



Overviews

Nalini Balbir

Functions of Multiple-Text Manuscripts in India: The Jain Case

Abstract: After a brief introduction on basics relating to Jain manuscript culture and a terminological discussion of the multiple-text manuscript (MTM) concept along with the treatment of Jain MTMs in manuscript catalogues, the present paper considers the possible reasons motivating the MTM phenomenon. The main part of the investigation concerns the combinations available in Jain MTMs, from binary associations to large-scale MTMs. The issue of canonized assemblages versus dynamic collections and the issue of language in MTMs which has to be connected with the coexistent use of languages in the Jain tradition (Prakrit, Sanskrit and vernaculars) are discussed with the support of instances as available in palm leaf and paper manuscripts, in pothīs and codices.

1 Preliminaries

The Jains form one of the oldest communities in India, which is still very much alive today. Although they have always been a minority in Indian society, they have a rich cultural heritage, with manuscript culture as one of its main manifestations. They are divided into monks and nuns on the one hand, and lay followers on the other. Mendicants lead a wandering life, except during the rainy-season, and depend on layfollowers for their subsistence. Jains believe in the teachings proclaimed by the Jinas. They are exceptional human beings, who reached omniscience in their last existence, after going through the cycle of rebirths, and finally reach emancipation from any kind of rebirth. In the line of 24 Jinas recognised by the tradition, the last was Mahāvīra who lived in the sixth-fifth centuries BCE and was a contemporary of Buddha. Both originally preached in Eastern India (the region known as Magadha). As a result of migrations, parts of the Jain communities then settled in the west or in the south. It is likely that Jains were always a minority within Indian society, as they are today with about four million followers (0,5% of the total Indian population). Probably at the end of the first century CE, the Jains split into two sections, the Śvetāmbaras and the Digambaras. These words refer to the external outfit of the mendicants, who wear a white monastic robe or go naked. Nudity is a central and decisive issue in this difference. Although both sections do not recognize the authority of the same scriptures, they otherwise have much in common.

Jain teachings were first transmitted orally, from master to disciple, from Mahāvīra to his direct disciples and then through various lineages of ascetics, but in the first centuries of the Common Era the need to have these teachings fixed was felt. The two Jain sectarian traditions, the Digambara and the Śvetāmbara, differ on how this was done: the former hold that their authoritative texts were put into writing around the second century CE, the latter in the middle of the fifth century. Writing is clearly viewed as a way to preserve the teaching. Traditional sources argue as follows: before the writing process started, some Jain texts had already been lost because there was no one to master them. In the time to come, more losses could happen, so writing was better than nothing. However, none of the written evidence (the manuscripts) dates back to these early periods. No Jain manuscript that we have is from an earlier date than the eleventh century. It is assumed that the rest did not survive the combination of heat and humidity that characterises the Indian climate. All Jain manuscripts were created in the Indian subcontinent. The most recent ones were written in the twentieth century, as writing by hand was never totally superseded by printing. Even now, Jain monks and nuns are encouraged to copy and to write by hand, sometimes producing true artefacts. So, despite the oral origins of the tradition, manuscripts and, in recent times, printed books are central to Jain culture.

2 Doctrinal background and Jain manuscript culture

Especially in Western India, that is Rajasthan and Gujarat, the Jains have often been a very influential minority because of the positions they occupied in economy, trade and finance. At times, these positions led them to build close relationship with dynasties in power. For earlier periods, it is difficult to determine the percentage of literacy among the Jains, but the sustained evidence of works copied in the form of manuscripts from the eleventh century onwards indicates that there were always at least some elite groups who were highly literate and considered literacy important. These groups consisted of merchants or businessmen—Seths—and their families, who were able to pay to commission manuscript production. In many cases, manuscripts were made by professional scribes and painters who had to be paid for their work. Of course, when the scribes were monks or nuns, there was no payment. Several manuscripts were produced for monks and nuns, but members of the Jain lay community could

also be the readers. The doctrine acknowledges that the close bond between the four parties making the Jain *saṅgha* is crucial. This is conceptualized in the notion of the ‘seven fields’ (*sapta-kṣetra*) from the twelfth century onwards, which is a particular application of the broader notions of ‘gift’ (*dāna*) and ‘spreading, religious diffusion or propaganda’ (*prabhāvanā*), i.e. spending money for the faith. The seven forms it may take are investing for 1) Jain images, 2) Jain temples, 3) Jain tradition, 4) monks, 5) nuns, and 6) other Jains. The third aspect— ‘Jain tradition’—covers activities connected with manuscript production, as the manuscript is the repository of the teaching, which, as a famous twelfth-century Jain teacher explained, is the true word. He clearly states that manuscripts have to be prepared in order to preserve the teaching, and that they have to be taken care of as objects. They are intended for monks and nuns, and serve as a basis for preaching to the followers: hence, the manuscript is essential in keeping alive the link between the two parts of the Jain community—the mendicants and the followers. This is an example of how treatises on lay conduct encourage lay followers to invest their money into manuscript production, and how the diffusion of manuscript culture became a part of Jaina ethics from the twelfth century onwards. Further, Jain manuscripts become visible in yearly festivals of the religious calendar when they are cleaned, preserved with additional pieces of cloth covering them, displayed and even taken in procession. As we will see, this performative aspect has encouraged the mass production of manuscripts belonging to one particular religious text, the *Kalpasūtra*. Thus, manuscripts are central to the Jain culture of Western India (Gujarat and Rajasthan), the area treated here.

The script of the manuscripts examined here is Devanāgarī, or variations of it. Their material is either palm leaf, attested from the eleventh to the thirteenth century, or paper from the fourteenth century onwards. Palm-leaf and paper manuscripts use the landscape format (*pothī*), but in certain contexts the codex form could also be used. Traditional Indian manuscripts have no quires and are originally unbound (even if Western librarians often considered it their job to bind them upon receipt; sometimes even with leather, which could be offensive to religious conceptions). The leaves of palm-leaf manuscripts were kept together with the help of a string passed through holes at the centre, and with upper and lower covers, whereas the folios of paper manuscripts were kept loose (even if a thread could be passed around the bundle). Their pages can be kept between two paper covers, two wooden covers or two cardboard covers, but this is far from being the rule. Today they are usually put between paper covers or in paper envelopes, which are wrapped in a white cotton cloth. Manuscripts

in book form, on the contrary, are stitched together or may be bound. This material aspect is not without relation to the transmission of texts.

The evidence used in the present essay comes either from the direct inspection of manuscripts in the cataloguing of which I have been involved in one way or the other (British Library, Cambridge University Library, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Udine Civic Library), or from the descriptions found in catalogues, provided they are sufficiently detailed to be made use of (e.g. Kapadia 1935ff. for Pune, Schubring 1944 for Berlin, Punyavijaya 1968 for Ahmedabad to some extent, Tripathi 1975 for Strasbourg).¹ This essay is the outcome of empirical research on Jain MTMs, but I have benefitted in my approach from the papers presented during the MTM Hamburg Conference and from the reading of various general or areal studies devoted to MTMs such as Friedrich and Schwarke 2016, Connolly and Radulescu 2015 or Andrist, Canart and Maniaci 2013, a classic.

3 Jain MTMs: issues of terminology

The issue of MTMs is not so obvious and has not necessarily been taken into account by cataloguers, at least in the field of Jain manuscripts. The issue of terminology should also be added to this: again, in this field the terms used to designate the reality which is the focus of this essay have fluctuated. Tripathi 1975, the author of the paradigmatic catalogue of Jain manuscripts preserved in Strasbourg University Library, which has a detailed introduction forming an in-depth methodological reflection on the cataloguer's work and on the notion of manuscript, makes use of a triple distinction: (1) simple, (2) collective, and (3) composite.²

1 Several of these catalogues are digitized on <https://wujastyk.net/mscats/>. The Leipzig collection (Krause 2013) contains MTMs with two to four texts (described in Krause 2013, XXXI–XXXII ‘Beschreibung der Sammelhandschriften’) but is not really interesting from this angle.

2 The following remark will be of interest only to those who were familiar with the Indological department of Berlin Free University between around 1970 and 1990: both the methodological concerns and the style of the introduction of Tripathi's catalogue (which was originally presented as a Habilitationsschrift) are deeply stamped with the influence of the late Klaus Bruhn (1928–2016), who occupied a unique place in twentieth-twenty-first German indology precisely because of his deep concern for methodology and reflection on our objects of study.

