JOHANNES BRONKHORST

ON THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE TATTVĀRTHA SŪTRA AND SOME EARLY COMMENTARIES*

(published in: *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 29 (1985), pp. 155-184)

I. Siddhasena Gaṇi's Ṭīkā

1. Of the commentaries to be studied this is by far the most recent one. It comments on the Tattvārtha Sūtra and the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya, and therefore postdates both. More helpful information for determining its date consists in the mention of Dharmakīrti and his Pramāṇaviniścaya in the commentary on TS 5.31 (I, p. 397). Dharmakīrti lived in the seventh century at the latest (about 600-660 A.D. according to Frauwallner 1961: 137f.; Lindtner 1980 argues for ca. 530-600). Siddhasena Gaṇi lived after this.

He appears to be referred to under the name 'Gandhahastin' in Śīlāṅka's commentary on the Ācārāṅga Sūtra (p. 1 and 55 [82]), because 'Gandhahastin' is used as a name of Siddhasena Gaṇi in several works (Sukhlal 1974: Intr. p. 55 f.). Śīlāṅka wrote in the middle of the 9th century or soon after that (Kapadia 1941: 197). Siddhasena Gaṇi wrote before this.

A further specification of Siddhasena Gaṇi's date is possible, as follows. The Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya on sūtra 9.22 explains the word *prāyaścitta* 'atonement' and makes in that connection the following observation (II, p. 254):

> *citī sañjñānaviśuddhyoḥ dhātuḥ / tasya cittam iti bhavati niṣṭhāntam auṇādikaṃ ca* / "The root is '*citī* in [the senses] "ideation" and "purification"'. *Citta* is its [derivative], ending in the suffix of the past participle (viz., *-ta*) and belonging to the words derived with an Uṇādi suffix".

Siddhasena Gaṇi comments:

> *citī sañjñānaviśuddhyor dhātur ityādi / bhīmasenāt parato 'nyair vaiyākaraṇair arthadvaye paṭhito dhātuḥ sañjñāne viśuddhau ca / iha viśuddhyarthasya saha*

* I am obliged to the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (Z.W.O.) for financial assistance.

> *sañjñānena grahaṇam | athavānekārthā dhātava iti sañjñāne paṭhito viśuddhāv api vartate | bhāṣyakṛtā copayujyamānam evārtham abhisandhāya viśuddhir api paṭhitā | tasya cittam iti rūpaṃ bhavati niṣṭhāntam auṇādikaṃ ca cetatīti cittaṃ viśudhyatīty arthaḥ |*
> "'*citĪ* in [the senses] "ideation" and "purification"' etc. After Bhīmasena this root has been read by other gram[156]marians in two meanings, 'ideation' and 'purification'. Here the meaning 'purification' has been accepted together with 'ideation'. Or, since roots have many meanings, [this root,] though read in [the sense] 'ideation', also has [the sense] 'purification'. And the author of the Bhāṣya, merely in view of the proper meaning [to be expressed by *prāyaścitta*], reads also 'purification'. The form *citta* is its [derivative], ending in the suffix on the past participle and belonging to the words derived with an Uṇādi suffix. *Citta* [is therefore so called] because it is derived from *cit* in the sense that it purifies".

The first thing to be noted is that Siddhasena Gaṇi offers two different solutions for what he considers problematic. This means that he is not certain about either of the two solutions.

His problem is that the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya mentions the root '*citĪ* in [the senses] "ideation" and "purification"' where Siddhasena Gaṇi knows this root as '*citĪ* in [the sense] "ideation"'. The sense "purification" is not assigned to this root in the Dhātupāṭha used by Siddhasena Gaṇi.

The first solution proposed is that grammarians other than Bhīmasena added this second meaning entry to the root *cit*. This solution presupposes that Bhīmasena had made a list of roots in which *cit* had one meaning entry, viz. 'ideation' (*sañjñāna*). The fact that these other grammarians are said to have worked after Bhīmasena suggests that in Siddhasena Gaṇi's opinion Bhīmasena was the first to add meaning entries to verbal roots.[1]

Siddhasena Gaṇi's second solution indicates that he was not acquainted with any list of roots where *cit* had both senses 'ideation' and 'purification'. This reduces the likelihood that Siddhasena Gaṇi's first solution is correct. His second solution can hardly be correct either, for the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya clearly quotes here from a Dhātupāṭha. It does so at some other places as well: on TS 1.5 (I, p. 44) it has *bhū*

---

[1] [Added in proofs:] Muni Jambūvijaya draws my attention to a passage in Hemacandra's Yogaśāstra on verse 4.90 (vol. II p. 881 in his edition, Bombay, Jaina Sāhitya Vikāsa Mandala, 1981) which reads: *bhīmasenāt pūrve ācāryyāḥ citaidhātuṃ viśudhāv api paṭhanti, yad āhuḥ 'citī saṃjñānaviśuddhyoḥ'*. One wonders if Hemacandra had another reading of Siddhasena Gaṇi's Ṭīkā before him, or perhaps merely

prāptāv ātmanepadī, which is Dhp. X.300; and *ghaṭa ity ukte yo 'sau ceṣṭābhinirvṛtta*[*ḥ*]… (I, p. 122, on TS 1.35) is an indirect reference to Dhp. I.800 *ghaṭa ceṣṭāyām.*
[157]

The belief that Bhīmasena added meaning entries to the Pāṇinian Dhātupāṭha was shared by later authors. Mīmāṃsaka (1973: II: 61) quotes passages from Maitreya Rakṣita, Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita and Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa in support of this. However, earlier authors do not know this idea (Bronkhorst 1981: §5). The Kāśikā on P. 7.3.34 goes to the extent of justifying the forms *udyama* and *uparama* by pointing out that they occur in the Dhātupāṭha as meaning entries; it did not therefore look upon meaning entries as later additions to the Dhātupāṭha.

This suggests that Siddhasena Gaṇi lived a fair amount of time after the Kāśikā. The Kāśikā was probably composed in the seventh century (Cardona 1976: 280-81). Siddhasena Gaṇi must have lived at least one or two centuries later. We may agree with Williams (1963: 7) that "Siddhasena cannot well be much earlier than A.D. 800". All the evidence combined allows us to assign Siddhasena Gaṇi roughly to 800-850 A.D.

II. Devanandin's Sarvārthasiddhi

2. In our attempt to determine the date of the Sarvārthasiddhi we shall make use of the fact that its author Devanandin (Pūjyapāda being an honorific) also composed a grammar, the Jainendra Vyākaraṇa. This grammar has survived in two recensions, a shorter and a longer one. The relation between these two recensions to each other and to other grammatical works has been discussed by Birwé (1971: 25 f.), whom I shall follow as far as possible.

One important reason to think that the shorter recension — called 'J(M)' by Birwé — is the original Jainendra Vyākaraṇa had been given by Kielhorn (1881: 77-78 [182-83]) already. J(M) does not give any *ekaśeṣa* rules — which make up P. 12.64-73 in Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī — and justifies this in J(M) 1.1.100: *svābhāvikatvād abhidhānasyaikaśeṣānārambhaḥ* "*ekaśeṣa* rules are not given, because the denotation [of more than one object with the help of one single word] is natural". As a result this grammar is called *anekaśeṣa* in Abhayanandin's Mahāvṛtti thereon: *devopajñam anekaśeṣavyākaraṇam* (on J[M] 1.4.97); *daivanandinam anekaśeṣaṃ vyākaraṇam* (on J[M] 3.3.84). The longer version J(Ś) does contain *ekaśeṣa* rules (1.3.97-107). Yet its

---

interpreted it differently. If Hemacandra represents Siddhasena's intentions correctly, which I do not consider likely, the main argument of my first section loses its value.

commentator, Somadeva, too calls the Jainendra Vyākaraṇa *anekaśeṣa* in his Śabdārṇavacandrikā on J(Ś) 1.4.114 (*devopajñam anekaśeṣavyākaraṇam*) and 3.3.98 (*paujyapādam anekaśeṣavyākaraṇam*).

Birwé refutes a number of arguments brought forth by K. B. Pathak according to whom J(Ś) is older than J(M) (p. 27 f.).
[158]

If then the shorter recension is the original Jainendra Vyākaraṇa, it must have been composed by the author of the Sarvārthasiddhi. This agrees with the evidence contained in the latter work. Birwé (1971: 35-44) discusses a number of passages of the Sarvārthasiddhi which quote or allude to grammatical sūtras. Once a J(M) sūtra is cited. In two cases it is clear that the reference is to sūtras of the Jainendra Vyākaraṇa even though no choice can be made between the shorter and the longer recension. In one case the choice is between Pāṇini and J(M). In other cases the situation is less clear, but thrice J(Ś) is excluded.

Thus far we can agree with Birwé. It is however not possible to follow him where he discusses the date of the original Jainendra Vyākaraṇa. Birwé gives some arguments meant to show that Devanandin lived later than the grammarian Candra and later than the commentary Kāśikā on the Aṣṭādhyāyī (p. 39 f.):

1) The Sarvārthasiddhi repeatedly says: *arthavaśād vibhaktipariṇāmaḥ/-mo bhavati* (on TS 1.26, 2.2, 4.15). This is a grammatical Paribhāṣā. Birwé observes: "The oldest source, employing (*vi*)*pariṇāma* in this technical sense, is, according to my knowledge, the *Cāndraparibhāṣāsūtra*[2] 75: *arthavaśād vibhaktivacanaliṅgapariṇāmaḥ*". Birwé thinks it is "clear that the source of Devanandin is Candra's *Paribhāṣāsūtra* 75. This furnishes another argument for the view that Candra lived prior to Devanandin".

Unfortunately for Birwé, this argument is undermined by the 'correctional addition' which he felt compelled to make, and which reads: "The oldest sources [*sic*], of which I know now (December 1969), [is] paribhāṣā no. 73: *arthavaśād vibhaktipariṇāmo bhavati* in Vyāḍi's Paribhāṣāsūcama [misprint for '-sūcana'], ed. K. V. Abhyankar". Vyāḍi's Paribhāṣāsūcana (or -vṛtti) dates from before Candra (Bronkhorst 1983: §6). Moreover, Vyāḍi's version of the Paribhāṣā is identical with the one cited in the Sarvārthasiddhi, whereas Candra's is not. This means that on this basis no conclusions can be drawn regarding Devanandin's date relative to Candra.

