ laṃbeya-
vvaṃ asidhāraṃ vataṃ caritavvaṃ*. See Mette 2010: 66.

will have to deal with or reject after renunciation.³⁶⁵ This is followed by a warning to Kaṃḍarīa by Puṃḍarīa that through being habituated to ease he will not be able to endure the various afflictions and indignities of the renunciant life.³⁶⁶ These insertions are relevant to Goyama's disquisition to Vesamaṇa, with the second intensifying the theme of food with particular reference to what has been described as the diet of the three *tāpasas*.

Some further comment can be made. Firstly, in the *Jñātādharmakathāḥ Sūtra* version Meha is addressed by his parents with the expression *jāyā*, "Oh son!"³⁶⁷ The same expression is preserved in the *ĀvCū* version but used by Puṃḍarīa in addressing his brother.³⁶⁸ This may well be the result of carelessness on the part of the redactor of the *ĀvCū* rather than punctiliousness about maintaining the precise wording of scripture. Some modifications can also be identified in the *ĀvCū* version. The *Jñātādharmakathāḥ Sūtra* commences the admonition by Meha's parents with a truncated version of a formula about the truth, supremacy and efficacy of the Jain doctrine which (with the terms involved assigned a different grammatical gender) is found in the *Paḍikkamaṇa* section of the *ĀvSū*.³⁶⁹ The *ĀvCū* drastically curtails the formula while also signalling that it occurs in the *Paḍikkamaṇa* section.³⁷⁰ Furthermore the *ĀvCū*

365 *ĀvCū* p. 385 ll. 7–10 (separating out the particle *i / ti* where necessary) *jātā! se ahākammi i vā uddesie vā missajāte i vā uddarae* [*Sthāna*, *Aup ajiḥoyarae*] *pūṭite kie pāmice acchejje aṇisaṭṭhe abhihaḍe ti vā thatie i* [*Aup thaviyae*; This and following not in *Sthāna*; Leumann *Aupapātika Sūtra* ed. p. 74 fn. 6: these are introduced from *Nāyā* 1. 144] *vā ratitae ti* [read *ratitae i?* *Aup raiyae*] *vā kaṃtārabhatte i vā dubbhikkhabhatte i vā gilānabhatte i vā vaddaliyābhatte i vā pāhuṇigabhatte ivā* [*sic*] *sejjātarapiṇḍe ti vā rāyapiṇḍe ti vā mūlabhoyāṇe ti vā kaṃḍabho* [abbreviated] *phalabho* [abbreviated] *bīyabho* [abbreviated] *harīyabhoyāṇeti vā* [*Sthāna paḍisiddhe*] *bhottae vā pātae*.

366 *ĀvCū* p. 385 ll. 10–12 = *Nāyā* p. 48 ll. 4–7 *tumaṇ ca ṇaṃ jātā! suhasamucite, ṇo ceva ṇaṃ duhasamucite, ṇalaṇ sītaṇ nālaṇ unhaṇ ṇalaṇ khuḥā ṇalaṇ pivāsā ṇalaṇ corā ṇalaṇ vālā ṇalaṇ daṃsā ālaṇ masagā ṇalaṇ vāṭiyapettīyasambhīyasannivāte vivīhe rogātaṃke uccāvāe vā gāmakamṭṭage vā bāvīsaṇ parīsaḥovasagge udinne samaṇ ahiyāsettae tti*.

367 The Prakrit expression is the equivalent of Sanskrit *jāta*; for the prolated vowel in the vocative see von Hinüber 2001: 229–230. I can find no evidence for this being a form of address used between siblings.

368 See note 366.

369 *Nāyā* p. 47 ll. 14–16: *esa ṇaṃ niggamthe pāvayaṇe saccae anuttarae kevaliye paḍipunṇe neyāyūye saṃsuddhae sallakattaṇe siddhimagge muttimagge nijjāṇamagge nīrvāṇamagge vsavvadukkhapaṇāṇamagge*. For the full text see Jās ed. p. 342 *Avassayasutta* 4 (*Paḍikkamaṇajjhayaṇam*) para 28: *inaṃ eva niggamthaṃ pāvayaṇaṃ saccaṃ anuttaraṃ kevaliyaṃ paḍipunṇaṃ neyāyūyaṃ saṃsuddhaṃ sallakattaṇaṃ siddhimaggaṃ muttimaggaṃ nijjāṇamaggaṃ nīrvāṇamaggaṃ vitahaṃ avisaṃdhiṃ savvadukkhapaṇāṇamaggaṃ, etthaṃ thīyā jīvā sijjhaṃti bujjaṃti muccaṃti parinīvāyaṃti savvadukkhāṇaṃ aṇṭaṃ kareṇṭi*.

370 *ĀvCū* p. 385 ll. 4–5: *niggamthe pāvayaṇe sacce anuttare kevalie evaṃ jahā Paḍikkamaṇe jāva savvadukkhāṇaṃ aṇṭaṃ kareṇṭi*.

inserts between the account of the difficulty of ascetic life and the delineation of the varieties of alms food an injunction that ascetic monks should avoid the eighteen forms of evil (here abbreviated to the first, taking life, and last, the thorn of false belief).³⁷¹

Acknowledgments

The sudden passing of Paul Dundas earlier this year, on 5 April 2023, at the age of 70, came as a great shock. When I embarked on my first teaching position, at the University of Edinburgh in 2005, Paul quickly became my mentor and friend. The five years we ran the Sanskrit department together at Buccleuch Place have been formative to me in many respects and will always stay with me. The publication of his final paper is my small tribute to one of the most learned and generous people I have known.