Normally a Manuscript contains one Text. Such a Manuscript shall be called a “simple Manuscript”. In the present Catalogue there are 141 cases, where the terms “Manuscript”, “Text” and “Entry” denote the same object from different viewpoints, because the relevant Manuscripts are “simple” ones (1975, 18).

Collective Manuscripts are not very common and somewhat untypical. They are conglomerates collected for different purposes [...]. They nevertheless have the outward appearance of a single Manuscript. One may quote as parallels the practice of some libraries to bind different offprints as a single book and the practice of booksellers to offer occasionally a number of small pamphlets, articles etc. as one item (1975, 18–19). [...] A collective Manuscript would consist of different Manuscripts, and not merely of different Texts combined in one and the same Manuscript (1975, 19 n. 17).

When the different Texts of a Manuscript are more or less closely related, we use the term “composite Manuscript” (1975, 19). [...] If the texts combined in such a Manuscript show only a minimum of unity, then we call it a composite Manuscript, treating even fragmentary or extremely small texts as separate Entries. If, on the other hand, the unit has been given the characteristics of a single text by the author himself or if the unit has developed this characteristic in the process of “Manuscript tradition”, then and only then we treat the unit as a single Text in a single Entry” (1975, 19–20).

Following this trend, I also used the expression ‘composite manuscripts’ when describing the Jain manuscripts of the British Library (Balbir, Sheth, Tripathi 2006). But I now find it inadequate because, according to Tripathi, ‘composite’ is not far from ‘heterogeneous’, and I would not hesitate to say that it is simply misleading because ‘composite’ rather refers to different physical manuscripts joined together. Tripathi’s ‘composite manuscripts’ correspond to what is now better designated as MTM. This term is much more satisfactory because it is purely factual and just takes into account the fact that a single material object contains more than one text, without any preconception about the relationship between the texts that are included. In its strict sense, an MTM would refer to a single codicological unit using the same material, the same layout, an uninterrupted foliation, written by one and the same hand and comprising more than one text: all these visual signs testify to the project of producing one manuscript. Here the purpose will be to show that when texts are put together in one manuscript, there is some reason behind it and there is some explicit or implicit link perceived between them. In most cases, texts that are part of MTMs can be transmitted independently in the form ‘one manuscript one text’ (Tripathi’s “simple” Manuscripts). So, having them put on par with others cannot be without purpose or meaning. We thus assume that an MTM is never a random combination but the result of a deliberate process. The introduction to the recent Hamburg publication on MTMs (Friedrich and Schwarke 2016) says:

MTM designates ‘a codicological unit ‘worked in a single operation’ (Gumbert) with two or more texts or a ‘production unit’ resulting from one production process delimited in time and space (Andrist, Canart, Maniaci). On the other hand, ‘composite’ seemingly is already established in the sense as used by Gumbert and others and refers to a codicological unit which is made up of formerly independent units (Friedrich and Schwarke 2016, 15-16).

The material evidence explored here shows that the boundary is indeed very thin between the two categories because the overwhelming material consists of texts which may be transmitted as independent units and, in a parallel process, may enter MTMs. In approaching MTMs, another factor one has to take into account is the flexibility of textual divisions and the identity of the textual units which are the basis for transmission. There are several Indian works (both in the Jain tradition and outside) that we now consider as one text, but they are divided into chapters or sections, the manuscript transmission of which shows that they can lead their own life independently. When we study the indigenous system of cross-referencing, for instance, we see that it resorts to the titles of these chapters or sections, or, in Buddhist texts, to individual sūtras—and not to the work in its globality. Therefore, it is risky and misleading to superimpose the modern perception of a text on this material, and probably more justified to think in terms of ‘blocks’ or ‘modules’. For example, we may have a manuscript containing only the first *śrutaskandha* (chapter) of the *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* (the second book in the Śvetāmbara Jain canon) or only the second, or another manuscript having only the 36th and last chapter of the *Uttarādhyāyanasūtra* etc. So, it is possible to have MTMs where one chapter of such a work would be copied along with one chapter of another work, etc. This can result into a demultiplication of texts which is the reflection of a general conception of what a text is.

4 Jain MTMs: their treatment in catalogues

The treatment of Jain MTMs in printed catalogues has been uneven and sometimes impractical: in most cases, each text has been described as an independent entry with cross-references to other entries (Kapadia 1935ff., Schubring 1944, etc.). This is acceptable, but there should be at least an appendix of some sort where all MTMs are listed with their contents so that one can form an idea on what they represent. This has been done in the British Library Catalogue, where they have been classified according to the number of texts contained: two to ten texts or more, preceded by a note on the principles and functions of such manuscripts (Balbir, Sheth, Tripathi 2006: vol. 1 Appendix A. Composite manu-

scripts, pp. 112-133). In the pioneering catalogue of Strasbourg Jain manuscripts, the presentation seems rather complicated:

A list of all the Texts in a particular Manuscript appears at the very end of the Entry for its first Text. The Texts within the Manuscript are numbered in the sequence in which they appear in the Manuscript, and this may be called a supplementary numbering. In the 'Description' of the first Text we use the formula 'A composite Manuscript containing ... Texts', in the 'Description' of the other Texts we use the formula 'For the description of this composite Ms. see **Ser. No. 999** (with a list of Texts 1-...)'. (Tripathi 1975, 20-21).

Nevertheless, the Appendix 1 'Correspondence table of numbers' (Tripathi 1975, 377-380) shows which manuscripts are MTMs and can be used as a basis. In general, this means that a considerable amount of preliminary work must be achieved in order to exploit the material of the catalogues with the aim to understand the processes of assemblages. Since the entries describing the textual units are scattered over the catalogue, one has to first reconstruct what the contents of a given MTM is.

The worst case is when the multiple-text character of a manuscript has been simply overlooked because the cataloguer or, more often, the person who has prepared preliminary lists has jumped directly to the end of the manuscripts without reading it carefully. In Indian manuscripts, the end part is the place where titles are given, but one should not wrongly take the title of the final text in a manuscript as being the title of the whole. Such a situation is more likely to happen where a manuscript does not contain any of the visual markers emphasizing the presence of distinct textual units. British Library Or. 2134 (manuscript D) is an extreme case where this occurred: the manuscript is written only in black ink—no red ink is used for titles, no orange or yellow pigment is used for highlighting, no larger spaces are included to draw attention to any kind of separation between the works copied. The result was that an Indian hand, probably the first buyer of the manuscript, wrote on the final folio (fol. 54) *Pramāṇamīmāṃsā patra 54* in Devanāgarī script, suggesting that the 54 folios manuscript contains only the *Pramāṇamīmāṃsā*, a philosophical work by the twelfth-century Jain scholar Hemacandra. This, however, is wrong and was assumed on the basis of the first text contained in the manuscript. The title of a part was given to the whole. In fact, the manuscript is an MTM containing four texts, which are distributed as follows:

<i>Pramāṇamīmāṃsā</i>	fols 1v-2r8
<i>Pramāṇamīmāṃsā</i> commentary	fols 2r8-43v13
<i>Parīkṣānāmaprakaraṇa</i>	fols 44r1-47r2
<i>Sarvajñasiddhiprakaraṇa</i>	fols 47r2-54v

In addition, the same grouping (without text 2, however) is already attested in an earlier palm-leaf manuscript kept in the library of Jaisalmer (Rajasthan), showing that the MTM is the result of a conscious arrangement. The British Library manuscript is not dated as a whole, but the date V.S. 1486 (= 1429 CE)³ appears at the end of the second text.

In the manuscripts that are considered here, i.e. Jain manuscripts written in Devanāgarī script, the folio number generally appears on the verso side of the page only, whether the material used is palm leaf or paper,⁴ in the bottom of the right margin; sometimes the folio number may be repeated in the top left margin as well. MTMs have a continuous foliation for the whole, which contributes to underlining the unitary character despite the inclusion of distinct texts within the same object. There are cases with double foliation noted in the same margin, one showing the continuous numbering, and the other the pagination of a specific text. However, in my experience, they are rather rare.⁵

5 Practical reasons for MTMs?

One could well argue that there are simple practical reasons behind the production of MTMs—for instance the length of the text. In this regard, there is a clear difference between the palm-leaf and the paper manuscripts in the Jain context. Palm-leaf manuscripts tend to be thicker than paper ones. The ratio of MTMs in palm leaf is higher than in paper. The former show a clear tendency to concentrate the text while the latter favour distribution or dispersion over a multiplicity

³ Vikrama samvat, year in the Vikrama era, which is one of the main chronological systems used in Indian manuscripts. Remove 57 in order to get the date in the Common Era.