---

[2] Liebich 1928: 49-52.

2) The Sarvārthasiddhi on TS 6.12 has: *itiśabdaḥ prakārārthaḥ*. The Kāśikā on P. 5.2.93 has: *itikaraṇaḥ prakārārthaḥ*. Birwé observes: "This explanation is unknown in the *Mahābhāṣya* and in the grammar of Candra". Further: "Regarding the fact that among Sanskrit grammars none is more wanting in originality than the *Jainendra-Vyākaraṇa*, it is highly improbable that Devanandin invented the formula"; so that the question arises: "Has Devanandin taken the [159] formula *itiśabdaḥ prakārārthaḥ* from the *Kāśikā* ?" Birwé seems to think so, because "among the extant *Kośas* the oldest one, namely that of Dhanaṃjaya, in which this meaning is to be traced, is later than Devanandin" (p. 41).

This argument is obviously very weak. One might wonder if even the most unoriginal grammarian may not sometimes display the vanishingly little bit of originality needed to say something like *itiśabdaḥ prakārārthaḥ*. (Note that the Sarvārthasiddhi on TS 1.16 and 2.16 has *vidhaśabdaḥ prakārārthaḥ*.)[3] But we don't even have to go this far. It is known (Bronkhorst 1983: §4) that before the Kāśikā, even before Candra and Bhartṛhari, commentaries on Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī existed, which have not survived. As long as we are not thoroughly acquainted with their contents, no chronological conclusions can be drawn from similarities like the one under discussion. To this must be added that a remark like *itiśabdaḥ prakārārthaḥ* can occur in many types of works, so that Devanandin may well have borrowed it from a non-grammatical text.

We conclude from the above that it is not certain that Devanandin lived after Candra and the Kāśikā. There is, on the contrary, evidence that he lived before these two:

1) Candra's grammar has the rule *śilāyā ḍhaś ca* (C. 4.3.80), which accounts for the words *śileya* and *śaileya*. These same two words are derived by 'some' in the Kāśikā on P. 5.3.102, as follows: *kecid atra ḍhañam apīcchanti, tadarthaṃ yogavibhāgaḥ kartavyaḥ / 'śilāyāḥ' ḍhañ pratyayo bhavati / śaileyam / tato ḍhaḥ / śileyam //*. Also the longer recension of the Jainendra Vyākaraṇa accounts for the derivation of both these words in J(Ś) 4.1.208-209, which read: *(208) śilāyā[ḥ ḍhañ (207)] (209) ḍha ca.*

Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī, contrary to these three works, only derives *śileya* in P. 5.3.102: *śilāyā ḍhaḥ*. The shorter recension of the Jainendra Vyākaraṇa squarely sides with Pāṇini, having only J(M) 4.1.156: *śilāyā ḍhaḥ*. This may possibly be explained by assuming that Devanandin lived before Candra.

2) Scharfe (1977: 168) notes that the Jainendra Vyākaraṇa is referred to by its commentators Abhayanandin and Somadeva as 'grammar without a single remainder'

(*anekaśeṣa*; see above) and observes: "This would be an unhappy characterization if Devanandin lived after Candra who also eliminated the single remainder process".

3) The Kāśikā has P. 7.3.117-119 as three different sūtras: (117) *idudbhyām*, (118) *aut*, (119) *ac ca gheḥ*. In the time of the Mahābhāṣya this was [160] one single rule: *idudbhyām aud ac ca gheḥ* (Kielhorn, 1887: 180 [228]). The Kāśikā on P. 7.3.119 still knows of grammarians who consider *aud ac ca gheḥ* as one sūtra. However, already Candra's grammar has equivalents for the three sūtras (C. 6.2.59, 61, 62). This may mean that already before Candra *aud ac ca gheḥ* had been split into two. Yet Y(M) 5.12.112 (*aud ac ca soḥ*) corresponds to its undivided form.

4) The Kāśikā has P. 5.1.57 *tad asya parimāṇam* and P. 5.1.58 *saṃkhyāyāḥ sañjñāsaṅghasūtrādhyayaneṣu* where these two were originally one sūtra (Kielhorn, ibid.). Candra has only *tad asya parimāṇam* (C. 4.1.62), but this may have been due to his desire to give the rule a wider scope, in agreement with P. 5.1.57-58 vt. 6; we do not know if the sūtra had already been split in his time. But J(M) 3.4.56 reads: *parimāṇāt saṅkhyāyāḥ saṅghasūtrādhyayane*, showing that this division had not yet taken place.

5) P. 4.1.15 ends in the Kāśikā: *-kvarapkhyunām*. The original ending was *kvarapaḥ* (Kielhorn, 1887: 181 [229]). Candra (2.3.17) has *khyun*, but may have added this himself, instigated by P. 4.1.15 vt. 6. J(M) 3.1.18, which corresponds to P. 4.1.15, is without *khyun*.

6) P. 6.3.6 reads in the Kāśikā: *ātmanaś ca pūraṇe*. Kielhorn (1887: 181-82 [229-39]) argues that *pūraṇe* is an addition made under the influence of P. 6.3.5 vt. 1. Also Candra (5.2.9) has *pūraṇe*: *ātmanaḥ pūraṇe*. J(M) 4.3.125, on the other hand, is without: *ḍaḍy ātmanaḥ*.

7) Another reason to think that Devanandin lived before, or at any rate not long after, Candra is the following. It is known that with Candra Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya started being looked upon with different eyes than before (Bronkhorst, 1983). Before this time the Mahābhāṣya was carefully studied, to be sure. It was not however considered the highest authority in matters grammatical, at least not by all. With and especially after Candra this changed.

---

[3] *itikaraṇaṃ prakārārtham* occurs in the Yuktidīpikā (p. 5, l. 16), of which it is not known if it knew the Kāśikā.

In this light we should look at the two recensions of the Jainendra Vyākaraṇa. Birwé (1971: 52-53) describes the difference in these words: "the shorter recension of the *Jainendra-Vyākaraṇa* … did not contain rules laying down the teachings of the *Mahābhāṣya*. … The teachings of the *Mahābhāṣya* are incorporated in form of sūtras into the longer recension of J, which represents a revised and enlarged version of the shorter recension …". It is not true that the author of the original Jainendra Vyākaraṇa, Devanandin, did not know the Mahābhāṣya. Quotations from and allusions to the Mahābhāṣya abound in the Sarvārthasiddhi; they have been collected by Phoolchandra Siddhant Shastry (1971: Prastāvanā, p. 50-51) and Birwé (1971: 37-39). The fact that Devanandin nevertheless neglected the Mahābhāṣya to a large extent while writing his grammar points to an early period, preferably [161] before Candra. The circumstance that this grammar was later changed into a work which more closely followed the Mahābhāṣya indicates the change of attitude after Devanandin.

8) We are now ready to turn to an indicator pointed out by Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (1956: 42-44; 1973: I: 449-52). Abhayanandin's Mahāvṛtti on J(M) 2.2.92 illustrates the rule that the imperfect (*laṅ*) is used to describe a well-known event which took place during the lifetime of the speaker with the example *aruṇan mahendro mathurām* "Mahendra subdued Mathurā". Mīmāṃsaka surmises that this example was taken over by Abhayanandin from Devanandin's original commentary. This allows him to identify Mahendra with the Gupta emperor Kumāra Gupta I, who was known by a variety of names: Śrī Mahendra, Aśvamedha Mahendra, Ajita Mahendra, Śrī Mahendra Siṃha, Siṃha Mahendra, Kumāra Gupta, Mahendra Kumāra, etc. (Allan, 1914: 61 f.). It is known that toward the end of the reign of this emperor the empire was threatened by enemies,[4] who were then defeated by his son Skanda Gupta.

If the above example indeed refers to an event in Skanda Gupta's struggle with the 'enemies' — which seems possible, but by no means certain —, if moreover the example was indeed given by Devanandin himself, then Devanandin must have lived not long after the beginning of Skanda Gupta's reign, i.e., not long after 455 A.D.

III. The Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya

3. The *citation citī sañjñānaviśuddhyoḥ* (above §1) from a Dhātupāṭha may help to determine the date of the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya. This entry does not occur in any

of the surviving lists of verbal roots (Palsule, 1955: 193, 197). This suggests that at some time of the history of the Dhātupāṭha changes were made in at least some of the meaning entries, and that the author of the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya used a version of the Dhātupāṭha which had not yet undergone such changes.[5] This last supposition would be strengthened in case further early instances could be adduced of roots + meaning entries which deviate from the Dhātupāṭha know to us. This can indeed be done. Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya appears to refer to four Dhātupāṭha roots with meaning entries: *ubundir niśāmane*, *skandir gatiśoṣaṇayoḥ* (Mbh. vol. I, p. 264, l. 8-9), *kṛṣir vilekhane* (Mbh. vol. II, p. 33, l. 25), *yajir haviṣprakṣepaṇe* [162] (Mbh. vol. II, p. 34, l. 5). The first three roots are found in the surviving Dhātupāṭha with these meaning entries, the fourth is not (cf. Bronkhorst, 1981: 349). Also the Aṣṭādhyāyī provides some reasons to think that the Dhātupāṭha which accompanied it differed in some few points from the Dhātupāṭha which came down to us. For a detailed discussion of these reasons I refer the reader to an earlier study (Bronkhorst, 1981: 341-42). Here I merely repeat the results: the original Dhātupāṭha possibly had *bhuj* in the sense *avana*, *dṛś* in the sense *ālocana*, *dhṛṣ* in the sense *vaiyātya*, where the surviving Dhātupāṭha gives the meanings *pālana*, *prekṣaṇa*, and *prāgalbhya* respectively.

All this evidence shows that a change may have taken place in the Dhātupāṭha, a change which concerned at least some of the meaning entries, and perhaps other features as well. This change appears to have taken place after Pāṇini (of course), Patañjali and the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya.

But this change must have taken place before Candra, the composer of the Cāndra Vyākaraṇa. This grammar includes a Dhātupāṭha which — even though it arranged the roots differently, reduced their number, and gave each of them as a rule but one meaning[6] — is clearly based on the Pāṇinian Dhātupāṭha. Well, Candra sides with the later, modified, list in all the cases where we found, or suspected to have found, an older version. Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya has *yaj* in the sense of *haviṣprekṣepaṇa*, Candra and the extant Dhātupāṭha have *yaj* in the sense *devapūjā*; the Aṣṭādhyāyī possibly had *bhuj* in the sense *avana*, *dṛś* in the sense *ālocana*, *dhṛṣ* in the sense *vaiyātya*; Candra and the surviving Pāṇinian Dhātupāṭha give the meanings *pālana*, *prekṣaṇa*, and *prāgalbhya* respectively. In the case of cit, Candra gives the single meaning *saṃjñāna*, but this is explained by the fact that Candra's roots almost always have a single meaning entry.