Shortly after he died, his partner, Rowan Flett, gave me a hard disk with the files from his computer, among which I found the article now published here. Paul had been working on it until the end of his life and intended it for publication, even if posthumously. I knew about its existence because he had mentioned it in our communications every now and then. In a message dated 15 July 2020 he wrote the following, after I had expressed my interest in publishing it in the *Indo-Iranian Journal*: “The Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi paper has been with me for a while now. I’m having difficulty deciding how to structure a final version, since the stuff about tāpasas is an episode in a broader narrative which requires a bit of explication. I may have to go with a slimline article, in which case when it’s done I’ll send it to you for comment. If it’s good enough for IJ, that would be great.” Instead, the article kept on growing over the years, and the version presented here is certainly not the “slimline article” he must have had in mind when he wrote these words. There can be no doubt though that, in his modest words, “it’s good enough for IJ”.

A few words are in place about the editing I have done. I have made no changes to the body of the text—which was complete—except for correcting obvious typos and making other minor adaptations. The notes on the other hand (371 in total!) required more work, as Paul had not been able to finish writing them all out, although most of them were complete. I have silently corrected and smoothened them where needed, but not introduced anything new

371 *no ya khalu kappati ... samaññāṇaṃ niggaṃthānaṃ pañātivāe vā jāva vā micchādamsaṇa-salle*. For the eighteen evils, see *Bhagavatī Sūtra* 1.9 and cf. Deleu 1970: 84.

that was not there in the first place, so that the article does represent the last stage of Paul's writing. The bibliography only existed in a rudimentary state, including abbreviated notes which gave me clues to identifying the sources referred to. Being able to access the files from his computer has been a great help in tracking down the references. I have done so to the best of my ability, but I am very much aware that I may occasionally have erred or missed something. Any faults that remain are mine and mine alone, and I take full responsibility for this publication. I would like to thank Peter Flügel for checking the final version of the edited draft, and Rowan Flett for sharing Paul's files with me.

References

Primary Sources

- Abhidhānarājendrakōśa*. Compiled by Vijayarajendrasuri, 7 vols, Ahmadavad 1986.
- Aṃgavijjā*. Muni Puṇyavijaya (ed.), *Aṅgavijjā: Science of Divination through Physical Signs & Symbols*, Varanasi 1957.
- Anuyogadvāra Sūtra*. Muni Jambūvijaya (ed.), *Anuyogadvārasūtram cūrṇi-vivṛtti-vṛttivibhūṣitam*, Mumbai 2000.
- Aupapātika Sūtra*. E. Leumann (ed.), *Das Aupapātika Sūtra, erstes Upāṅga der Jaina*, Leipzig 1883.
- Aupapātika Sūtra*. Muni Vijayamunicandrasūri (ed.), *NavāṅgaṭikākṛdācāryapravaraśrīAbhayadevasūrivihitavṛttisahitam Uvavāisuttam* [sic], Mumbai 2012.
- Aupapātika Sūtra*. Amar Muni (ed.), *Sacitra Aupapātika Sūtra*, Dillī 2003.
- Aupapātika Sūtra* with Abhayadevasūri's commentary. Vijayamunicandrasūri (ed.), *Uvavāi[a]suttam*, Mumbai 2012.
- ĀvCū: *Āvaśyakacūrṇi*. Jinadāsa, *Āvaśyakacūrṇi*, 2 vols, Ratlām 1928 and 1929.
- ĀvNiryH: *Āvaśyaka Niryukti*. Āryarakṣitavijaya (ed.), *Āvaśyakaniryukti* with Haribhadra's commentary, Ahmedabad 2013.
- ĀvNiryL: *Āvaśyaka Niryukti*. Kusumaprajñā (ed.), *Āvassayanijjuttī (Āvaśyakaniryukti)* by Bhadrabāhu, Ladnūṃ 2021.
- ĀvSū: *Āvaśyaka Sūtra*. Muni Puṇyavijaya & A.M. Bhojak (eds.), *Dasaveyāliyasuttam, Uttarajjhayaṇāim and Āvassayasuttam*, Bombay 1977.
- Bhagavatī Sūtra*. J. Doshi & A.M. Bhojak (eds.), *Viyāhapaṇṇattisuttam*, 3 vols, Bombay 1974–1982.
- Bhagavatī Sūtra*. Muni Dīparatnasāgara (ed.), *Āgamasuttāṇi (saṭikam) bhāgaḥ 5: Bhagavatīāṅgasūtram*, Ahmadāvād 2000.
- Bhagavatī Sūtra*. Amar Muni, Varun Muni & Sanjay Surana (ed.), *Illustrated Shri Bhagavatī Sutra (Vyakhya Prajnapti)*, trans. S. Bothara, illus. T. Sharma, 4 vols, Delhi 2005–2013.

D: see UttNiryD.

Devavimala, *Hīrasaubhāgya*. M. Pandit Sivadatta & K.P. Parab (eds.), *The Hīrasaubhāgya of Devavimalagaṇi with his own gloss*, Bombay 1900.

Devasūri, *Pramāṇanayatattvālaṃkāra*. M. Lādhā (ed.), *Pramāṇanayatattvālokālaṃkāra with the Syādvādaratnākara autocommentary*, Dillī 1988.

Devendrasūri, *Vandāruvṛtti. Śrāddhapratikramaṇasūtravṛtti*, Muṃbāi 1988.

Dhammapada. O. von Hinüber & K.R. Norman (eds.), *Dhammapada*, Bristol 2014 (reprint of 1994 with indexes).

Dharmasāgara, *Kīraṇāvalī*. Muni Vairāgyarativijaya & Muni Praśamarativijaya (eds.), *Kalpasūtra commentary by Dharmasāgara*, Bhavnagar 2003.

H: see ĀvNiryH

Hemacandra, *Sthavirāvalī*. H. Jacobi (ed.), *Sthavirāvalīcarita or Paṛiśiṣṭaparvan*, Calcutta 1883.