⁴ The foliation is generally written in the form of numbers. A system making use of letter-numerals can also be encountered, mostly in palm-leaf manuscripts and occasionally in paper manuscripts of the early period (fourteenth century).

⁵ Kapadia 1937, 173 gives the example of one Pune manuscript (*Meghamālāvratapūjā* No. 96 of 1898–99) illustrating this fact. For double foliation in other types of Indian manuscripts see, for instance, De Simini 2016, 262.

of supports. The extent of palm-leaf manuscripts varies between 15 to 600 leaves, the extent of paper manuscripts may vary from 1 to 400 (Kapadia 1938a, 16). Indeed, there are many examples of paper manuscripts containing a very short text, which occupies a single folio or only a part of one folio and is also transmitted independently in other manuscripts. Small-size manuscripts tend to be on the increase in later times (eighteenth-nineteenth centuries), although this is difficult to state categorically in the absence of large-scale investigation.⁶ Even if the inclusion of a short prayer composed of only a few verses in larger units such as MTMs could contribute to a better preservation and would diminish the risk of the manuscript going astray, this cannot be a sufficient means of explanation. Also, in any case, we have extreme examples of single-folio paper manuscripts which are themselves MTMs.⁷ Thus, statements such as the following require qualification:

Factors of practical utility and religious usage require that tracts and hymns which are short and popular are often handed down in the Manuscript tradition as more or less compact units containing a larger or smaller number of such compositions (Tripathi 1975, 19).

The existence of extreme cases such as single-folio manuscripts which are MTMs suggests that any type of MTMs has its own rationale, whether it has been stated by those who produce them or, much more often, whether it has to be deduced, or even speculated on, by us who study this heritage.

Paratextual remarks suggesting the deliberate wish of some individual to collect several texts together are only found occasionally (see below) and mostly remain implicit in the corpus I have examined. In brief, we normally do not have statements which would say ‘So and so got these texts copied in this manuscript for such and such reason’. We also lack any name of a compiler. The purposive character of the manuscript production appears between the lines. For instance, we have an undated manuscript, probably from the seventeenth

⁶ For instance, collections of Jain manuscripts such as Paris and Udine, which have a large number of ‘recent’ manuscripts, show a high proportion of manuscripts having one folio or just a few folios.

⁷ Examples of one folio: several texts are Udine FP 4288 (*Samśāradava-avacūri*, *Samakitavipāka-gāthā* and *Sādhu-aticāra-gāthā*); Udine FP 4339 (*Jñānapañcamī-stavana* and *GauḍīPārśvanātha-stavana*); Udine FP 4364 (two hymns by the same author); Udine FP 4419 (two hymns); Udine FP 4423 (two hymns in Gujarati); Udine FP 4456, Udine FP 4478 (three texts), etc.; British Library Or. 15633/68 (two short Gujarati compositions by the same author, Devavijaya), Or. 15633/105, Or. 15633/113, etc. For two folios—two texts, see for instance British Library Add. 26.452 manuscript P, having two short poems in Gujarati by the same author, Rddhivijaya; MSS. Guj. 14, containing two works by the same author, Ṛṣi Gurudāsa; etc.

century onwards, of only ten folios where eleven short texts in Gujarati have been put together. They are either hymns or simple doctrinal texts for daily use.⁸ Two of them (Nos 5 and 10) are by the same author, Ṛṣabhadāsa; some others are connected through the goddess they share in celebration, Cakreśvarī, especially addressed in Nos 4 and 11. The unitary project is further underlined through the presence of opening scribal phrases underlining the serial number of the text (e.g. *atha paṃca* at the beginning of No. 5). In addition, three of the textual units (Nos 1, 7, 11) mention the name of the person who is the reader, a lady called Vajakuara, for whom the manuscript is meant, testifying to a project targeted at a specific individual. The fact that this name appears in the initial and in the final texts of the manuscript may be considered an additional way to highlight the unitary character of the project.

6 Minimal MTMs: one manuscript, two texts

The overwhelming majority of situations exhibited by the manuscripts of the Jain collections are those where the number of texts amounts to two—so the minimal pattern. At least this is applicable if we take multiple as starting with two, which would not be acceptable to the Sanskrit grammatical tradition where a distinction is made between dual and plural—plural starting with three!

6.1 Text and commentary

Manuscripts containing a main text and its commentary can be seen as one form of MTMs. This could be disputed as being a boundary-case or could be refused as a non-MTM, but a simple fact goes against this view: a main text and a commentary can be copied independently in separate physical units and live their own lives. This happens very often. If, then, text and commentary are copied in one manuscript, one can assume a priori that there is a reason. This combination has to be linked to the importance of exegetical literature in India: commenting upon a text is a special manner of reading it and transmitting to others the way one has understood it. Jains have been using a wide range of languages

⁸ British Library Or. 15633/5: 1) *Pārśvanātha-covīsa-daṇḍaka*; 2) *Ātma nī sajjhāya*; 3) *Ātma nī sajjhāya*; 4) *Caitrī nī thoya*; 5) *Śrāvaṇa-śukla-pancamī nī thoya*; 6) *Niścaya-vyavahāra nī sajjhāya*; 7) *Jina-stavana*; 8) *Pratyākhyāna-sajjhāya*; 9) *Ātma ne hita-śikṣā sajjhāya*; 10) *Ṛṣabhanātha thoya*; 11) *Oḷī nī thoa*.

in the course of their tradition and they were accustomed to work in and between multiple languages. Their sacred scriptures and other early authoritative texts were written in various dialects of Prakrit, coming under the broader heading Middle Indic. They were perceived as socially less restrictive than Sanskrit, a language which was identified with the Brahmanic tradition. Jains, like Buddhists, wanted to differentiate themselves from the Brahmin ideology and its connection with Sanskrit; thus they did not use it at first. However, from early in the Common Era, the Jains had been full participants in the intellectual and literary cultures of Sanskrit, the language of academic communication and knowledge *par excellence*, which they came to use both in commentaries and in treatises. Later on, all the vernacular languages written and spoken in the regions where Jain communities settled were used as literary languages and played an extremely important role in the transmission of the teaching. For the areas under consideration here, these are forms of Gujarati, Rajasthani and Hindi in particular.

The commentaries are a conspicuous application of this multiple use of languages. They also produce several modes of presentation.

In London, British Library, Or. 13741, the main text is the *Bhaktāmarastotra*, a famous Jain hymn of praise in 48 verses written in Sanskrit. Each verse is followed directly by its commentary: so, there are two texts in the manuscript, but they are not visually distinguished from each other as units. The unit is rather the verse, i.e. the root-text (*mūla*) + its commentary. In the more commonly used standard form of presentation, however, the main text is not divided into smaller units but is first copied as a whole and forms text 1; then the commentary follows as text 2. In this case, the commentator has to repeat in the original language the beginning of the phrases which he wants to explain and which are found in full several folios before. This arrangement in successive layers is less accessible if one is not familiar enough with the contents of the root-text;⁹ it is most common in palm-leaf manuscripts transmitting canonical texts. In addition to the main text in Prakrit and the standard Sanskrit commentary, these manuscripts can also provide a third text, the programmatic verse commentaries in Prakrit.¹⁰ This layer, which in fact represents the earliest phase of exegesis and is close to oral teaching, has become extremely rare and almost extinct in paper manuscript transmission.

⁹ For instance Pune 26/1880–87 Anga 6 and Anga commentary.

¹⁰ E.g. Cambay No. 6 containing 1) *Sūtrakṛtāṅga-vṛtti*, thus the Sanskrit commentary, then *Sūtrakṛtāṅga-niryukti*, the Prakrit verse commentary, and finally 3) *Sūtrakṛtāṅga-sūtra*, the *mūla* in Ardhmāgadhi.

Jain manuscripts have also devised formats which seem to be specific to them within the Indian manuscript culture and where the main text occupies the centre of the page, and the commentary fills the margins. In this way, both texts are visible at the same time, and no browsing through the manuscript is required because the size of the commentary's script is adapted to the contents. There are two kinds of such layouts. In one of them, three spaces are prepared (*tripāṭha*): text 1 at the centre in larger script; text 2, i.e. commentary, in top and bottom margins. In a more sophisticated form of layout, the commentary additionally fills the left and the right margins, thus resulting in a total of five writing spaces (*pañcapāṭha*). The direction of reading is upper part – right part – left part – lower part. In all these forms, which seem to have developed not earlier than the fifteenth century, the commentary's script is often in a smaller size than that of the main text. In these cases, the main text and the commentary may be written in the same language or in distinct languages.