---

[4] So Divekar (1920), who adds that they must be the Hūṇas mentioned at the end of the inscription. Fleet (1888: 55 n. 2) had opted for the reading 'Puṣyamitra'.

[5] I have argued elsewhere (1981) that meaning entries were probably part of the Dhātupāṭha from its beginning.

[6] The verse at the end of Cāndra's Dhātupāṭha explains why: *kriyāvācitvam ākhyātum ekaiko 'rtho nidarśitaḥ | prayogato 'nugantavyā anekārthā hi dhātavaḥ ||*. See Liebich 1902: 34*.

I have shown elsewhere (1983) that in the period before Candra many parts of Pāṇini's grammar were 'improved'. There is evidence from Dhātupāṭha, Gaṇapāṭha and Sūtrapāṭha concerning this. This period came to an end when, with Candra and esp. Bhartṛhari, another movement started gaining momentum, a movement in which Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya was considered the highest authority, and in which no 'improvements' of Pāṇini's grammar were tolerated any longer. It is clear that the changes under consideration were probably also made in this period. It is only unfortunate that we know virtually nothing about the earlier Dhātupāṭha which needed 'improvement'.
[163]

It follows from the above that the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya was most probably composed well before Candra, before the new version of the Dhātupāṭha known to Candra had gained currency. Candra may have lived around 450 A.D. (Scharfe, 1977: 164).

There is reason to think that the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya should not be dated earlier than the fourth century A.D. This century saw the establishment of the Gupta empire in and around Pāṭaliputra. This empire was characterized by peace and prosperity, as well as by the increased use of Sanskrit. Epigraphic evidence testifies to the religious tolerance of this time, also with respect to Jainism (Shah, 1932: 205 f.). The Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya was written in Pāṭaliputra[7], in Sanskrit. It is tempting to think that it was written in the Gupta empire, and therefore in the fourth century A.D.

IV. Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya and Tattvārtha Sūtra

4.1. The distance of time which separates Siddhasena Gaṇi's Ṭīkā from the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya on which it comments is according to the above at least four hundred years. Siddhasena Gaṇi's may be the first commentary on the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya, and the first to state that this Bhāṣya and the Tattvārtha Sūtra to which it belongs were composed by the same author (Sukhlal, 1974: Intr. p. 31 n., 34). Devanandin's Sarvārthasiddhi, which we have seen to be much closer in time to the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya, ignores the latter completely; this means no doubt that it did not know the Bhāṣya or did not consider it a composition of the author of the Tattvārtha Sūtra. It is therefore of some importance to study the internal evidence of

[7] The concluding verses of the Bhāṣya (II, p. 326) tell us that their author lived in Kusumapura, which is Pāṭaliputra.

Sūtra and Bhāṣya. I shall present some facts which indicate that Sūtra and Bhāṣya had different authors.

1) Sūtra 2.37 distinguishes five kinds of bodies: *audārika*, *vaikriya*, *āhāraka*, *taijasa* and *kārmaṇa* (*audārikavaikriyāhārakataijasakārmaṇāni śarīrāṇi*). Sūtras 2.41-43 deal with the last two of these bodies (*pare*, 2.40, i.e. the two following the three which precede *taijasa*: *prāk taijasāt*, 2.39), *taijasa* and *kārmaṇa*. The two bodies are: (2.41) *apratighāte* "without obstruction", (2.42) *anādisambandhe ca* "and connected [with the soul] without beginning", (2.43) *sarvasya* "each [soul which is in *saṃsāra*] has [these two bodies]".

The Bhāṣya on this last sūtra, after explaining it in this manner, continues: "But some teachers explain [the situation] with reference to the doctrine of aspects (*nayavāda*) as follows: Only the *kārmaṇa* body [164] is connected [with the soul] without beginning; that is to say (*iti*): the soul has a beginningless connection with that [*kārmaṇa* body]. The *taijasa* [body], on the other hand, is dependent on attainment (*labdhi*). And not every [soul] has that attainment which gives rise to a *taijasa* [body] (*taijasalabdhi*), only some [souls] have it" (*eke tv ācāryā nayavādapekṣaṃ vyācakṣate / kārmaṇam evaikam anādisambandham / tenaivaikena jīvasyānādiḥ sambandho bhavatīti / taijasaṃ tu labdhyapekṣaṃ bhavati / sā ca taijasalabdhir na sarvasya, kasyacid eva bhavati /*).

It appears from this passage that a difference of opinion existed regarding the nature of the *taijasa* body. The author of the sūtras considered it a constant accompaniment of souls in *saṃsāra*. Others did not agree, and their reasons are clear. They looked upon the *taijasa* body as "producing heat in the case of a curse caused by anger, producing cool rays in the case of a favour caused by kindness, bringing about the lustre of many shining lights in embodied beings, like gems, fire, and the chariots of the luminaries" (Bhāṣya on sūtra 2.43, p. 201: *kopaprasādanimittau śāpānugrahau prati tejonisargaśītaraśminisargakaram, tathā bhrājiṣṇuprabhāsamudayacchāyānirvartakaṃ saśarīreṣu maṇijvalanajyotiṣkavimānavad iti*). This clearly describes the powers attained by a man who has long practised asceticism,[8] and not therefore 'every soul'. The question is which of the two opinions was accepted by the author of the Bhāṣya.

The first thing to be noted is that the Bhāṣya on 2.44 explains the sūtra from both points of view, first assuming that all souls have a *taijasa* and a *kārmaṇa* body, then accepting only the *kārmaṇa* body as invariable accompaniment of the soul. More

[8] The 'ability to curse and bestowe favours' (*śāpānugrahasāmarthya*) is indeed enumerated among the 'accomplishments' (*ṛddhi*) which can be attained, in the concluding section of the Bhāṣya (II, p. 315); see also below.

interesting however is the Bhāṣya on 2.49. After explaining this sūtra, which describes the *āhāraka* body, the Bhāṣya continues on its own, not prompted by anything in the sūtra: *taijasam api śarīraṃ labdhipratyayaṃ bhavati* "Also the *taijasa* body is dependent upon attainments". Nothing suggests that anything but the opinion of the author of the Bhāṣya is here presented.

It can cause not surprise that Siddhasena Gaṇi attempts to solve the problem by postulating the existence of two different kinds of *taijasa* body. One of these is responsible for the digestion of food and accompanies each and every soul which is not liberated. Only the other one is 'dependent upon attainments' and enables its owner to exercise the powers connected with this second kind of *taijasa* body. Ingenious as this solution is, it does not represent the opinions expressed in either [165] sūtra or Bhāṣya. At best it is a combination of these opinions, and stresses, in being so, the difference which exists between these two opinions.

The Bhāṣya goes once again through the list of bodies (p. 211 f.), this time paying attention to their names. The *taijasa* body is described as follows (p. 214): "*taijasa* means 'modification of *tejas*', 'of which the essence is *tejas*'; **it is for curses and favours**" (*tejaso vikāras taijasaṃ tejomayaṃ tejaḥsvatattvaṃ śāpānugrahaprayojanam*). Again no word about another kind of *taijasa* body. We may therefore be sure that the author of the Bhāṣya was one of the teachers mentioned under sūtra 2.43, who disagreed with the author of the Sūtra.

The disagreement which we here find between Sūtra and Bhāṣya is found between the sūtras as accepted in the Sarvārthasiddhi. There sūtras 2.41 and 42 state that *taijasa* and *kārmaṇa* bodies accompany every soul in *saṃsāra* from beginningless time (41: *anādisaṃbandhe ca*; 42: *sarvasya*). These sūtras do not differ from those accepted in the Bhāṣya (see above). However, the Sarvārthasiddhi also comments on a sūtra which is not found in the Bhāṣya, viz. 2.48: *taijasam api* [*labdhipratyayam* 47] "Also the *taijasa* [body] is dependent upon attainments". It seems unlikely that both sūtras 2.41-42 and sūtra 2.48 were part of the original Tattvārtha Sūtra.

It is tempting to think that the 'sūtra' *taijasam api* was taken from the Bhāṣya, which, as we know, contains the phrase *taijasam api śarīraṃ labdhipratyayaṃ bhavati*. This is not however necessarily true. Given the existence of an original sūtra *labdhipratyayaṃ ca* (2.48 in the Bhāṣya, 2.47 in the Sarvārthasiddhi) which concerned the *vaikriya/vaikriyika* body mentioned in the preceding sūtra, it required not much imagination for those who looked upon the *taijasa* body as also 'dependent upon attainments' to add the sūtra *taijasam api*. The different positions of the new sūtra and the Bhāṣya phrase guarantee that at any rate the new sūtra did not owe its existence to the mistake of considering a Bhāṣya sentence as really being a sūtra.

2) There is reason to think that the Bhāṣya misinterprets a sūtra at at least one occasion. This is sūtra 2.22, which must be read together with its context in order to be correctly understood: (2.15) *pañcendriyāṇi* "There are five senses", … (2.20) *sparśanarasanaghrāṇacakṣuḥśrotrāṇi* "[They are:] touching, tasting, smelling, sight, hearing", (2.21) *sparśarasagandhavarṇaśabdās teṣām arthāḥ* "Touch, taste, smell, colour and sound are their objects", (2.22) *śrutam anindriyasya* "*śruta* is the object of no sense", (2.23) *vāyvantānām ekam* "[The elements] upto and including wind have one [sense]".
[166]

We see that sūtra 2.22 must be connected with what precedes, since 2.23 enters upon a new topic. This means that śruta must here be an **object** of knowledge, and therefore the object of scriptural knowledge.

This is precisely the interpretation given in the Sarvārthasiddhi (p. 128). It explains sūtra 2.22 (there 2.21) in the following manner: "*śruta* is the *artha* (cf. sūtra 2.21), [viz.] the object of scriptural knowledge (*śrutajñāna*). It is the object of no sense, because the soul which has fully reached the destruction or the calming of the obstruction of scriptural knowledge obtains knowledge regarding the object of scriptural knowledge which does not depend on the senses" (*śrutajñānaviṣayo 'rthaḥ śrutam / sa viṣayo 'nindriyasya pariprāptaśrutajñānāvaraṇakṣayopaśamasyātmanaḥ śrutārthe* [v.l. *śrutasyārthe*] *'nindriyālambanajñānapravṛtteḥ*).