Hemacandra, *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita*. Munirāja Śrīcaraṇavijayaṇi Mahārāja, Śrīramaṇīkavijayaṇi Gaṇi & Vijayaśīlacandrasūri (eds.), *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritamahākāvyaṃ*, 5 vols, Ahmedabad 2001.

Hīrapraśnottara. Kirtivijaya, *Hīrapraśnottarāṇi*, Mumbai 1988.

Jinacarita. H. Jacobi (ed.), *The Kalpasūtra of Bhadrabāhu*, Leipzig 1879, 33–76.

Jñātādharma-kathāḥ Sūtra. Muni Jambūvijaya (ed.), *Nāyadhammakahāo (Jñātādharma-kathāṇiṅgasūtram)*, Bombay 1989.

Kālidāsa, *Abhijñānaśākuntalam*. R. Pischel (ed.), *De Kālidāsaes Çākuntali recensioibus: dissertatio inauguralis philologica*, Vratislavae 1970.

Kālidasa, *Kumārasaṃbhava*. Suryakanta (ed.), *The Kumārasaṃbhava of Kālidāsa*, New Delhi 1962.

Kauṇḍinya on *Pāśupata Sūtra*. A. Shastri (ed.), *Pasupata Sutras with Pancharthabhashya of Kaundinya*, Trivandrum 1940.

Manusmṛti. P. Olivelle (ed.), *Manu's Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānavadharmaśāstra*, New York 2005.

MBh: *Mahābhārata*. V.S. Sukthankar (ed.), *The Mahābhārata: For the First Time Critically Edited*, 19 vols, Poona 1933–1966.

Municandrasūri on *Upadeśapada*. Pratāpavijayaṇi (ed.), *Upadeśapada with commentary of Municandrasūri*, Baroda 1923.

Nāyā: Nāyādhammakahāo. See *Jñātādharma-kathāḥ Sūtra*.

Ś: see UttNiryŚ.

Senaprasna, compiled by Śubhavijaya. *Praśnaratnākaraḥ Śrī Senaprasnaḥ*, Muṃbāi 1919.

Siddharṣi, *Upamitibhavaprapaṇcakathā*. Vijayaṇinendrasūri (ed.), *Upamitibhavaprapaṇcakathā*, Lākḥābāval.

Śīlāṅka, *Cauppannamahāpurisacariya*. A.M. Bhojak (ed.), *Cauppannamahāpurisacariya*, Varanasi 1961.

- Sthānāṅga Sūtra*. Muni Jambūvijaya (ed.), *Thāṇaṅgasuttaṃ and Samavāyaṅgasuttam*, Bombay, 1985.
- Upāsakadaśāḥ Sūtra*. A.F.R. Hoernle (ed./tr.), *Uvāsagadasāo or the Religious Experience of an Uvāsaga*, Calcutta 1890.
- Upāsakadaśāḥ Sūtra & Anuttaraupapādikadaśasūtra*. Amaramuni (ed.), *Illustrated Upāsakadashā and Anuttaraupapātikadashā Sūtra*, New Delhi 2001.
- Uttarādhyayana Sūtra*. J. Charpentier (ed.), *Uttarādhyayana Sūtra: being the first Mūla-sūtra of the Śvetāmbara Jains*, 2 vols, Uppsala 1922.
- Uttarādhyayana Niryukti*. See Bollée 1995.
- UttNiryD: *Uttarādhyayana Niryukti* with Devendra. Vijayomaṅgasūri (ed.), *Śrī-Ātma Devendra-śrīman-Nemicandrasūri-vihita-sukhabodhākhyā-vṛtti-yutāni śrī-Uttarādhyayanāni*, 2 vols, Bombay 1937.
- UttNiryL: *Uttarādhyayana Niryukti*. Ācārya Mahāprajña (ed.), *Niryuktipaṃcaka*, vol. 3, Lāḍnūṃ 1999.
- UttNiryŚ. *Uttarādhyayana Niryukti* with Śāntisūri. Dīparatnasāgara (ed.), *“Uttarādhyayanāni” mūlam eva vṛttiḥ*, 3 vols, Pālitaṇā 2017.
- Varāhamihira, *Bṛhatsaṃhitā*. A.V. Tripāṭhī (ed.) *Bṛhatsaṃhitā*, 2 vols, Varanasi 1968.
- ViĀvBh: *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya*. Caturavijaya (ed.), *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣyam*, vol. 5, Benares 1912.
- ViĀvBh: *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya*. D. Malvania (ed.), *Ācārya Jinabhadra's Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya with Auto-Commentary*, 3 parts, Ahmedabad 1966–1968.
- Vimalasūri, *Paumacariya*. Muni Puṇyavijaya (ed.), *Paumacariya*, Varanasi 1962.
- ВТК: Jinaprabhasūri, *Vividhatīrthakalpa*. Muni Jinavijaya (ed.), *Vividhatīrthakalpa*, Shantiniketan 1934.