Another original kind of layout is specifically connected with textual transmission through translations, especially translations from Sanskrit or Prakrit into vernaculars. Whereas a part of the monastic elite was always educated in Sanskrit and Prakrit, the majority had mediated access to scriptures through vernacular languages such as Gujarati or Hindi; so, from the sixteenth century onwards, the commentaries known as *Ṭabo* developed as a sub-genre. There, the root-text is often written in large script and in the original Sanskrit or Prakrit. The Gujarati is a word to word translation, which is laid out in the form of compartments and is often emphasized through dividers. It results into a bilingual document. This is useful both for understanding the original, and it also functions as a tool for learning the language.

Thus, different layouts, evolving towards functional forms of visual organisation, correspond to different modes of transmitting knowledge, which also target distinct audiences. These layouts are challenging because they do not correspond to the expected form of MTMs, but they nevertheless deserve to be included in this category, for the format text-plus-commentary is the primary form of MTM in the Indian context.

6.2 Other binary combinations

Apart from the combination text-plus-commentary, there are other types of binary combinations of texts in a single manuscript which consistently recur and thus form established pairs. One famous example among Jains is the association between the *Kalpasūtra*, on the one hand, and any version of the Kālaka story, on the other, which, in addition, is one of the main instances of illustrated

manuscripts. This association is attested in palm-leaf manuscripts.¹¹ It is continued in paper manuscripts and widely attested.¹² But how are these two texts related? The *Kalpasūtra* belongs to the canonical scriptures and provides the Jains with sacred history in the first section, their early church history in the second, and a specific set of monastic rules to be observed during the rainy season in the third. During the rainy season, characterized by warmth and dampness, Jain ascetics lead a sedentary life and stop wandering from one place to the other for practical as well as ethical reasons. In the *Kalpasūtra*, the concept of respecting religious seniority and forgiveness is central. From the fourteenth century onwards, we see a growing public use of this text, manuscripts of which are carried in procession with the pictures being used for sermons. This happens in the context of a special eight-day festival of high antiquity, known as Paryushan, which takes place at the end of August or the beginning of September. The story of Kālaka, which is an eventful narrative, is closely connected to the *Kalpasūtra* because tradition, as narrated in the legends themselves, introduces the main character Kālaka as the teacher under whose authority the date of the festival end was fixed and rescheduled to be on the day before as to prevent it from colliding with a local non-Jain festival. With this association, we have a case where multiplicity can confine to unity through integration since the Kālaka story is often considered as forming the ninth part of the *Kalpasūtra*, which itself consists of eight parts. From the cataloguer's practical point of view, we can thus assume that when a manuscript of the Kālaka story has a foliation starting with a three-digit number, it means that it was originally part of a two-text manuscript from which it had been separated.¹³ Even if we are not in a position to make use of statistical data and to treat them systematically, the fact that there are well-established or steady binary group-

¹¹ E.g. Cambay No. 42, 108 fols., first half of the fourteenth century; Cambay No. 44, 166 fols, latter half of the fifteenth century; also in Cambay No. 48 with other texts belonging to the *Kalpasūtra* corpus; Cambay No. 50, 132 fols, latter half of the fourteenth century. See also Nos 51, 52 or 54, the latter containing three texts (*Kalpasūtra* and two different versions of the Kālaka story).

¹² E.g., among many others, British Library I.O. San. 3177 dated V.S. 1485 (= 1428 CE); Or. 5151, dated V.S. 1903 (= 1846 CE).

¹³ This is the case with Cambridge, University Library, MS. Or. 845, the folios of which are numbered 145 to 156: see <https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-OR-00845/1>. One manuscript from the British Library containing a version of the Kālaka story foliated 113 to 121 has wrongly been given a shelfmark (Or. 13475) different from the *Kalpasūtra* manuscript foliated 1 to 112 (Or. 13959) although they belong together forming part 1 (*Kalpasūtra*) and part 2 (*Kālaka*) of the same codicological unit.

ings is clear. Another instance is provided by manuscripts where two texts belonging to the same category follow each other. For instance, the *Aupapāti-kasūtra* and the *Rājaprasānīya*, which together constitute items 1 and 2 of the canonical category of Upāṅgas, are often copied in the same manuscript¹⁴ while other texts of this category are transmitted individually. Common thematic unity or complementarity of subjects are other ubiquitous criteria for selection. Thus, one didactic text dealing with the classification of living beings, and another one with their place in the parts of the universe, are collected in the same physical object.¹⁵ However, in addition to regular patterns, there are an infinite number of cases where the resulting pair could be of any kind. The reader's taste, the teacher's initiative for the pedagogical use or simply the desire to fill a half-used page with a second text could have been the motivation.

7 Canonized assemblages

7.1 MTMs and the Śvetāmbara 'canon'

Any handbook on Śvetāmbara Jainism states that the scriptural source of the mainstream teaching is made of a 'canon' which includes 45 independent works.¹⁶ The presentation then continues with their titles and a brief description of their contents. This could suggest that the canon has been transmitted in a uniform manner and that there are MTMs including these 45 texts. However, this is far from being the case. The expected maximum combination, a 45-text MTM, is not a reality. The most common form of manuscript transmission in this case is one manuscript per text, and an uneven number of manuscripts for each of them: some have been copied very frequently, others much less. Thus, there is a broad discrepancy between the vision of a canon as a global entity and the presence of the texts in the materiality of the manuscripts, although the groupings are rather old. In the seventeenth century, when the issue of the number of scriptures building the canon became crucial for the Jains, we see individual or

¹⁴ Pune 72/1880–81, 223 folios, with the corresponding Sanskrit commentaries by Abhayadeva (Ser. No. 190, 197, 182, 185), no date, sponsored by a laywoman named Kurandevī after she had listened to the teaching of the teacher Jinaprabhasūri (*athaupapātikopāṅga-Rājaprasānīya-pustakaṃ / niśāmya deśanām tām sā svaśreya 'tha vyalilikhat*, colophon verse 17 p. 171).

¹⁵ E.g. Udine FP 4312.

¹⁶ This is true for the so-called Mūrtipūjakas. The other branch of Śvetāmbara Jains, the Sthānakavāsins, recognize as authoritative only 32 books out of these 45.

family projects formed by Jain laypeople to either collect existing manuscripts of each of the 45 texts and bring them together, or to get one manuscript of each of the 45 texts copied. However, now that the manuscripts have been displaced from the temple libraries where they originally belonged and are scattered across and outside India, it is impossible to do more than get hold of five to ten manuscripts belonging to the same project.¹⁷ Thus, there are two extreme patterns: one text per manuscript and aborted global projects which would have included the 45 texts, but not necessarily in a unique MTM. In between, there is space for other kinds of configurations. The 45 canonical books are traditionally divided into various categories: 11 Angas, 12 Upāṅgas, 4 Mūlasūtras, 6 Ched-asūtras, 2 methodological treatises, 10 Prakīrṇakas, which in theory would offer scope for reflection in MTMs. Instances of MTMs containing canonical texts do exist, but, depending on the categories, they offer partial or complete sets (leaving out binary combinations; cf. above). As for the Angas, evidence for partial sets is available in palm-leaf manuscripts from the twelfth century onwards. This usage is continued in paper manuscripts from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but for some unclear reason this ratio of MTMs seems to have then decreased in favour of the pattern one text / one manuscript. The Angas which were copied in succession in MTMs are exclusively Nos 6 to 11, which share common formal features: they are written in prose, are relatively short and, except for one of them (No. 10), all have a narrative character. The maximum combination with six texts is represented by some specimens, where both the main texts and their most famous commentaries, the latter authored by the eleventh-century monk Abhayadeva, were copied.¹⁸ Instances of MTMs of Angas with five texts are also rather rare;¹⁹ while smaller combinations with less than six texts seem to be more frequent.²⁰ The colophons of palm-leaf MTMs use col-

17 For a more detailed discussion of this issue see Balbir 2006 and 2014.

18 For instance Cambay No. 13, palm leaf, 472 folios.

19 Cambay No. 14, palm leaf, 308 folios, dated V.S. 1301 (= 1244 CE) has Angas 7 to 11, each followed by Abhayadeva's commentary. Pune 1206/1886–92, 102 folios, dated V.S. 1553 (= 1496 CE) is an example of a paper manuscript with the same combination (Ser. No. 141, 147, 157, 165, 179; manuscript not examined directly). Under Ser. 179 the date is given as V.S. 1512 (= 1455 CE). Strasbourg 4482, 105 folios, no date, very thin paper, also has the same combination (Ser. No. 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 2, 4, 6, 8, 10), also with Abhayadeva's commentary.