However, the Bhāṣya interprets the word *śruta* differently, identifying it with *śrutajñāna* 'scriptural knowledge'. Since the Bhāṣya gives not further explanation,[9] we are left to guess what exactly could be meant. Siddhasena Gaṇi offers no help, and it is hard to see how knowledge can be an object (*artha*). Indeed, if we wish to interpret *śruta* as *śrutajñāna* we may be forced to take *artha* in a different sense. This is what the Sarvārthasiddhi does in a second, alternative, explanation of the sūtra: "Or *śruta* is scriptural knowledge (*śrutajñāna*); it is the *artha*, i.e. the purpose, of no sense" (*athavā śrutajñānaṃ śrutam, tad anindriyasyārthaḥ prayojanam iti yāvat*). However, since *artha* means 'object' in the preceding sūtra 2.21, it must have this same sense in 2.22. We must conclude that the interpretation of the Bhāṣya does not easily fit the sūtra, and appears not to come from the author of the Sūtra.

---

[9] The Bhāṣya on sūtra 2.22 consists of one sentence: *śrutajñānaṃ dvividham anekadvādaśavidhaṃ naindriyasyārthaḥ.* Apart from virtually quoting sūtra 1.20 (*śrutaṃ matipūrvaṃ dvyanekadvādaśabhedham*), it does nothing much beyond substituting *śrutajñāna* for *śruta.*

3) A deviation between Sūtra and Bhāṣya appears to be present at 3.4 as well. Sūtras 3.3-5 describe the hells (*naraka*): (3.3)[10] *nityāśubhataraleśyāpariṇāmadehavedanāvikriyāḥ* "The ever more disagreeable *leśyā*s, situations, bodies, sensations and failures [in those hells] are uninterrupted", (3.4) *parasparodīritaduḥkhāḥ* "Their suffering is mutually [167] brought about", (3.5) *saṅkliṣṭāsurodīritaduḥkhāś ca prāk caturthyāḥ* "Until the fourth [region] their suffering is also brought about by troublesome Asuras".

The causes of suffering in the hells are, according to the sūtras, primarily the properties acquired by the inhabitants of hell, and further 'troublesome Asuras'. No word is here said about the nature of the hells themselves, i.e., the places where all these sufferings have to be undergone.

The author of the Bhāṣya apparently considered this a lacuna, which he tried to fill under sūtra 3.4. He begins his explanation of this sūtra in the following manner (p. 241): "In the hells the sufferings of the inhabitants of hell are also (*ca*) mutually brought about. This means: also (*ca*) as a result of the disagreeable situation of matter caused by the nature of the place" (*parasparodīritāni ca duḥkhāni narakeṣu nārakāṇāṃ bhavanti / kṣetrasvabhāvajanitāc cāśubhāt pudgalapariṇāmād ity arthaḥ /*). A specification of 'the disagreeable situation of matter caused by the nature of the place' follows.

It is true that the Bhāṣya every now and then goes beyond what is found in the sūtras. Nothing can be concluded from this by itself. But here the Bhāṣya ascribes to a sūtra what is clearly not in it. If the author of the Bhāṣya had written the Sūtra himself, he could have made the sūtras in accordance with his wishes. As it is, not even the word *ca* is found in sūtra 3.4 in any of the mss.

4) A clear deviation between Sūtra and Bhāṣya is visible in 4.4. The sūtra describes what varieties exist in each of the four classes of gods and their subdivisions, which had been the subject of discussion of the three preceding sūtras. Sūtra 4.4 reads: *indrasāmānikatrāyastriṃśapāriṣadyātmarakṣalokapālānīkaprakīrṇakābhiyogyakilbiṣikāś caikaśaḥ.* The Bhāṣya commences its explanation with the remark that in each of the classes of gods the gods are of ten kinds (p. 275: *ekaikaśaś caiteṣu devanikāyeṣu devā daśavidhā bhavanti*). This fits the sūtra well; the ten kinds of gods must obviously be named (1) *indra*, (2) *sāmānika*, (3) *trāyastriṃśa*, (4) *pāriṣadya*, (5) *ātmarakṣa*, (6) *lokapāla*, (7) *anīka*, (8) *prakīrṇaka*, (9) *ābhiyogya*, (10) *kilbiṣika*. However, the Bhāṣya enumerates the following **eleven** kinds of gods immediately after announcing ten of

[10] A number of mss. begin this sūtra with the words *teṣu nārakā*[*ḥ*]. However, this addition was apparently not known to the Bhāṣya, which explains this sūtra as concerning hells (*naraka*, from 3.2)

them: (1) *indra*, (2) *sāmānika*, (3) *trāyastriṃśa*, (4) *pāriṣadya*, (5) *ātmarakṣa*, (6) *lokapāla*, (7) *anīkādhipati*, (8) *anīka*, (9) *prakīrṇaka*, (10) *ābhiyogya*, (11) *kilbiṣika*. That is to say, the Bhāṣya adds one kind of gods (no. 7: *anīkādhipati*) which is not mentioned in the sūtra.

It might be conjectured that the author of the Bhāṣya does no more than give two subdivisions of the single kind called *anīka* in the sūtra. [168] This is indeed how Siddhasena Gaṇi tries to explain the situation (p. 276): "In the sūtra only the armed forces (*anīka*) have been mentioned by the Sūri, not the leaders of the armed forces (*anīkādhipati*). In the Bhāṣya, on the other hand, [the latter] have been included. It has been explained thus by the author of the Bhāṣya, considering the complete oneness of armed forces and the leaders of armed forces; or otherwise the number ten would not be valid" (*sūtre … [a]nīkāny evopāttāni sūriṇā, nānīkādhipatayaḥ, bhāṣye punar upanyastās tad etad ekatvam evānīkānīkādhipatyoḥ paricintya vivṛtam evam bhāṣyakāreṇa, anyathā vā daśasaṅkhyā bhidyeta*). But this does not solve the difficulty. If the author of the Bhāṣya also composed the sūtra, he would have incorporated into the sūtra what he thought necessary to mention while paraphrasing it. Moreover, the eleven items which he enumerates are repeated and briefly explained in the immediately following sentences of the Bhāṣya. The 'leaders of armed forces' (*anīkādhipati*) are compared to judges (*daṇḍanāyaka*) in human society, the 'armed forces' (*anīka*) to human armed forces (*anīkādhipatayo daṇḍanāyakasthānīyāḥ / anīkāny anīkasthānīyāny eva /*). No trace here of an attempt to show the 'complete oneness' of these two kinds of gods. The Bhāṣya's must therefore be seen as an effort to improve upon the sūtra, made by someone (the author of the Bhāṣya) different from the composer of the sūtra.

5) The different authorship of Sūtra and Bhāṣya is also visible in their diverging choice of words. In a number of cases the Bhāṣya uses the same word as the sūtra as long as it explains the latter. But as soon as the Bhāṣya gives an exposition of its own, a different word is used. This is true of 'Meru' (3.9 and 4.14) which becomes '(Mahā-)Mandara' (I, p. 256, 257, 281)[11]; *kāla* (1.8, 4.15, 5.22, 38, 107) becomes *addhā* (I, p. 67) or *addhāsamaya* (I, p. 316)[12] *atīcāra* (7.18) becomes *aticāra* (II, p. 96-116, repeatedly); *paryāptanāman* (8.12) becomes *paryāptināman* (II, p. 162); *śaikṣaka* (9.24) becomes *śikṣaka* (II, p. 256). It is true that some of these cases depend heavily on the

---

rather than inhabitants of hell (*nāraka*); it also conflicts with sūtra 3.6, where *teṣu* clearly refers to *naraka* (rather than *nāraka*), which must therefore be the subject-matter of the preceding sūtras 3.3-5.

[11] Jacobi (1906: 313) says about the first occurrence of 'Mandara': "Es folgen nun einige Angaben über Videha, die ein späterer Zusatz zu sein scheinen, weil hier Mandara statt Meru gebraucht wird". Rather than just this section, we look upon the whole of the Bhāṣya as a "späterer Zusatz".

[12] Cf. Phoolchandra Siddhant Shastry, 1971: Prastāvanā, p. 34-35.

trustworthiness of the edition used, yet they support the view that the author of the Bhāṣya was not the author of the Sūtra.

4.2. The preceding section leaves little doubt that the author of the Tattvārtha Sūtra was not also the author of the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya. Yet the Bhāṣya has some features which suggest the opposite.
[169]

At no place does the Bhāṣya mention alternative readings of sūtras. Moreover, the Bhāṣya contains numerous references to sūtras and/or other parts of the Bhāṣya. For this purpose the following words are used: *vakṣyāmi*, *pravakṣyāmi*, *upadekṣyāmaḥ*, *vakṣyāmaḥ*, *uktaṃ bhavatā* (said by an imaginary opponent), *vakṣyate/vakṣyante*, *ukta*, *vyākhyāta*, *vakṣyati*. The first six of these — which are used in about half the cases — seem to ascribe the passage referred to to the author or authors of the Bhāṣya. In many of these cases sūtras seem to be referred to, and in a fair number of them there can be no doubt about this.[13] How can this be explained?

Before we try to answer this question, it must be pointed out that even the cross-references retain a peculiarity which can be considered an indication that the sūtras existed before the Bhāṣya. The words used to refer to sūtras and/or other parts of the Bhāṣya make it possible to distinguish between sūtras and passages which are still to come on the one hand, and those which have already occurred earlier on the other. In general this distinction is well observed, and this can hardly surprise us. There are however a number of noteworthy exceptions. Here *uktam* and *uktaṃ bhavatā* (uttered by an imaginary opponent) refer to sūtras which are still to come! *uktaṃ bhavatā* refers to sūtras 5.12 and 10.5 in the Bhāṣya on 3.6 (I, p. 246); to sūtra 6.18 in the Bhāṣya on 3.13 (I, p. 264); to sūtras 6.14 and 6.20 in the Bhāṣya introducing 4.1 (I, p. 271); and to sūtra 6.17 in the Bhāṣya on 4.27 (I, p. 308). *ukta* refers to sūtra 5.18 in the Bhāṣya on 3.1 (I, p. 230) and to sūtras 5.22 and 5.39 in the Bhāṣya on 4.15 (I, p. 289). Such references to future passages with the help of past verbal forms occur only in the case of references to sūtras, with one exception. The Bhāṣya on 5.19 contains the remark: *prāṇāpānau ca nāmakarmaṇi vyākhyātau*. The reference is to the Bhāṣya on 8.12 (II, p. 161), as Siddhasena Gaṇi confirms.[14]

---

[13] This is especially the case where a sūtra which defines or specifies the meaning of a term, say x, is introduced as *x vakṣyāmaḥ*, or similarly. Cf., e.g., the introductions to sūtras 1.8, 1.14, 1.34, etc. Downright quotations of sūtras also occur in such contexts, e.g. I, p. 169, 188, 228, etc.