Secondary Sources

- Acharya, D. 2013. How to Behave like a Bull? New Insight into the Origin and Religious Practices of Pāśupatas, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 56, 101–131.
- Aciri, A. 2015. Between Impetus, Fear and Disgust: ‘Desire for Emancipation’ (*saṃvega*) from Early Buddhism to Pātañjala Yoga and Śaiva Siddhānta, in: P. Bilimoria & A. Wenta (eds.), *Emotions in Indian Thought-Systems*, London/New York, 198–227.
- Alsdorf, L. 1974. *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden.
- Alsdorf, L. 1998. *Kleine Schriften: Nachtragsband*, Wiesbaden.
- Anālayo. 2016. *The Foundation History of the Nuns’ Order*, Bochum/Freiburg.
- Bakker, H.T. 2019. *Holy Ground: Where Art and Text Meet*, Leiden/Boston.
- Balbir, N. 1993a. *Āvaśyaka-Studien. Introduction générale et traductions*, Stuttgart.
- Balbir, N. 1993b. Jaina Exegetical Terminology: Pk. *vibhāṣā* ‘Detailed Exposition’, in: R. Smet & K. Watanabe (eds.), *Jain Studies in Honour of Jozef Deleu*, Tokyo, 67–84.
- Balbir, N. 2020. Les débuts de la scolastique jaina: stratégies interprétatives et reception,

- in: G. Colas and É. Aussant (eds.), *Les scolastiques indiennes: genèses, développements, interactions*, Paris, 57–71.
- Balbir, N. 2022a. On the Syntax of Colophons in Jain Palm-Leaf and Paper Manuscripts from Western India, in: N. Balbir & G. Ciotti (eds.), *The Syntax of Colophons: A Comparative Study across Pothi Manuscripts*, Berlin/Boston, 119–148.
- Balbir, N. 2022b. Translating Sacred Scriptures: The Śvetāmbara Jain Tradition, in: H. Israel (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Religion* (London), 399–414.
- Barnett, L.A. 1907. *The Antagaḍa-dasāo and Aṇuttarovavāiḍya-dasāo*, London.
- Bhatt, B. 2012. Early Jainism and Śaivism: Their Interaction and Counteraction, *Sambodhi* 35, 12–31.
- Biardeau, M. 2002. *Le Mahabharata. Un récit fondateur de brahmanisme et son interprétation*, 2 vols, Paris.
- Bisschop, P.C. 2010. Śaivism in the Gupta-Vākāṭaka Age, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 20.4, 477–488.
- Bisschop, P.C. 2020. From Mantramārga Back to Atimārga: Atimārga as a Self-referential Term, in: D. Goodall, S. Hatley, H. Isaacson & S. Raman (eds.), *Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions: Essays in Honour of Alexis G.J.S. Sanderson*, Leiden/Boston, 15–32.
- Bisschop, P.C., Kafle, N. & Lubin, T. 2021. *A Śaiva Utopia: The Śivadharma's Revision of Brahmanical Varṇāśramadharma*, Napoli.
- Bodewitz, H.W. 1974. Vedic dhāvayati 'to drive', *Indo-Iranian Journal* 16, 81–95.
- Boer, L. den. 2020. *Early Jaina Epistemology. A Study of the Philosophical Chapters of the Tattvārthādhigama. With an English Translation of the Tattvārthādhigamabhāṣya* 1, 11.8–25, and V, Ph.D. dissertation, Leiden.
- Böhtlingk, O. & Roth, R. 1852–1875. *Sanskrit Wörterbuch*, St. Petersburg.
- Bollée, W.B. 1977. *Studien zum Sūyagaḍa: die Jainas und die anderen Weltanschauungen vor der Zeitwende, Teil I*, Wiesbaden.
- Bollée, W.B. 1994. *Materials for an Edition and Study of the Piṇḍa- and Oha-Nijjuttis of the Śvetāmbara Jain Tradition 11: Text and Glossary*, Stuttgart.
- Bollée, W.B. 1995. *The Nijjuttis on the Seniors of the Śvetāmbara Siddhānta: Āyāranga, Dasaveyāliya, Uttarajjhāyā and Sūyagaḍa*, Stuttgart.
- Bollée, W.B. 1997. Das Aupapātika Sutra, erstes Upāṅga der Jaina. II. Theil: Anmerkungen von Dr. Ernst Leumann, *Bulletin d'études indiennes* 15, 311–363.
- Bollée, W.B. 1998. *Bhadrabāhu, Brhatkalpa-Niryukti and Sanghadāsa Brhat-Kalpa-Bhāṣya*, 3 vols, Stuttgart.
- Bollée, W.B. 2002. *The Story of Paesi (Paesikahāṇayam). Soul and Body in Ancient India: A Dialogue of Materialism*, Wiesbaden.
- Bollée, W.B. 2010. *Samantabhadra Deva's Ratnakaraṇḍaka-Śrāvaka-cāra with illustrative stories from Prabhācandra's commentary*, Shravanabelgola/Bangalore.