20 For instance, Cambay No. 12, palm leaf, 331 folios, dated V.S. 1184 (= 1127 CE) has Angas 6 to 9 with Abhayadeva's commentary. Examples of paper manuscripts are Pune 55/1870–71, 39 folios, 'old', Angas 7 to 9 with Abhayadeva's commentary (Ser. No. 139, 145, 154). Pune 164/1873–74, 24 folios, 'old', has the same combination (Ser. No. 140, 146, 156) as well as Pune 144/1881–82, 26 folios, 'old' (Ser. No. 142, 148, 158). Pune 120/1872–73, 67 folios, 'not modern', has Angas 9 to 11 without commentary (Ser. No. 151, 161, 175).

lective designations to refer to the object: ‘manuscript containing the main text and commentary of four Angas’, ‘manuscript with the commentary on the main text of five Angas’, or ‘manuscript containing the commentary on six Angas’.²¹ Such words point to these MTMs as a coherent unit rather than as a simple assemblage of works. When both the Prakrit main texts and the most famous Sanskrit commentary thereupon are combined in one physical object, the result may be a bulky palm-leaf MTM, which can count more than 470 folios. The colophons show that the production of such an object is the outcome of an explicit decision on the donors’ part. Taking note of the fact that, in their time, it is impossible to have access to the Jain teaching without copying manuscripts, they had them copied, and these copies have been made use of in public preaching.²² Such an explanatory discourse, which is no longer present in later manuscripts, seems to refer to a period where manuscript writing was still in an initial phase, as the donors clearly say that having a manuscript written is the best way to spread religious teaching.

On the contrary, Angas other than Nos 6 to 11 do not seem to be found in MTMs, the largest of which is the fifth. If it were associated with additional texts, the result would be an inconveniently oversized and unwieldy manuscript, so it stands alone. It has also given birth to de-multiplied contents, in the form of short treatises dealing with some of its technical aspects, which are then assembled in MTMs. They complement each other with regard to their subject, and are formally identical insofar as each of them has 36 verses (hence they are called *ṣaṭtriṃśikās*). Such a phenomenon is part of a broader process where old material is extracted, reworked and reformulated. This is a general trend in Indian thought and pedagogy: creating manuals, which are sometimes more user-friendly, to suit new audiences and new forms of spreading knowledge.²³ MTMs are a way to convey these new forms.

The twelve Upāṅgas tend to be transmitted in the format one text—one manuscript, except for binary combinations involving items 1 and 2 of the group

²¹ Cambay No. 12: *Jñātādharmakathādy-aṅga-catuṣṭaya-sūtra-vṛtti-pustakam* (p. 27); No. 13: *Jñātādharmakathāṅga-prabhṛti-ṣaḍ-aṅgī-sūtra-vṛtti-pustakam* (p. 32 and p. 33 verse 11); No. 14: *Upāsakadaśā-pramukhya-paṃcāṅga-sūtra-yuta-vivṛteḥ pustakam* (p. 35); Strasbourg 4482 (under Ser. No. 10): *paṃcāṅga-pustakam idaṃ kumudopamānaṃ*.

²² Cambay No. 13 p. 33 verse 12.

²³ See, for instance, Pune 1935 (vol. 17,1: Ser. No. 98 and following): the *Paramāṇukhaṇḍa-ṣaṭtriṃśikā*, dealing with atoms, is combined with the *Pudgala-ṣaṭtriṃśikā*, dealing with matter, the *Nigoda-ṣaṭtriṃśikā*, dealing with the most minute form of living beings, and the *Bandha-ṣaṭtriṃśikā*, dealing with the formation of karman. All have Anga 5, the *Vyākhyāprajñapti*, as their source.

(see above). MTMs, however, seem to be the favoured mode of transmission of the so-called Prakīrṇakas or ‘miscellanies’. This generic term can designate any kind of textual miscellany. Yet, in the context of Śvetāmbara Jainism it refers to a peripheral category of the canon which includes a collection of various texts in verse (mostly) or in prose and verse written in Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī Prakrit. In contrast with other groups of the canon, this one is characterised by its fluidity, having between 10 and 20 texts, including some disputed texts dubbed ‘super-numerary Prakīrṇakas’. In the corpus of palm-leaf manuscripts perused here (Cambay, Patan), the Prakīrṇakas that are available in MTMs are found along with all sorts of other texts, whether didactic or narrative, canonical or non-canonical, even when they follow each other and thus form a group.²⁴ There is only one single instance of an MTM exclusively containing Prakīrṇakas. This is a ‘very old’ (*atijirṇa*) manuscript of 130 folios containing a set of the following 13 texts:²⁵

1. *Kuśālānubandhi* (also known as *Catuḥśaraṇa*)
2. *Ārapaccakkhāṇa*
3. *Bhaktaparijñā*
4. *Samstāra*
5. *Tandulaveyāliya*
6. *Candravijjhaya*
7. *Devendrastava*
8. *Gaṇividyā*
9. *Mahāpaccakkhāṇa*
10. *Virastava*
11. *Ajivakalpa*
12. *Gacchācāra*
13. *Maraṇasamādhī*

This pattern, which is noteworthy because of its rarity in palm-leaf manuscripts, becomes the prevalent one in paper manuscripts where the same texts are copied in succession in the same manuscript. A Pune paper manuscript dated V.S. 1671 (= 1614 CE) has a total of 14 texts. It shows that items 1 to 13 form a kind of

²⁴ For instance, Patan No. 12, 238 folios, contains 20 texts among which No. 3 to 9 belong to this category; No. 95, 161 folios, contains 34 texts among which No. 11 to 13 belong to this category; No. 4 (p. 407), 178 folios, has 5 texts, out of which four are Prakīrṇakas. The Cambay collection of palm-leaf manuscripts has only instances of single Prakīrṇakas.

²⁵ Patan No. 82 p. 60. Used by the editors of the *Paiṇṇayasuttaṃ*, Bombay, 1984 (Jaina Āgama Series), I, see English introduction p. 79. The titles have not been harmonised here, being given either in their Prakrit or in their Sanskrit forms.

nucleus. They are copied in the same sequence, but one item is added: the *Tīrthodgālī*, belonging to the supernumerary Prakīrṇakas.²⁶ Another Pune manuscript, not dated but said to be ‘old’, has 15 texts. It also contains the same nucleus (items 1 to 13), although the sequence is different, and has two additional items: the *Ārāḍhanāpatākā* and the *Sārāvalī*.²⁷ Yet, another one, not dated, but said to be ‘fairly old’, has 11 texts. Items 1 to 11 are present, in a slightly different order, but items 12 and 13 are absent. Finally, a manuscript now kept in Cambridge University Library, created in 1863 CE in Bikaner (Rajasthan), contains exactly the same 13 texts as our reference palm-leaf manuscript, with only a slight variation in the sequence.²⁸ Despite the actual number of texts present in the manuscript, however, the final colophon gives the title as *Dasapañṇā-sūtra*, ‘Sacred writing of ten miscellanies’, showing that the standard number was somehow regarded as being ten, even though it was more symbolic than real.²⁹

7.2 MTMs and the teaching on karma

Texts sharing a common theme are often found in the same manuscript. The teachings relating to karma are at the centre of Indian religious traditions and address the retribution for acts committed and its consequences in this life or in next rebirths. In Jainism, this teaching is divided into a large number of categories, and this knowledge is transmitted through works known as *Karmagranthas*, ‘works about karmas’, written in Prakrit verses. These works are liable to be associated rather freely and are basically independent texts. There is a broad spectrum of the forms in which their manuscripts are transmitted: manuscripts can have only one text alone or one text with commentary, either in Sanskrit or in Gujarati, but they can also include between two to six of these texts. The tradition has canonized sets of five on the basis of their common authorship, an organization principle of texts in MTMs also attested elsewhere in Jain contexts: all of them have been written by Devendrasūri, a pupil of Jagaccandrasūri of the Tapāgaccha. A sixth one, which was written by a different author (Candrarṣi Mahattara) and is complementary in its contents, has joined them, so that a sixfold set has also found widespread

²⁶ Pune 386(a)/1879–80 (Ser. No. 268), 132 folios. The count of items (p. 259) is not correct.

²⁷ Pune 141(a)/1872–73 (Ser. No. 269), 95 folios, ‘old’.