[14] Siddhasena Gaṇi tries to solve the problem in the following manner: … *prāṇāpān[au]* … *nāmakarmaṇi* … *vyākhyāsyete / kathaṃ tarhi vyākhyātau / āśaṃsāyām arthe bhūtavad vartamānavac ca pratyayā bhavanti, upādhyāyaś ced āgamiṣyati tad vyākaraṇam adhītam evam ihāpi nāmakarmāśaṃsitam ity adoṣaḥ /* "*prāṇa* and *apāna* will be explained [in the section] on *nāmakarman*. How then [is the word] *vyākhyātau* ('have been explained') [to be accounted for]? There is nothing wrong since 'when hope is

[170]

A peculiarity of the cross-references in the first person is that they are always in the plural number (*upadekṣyāmaḥ*, *vakṣyāmaḥ*) when they occur in the body of the Bhāṣya. The two first person cross-references in the introductory stanzas, on the other hand, are singular: *vakṣyāmi*, *pravakṣyāmi*. I do not know what conclusions to draw from this.

We return to the question how and why the Tattvārtha Sūtra and the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya could become a unified whole so that no variant readings of sūtras are mentioned in the Bhāṣya, and references to sūtras could be made in the Bhāṣya in the first person. The answer must be that the author incorporated the pre-existing Sūtra into his own Bhāṣya and made of the two a single work, which he could refer to as his composition, without necessarily having the intent to cheat. The reason to think that this must be the answer is that there is at least one other work in which something similar took place. The other work is the combined Yoga Sūtra and Yoga Bhāṣya.

Like the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya, the Yoga Bhāṣya makes no mention of the variant readings of the sūtras on which it comments. And even though the number of cross-references in the Yoga Bhāṣya is small, and the number in which first person endings are used even smaller — I counted five —, in three cases the word *vakṣyāmaḥ* is used to introduce a set of sūtras, viz. before YS 2.30, 2.40, 2.46. Most interesting is that the combined Yoga Sūtra and Yoga Bhāṣya present themselves, in the colophons, as a unified whole called 'Patañjali's authoritative book on Yoga, and exposition of Sāṃkhya' (Bronkhorst, 1984: § 1; 1986: ch. VI).

We are justified in comparing the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya with the Yoga Bhāṣya, because a number of similarities between these two works indicate that they came from related milieus. The most noteworthy of these similarities is the occurrence in both works of two illustrations — fire in dry grass which is either heaped up or spread out, and drying a piece of cloth which is either rolled up or unrolled — illustrating the difference between *nirupakrama* and *sopakrama karman*; see

---

the meaning [to be expressed] the suffixes are as if a past [tense] and a present [tense are to be expressed, as e.g.] "if the teacher will come, then grammar is studied"'; in the same way is here too [the section on] *nāmakarman* hoped [to be written]". This passage contains a reference to a grammatical work. Cf. the Kāśikā on P. 3.3.132: *tatra bhaviṣyati kāle āśaṃsāyāṃ gamyamānāyāṃ dhātoḥ vā bhūtavat pratyayā bhavanti, cakārād vartamānavac ca / upādhyāyaś ced āgamat, āgataḥ, āgacchati, āgamiṣyati, ete vyākaraṇam adhyagīṣmahi, ete vyākaraṇam adhītavantaḥ, adhīmahe, adhyeṣyāmahe /.*

Tat[171]tvārthādhigama Bhāṣya 2.52 and Yoga Bhāṣya 3.22.[15] But there are far more similarities, a proper study of which remains a desideratum.[16]

The time of the Yoga Bhāṣya cannot be far removed from that of the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya. If we accept that Vindhyavāsin wrote the Yoga Bhāṣya, we can make use of Paramārtha's biography of Vasubandhu, preserved in Chinese (T. 2049; tr. Takakusu, 1904a; partial transl. Takakusu, 1904b: 40 f.). Paramārtha lived from 500 until 569 A.D., and appears to be the first author whose testimony regarding Vindhyavāsin's date has survived. In his biography of Vasubandhu (T. 2049, p. 189b24 f.; Takakusu, 1904a: 281 f., 1904b: 40 f.) Vindhyavāsin figures as the conqueror in dispute of Buddhamitra, the teacher of Vasubandhu. Vasubandhu, who was absent during the dispute, returned, became angry, found out that Vindhyavāsin had died ("had become a stone") and wrote a book named Paramārtha Saptati against the Sāṃkhya philosophy. In the beginning of this story Vindhyavāsin is said to have lived "more than 1100 years after the death of the Buddha".[17] Since Paramārtha himself lived 1265 years after the Nirvāṇa of the Buddha according to a statement quoted by P'u-kuang (T. 1821, p. 282a15-16; Péri, 1911: 360-61) and this must have been between 546 and 569 A.D., 1100 years after the death of the Buddha becomes roughly 400 A.D. (cf. Frauwallner, 1951: 7-8).

V. The Form and Origin of the Tattvārtha Sūtra

5.1. If the author of the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya was not also the author of the Tattvārtha Sūtra, we can ask the question if the Bhāṣya contains the sūtras in their original form. It is conceivable that the author of the Bhāṣya made changes in the sūtras where this would suit his purposes; or the sūtras may have been handed down to him by a tradition which did not in all details preserve their original form.

The passages discussed in § 4.1 show that the author of the Bhāṣya did not change the sūtras without any restraint. Indeed, had he done so, it would have been much harder or even impossible to find deviations between Sūtra and Bhāṣya. Yet we cannot

---

[15] Woods (1927: xix) concludes that here "Tattvārthādhigama-sūtra ii.52 refers to Yoga-sūtra iii.22"; but nothing proves that the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya and the Yoga Bhāṣya, or the Sūtras, exerted a direct influence on each other in either direction.

[16] An exhortation to this effect is made in Folkert, 1976: 146.

[17] The text has *jiu bai nian zhong* "around the year 900" (cf. Takakusu, 1914). However, a remark by Hui-chao reproduced in Péri, 1911: 357 (T. 1832, p. 688b5 f.) shows that the original reading was *yi qian yi bai yu nian* "more than 1100 years.

exclude the possibility [172] that he made minor, perhaps rather inconsequential, changes, or that the tradition from which he derived the sūtras had made changes.

In order to investigate this question further we are dependent upon Devanandin's Sarvārthasiddhi. The Tattvārtha Sūtra as commented upon in this work differs from the Sūtra as known to the Bhāṣya at a number of points.[18] Did the Sarvārthasiddhi derive its Sūtra text from the Bhāṣya, introducing changes where this was considered convenient? Or did this text reach Devanandin through an independent tradition? Related with this question, but to be kept separate from it, is the other one if Devanandin knew the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya.

No decisive evidence is known to me that Devanandin was acquainted with the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya. Some amount of similarity exists between the Sarvārthasiddhi and the Bhāṣya, but this was anyhow to be expected: both texts comment on (almost) the same Sūtra text, and both may have made use of the same or almost the same older — canonical or non-canonical — works. Given this situation the similarity between these two earliest commentaries on the Tattvārtha Sūtra is small.

The reading of the sūtras accepted in the Sarvārthasiddhi deviates from those in the Bhāṣya at a number of places. A few times the Sarvārthasiddhi gives a *varia lectio* of a sūtra.[19] But its author does not seem to be aware of the form of the sūtras accepted in the Bhāṣya.

At least once the Sarvārthasiddhi appears to preserve the original sūtra where the Bhāṣya has the sūtra in a modified form. This is sūtra 2.7, which will be discussed in context:

Sūtra 2.1 enumerates five states which constitute the essence of the soul: "The essence of the soul is [constituted by] (i) the state of calming [of *karman*], (ii) the state of destruction [of *karman*], (iii) the mixed [state], (iv) [the state] of arousal [of *karman*], and (v) [the state] which remains in modification" (*aupaśamikakṣāyikau bhāvau miśraś ca jīvasya svtattvam audayikapāriṇāmikau ca*). Sūtra 2.2 tells us that these states "have 2, 9, 18, 21, and 3 divisions respectively" (*dvinavāṣṭādaśaikaviṃśatitribhedā yathākramam*). These divisions are duly enumerated in sūtras 2.3-7.

The last of these sūtras reads: *jīvabhavyābhavyatvādīni ca.* This looks problematic. The word *ādi* 'etc.' in this sūtra expands the number beyond the three items which sūtra 2.2 told us to expect. One would expect sūtra 2.7 without the word *ādi*, yet the Bhāṣya makes an [173] explicit reference to this word and thus testifies that this little word did not slip in later due to a scribal error.

---

[18] An enumeration of these differences is given in Jaini, 1920: 204-10, and in the edition of the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya, II, p. 347-55.

[19] E.g. on TS 1.16 (p. 79), 2.53 (p. 146).

But the Sarvārthasiddhi has sūtra 2.7 without *ādi*: *jīvabhavyābhavyatvāni ca*! Could this be an indication that this commentary made use of a version of the Tattvārtha Sūtra which is independent from the one used in the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya, a version moreover which may at times be closer to the original than that used in the Bhāṣya? If this is true, it is an additional indication that the author of the Bhāṣya cannot have been the author of the sūtras.

It must be added that both the Bhāṣya and the Sarvārthasiddhi state that there are more 'states which remain in modification' (*pāriṇāmika bhāva*) than just the three (*jīvatva*, *bhavyatva*, *abhavyatva*) enumerated in this sūtra. But both agree that only these three are characteristic of the soul and are not found elsewhere.