- Brockington, J. 2020. Religious Practice in the Sanskrit Epics, in: G. Flood (ed.), *Oxford History of Hinduism: Hindu Practice*, Oxford, 79–100.
- Bronkhorst, J. 2017. The *Mahābhārata* and the Revival of Brahmanism, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 45, 575–585.
- Brown, W. Norman. 1941. *Manuscript Illustrations of the Uttarādhyayana Sūtra*, New Haven.
- Bruhn, K. 1981. Āvaśyaka Studies 1, in: K. Bruhn & A. Wezler (eds.), *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus: Gedenkschrift für Ludwig Alsdorf*, Wiesbaden, 11–49.
- Bruhn, K. 1998. Bibliography of Studies Connected with the Āvaśyaka-Commentaries, in: B. Plutat (ed.), *Catalogue of the Papers of Ernst Leumann in the Institute for the Culture and History of India and Tibet, University of Hamburg*, Stuttgart, 119–136.
- Buitenen, J.A.B. van. 1975. *Mahābhārata. 2: The Book of the Assembly Hall. 3: The Book of the Forest*, Chicago.
- Burrow, T. 1955. Sanskrit *Kava-* and Related Words, *Indian Linguistics* 16, 187–193.
- Caillat, C. 1965. *Les Expiations dans le rituel ancien des religieux jaina*, Paris.
- Chojnacki, Christine. 1995. *Vividhatīrthakalpāḥ. Regards sur le lieu saint jaina*, Tome 1–2, Pondichéry.
- Collins, S. 2020. *Wisdom as a Way of Life: Theravāda Buddhism Reimagined*, New York.
- Cort, J.E. 1990. The Jain Sacred Cosmos: Selections from a Medieval Pilgrimage Text, in: P. Granoff (ed.), *The Clever Adulteress and Other Stories: A Treasury of Jain Literature*, Oakville, 245–290.
- Cort, J.E. 1995. Absences and Transformations: Ganesh in the Shvetambar Jain Tradition, in: P. Pal (ed.), *Ganesh the Benevolent*, Mumbai, 81–94.
- Cort, J.E. 2001. *Jains in the World: Religious Values and Ideology in India*, New York.
- Cort, J.E. 2022. Who is a Yogī? Depictions of the Yogi in Classical and Medieval Digambara Jain Literature, *International Journal of Jaina Studies* 18.1, 1–61.
- Couture, A. 2017. *Kṛṣṇa in the Harivaṃśa. Vol. 2: The Greatest of All Sovereigns and Masters*, New Delhi.
- Davidson, R.M. 2002. *Indian Esoteric Buddhism: A Social History of the Tantric Movement*, New York.
- Deleu, J. 1970. *Viyāhapannatti (Bhagavāi). The Fifth Aṅga of the Jaina Canon*, Brugge.
- Deleu, J. 1976. *Die Mythologie des Jinismus*, Stuttgart.
- Deleu, J. 1996. *Nirayāvaliyāsuyakkhanda: Uvangaś 8–12 of the Jain canon: introduction, text edition and notes*, translated from the Dutch by J.W. de Jong and R. Wiles, Tokyo.
- Desāi, R.D. 1974. *Guru Gautamsvāmī*, Ahmedabad.
- Deshpande, M.M. 2009. Interpreting the Aśokan Epithet devānāmpīya, in: P. Olivelle (ed.), *Aśoka in History and Historical Memory*, Delhi, 19–44.

- Detige, Tillo. 2020. Not *Just* Stories: Jain and Buddhist Narratives as Epistemic Technology, in: M. Poorthuis & E. Ottenheim (eds.), *Parables in Changing Contexts: Essays on the Study of Parallels in Christianity, Judaism, Islam, and Buddhism*, Leiden/Boston, 95–126.
- Devluk, N. 1995. *Mahāmaṇi Cintāmaṇi Śrī Guru Gautamasvāmī*, Bhāvnagar.
- Dhaky, M.A. 2004. Ārya Bhadrabāhu, in: M.A. Dhaky & J.B. Shah (eds.), *Jambū-Jyoti (Munivara Jambūvijaya Festschrift)*, Ahmedabad, 108–155.
- Dhaky, M.A. 2012. *Studies in Nirgrantha Art and Architecture*, Ahmedabad.
- Douglas, E. 2020. *Himalaya: A Human History*, New York.
- Dundas, P. 1998. Becoming Gautama: Mantra and History in Śvetāmbara Jainism, in: J.E. Cort (ed.), *Open Boundaries: Jain Communities and Cultures in Indian History*, Albany, 31–52.
- Dundas, P. 2002. *The Jains*. Second revised and enlarged edition, London/New York.
- Dundas, P., 2006. The Later Fortunes of Jamāli, in: P. Flügel (ed.), *Studies in Jaina History and Culture: Disputes and Dialogues*, London/New York, 33–60.
- Dundas, P. 2012. Hinduism and Jainism, in: K.A. Jacobsen et al. (eds.), *Brill's Encyclopedia of Hinduism*, vol. 4, Leiden/Boston, 559–572.
- Dundas, P. 2014. Floods, Taxes, and a Stone Cow: A Jain Apocalyptic Account of the Gupta Period, *South Asian Studies* 30.2, 230–244.
- Dundas, P. 2020. Pārśva and Mahāvīra in History, in: J.E. Cort, P. Dundas, K.A. Jacobsen & K.L. Wiley (eds.), *Brill's Encyclopedia of Jainism*, Leiden/Boston, 115–135.
- Dundas, P. 2022. The Second Phase of Prakrit Kavva: Towards Contextualising Pravaraśena's Setubandha, *Bulletin d'Études Indiennes* 35, 49–100.
- Esposito, A.A. 2011. The Prākṛit of the Vasudevahiṇḍī: An Addendum to Pischel's Grammar, *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Südasiastudien* 28, 29–50.
- Feller, D. 2016. Magical Kitchens or Hunting? How to survive in the epic jungle, in: C. Pieruccini & P.M. Rossi (eds.), *A World of Nourishment: Reflections on Food in Indian Culture*, Milano, 59–70.
- Flügel, P. 2020. Jaina Non-Tīrthas in Madhyadeśa 1: Fragments of Digambara Temples and a New Vaiṣṇava Inscription in Tumain, *Jain Studies: Newsletter of the Centre of Jaina Studies* 15, 23–30.
- Franco, E. 2018. Xuanzang's Silence and Dharmakīrti's Dates, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 46/47, 117–141.
- Fynes, R.C.C. 1998. *Hemacandra, The Lives of the Jain Elders*, Oxford/New York.
- Geslani, M. 2018. *Rites of the God-King: Śānti and Ritual Change in Early Hinduism*, New York.
- Ghatage, A.M. 2004. *A Comprehensive and Critical Dictionary of the Prakrit Languages with Special Reference to Jain Literature*, vol. 3, Pune.
- Goldman, R. 2007. *The Rāmāyaṇa: An Epic of Ancient India. Vol. 1: Bālakāṇḍa*, New Delhi (reprint of the Princeton edition of 1984).