²⁸ Add. 1816 dated V.S. 1920, Śāka 1785, 92 folios, digitized on <https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01816/1>

²⁹ Add. 1816, fol. 92r iti *śrīDasa-paṇṇā-sūtraṃ samāptaṃ || cha || 12 || dve sahasre śatāṇy aṣṭau / catvāriṃśac ca sapta ca / 2847/ iha prakīrṇa-daśake || ślokaśaṃkhyāpramāṇakaṃ /1||*

dissemination.³⁰ In such cases, the grouping is emphasized through the expression ‘set of five’ or ‘set of six’ (*Karmagrantha- pañcaka* or *-ṣaṭka*) in the manuscript colophons.

These karma classics had been accompanied by Prakrit verse-commentaries (*bhāṣya*) representing a stage of scholarship that seems to have become obsolete at some point of time. They are not well-known and have not yet been studied. Under these circumstances, the fact that they are found with the classic works in two manuscripts exhibiting a comparable arrangement is all the more remarkable:

Ahmedabad MS L.D. 1394, 26 folios

dated V.S. 1530 (= 1473 CE)

1. *Karmavipāka-prakaraṇa*
2. *Karmastava*
3. *Karmastava-bhāṣya*
4. *Āgamikavastuvicāra-prakaraṇa*
5. *Ṣaḍaśīti-bhāṣya*
6. *Sārdhaśatakanāma-prakaraṇa*
7. *Sārdhaśataka-bhāṣya*
8. *Bandhasvāmitva-prakaraṇa*
9. *Śataka-prakaraṇa*
10. *Śataka-bhāṣya*
11. *Saptatikā*
12. *Sattariśāra*
13. *Sattari-bhāṣya*

British Library, Or. 2137, MS B,

40 folios, 0. *Samgrahaṇīratna*

1. *Karmavipāka*
2. *Karmastava*
3. *Karmastava-bhāṣya*
4. *Āgamikavastuvicāra-prakaraṇa*
5. *Ṣaḍaśīti-laghubhāṣya*
6. *Bandhasvāmitva*
7. *Śataka*
8. *Śataka-bhāṣya*
9. *Sārdhaśataka-prakaraṇa*
10. *Sārdhaśataka-bhāṣya*
11. *Saptatikā*
12. *Sattariśāra*
13. *Sattari-bhāṣya*

The text numbered ‘0’ in the British Library manuscript is a classic cosmological work which does not belong to the rest of the corpus. However, it can be regarded as a logical and coherent addition since one of the main concerns of karma works is to determine in which area of the universe beings are reborn. Apart from this, the list of texts attested in both manuscripts is identical. The sequence in the first half (1–5) and in the final part (11–13) are identical, whereas the texts’ sequence differs in the central parts. No convincing explanation can be provided for this difference, which can nevertheless be considered a minor issue. The main point is that the two manuscripts preserve an older and a newer type of teaching about karma in a similar way and are rare evidence of this inclusive trend.

³⁰ Numerous instances in the British Library collection (see Balbir / Sheth / Tripathi 2006: vol. 2 pp. 297–334); Paris BnF Sanscrit 1659; Udine FP 4421 (three Karmagranthas with Gujarati commentary).

7.3 MTMs and hymns

Hymns probably form the area of religious literature where text-production is almost unlimited. The repertoire is infinite, and new hymns are produced every day as expressions of spontaneous religiosity, while others are sophisticated literary compositions where authors display their knowledge of poetry. They are transmitted either through single manuscripts or through MTMs, with an extreme fluidity in the way they are associated and the number of components the manuscripts include. Instances of obvious regular patterns would be several hymns by the same author or several hymns dedicated to the same Jina or deity, but no other more imaginative combination can be ruled out. Yet, there has been a kind of canonization of some hymns that have been assigned special importance, antiquity or fame by the tradition, either on account of the legendary figures of their authors, or because belief in their efficiency and in their curative powers has formed progressively. Today, the collections known as ‘Nine Remembrances’ (*Nava-smaraṇas*) or ‘Seven Remembrances’ (*Sapta-smaraṇas*) are familiar to all Śvetāmbara Jains and illustrate this tendency. They look ready-made and eternal, but they certainly have a history and a dynamic. It is difficult to determine when the hymns building these collections came to exist as a corpus.³¹

Evidence from palm-leaf manuscripts suggests that no collection was formed in this phase. Some of the individual hymns which later became part of the ‘Seven’ or ‘Nine Remembrances’ are transmitted in MTMs, but along with all sorts of texts, not necessarily of the same literary genre.³² However, there is some indication suggesting that in approximately the same period (thirteenth to fourteenth centuries), there were seven hymns that were regarded as forming a unitary text. In V.S. 1364 (= 1307 CE), Jinaprabhasūri, a celebrated Śvetāmbara monk belonging to the Kharataragaccha monastic order and a prolific writer, composed a continuous commentary on each of the following texts in turn, giving his work the collective designation *Sap-tasmarāṇa-vṛtti*:³³

1. *Ajitaśānti-stava* by Nandiṣeṇa, fols 1r–8v
2. *Ullāsikkama-stotra* or *Laghu Ajitaśānti* by Jinadattasūri, fols 9r–12v

³¹ For some brief remarks on this topic see Cort 2005, 113 (n. 20–22).

³² For instance Patan No. 22, more than 142 folios, contains 47 texts, among which *Bhaktāmarastotra* (as item 32) and *Śāntistava* (as item 42). Cambay No. 126 (Punyavijaya 1966, 208–209), 129 folios, contains 14 texts among which *Bhayaharastotra* (as item 9), *Laghu Ajitaśāntistava* (as No. 12) and *Bhaktāmarastotra* (as No. 13).

³³ To the best of my knowledge, this work is unpublished. The information given here is based on the manuscript AKGM 13707, 23 folios, kept at Koba (of which a PDF was graciously provided by this Institute).

3. *Namiūṇa* or *Bhayahara-stotra* by Mānatuṅga, fols 12v–16r1
4. *Taṃ jayau-stotra* by Jinadattasūri, fols 16v–17v12
5. *Mayarahiyaṃ* or *Gurupāratantrya-stotra* by Jinadattasūri, fols 17v–19v
6. *Siggham avaharau-stotra* by Jinadattasūri, fols 19v6–20r14
7. *Uvasaggahara-stotra* by Bhadrabāhu, fols 21r9 – end.

In the seventeenth century (V.S. 1695 = 1638 CE), Samayasundara, a member of the same monastic order, achieved the same project and explicitly introduced himself as following his predecessor.³⁴ The hymns quoted and explained in his commentary are thus the same as in his predecessor's work. This shows that the notion of seven hymns as a whole was standardized and that there were fixed contents promoted as authoritative by two Kharataragaccha leaders with a 300-year interval. The sectarian tinge is palpable in the selection of hymns as three of them are authored by Jinadattasūri (1075–1154), one of the most celebrated leaders of this group, to whom magical powers were ascribed, and who was considered a powerful miracle-maker.

However, this does not mean that the identity of the seven texts was permanently fixed without variance. Several paper-MTMs with the collective title *Saptasmarāṇa* in their final colophons contain some of the items included in the above list, and also some others, which are sometimes in a different sequence, thus exhibiting a variable degree of stability. Here are some instances:

Ahmedabad ms., V.S. 1668 (= 1611 CE) ³⁵ <i>saptasmarāṇāni</i> in the colophon	Ahmedabad ms., V.S. 1699 (= 1642 CE) ³⁶ ending with <i>saptasmarāṇāni sampūrṇāni</i> 'thus end the Seven Remembrances'
1. <i>Navakāra</i>	1. <i>Navakāra</i>
2. <i>Uvasaggahara</i>	2. <i>Uvasaggahara</i>
3. <i>Ajitasanti</i>	3. <i>Santikara-stotra</i> by Muncandrasūri
4. <i>Namiūṇa</i> or <i>Bhayahara</i>	4. <i>Namiūṇa</i> or <i>Bhayahara</i>
5. <i>Bhaktāmara</i>	5. <i>Ajitaśānti</i>
6. <i>Tijayapahutta</i>	6. <i>Bhaktāmara</i>
7. <i>Laghuśānti</i> by Mānadeva ³⁷	7. <i>Bṛhat-śānti</i> by Vādivetāla Śāntisūri ³⁸

³⁴ 1942: 29 (Samayasundara invites the reader who is desirous to know more about the *Bhayaharastotra* to read his predecessor's commentary); 1942, 51 (final *praśasti* where Samayasundara explicitly states that he followed his predecessor).

³⁵ Ahmedabad 7009 (Ser. No.1417).

³⁶ Ahmedabad 4007 (Ser. No. 1412).