Sūtra 5.26 reads, according to the Bhāṣya, *saṅghātabhedebhya utpadyante*. In the Sarvārthasiddhi it has the form *bhedasaṃghātebhya utpadyante*. There is reason to think that the latter is the original shape of this sūtra. In that form it fits among the surrounding sūtras, in the following manner: (5.25) *aṇavaḥ skandhāś ca* [*pudgalāḥ* (23)] "Atoms and aggregates [constitute matter]", (5.26) *bhedasaṅghātebhya utpadyante* "They arise from separation and combination", (5.27) *bhedād aṇuḥ* "The atom from separation", (5.28) *bhedasaṅghātābhyāṃ cākṣuṣāḥ*[20] "The visible [aggregates] from separation and combination".

In this interpretation there is no difficulty of *anuvṛtti*: the subject-matter in 5.26 is *aṇavaḥ skandhāś ca*, precisely what has been mentioned in 5.25. The plural number of *bhedasaṅghātebhya[ḥ]* in 5.26 is explained by the following two sūtras: this compound unites two 'separations' (*bheda*) and one 'combination' (*saṅghāta*). What we have to assume in order to make this interpretation possible is that *cākṣuṣa* 'visible' is equivalent to *skandha* 'aggregate'. This is permissible since sūtra 5.23 tells us that matter possesses colour (*varṇa; sparśarasagandhavarṇavantaḥ pudgalāḥ*).

The Bhāṣya has more trouble explaining sūtra 5.26. To begin with, it confines the subject-matter to aggregates (*skandha*). The plural number of *saṅghātabhedebhya[ḥ]* is accounted for by saying that aggregates arise from combination (*saṅghāta*), from separation (*bheda*), and from *saṅghātabheda* (*saṅghātād bhedāt saṅghātabhedād ity ebhyas tribhyaḥ kāraṇebhyaḥ skandhā utpadyante dvipradeśādayaḥ*). What is meant by *saṅghātabheda* is explained a little later (p. 370): *ata eva ca saṃghātabhedābhyām ekasāmayikābhyāṃ dvipradeśādayaḥ skandhā utpadyante / anya*[174]*saṃghātenānyato bhedeneti /* "These same aggregates, which cover two or more *pradeśa*s, also arise from simultaneous combination and separation; that is to say (*iti*), by combination with one thing [and] separation from another". This threefold cause of aggregates turns out to be

[20] The Sarvārthasiddhi has *cākṣuṣaḥ*.

only valid for invisible aggregates, in view of sūtra 5.28. The Bhāṣya here comments: *bhedasaṅghātābhyāṃ cākṣuṣāḥ skandhā utpadyante / acākṣuṣās tu yathoktāt saṅghātād bhedāt saṅghātabhedāc ceti /* "The visible aggregates arise from separation and combination; the invisible aggregates, on the other hand, from combination, from separation, and from *saṅghātabheda*, as explained".

Apart from this forced interpretation in the Bhāṣya, there is the difficulty of explaining how a supposedly original *saṅghātabhedebhya utpadyante* could be changed to *bhedasaṃghātebhya utpadyante* which we find in the Sarvārthasiddhi. The answer does not lie in the way the Sarvārthasiddhi comments upon the sūtra. Here too it concerns the aggregates only, and the plural number of *bhedasaṃghātebhya[ḥ]* is explained as in the Bhāṣya. No discernible reason can therefore account for this change.

The reverse change — from an original *bhedasaṅghātebhya utpadyante* to *saṅghātabhedebhya utpadyante* which we find in the Bhāṣya — is understandable in the light of the interpretation given in the Bhāṣya. The original reading would not only too easily show the intentions of the author of the sūtras, it would also blur the distinction between the origins of visible and invisible aggregates, both being *bhedasaṅghāta*. It seems therefore that the author of the Bhāṣya occasionally made changes — be it only minor changes — in the sūtras in order to make them suit his own ideas. It is clear that this assumption explains why the Bhāṣya never makes any mention of variant readings in the sūtras.

A difference in the order of the items enumerated exists also between the two versions of sūtra 6.7 (in the Bhāṣya) / 6.8 (Sarvārthasiddhi). the two versions are identical but for the order of the words *vīrya* and *adhikaraṇa*: *tīvramandajñātājñātabhāvavīryādhikaraṇaviśeṣebhyas tadviśeṣaḥ* (Bhāṣya); *tīvramandajñātājñātabhāvādhikaraṇavīryaviśeṣebhyas tadviśeṣaḥ* (Sarvārthasiddhi). The Sarvārthasiddhi explains the terms briefly and in such a manner that their order could not possibly make any difference. The Bhāṣya, on the other hand, pronounces all the terms known, except *adhikaraṇa*, the explanation of which it leaves to the following sūtra (6.8/6.7), thus:

> *atrāha — tīvramandādayo bhāvā lokapratītāḥ / vīryaṃ ca jīvasya kṣāyopaśamikaḥ kṣāyiko vā bhāva ity uktam / athādhikaraṇaṃ kim iti / atrocyate — (6.8) adhikaraṇaṃ jīvājīvāḥ /*
> "Here [an opponent] says: The intense (*tīvra*), weak (*manda*) and further states (*bhāva*) are known from the [175] world. It has also been said that energy (*vīrya*) is a state of both destruction and calming [of *karman*] (so the Bhāṣya on

> 2.5) or [a state] of destruction [of *karman*] (so 2.4) of the soul. But what is *adhikaraṇa*? [The answer] to this is given: (6.8) *adhikaraṇa* is soul or not-soul."

It is obvious that this passage could provide a reason for reversing the order of *adhikaraṇa* and *vīrya*. It is therefore fair to assume that the Sarvārthasiddhi preserves in all likelihood the original reading of sūtra 6.7/6.8.

It is finally interesting to look at the two versions of TS 5.38 (Bhāṣya) / 5.39 (Sarvārthasiddhi). The Bhāṣya has: *kālaś cety eke*; in this form the sūtra means to say that some consider also time (*kāla*) a substance (*dravya*). The sūtra evokes suspicion in this form since it is the only one that refers to 'some', i.e. to others than the author of the sūtras. The same sūtra reads in the Sarvārthasiddhi: *kālaś ca*. It is easy to imagine that an original *kālaś ca* was changed into *kālaś cety eke* by someone who was doubtful about the correctness of this sūtra but was hesitant to drop it altogether. The reverse process is harder to explain, since *kālaś cety eke* cannot but be acceptable to all, both those who do and who do not accept time as a substance.

It is worthwhile in the present context to discuss a few cases where deviations between the Śvetāmbara and Digambara Sūtra text are due to mistakes regarding what are sūtras and what commentary, i.e., in the final analysis, due to editing mistakes. An example is TS 1.21-23 which read in the Bhāṣya: (1.21) *dvividho 'vadhiḥ* "*avadhi* [knowledge] is of two kinds", (1.22) *tatra bhavapratyayo nārakadevānām* "Among these, [*avadhi* knowledge] which is depending on the state of existence [occurs] among the inhabitants of hell and the gods", (1.23) *yathoktanimittaḥ ṣaḍvikalpaḥ śeṣāṇām* "[The other kind of *avadhi* knowledge] which is caused by the factors described [occurs] among the remaining [beings]".
Sūtra 1.23 refers back to something which should be, but is not in sūtra 1.21. The situation improves when we view the phrase which makes up the Bhāṣya on 1.21 as really part of sūtra 1.21. The sūtra then becomes: (1.21) *dvividho 'vadhiḥ bhavapratyayaḥ kṣayopaśamanimittaś ca* "*avadhi* [knowledge] is of two kinds, depending on the state of existence, and caused by the destruction or calming [of *karman*]". The Sarvārthasiddhi confirms that this is indeed the original sūtra. It reads (p. 86): *atrocyate — dvividho 'vadhir bhavapratyayaḥ kṣayopaśamanimittaś ca*.
The words *atrocyate* and the like are regularly used to introduce a sūtra in the Sarvārthasiddhi, so that there can be no doubt that here too a sūtra is introduced. The fact that the editor of the Sarvārthasiddhi [176] looked upon it as part of the introduction to the following sūtra, and therefore as a sūtra in itself, cannot change this.

We see, incidentally, that the argument according to which sūtra 1.23 refers back to the Bhāṣya on sūtra 1.21, thus showing that Sūtra and Bhāṣya were made by the same person, is invalid.

An obvious editing mistake is the absence in Jacobi's (1906: 540) edition of the word *pūrvavidaḥ* after *śukle cādye* (TS 9.40). This one word is treated as a separate sūtra in the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya (II, p. 275), and is joined with the preceding *śukle cādye* to form one sūtra in the Sarvārthasiddhi (p. 347). Both commentaries comment upon this word.

Bhatt and Tripathi (1974: 65-71) argue that originally a sūtra on *kevalajñāna* existed between TS 1.26 and 1.27 (in the Bhāṣya edition; between 1.25 and 1.26 in the edition of the Sarvārthasiddhi). They derive their evidence, and even the form which this sūtra must have had (*svarūpotthaṃ kevalam*), from Amṛtacandra's Tattvārthasāra. Amṛtacandra must have lived "ca. 10th century A.D." according to one of these two authors (Bhatt, 1977: 803). The question how this one sūtra could survive from "ca. 2nd century A.D." (so Bhatt, 1977: 802) to the 10th century, even though neglected by all commentators on the Tattvārtha Sūtra, is not addressed. We can therefore safely ignore Bhatt and Tripathi's proposal.