- Gough, E. 2021. *Making a Mantra: Tantric Ritual and Renunciation on the Jain Path to Liberation*, Chicago.
- Hanaki, T. 1970. *Aṇuogaddārāṃ (The Doors of Disquisition)*. English translation, Vaishali.
- Handelman, D. & Shulman, D. 1997. *God Inside Out: Śiva's Game of Dice*, New York/Oxford.
- Hara, M. 2002. *Pāśupata Studies*, ed. by J. Takashima, Vienna.
- Harzer, E. 2015. Vṛātya "Running Expeditions" (*dhāvayanti*), in: T. Pontillo et al. (ed.), *The Volatile World of Sovereignty: The vṛātya problem and kingship in South Asia*, New Delhi, 216–230.
- Hegewald, J. 2012. Images of the Cosmos: Sacred and Ritual Space in Jaina Temple Architecture in India, in: D. Ragavan (ed.), *Heaven on Earth: Temples, Rituals, and Cosmic Symbolism in the Ancient World*, Chicago, 55–88.
- Higham, N.J. 2018. *King Arthur: The Making of the Legend*, New Haven/London.
- Hiltebeitel, A. 2016. *Nonviolence in the Mahābhārata: Śiva's summa on Ṛṣidharma and the gleaners of Kurukṣetra*, Abingdon.
- Hinüber, O. von. 2001. *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*, 2nd ed., Vienna.
- Hinüber, O. von. 2019. *Kleine Schriften III*, Wiesbaden.
- Hooper, J. 2020. Jain Meditative and Contemplative Practices, in: J.E. Cort, P. Dundas, K.A. Jacobsen & K.L. Wiley (eds.), *Brill's Encyclopedia of Jainism*, Leiden/Boston, 543–561.
- Jacobi, H. 1879. *The Kalpasūtra of Bhadrabāhu*, Leipzig.
- Jacobi, H. 1884. *Jaina Sutras, Part I*, Oxford.
- Jacobi, H. 1895. *Jaina Sutras, Part II*, Oxford.
- Jain, B. 1978. *Bhārat ke Digambar Jain Tīrth, vol. 4: Rājasthān-Gujarāt-Mahārāṣṭra*, Bombay.
- Jaini, P.S. 2000. The Pure and the Auspicious in the Jaina Tradition, in P.S. Jaini (ed.), *Collected Papers on Jaina Studies*, Delhi, 229–242.
- Johnson, H.M. 1962. *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritra by Hemacandra. The Lives of Sixty-three Illustrious Persons*, vol. 6, Baroda.
- Jones, J.J. 1956. *The Mahāvastu*, vol. 3, London.
- Jyväsjärvi, Mari. 2010. Retrieving the Hidden Meaning: Jain Commentarial Techniques and the Art of Memory, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 38, 133–162.
- Kafle, N. 2020. *Niśvāsamukhatattvasaṃhitā: A Preface to the Earliest Surviving Śaiva Tantra (on non-Tantric Śaivism at the Dawn of the Mantramārga)*, Pondicherry.
- Kapadia, H.R. 2000. *A History of the Canonical Literature of the Jainas*, Ahmedabad (first edition: Surat 1941).
- Karashima, S. 2012. *Die Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ: Verhaltensregeln für buddhistische Mönche der Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins*, Tokyo.
- Kirfel, W. 1967. *Die Kosmographie der Inder: nach Quellen dargestellt*, Hildesheim.

- Koch, R.-H. 1990. *Die Namaskāra-vyākhyā der Āvaśyaka-Tradition*, Ph.D. dissertation, München.
- Koch, R.H. 1991–1992. *Āvaśyaka*-Tales from the *Namaskāra-Vyākhyā*, *Indologica Taurinensia* 17/18, 221–271.
- Koch, R.H. 1995–1996. Udayana and Vāsavadattā according to the *Āvaśyaka* Tradition, *Indologica Taurinensia* 21/22, 183–196.
- Koch, R.H. 1998. Subhūma in den Jaina-Versionen der Paraśurāma-Erzählung, *Berliner Indologische Studien* 11/12, 123–158.
- Koch, R.H. 2000. Review of 'Nalini Balbir, *Āvaśyaka Studien: Introduction générale et traductions, mit einem Glossar von T. Oberlies, Stuttgart 1993*', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 150.1, 365–377.
- Koch, R.H. 2009. On the Interrelation of Certain Prakrit Sources, *Indologica Taurinensia* 35, 275–286.
- Krümpelmann, K. 2021. Theorie der Exegese: Die Einleitung im Kommentar des Abhayadevasūri zum *Sthānāṅgasūtra*, in: U. Niklas et al. (eds.), *“Das alles hier”: Festschrift für Konrad Klaus zum 65. Geburtstag*, Heidelberg/Berlin, 189–227.
- Lalwani, K.C. 1973–1985. *Bhagavatī Sūtra*, edition and translation of śatakas 1–11, 4 vols, Calcutta.
- Leumann, E. 2010. *An Outline of the Āvaśyaka Literature*, translated by G. Baumann, Ahmedabad. [Original: *Übersicht über die Āvaśyaka-Literatur*, herausgegeben von W. Schubring, Hamburg 1934.]
- Luithle-Hardenberg, A. 2011. *Die Reise zum Ursprung: Die Pilgerschaft der Shvetāmbara-Jaina zum Berg Shatrunjaya in Gujarat, Indien*, München.
- Luithle-Hardenberg, A. 2012–2013. Ādinātha, der verborgene Kulturbegründer, *Münchener Indologische Zeitschrift* 2, 100–116.
- Mahetā, M. 1989. *Jain Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihās*, vol. 3, Vārāṇasī.
- Malalasekara, G.P. 1937–1938. *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*, 2 vols, London.
- Malamoud, C. 1996. *Cooking the World: Ritual and Thought in Ancient India*, Delhi.
- Marciniak, K. 2019. *The Mahāvastu: A New Edition*, vol. 3, Tokyo.
- Marciniak, K. 2020. *The Mahāvastu: A New Edition*, vol. 2, Tokyo.
- McGovern, N. 2019. *The Snake and the Mongoose: The Emergence of Identity in Early Indian Religion*, New York.
- Mehta, M., and Chandra, K.R. 1972. *Āgamic Index. Vol. I. Prakrit Proper Names. Part 1*, Ahmedabad.
- Mette, A. 1974. *Piṇḍesaṇā. Das Kapitel der Oha-nijjuttī über den Bettelgang*, Wiesbaden.
- Mette, A. 1983. The Tales Belonging to the *Namaskāra-Vyākhyā* of the *Āvaśyaka-Cūrṇi*, *Indologica Taurinensia* 11, 129–144.
- Mette, A. 1987. Gotama und die Asketen—Eine jainistische Legende, *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 13/14 (Festschrift Wilhelm Rau), 139–148.