³⁷ Similar contents with slight variations in the order in Ahmedabad 1707 (Ser. No. 1413), datable around V.S. 1850, Ahmedabad 4830 (Ser. 1422), datable around V.S. 1750 or Ahmeda-

In these two representatives of the manuscript tradition, we see that two items of the preceding list have been substituted by the *Navakāra* and by the *Bhaktāmara*. The former, also known as the *Pañcanamaskāra*, is always recited in its original Prakrit and is an inaugural and auspicious homage to the Five Entities, i.e. teachers and Omniscient beings. It has become a Jain identity marker increasingly used at the beginning of any work or ceremony. The *Bhaktāmara* is a famous Sanskrit hymn addressed to the first Jina, and even more so, to the concept of a Jina. Both these texts are extremely popular and have been ascribed with a protective value. It is interesting to note that they have become an integral part of the nine-element version of the Remembrances in its classical form, the *Nava-smaraṇa*:

1. *Pañcanamaskāra*
2. *Uvasaggahara*
3. *Santikara*
4. *Tijayapahutta*
5. *Namiūṇa* or *Bhayahara*
6. *Ajitaśānti*
7. *Bhaktāmara*
8. *Kalyāṇamandira*
9. *Bṛhacchānti*.³⁹

Nevertheless, slightly varying MTMs are available.⁴⁰ The fundamental position of the *Pañcanamaskāra* as an unquestionable prerequisite leads to a perhaps unexpected consequence: it might not be counted with the texts comprising the MTM so that the collective designation ‘Seven Remembrances’ or ‘Nine Remembrances’ can be given to a codicological unit containing in fact eight or ten items. One instance in point is the British Library manuscript Or. 16132/9 (40 folios), which is undated, but might go back to the end of the nineteenth century.

bad 5658/1 (Ser. No. 1424), dated V.S. 1762 (= 1705 CE) where the author of the commentary uses a collective designation (*saptānām smaraṇānām ca ṭabārtho likhyate mayā*). Ahmedabad 6739/1 (Ser. No. 1415), dated V.S. 1702 (= 1645 CE), has the *Bṛhat-śānti* but not the *Laghuśānti*; Ahmedabad 6028 (Ser. No. 1414), datable around V.S. 1850 is the same.

38 Same contents in the same order in Ahmedabad 5955 (Ser. No. 1418), dated V.S. 1757 (= 1700 CE), but no collective designation.

39 See for instance Nawab 1961, Kapashi 2007 or the numerous popular editions in the form of booklets that are owned and used by practising Jains.

40 For instance, Ahmedabad 2565 (Ser. No. 1410), datable around V.S. 1650, Ahmedabad 8056 (Ser. No. 1409), datable around V.S. 1750, or Ahmedabad 7275 (Ser. No. 7561), datable around V.S. 1950, do not contain the *Kalyāṇamandirastotra* but have the *Bṛhat-śānti*.

ry, where each of the hymns is followed by its commentary in Gujarati. The collective designation, *Sātasmarāṇa*, strictly applies if the opening Fivefold homage is not included in the numbering:

0. *Navakāraṃmantra*
1. *Uvasaggahara*
2. *Śāntikara*
3. *Tijayapahutta*
4. *Namiūṇa*
5. *Ajita-Śānti*
6. *Bhaktāmara*
7. *Bṛhacchānti*.⁴¹

The same situation holds true for the British Library manuscript Or. 15633/185 (77 folios), dated V.S. 1911 (= 1854 CE), an MTM including the ‘Nine Remembrances’, so

0. *Navakāraṃmantra*
1. *Uvasagga*
2. *Śānti*
3. *Tijayapahutta*
4. *Bhayahara*
5. *Ajitaśānti*
6. *Bhaktāmara*
7. *Laghuśānti*
8. *Bṛhacchānti*
9. *Kalyāṇamandira*.⁴²

This trick allows the inclusion of the *Laghuśānti* which is not part of the standard ‘Nine Remembrances’, so the standardization is relative. The same collective designations refer to moving entities. Comparing the seven-hymn and the nine-hymn versions also shows that the two lists are not separated by a tight boundary. The *Laghuśānti* present in Or. 15633/185 is often attested in the ‘Seven Re-

⁴¹ Same situation applicable to Ahmedabad 7044 (Ser. No. 1421), dated V.S. 1853 (= 1796 CE) at the end of the *mūla* and V.S. 1909 (= 1852 CE) at the end of the Gujarati commentary, Pune Ser. No. 745 (Kapadia 1940, vol. XVII [3]) with the title *Saptasmarāṇaṭikā*, or Berlin Ms. or. fol. 1669 (Schubring 1944: Ser. No. 379), dated V.S. 1936 (= 1879 CE) by a more recent hand which designates the manuscript as *śrī-Saptasmarāṇasūtram*.

⁴² See other examples in Pune (Kapadia 1940, vol. XVII 3(a), Nos 738, 739, 744).

membrances', whereas the *Bhaktāmara* available in some 'Seven Remembrances' MTMs is a regular feature of the *Navasmarāṇas*.⁴³ There is a nucleus which functions as a magnet around which other texts are grouped. The evidence of the manuscripts shows that, in their present understanding, the associations of the hymns into an entity are rather recent constructions.⁴⁴ In addition, the transmission of these hymns through MTMs, which function as corpus organizers, is only one possibility. The dissemination of the individual components as single texts in single manuscripts is attested in similar proportions. In more general terms, the fluidity and absence of any normative constraint observed here, despite the presence of normalizing tendencies and irrespective of the religious ideologies, is quite typical of the general Indian situation.

8 Free associations, vademecums, polyglots or monolinguals

In contrast to the MTMs discussed in the previous section, where regular sequences of texts tend to have become standardized and form a corpus, there are several which are idiosyncratic objects showing a dynamic process. They contain partly unpredictable groupings and would ideally require individual descriptions, as each MTM is unique. However, some trends can be detected.

One of the main functions of MTMs is to organize knowledge by producing objects that are not only handy in size but also rich in content. This starts with the palm-leaf manuscripts and continues when paper is increasingly used. In the paratextual information provided in some colophons of palm-leaf manuscripts such codicological units are known as *prakaraṇapustikās* 'manuscripts containing didactic texts.' Such collective designations contribute to qualifying the manuscript as a coherent unit. One contains four texts, each dealing with the subtleties of karma theory, and was copied in V.S. 1290 (= 1233 CE) to be read by

⁴³ Here, my main concern is to draw attention to the issue of the Remembrances corpus, but further detailed investigations need to be carried out. It would be important to consider the *Saptasmarāṇa* commented by Siddhicandra (*śaśvat saptasmarāṇānāṃ vṛttir eṣā vidhīyate*, verse 5), a seventeenth-century monk belonging to the Tapāgaccha monastic order, and to compare his list of hymns with the Kharataragaccha ones mentioned above (Samayasundara is roughly a contemporary of Siddhicandra), in order to estimate a possible connection between the selection of hymns and the sectarian affiliation. For preliminary information see Desai 1941, 74.

⁴⁴ Cf. Kapashi 2007, 12–13.

a pious Jain laywoman;⁴⁵ another one contains 14 texts and was copied in memory of a deceased parent in V.S. 1308 (= 1251 CE).⁴⁶ The most precise generic term available in such contexts is ‘didactic texts’ because the texts included are not always formally identical. For instance, these 14 texts are in parts treatises on ethical behaviour or cosmology; in parts, they are formulas to be recited in the performance of daily ritual or hymns of praise. In such patterns, we see free associations which have not given rise to established sets in the manuscript tradition combined with a nucleus of works which enjoyed great popularity and are liable to recur in many MTMs with the same purpose. Dharmadāsa’s *Upadeśamālā*, in Prakrit, and Hemacandra’s *Yogaśāstra* chapters 1-4, in Sanskrit, belong to them. Functioning as magnets or attractive units, they are also found in another comparable collection, which was prepared in V.S. 1325 (= 1268 CE) for the son of a minister and is called *svādhyāyapustikā* ‘manuscript for personal study’;⁴⁷ and in yet another 25-text manuscript, which does not contain any self-designation, but was copied by a man in the memory of his mother in V.S. 1290 (= 1233 CE).⁴⁸ Even though we see that some of the MTM projects were intended for an individual reader, we also see that the intended readership is not clearly defined as, for example, where a manuscript had been commissioned as a pious act to commemorate a family member.