5.2. We come to our final question. What was the original affiliation and date of the Tattvārtha Sūtra?

Williams (1963: 2) gives the following arguments in support of this view that the Tattvārtha Sūtra is a Digambara work:

> "Consider first the seventh *adhyāya* of the *Tattvārtha-sūtra*, the only section devoted — and that only in part — to the lay life. Here the Śvetāmbara and Digambara recensions do not differ except in the numbering, as *sūtras* 4 to 8, which are missing from the Śvetāmbara version, have in fact been transferred to the *bhāṣya*. Yet the text as accepted by the Śvetāmbaras shows some curious features. First, in *sūtra* 18 [= 13 in the Bhāṣya, J.B.] it is specified that the layman, before he can take the *vratas*, must be devoid of the three *śalyas*; elsewhere this condition is only laid down in the Digambara *śrāvakācāras*, indeed the term does not seem to find a mention in Śvetāmbara texts. Secondly, the sequence of the *vratas* in sūtra 21 [16] does not follow the model of the *Upāsaka-daśāḥ* which is rigidly observed in the Śvetāmbara tradition and, by making the *deśāvakāśika-vrata* follow the *dig-vrata*, violates the principle by which practices of brief duration repeated at intervals are confined to the category of the *śikṣā-vratas*. Thirdly, in *sūtra* 24 [= 19] the term *śīla* is used in a

> sense, normal in [177] Digambara works but not elsewhere admitted by the later Śvetāmbaras, to designate the *guṇa-vratas* and *śikṣā-vratas*. Fourthly, for the *satya-*, *bhogopabhoga-*, *anartha-daṇḍa-*, *poṣadhopavāsa-*, and *sallekhanā-vratas* the *aticāras* listed diverge markedly from the schema of the Śvetāmbara texts, which, apart from the *Dharma-bindu*, adhere unvaryingly to the *Upāsaka-daśāḥ* pattern until the time of Hemacandra. Fifthly, the information supplementary to the *vratas* is limited to a couple of *sūtras* (38 and 39 [= 33 and 34]) emphasizing the importance of *dāna*, no mention at all being made of the *āvaśyakas*, which are given extensive treatment in all the Śvetāmbara *śrāvakācāras*. As the *vratas* and their *aticāras* represent the nucleus of the whole lay doctrine any variation in the presentation must be of considerable significance; and for these reasons the *Tattvārthasūtra* cannot, from the point of view of the *śrāvakācāra*, be regarded as a Śvetāmbara work."

I must admit my incompetence to express an opinion on the correctness or otherwise of these observations. Certain is that Schubring (1964: 202-03 [485-86]) reviewed them sympathetically. Moreover, the assumption that the Tattvārtha Sūtra originally belonged to a Digambara milieu makes it understandable that the Digambara Devanandin still had access to an independent version of that work, even though the Śvetāmbara Bhāṣya had been written perhaps as much as a century earlier. Also the mention of 'nakedness' (*nāgnya*) in TS 9.9. amongst the sufferings to be borne agrees well with a Digambara origin.

One fact militates against a Digambara origin of the Tattvārtha Sūtra. This is TS 9.11 (*ekādaśa jine*) which says that a Jina must bear eleven sufferings (*parī-/pariṣahā*). Amongst these sufferings must be counted hunger (*kṣudh*) and thirst (*pipāsā*). This is hard to reconcile with the Digambara belief that a Jina does not eat and drink.[21] Devanandin tries to solve the problem by proposing that *pariṣahopacāra* 'suffering in a metaphorical sense' is intended here. He also offers an alternative; perhaps *na santi* must be understood with this sūtra, so that it comes to mean: "There are not eleven sufferings in the case of a Jina." But neither of these solutions is acceptable.

If we sum up the above, we can say that the Tattvārtha Sūtra was in all probability composed by a Jaina belonging to a sect which had more contacts with Digambaras than with Śvetāmbaras. This sect shared with the Digambaras much concerning the lay

---

[21] Cf. Sarvārthasiddhi on 6.13 (p. 249): *kavalābhyavahārajīvinaḥ kevalina ityevamādi vacanaṃ kevalināṃ avarṇavādaḥ*; and on 8.1 (p. 284): *kevalī kavalāhārī … [i]tyevamādiḥ viparyayaḥ.*

life, as well as nakedness of its monks, and probably the same region.[22] However, this [178] sect did not share the belief of the Digambaras that a Jina does not eat and drink.

A sect of this kind existed. The Yāpanīyas shared many characteristics with the Digambaras, among them nakedness and the same region, but disagreed primarily on the question of *strī-mukti* ('liberation of women') and *kevali-bhukti* ('taking food of *kevalin*s) (Upadhye, 1933). Inscriptions which refer to them date back to the fifth century A.D. Devasena's Darśanasāra (10th cent. A.D.) gives the year 205 after the death[23] of King Vikrama as the date of origin of the Yāpanīya sect, which may therefore go back to the 2nd century A.D. (Upadhye, 1933: 225). Perhaps this sect came into existence soon after the two major ones, of the Śvetāmbaras and of the Digambaras (Premī, 1939: 41). It is possible that the Yāpanīyas preserved an early, perhaps 'proto-Jaina' attitude (Williams, 1966: 5), which would support their early existence.

If we are right in connecting the Tattvārtha Sūtra with the Yāpanīya sect, there are two consequences. First, the Yāpanīya sect existed before the composition of the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya, and therefore in all likelihood prior to the fourth century A.D. Second, the Tattvārtha Sūtra was composed after the origin of the Yāpanīya sect, i.e., after 150 A.D. at the earliest.

Some caution must however be maintained. The Tattvārtha Sūtra is not polemical in any way. Had it been so, it would not have been accepted by both the Śvetāmbaras and Digambaras. This absence of sectarianism goes to the extent that no word is said about the 'liberation of women' which was a topic of great interest among the Yāpanīyas.[24] We can only guess how this is to be explained. Possibly the text underwent some form of censure before it reached its earliest commentators. Perhaps also the text was composed in a time when there was no disagreement as yet on this topic, or even in the time before a split had occurred between the Yāpanīyas and the Digambaras.

VI. Some consequences

6.1. The immediate results of this study can be briefly restated as follows. The Tattvārtha Sūtra seems to be a Yāpanīya work in origin which nonetheless proved acceptable to the Śvetāmbaras and Digambaras as well. Composed in all probability

---

[22] Probably the northern region of Karnāṭaka (Desai, 1957: 164).

[23] See Jain, 1964: 67.

[24] It is rejected in the Sarvārthasiddhi on 8.1 (p. 284): … *strī sidhyatītyevamādiḥ viparyayaḥ*; and on 10.9 (p. 362-63): *liṅgena kena siddhiḥ / … dravyataḥ pulliṅgenaiva /.*

some time between 150 and 350 A.D., it came to be commented upon by commentators belonging to both these sects. The earliest surviving commentary seems to have [179] been made in the 4th century A.D. by a Śvetāmbara who incorporated the sūtras into his work, the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya, introducing at times minor changes and adjustments into the Sūtra text. This way of creating a unified work out of older sūtras and the own commentary is not unknown in ancient India; it finds a close parallel in the combined Yoga Sūtra and Yoga Bhāṣya. The Digambara Sarvārthasiddhi of Devanandin appears to date from the 5th century A.D., and is based on a Sūtra text which was not taken from the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya and may retain earlier readings at some places. The idea that the Tattvārtha Sūtra and the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya had one single author is for the first time met with in Siddhasena Gaṇi's Ṭīkā, which belongs to the period 800-850 A.D.

6.2. Besides these immediate results there are some other consequences which deserve our attention.

To begin with, recall that Siddhasena Gaṇi wrote before Śīlāṅka, and therefore before the middle of the 9th century. The Kāśikā, on the other hand, must have preceded Siddhasena Gaṇi by 'a fair amount of time', 'at least one or two centuries'. This means that we cannot date the Kāśikā later than about 750 A.D. In view of the fact that I-ching's testimony does not — contrary to the general opinion — seem to concern the Kāśikā (Brough, 1973: 255 f.; Bronkhorst, 1990: § 3.1), and that there is "obviously some conjecture involved" in the other arguments used to determine the date of the Kāśikā (see Cardona, 1976: 280-81), this result is welcome.

Then there is the change which the Pāṇinian Dhātupāṭha underwent in its meaning entries after the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya and before Candra. The tradition associates the Dhātupāṭha in its present form with Bhīmasena. If we accept this, and take it that Bhīmasena made the changes under consideration, he must be assigned to this period, i.e., roughly to a time between 350 and 450 A.D.

My final observation concerns the canonical tradition of the Jainas. TS 9.40 (Bhāṣya) / 9.37 (Sarvārthasiddhi) tells us that the first two stages of 'pure meditation' (*śukla dhyāna*) are accessible to one who knows the Pūrvas (§ 5.1 above). The fourteen Pūrvas together constituted one of the twelve Aṅgas of the Jaina canon. They have been lost for a very long time. Indeed, I shall argue that their mention in the present context indicates that they were lost already when the Tattvārtha Sūtra was composed.

For suppose that the Pūrvas still existed at the time that the idea became current that their knowledge was an essential precondition for the attainment of the early stages of 'pure meditation', and therefore for reaching the goal of the religious life. In that case

the Pūrvas would [180] have been studied intensely, perhaps more intensely than the other Aṅgas, and as a result the Pūrvas would have stood good chances of surviving, at least as good as, or even better than, the other Aṅgas. As it is, only the Pūrvas have been lost. We must conclude that the condition that one must know the Pūrvas in order to attain to the early stages of pure meditation, was made at a time when no one knew the Pūrvas any longer.[25] The idea behind this condition must have been the belief (which came to stay among the Jainas) that liberation is in the present age no longer possible in this world.

Bibliographical References

Allan 1914 — John Allan, Catalogue of the Coins of the Gupta Dynasties and of Śaśāṅka, King of Gauḍa. London: British Museum, 1914.

Alsdorf 1973 — Ludwig Alsdorf, What were the Contents of the Dṛṣṭivāda. In: German Scholars on India. Contributions to Indian Studies ed. by the Cultural Department of the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany, New Delhi. Vol. I. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1973, pp. 1-5.

Bhatt 1977 — Bansidhar Bhatt, Tattvārtha Studies III (summary). In: XIX. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 28. September bis 4. Oktober 1975 in Freiburg im Breisgau. Vorträge hrsg. W. Voigt. [Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft Suppl. III]. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1977, pp. 802-806.

Bhatt-Tripathi 1974 — Id. - Chandrabhal Tripathi, Tattvārtha Studies I-II. The Brahmavidyā, Adyar Library Bulletin 38 (1974) 64-83.

Birwé 1971 — Robert Birwé, Introduction to Śākaṭāyana-Vyākaraṇam, ed. Śambhunātha Tripāṭhī. [Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Jaina Granthamālā, Saṃskṛta Granthāṃka 39]. Varanasi: Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha Prakāśana, 1971.

Bronkhorst 1981 — Johannes Bronkhorst, Meaning Entries in Pāṇini's Dhātupāṭha. Journal of Indian Philosophy 9 (1981) 335-357.

Bronkhorst 1983 — Id., On the History of Pāṇinian Grammar in the Early Centuries Following Patañjali. Journal of Indian Philosophy 11 (1983) 357-412.