- Mette, A. 1991. Notes on *samaya*, 'convention', in Pali and Prakrit, in: C. Caillat & J.G. de Casparis (eds.), *Middle Indo-Aryan and Jaina Studies*, Leiden/Boston, 69–80.
- Mette, A. 2010. *Die Erlösungslehre der Jaina: Legenden, Parabeln, Erzählungen*, Berlin.
- Monier-Williams, M. 1872. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Oxford.
- More, A. 2020. Laity in the Śvetāmbara Scriptural Canon, in: J.E. Cort, P. Dundas, K.A. Jacobsen & K.L. Wiley (eds.), *Brill's Encyclopedia of Jainism*, Leiden/Boston, 426–434.
- Norman, K.R. 1992. *Collected Papers. Volume III*, Oxford.
- Norman, K.R. 2001. *Collected Papers. Volume VII*, Oxford.
- Norman, K.R. 2007. *Collected Papers. Volume VIII*, Oxford.
- Oberlies, T. 1993. *Āvaśyaka-Studien: Glossar ausgewählter Wörter zu E. Leumanns "Die Āvaśyaka-Erzählungen"*, Stuttgart.
- Oberlies, T. 1995. Beiträge zur Pali-Lexikographie (Miscellanea Palica 11), *Indo-Iranian Journal* 38.2, 105–147.
- Oberlies, T. 1997. Pāli, Pāṇini and 'Popular' Sanskrit, *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 23, 1–26.
- Oberlies, T. 2007. Honig, Bienen und Zwillinge: Vom indogermanischen Rituel der 'Götterbewirtung' zum vedischen Arghya (Nachbetrachtungen zur *Religion des Ṛgveda*, Teil 3), *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 24, 141–171.
- Ohira, S. 1982. *A Study of the Tattvārthasūtra with Bhāṣya*, Ahmedabad.
- Ohira, S. 1994. *A Study of the Bhagavatīsūtra: A Chronological Analysis*, Ahmedabad.
- Olivelle, P. 2005. *Manu's Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānava-Dharmaśāstra*, Oxford/New York.
- Ollett, A. 2017. *Language of the Snakes: Prakrit, Sanskrit, and the Language Order of Pre-modern India*, Oakland.
- Ollett, A. 2018. The Taraṅgavatī and the History of Prakrit Literature, in: N. Balbir & P. Flügel (eds.), *Jaina Studies: Selected Papers in the 'Jain Studies' Section at the 16th World Sanskrit Conference, Bangkok, Thailand and the 14th World Sanskrit Conference, Kyoto, Japan*, Bangkok, 129–164.
- Patel, D.M. 2014. *Text to Tradition. The Naiṣadhīyacarita and Literary Community in South Asia*, New York.
- Poddar, R.P. 2009. *A Comprehensive and Critical Dictionary of the Prakrit Languages with Special Reference to Jain Literature*, vol. 4, Pune.
- Pollock, S. 2018. "Indian Philology": Edition, Interpretation, and Difference, in: S. D'Intino & S. Pollock (eds.), *L'espace du sens. Approches de la philologie indienne. The Space of Meaning. Approaches to Indian Philology*, Paris, 3–45.
- Prakash, O. 1961. *Food and Drinks in Ancient India*, Delhi.
- Premī, N. 1942. *Jain Sāhitya aur Itihās*, Bambaī.
- Ravishankar, C.V. 2018. *Sons of Sarasvatī: Late Exemplars of the Indian Intellectual Tradition*, New York 2018.