[25] Alsdorf (1973) draws attention to a passage of the Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi from which he concludes that

Bronkhorst 1984 Id., "Patañjali and the Yoga sūtras." Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik 10, 191-212.

Bronkhorst 1986 Id., The Two Traditions of Meditation in Ancient India. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden. (Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien, 28.)

Bronkhorst 1990 Id., Vārttika. Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens 34 (1990), 123-146.

[181]

Brough 1973 John Brough, I-ching on the Sanskrit Grammarians. Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 36 (1973) 248-260.

C. Sūtra in Candra's Grammar. See Liebich, 1902.

Cardona 1976 George Cardona, Pāṇini: A Survey of Research. Delhi - Varanasi - Patna: Motilal Banarsidass, 1980.

Desai 1957 P. B. Desai, Jainism in South India and Some Jaina Epigraphs. [Jīvarāja Jaina Granthamālā 6]. Sholapur: Jaina Saṃskṛti Saṃrakshaka Sangha, 1957.

Devanandin See J and Phoolchandra Siddhant Shastry, 1971.

Dhp. Pāṇinian Dhātupāṭha.

Divekar 1920 H. R. Divekar, Puṣyamitras in Gupta Period. Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute 1 (1920) 99-103.

Fleet 1888 Johan Faithfull Fleet, Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum. Vol. III. Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings and Their Successors. Calcutta: Government Printing, 1888

Folkert 1976 Kendall W. Folkert, Jaina Studies: Japan, Europe, India. In: In Memory of Dr. A. N. Upadhye, edd. D. Malvania and H. C. Bhayani. [Sambodhi 5,2-3]. Ahmedabad: L. D. Institute of Indology, 1976, pp. 138-147.

Frauwallner 1951 Erich Frauwallner, On the Date of the Buddhist Master of the Law Vasubandhu. [Serie Orientale Roma III]. Roma: Is.M.E.O., 1951.

Frauwallner 1961 Id., Landmarks in the History of Indian Logic. Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens 5 (1961) 125-148 [= Kleine Schriften. Wiesbaden 1982, pp. 847-870].

J(M) Devanandin: Jainendra Vyākaraṇa, with Abhayanandin's commentary Jainendra Mahāvṛtti edd. Shambhu Nath Tripathi and Mahadeo Chaturvedi. [Jñānapītha Mūrtidevī Jaina

knowledge of the contents of the Pūrvas was already lost at that time.

Granthamālā, Saṃskrit Grantha No. 17|. Kāshī: Bhāratīya Jñānapītha, 1956.

J(Ś) Jainendra Vyākaraṇa as contained in Śabdārṇavacandrikā.

Jacobi 1906 Hermann Jacobi, Eine Jaina-Dogmatik: Umāsvāti's Tattvārthādhigama Sūtra. Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 60 (1906) 287-325 / 512-551.

Jain 1964 Jyoti Prasad Jain, The Jaina Sources of the History of Ancient India (100 B.C. - A.D. 900). Delhi: Munshi Ram Manohar Lal, 1964.

Jaini 1920 Tattrarthadhigama Sutra (A Treatise on the Essential Principles of Jainism) by Sri Umasvami Acharya, ed. with intr., transl., notes and comm. … by J. L. Jaini. [Bibliotheca Jainica, Vol. II]. Arrah 1920 [reprinted New York: AMS Press, 1974].

Kapadia 1941 Hiralal Rasikdas Kapadia, A History of the Canonical Literature of the Jainas. Bombay: Gujarati Printing Press, 1941.

[182]

Kāśikā Kāśikā. A Commentary on Pāṇini's Grammar, edd. Aryendra Sharma, Khanderao Deshpande and D. G. Padhye. 2 pts. [Sanskrit Academy Series 17/20]. Hyderabad: Sanskrit Academy — Osmania University, 1969-70.

Nyāsa or Pañcikā Commentary of Ācārya Jinendrabuddhipāda and Padamañjarī of Haradatta Miśra on the Kāśikāvṛtti [Commentary on the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini] of Vāmana-Jayāditya, edd. Swami Dwarikadas Shastri and Pt. Kalikaprasad Shukla. 6 vols. [Prāchya Bhāratī Series 2-7]. Varanasi: Prachya Bharati Prakashan / Tara Publications, 1965-67.

Kielhorn 1881 Franz Kielhorn, On the Jainendra-Vyâkaraṇa. Indian Antiquary 10 (1881) 75-79 [= Kleine Schriften I. Wiesbaden 1969, pp. 180-184].

Kielhorn 1887 Id., Notes on the Mahabhashya 6. The text of Panini's Sutras, as given in the Kasika-Vritti, compared with the text known to Katyayana and Patanjali. Indian Antiquary 16 (1887) 178-184 [= Kleine Schriften I, pp. 226-232].

Liebich 1902 Bruno Liebich (ed.), Cāndra-Vyākararṇa. Die Grammatik des Candragomin: Sūtra, Uṇādi, Dhātupāṭha. [Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, XI. Bd. / No. 4]. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1902.

Liebich 1928	Id., Konkordanz Panini - Candra. [Indisch Forschungen, 6. Heft]. Breslau: M. & H. Marcus, 1928.
Lindtner 1980	Christian Lindtner, Apropos Dharmakīrti — Two New Works and a New Date. Acta Orientalia 41 (1980) 27-37.
Mbh.	Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya.
Mīmāṃsaka 1956	Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka, Jainendra śabdānuśāsana tathā usake khilapāṭha. In: J(M), pp. 39-54 (intr.)
Mīmāṃsaka 1973	Id., Saṃskṛta Vyākaraṇa-Śāstra kā Itihāsa. Parts I-III. Sonipat: Rāma Lāl Kapūr Trust, Saṃvat 2030.
P.	Pāṇinian sūtra.
Palsule 1955	Gajanan Balkrishna Palsule, A Concordance of Sanskrit Dhātupāṭhas (with Index of Meanings). [Deccan College Dissertation Series 14]. Poona: Deccan College, 1955.
Péri 1911	Noël Péri, A propos de la date de Vasubandhu. Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient 11 (1911) 339-390.
Phoolchandra Siddhant Shastry 1971	Sarvārtha Siddhi of Pëjyapāda. The Commentary on Āchārya Griddhapiccha's Tattwārtha Sūtra, ed. Pt. Phoolchandra Siddhant Shastry. [Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Granthamālā, Saṃskrit Grantha No. 13]. Delhi - Varanasi: Bharatiya Jnanapitha, 1971.
Premī 1939	Nāthūrāma Premī, Yāpanīya sāhitya kī khoja. [183] Anekānta [= Jaina Sāhitya aura Itihāsa. Bombay 1942, pp. 41-60].
Scharfe 1977	Hartmut Scharfe, Grammatical Literature. [A History of Indian Literature, Vol. V / Fasc. 2]. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1977.
Schubring 1964	Walther Schubring, Besprechung von Williams 1963. Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 114 (1964) 202-204 [= Kleine Schriften, Wiesbaden 1977, pp. 485-487].
Shah 1932	Chimanlal J. Shah, Jainism in North India: 800 B.C. - A.D. 526. [Studies in Indian History of the Indian Historical Research Institute, St. Xavier's College, Bombay, No. 6]. London - New York - Toronto - Calcutta - Bombay - Madras: Longmans, Green and Co., 1932.
Siddhasena Gaṇi	See under Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya.
Śīlāṅka	Śīlāṅka: Ācāraṭīkā. In: Ācārāṅgasūtram and Sūtrakṛtāṅgasūtram, with the Niryukti of Ācārya Bhadrabāhu Svāmī and the Commentary of Śīlāṅkācārya … originally ed. Ācārya Sāgarānandasūrijī Mahārāja, re-ed. with appendices etc. by Muni

	Jambūvijayajī. [Lālā Sundarlāl Jain Āgamagranthamālā, Vol. I]. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1978.
Sukhlal 1974	Pt. Sukhlalji's Commentary on Tattvārtha Sūtra of Vācaka Umāsvāti, transl. by K. K. Dixit. [L. D. Series 44]. Ahmedabad: L. D. Institute of Indology, 1974.
T.	Taishō edition of the Tripiṭaka in Chinese.
Takakusu 1904a	J. Takakusu, The Life of Vasu-bandhu, by Paramārtha (A.D. 499-569). T'oung Pao sér. II / vol. 5 (1904) 269-296.
Takakusu 1904b	Id., La Sāṃkhyakārikā, étudiée à la lumière de sa version chinoise. Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient 4 (1904) 1-65 / 978-1064.
Takakusu 1914	Id., The Date of Vasubandhu 'in the nine hundreds'. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland 1914, pp. 1013-1016.
Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya	Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya, with Siddhasena Gaṇi's commentary ed. H. R. Kapadia. 2 pts. [Sheth Devchand Lalbhai Jain Pustakoddhar Fund Series, Nos. 67 / 76]. Surat: Sheth Devchand Lalbhai Jain Pustakoddhar Fund, Badekhan Chakla, 1926-30
TS	Tattvārtha Sūtra. See Jacobi 1906 and Jaini 1920.
Upadhye 1933	A. N. Upadhye, Yāpanīya Saṅgha — A Jaina Sect. Journal of the University of Bombay 1,6 (1933) 224-231.
vt.	vārttika in Mahābhāṣya.
Williams 1963	R. Williams, Jaina Yoga. A Survey of the Mediaeval Śrāvakācāras. [London Oriental Series, Vol. 14]. London - New York - Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1963.
Williams 1966	Id., Before Mahāvīra. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland 1966, pp. 2-6.
[184]	
Woods 1927	James Haughton Woods (tr.), The Yoga-System of Patañjali or the Ancient Hindu Doctrine of Concentration of Mind. [Harvard Oriental Series 17]. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927 [reprinted Delhi - Varanasi - Patna: Motilal Banarsidass, 1966].
YS	Yoga Sūtra.
Yuktidīpikā	Yuktidīpikā. An ancient commentary on the Sāṃkhya-Kārikā of Īśvarakṛṣṇa, ed. Ram Chandra Pandeya. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1967.

[Added in proofs:] Two recent works did not become accessible to me until after this article had been sent off for publication: Mokṣa in Jainism according to Umāsvāti, by Robert J. Zydenbos (Franz Steiner, Wiesbaden, 1983); and A Study of Tattvārthasūtra with Bhāṣya, by Suzuko Ohira (L. D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad, 1982). The opinions expressed in this article remain however unaffected.