- Roth, G. 1983. *Malli-Jñātā: das achte Kapitel des Nāyādharmakahāo im sechsten Aṅga des Śvetāmbara Jainakanons*, Wiesbaden.
- Sadovski, V. 2009. On Horses and Chariots in Ancient Indian and Iranian Personal Names, in: B.G. Fagner et al. (eds.), *Pferde in Asien: Geschichte, Handel und Kultur*, Vienna, 111–127.
- Sanderson, A. 2012. Śaivism and Brahmanism. All Souls, Hilary Term 2012, Handout 1, 18 January, Oxford.
- Saxena, K.K. 2021. *Before Kṛṣṇa: Religious Diversity in Ancient Mathura*, New Delhi.
- Schubring, W. 1918. *Das Mahānisiha-Sutta*, Berlin.
- Schubring, W. 1935. *Die Lehre der Jainas nach den alten Quellen dargestellt*, Berlin/Leipzig.
- Schubring, W. 1966. *Drei Chedasūtras des Jaina-Kanons. Āyāradasāo, Vavahāra, Nisīha*, Hamburg.
- Schubring, W. 1977. *Kleine Schriften*, ed. K. Bruhn, Wiesbaden.
- Schubring, W. 1978. *Nāyādharmakahāo: das sechste Aṅga des Jaina-Siddhānta*, ed. J. Deleu, Wiesbaden.
- Selva, U. 2019. *The Pāippalādasamhitā of the Atharvaveda: A New Critical Edition of the Three 'New' Anuvākas of Kāṇḍa 17 with English Translation and Commentary*, Ph.D. dissertation, Leiden.
- Sen, Madhu. 1975. *A Cultural Study of the Nisīṭha Cūrṇi*, Amritsar.
- Settar, S. 1986. *Inviting Death*, Dharwad.
- Shah, U.P. 1955. *Studies in Jaina Art*, Banaras.
- Shah, U.P. 1987. *Jaina-Rūpa-Manḍana (Jaina Iconography)*, New Delhi.
- Sheth, H.T. 1963. *Pāia-Sadda-Mahapṇavo*, Varanasi.
- Shulman, E. 2021. *Visions of the Buddha: Creative Dimensions of Early Buddhist Scripture*, New York.
- Silk, J.A. 2008. *Managing Monks: Administrators and Administrative Roles in Indian Buddhist Monasticism*, New York.
- Silk, J.A. 2020. A Trust Rooted in Ignorance: Why Ānanda's Lack of Understanding Makes Him a Reliable Witness to the Buddha's Teachings, in: P.W. Kroll & J.A. Silk (eds.), *"At the Shores of the Sky": Asian Studies for Albert Hoffstädt*, Leiden/Boston, 23–37.
- Slaje, W. 2019. *Kleine Schriften zur kaschmirischen Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte*, Band II, Marburg.
- Smith, J. 2009. *The Mahābhārata: An Abridged Translation*, New Delhi.
- Stein, Otto. 1948. *The Jinist Studies*, ed. Muni Jina Vijaya, Ahmedabad.
- Stein, Otto. 1967. Itinerary of Mahavira: being a Geography of the Towns of Monsoon Retreat of Mahavira, *Jain Journal* April 1967, 186–197.
- Szántó, P. 2022. Buddhist Homiletics on Gambling (*Saddharmaparikathā, Ch. 12), *Indo-Iranian Journal* 65, 340–387.

- Tatia, N. 1951. *Studies in Jain Philosophy*, Banaras.
- Tawney, C.H. 1924. *The Ocean of Story. Being C.H. Tawney's Translation of Somadeva's Kathā Sarit Sāgara (or Ocean of Streams of Story)*, vol. 1, London.
- Thieme, P. 1971. *Kleine Schriften I–II*, ed. G. Buddruss, Wiesbaden.
- Tieken, H. 1983. *Hāla's Sattasaī: Stemma and Edition (Gāthās 1–50), with Translation and Notes*, Ph.D. dissertation, Leiden.
- Tieken, H. 2009. Two particular usages of the particle kira/kiri in Apabhraṃśa, *Sambodhi* 32, 33–36.
- Tieken, H. 2023. *The Aśoka Inscriptions: Analysing a Corpus*, Delhi.
- Tripathi, C. 1981. The Jaina Concordance in Berlin. A Bibliographical Report, in: K. Bruhn & A. Wezler (eds.), *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus. Gedenkschrift für Ludwig Alsdorf*, Wiesbaden, 301–329.
- Turner, R.L. 1966. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*, London.
- Vinayasāgar, M. 1987. *Gautam Rās: Paṛiśīlan*, Jaipur.
- Walker, T. 2018. *Samvega* and *Pasāda*: Dharma Songs in Contemporary Cambodia, *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 41, 271–325.
- Wezler, A. 1978. *Die wahren "Speiseresteesser" (Skt. vighaśāsin)*, Mainz.
- Wiley, K.L. 1999. Gotra Karma: A Contrast in Views, in: N.K. Wagle & O. Qvarnström (eds.), *Approaches to Jaina Studies: Philosophy, Logic, Rituals and Symbols*, Toronto, 113–130.
- Wiley, K.L. 2000. Colors of the Soul: By-Products of Activity or Passions? *Philosophy East and West* 50.3, 348–366.
- Wiley, K.L. 2012. Supernatural Powers and their Attainment in Jainism, in: K.L. Jacobsen (ed.), *Yoga Powers: Extraordinary Capacities Attained Through Meditation and Concentration*, Leiden/Boston, 145–194.
- Williams, R.W. 1959. *Two Prakrit Versions of the Maṇipatī-Carita*, London.
- Williams, R.W. 1963. *Jaina Yoga: A Survey of the Medieval Śrāvākācāras*, London.
- Wu, J. 2014. Violence, Virtue and Spiritual Liberation: A Preliminary Survey of Buddhist and Jaina Stories of Future Rebirths of Śreṇika Bimbisāra and Kūṇika Ajātaśatru, *Religions of South Asia* 8.2, 149–179.
- Wu, J. 2015. Comparing Buddhist and Jaina Attitudes towards Warfare: Some Notes on Stories of King Ajātaśatru's/Kūṇika's War against the Vṛjīs and Related Material, *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 18, 95–112.
- Wu, J. 2017. Parallel Stories in the *Āvaśyakacūṛṇi* and the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya: A Preliminary Investigation, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 137.2, 315–347.
- Wynne, A. 2019. Did the Buddha exist? *Journal of the Oxford Centre for Buddhist Studies* 16, 98–148.
- Yagi-Hohara, A. 2018. On the Meaning of AMg. *allīṇa*, *palīṇa*, in: N. Balbir & P. Flügel (eds.), *Jaina Studies: Selected Papers in the 'Jain Studies' Section at the 16th World San-*

skrit Conference, Bangkok, Thailand and the 14th World Sanskrit Conference, Kyoto, Japan, Bangkok, 7–14.

Zwilling, L., & Sweet, M.J. 1996. “Like a City Ablaze”: The Third Sex and the Creation of Sexuality in Jain Religious Literature, *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 6.3, 359–384.