In the combinations of the kind just described as we see them in palm-leaf manuscripts, the languages used are Prakrit and Sanskrit, with Prakrit occurring more often. The bilingual formula continues to be attested in paper manuscripts, and we have countless examples of MTMs associating one canonical text in Prakrit, one didactic text in Prakrit and two in Sanskrit, for instance, even up to the nineteenth century. However, shifts in language combinations are salient in MTMs from the sixteenth century onwards. The bilingual formula was often replaced by a three-language formula, resulting into MTMs with texts in Prakrit, Sanskrit and texts in a vernacular language, i.e. predominantly Gujarati. In MTMs that comprise a ‘practical canon’ and contain several texts that have become popular for the dissemination of the teaching, the proportion of Prakrit may reach 10% against 90% for the vernacular. In extreme cases, the contents of a text having Prakrit as its original language is present through its Gujarati rendering. The majority of *pothis* or codices containing more than five texts, and often even more than ten, are the equivalent of private prayer or ritu-

⁴⁵ Cambay No. 117, 188 fols (Punyavijaya 1961, 192–193).

⁴⁶ Cambay No. 101, 220 fols (Punyavijaya 1961, 163–165).

⁴⁷ Cambay No. 91, 160 fols (Punyavijaya 1961, 144–146).

⁴⁸ Cambay No. 88, 318 fols (Punyavijaya 1961, 131–139).

al manuals (*pūjā* or *svādhyāya*). They are meant to include everything which is useful in the context of daily ritual and religious life for any pious layman, from textbooks on the doctrine (such as the *Tattvārthasūtra*) to narrative texts, hymns and *vidhis*.⁴⁹ They are marked by multilingualism since they often exhibit Sanskrit or Prakrit texts and Gujarati compositions side by side. To mention only one extreme instance of this situation, the Koba ms. No. 22590 is an MTM dated VS 1859 (= 1802 CE) which gathers 176 texts, some of them very short, over only 60 folios, with a proportion of hardly 5% in Sanskrit, the rest being in Gujarati, Rajasthani or Old Hindi.

However, monolingual MTMs in which all textual units are in the vernacular language are also widely attested. The monolingual pattern is at the highest in MTMs where texts intended for usage in daily religious practice are copied together. Probably the oldest Jain manuscript to have entered a non-Indian library, namely British Library, Harley 415, was copied in V.S. 1673, Śāka 1540 (= 1616 CE). This 25 MTM contains a collection of Jain hymns and narrative poems, which vary in type and length but are all in Gujarati and could have represented an easily available or fashionable kind of cultural repertory of texts:

1. <i>Tīrthamālā-stavana</i> , fragment	fol. 3r
2. <i>Pārśvanātha-vinatī</i>	fol. 3r-v
3. <i>Śāntinātha-stavana</i>	fols 3r-4v
4. <i>Ādinātha-Śatrunjaya-maṇḍana-stavana</i>	fols 4v-5v
5. <i>Śāntinātha-vinatī</i>	fols 5v-6v
6. <i>Cauvīsa-tīrthaṃkara-vinatī</i>	fols 6v-7v
7. <i>Jīrāula-Pārśvanātha-vinatī</i>	fols 7v-8r
8. <i>Sīmandharasvāmi-stavana</i>	fol. 8r
9. <i>Śāntinātha-vinatī</i>	fols 8r-9r
10. <i>Vaṭapadma-maṇḍana-ŚrīCintāmaṇi-Pārśvanātha-vinatī</i>	fols 9r-10v
11. <i>Śatrunjaya-maṇḍana-Śrī-Ādinātha-vinatī</i>	fols 10r-11r
12. <i>Aṣṭāpada-stavana</i>	fols 11r-12r
13. <i>Aṣṭāpada-ṛddhi-varṇaṇa-stavana</i>	fols 12r-14v
14. <i>Ṛṣabhadeva-dhavalabandha-vivāhalu</i>	fols 14v-24r
15. <i>Gautamasvāmi-rāsa</i>	fols 24r-26v
16. <i>Sikhāmaṇi nī caupai</i>	fols 26v-27r

⁴⁹ For instance Tripathi 1975: Strasbourg Ser. No. 245 (11 texts, Digambara), 306 (Kannada palm-leaf manuscript containing 18 texts, Digambara).

17. <i>Ādinātha-gīta</i>	fol. 27r
18. <i>Ārdrakumāra-vivāhalu</i>	fols 27r–28v
19. <i>Kamalā-gīta</i>	fol. 28v
20. <i>Āṣāḍhabhūti-gīta</i>	fols 29r–31r
21. <i>Meghakumāra-gīta</i>	fol. 31r–31v
22. <i>Śivakumāra-gīta</i>	fols 31v–32r
23. <i>Thāvaccāputra-gīta</i>	fols 32r–33r
24. <i>Gajasukumāra-sajjhāya</i>	fols 33r–34r
25. <i>Śālibhadra-caupāī</i>	fols 34r–41r

Although it is not a systematic process, turning to monolingual, vernacular MTMs may have been accompanied by a shift in the format of the manuscript to a codex, or a *guṭakā*, replacing the traditional pothī format. The *guṭakā* is made of ‘small format paper folios which can be loose but which are usually found stitched together with a cloth or cardboard binding’ (Williams 2014, 183). This format, which was used by other communities than the Jains in the same period, is defined as a container for distinct texts and seems to have worked as a rather free type of container, where material more diverse than what is found in the *pothis* could be copied.⁵⁰ It was primarily intended to be used as an *aide mémoire* for personal use or an accessory to oral recitation. The Udine collection for instance preserves such a *guṭakā* (16 × 20 cm), which is dated V.S. 1708 (= 1651 CE), has 257 pages and contains 26 texts.⁵¹ The first one, the *Catuḥśaraṇa prakīṇaka*, a fairly popular Jain canonical work is in its original Prakrit, but all the other texts are in vernacular, including a Gujarati rendering of the *Uttarādhyāyanasūtra*, another fundamental and wide-spread Jain canonical work. This is followed by a group of individual ‘songs’ (*gītā*). Some of them are narrative, others didactic (about varieties of karma, carelessness, etc.); then there are various narrative poems and a group of hymns to each of the 24 Jinas. In brief, such a document compiles much knowledge that is essential to a Jain. It is a kind of self-sufficient handbook which one can use for daily reading and worship, comparable to those now available in the printed form. Even if it is the only book one owns, it contains all that is basic and necessary.

Some of the Jain *guṭakās* display cultural hybridation, accommodating both Jain and non-Jain texts in the same codicological unit. A seventeenth-century

⁵⁰ Williams 2014, 183 ff. My thanks to Tillo Detige (Ghent University) for having drawn my attention on this thesis.

⁵¹ Udine FP 4505.

manuscript, also kept in Udine, starts with a Sanskrit synonymous lexicon written by the famous Jain author Hemacandra in the twelfth century (the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi*, incomplete). It continues with two religious hymns to the first Jina, Ṛṣabha, but then also has two selections of Hindu *Purāṇas*.⁵² Such collections are significant to understand the religious situation in Western India in late periods (these manuscripts are not dated but are not very old). It would be wrong to consider Jainism in isolation from a prevalent atmosphere where Hindu trends are the majority; particularly in Rajasthan, they are represented by Vaiṣṇava movements and devotion to Kṛṣṇa. In the daily perception and practice of the people, interactions between Jains and Vaiṣṇavas are a reality which is illustrated by common food habits, marriages and even visits to the temples of the other faith. Such manuscripts as those under consideration are supportive evidence of this phenomenon. Indeed, the Jains have their own literary tradition, but this does not mean that they do not have a certain amount of familiarity with Vaiṣṇava or Kṛṣṇaite works.

Nothing is simple in the way the use of languages is negotiated because in the cosmopolitan culture of the Jains, different languages serve different purposes. Even those who do not possess active proficiency in Prakrit, the traditional languages of the Jain scriptures, or in Sanskrit, the cultural language *par excellence*, view them as vested with special prestige, power or efficiency. Such a perception goes beyond any individual. This is why there are certain ritual texts or hymns of praise that are always recited in these languages, with the result that language unity is not a structuring principle in MTMs. The person for whom they are meant is exposed to all these languages at the same time, and it is taken for granted that they have sufficient command, at least for the purpose of memorization: thus, we can have a three-text manuscript with two hymns to the same goddess, Sarasvatī, one in Prakrit and Sanskrit, the other one in Gujarati.⁵³

52 Udine FP 4511, dated V.S. 1704 (= 1647 CE), eight texts.

53 Udine FP 4418, 3 folios: 1 in Prakrit and Sanskrit, 44 stanzas, 2) in Gujarati, 34 stanzas.

9 MTMs and modularity

9.1 Liturgical manuscripts

An important kind of liturgical manuscript in the Jain context are those which are used in the daily ritual of confession and repentance (*Pratikramaṇasūtra* or *Ṣaḍāvaśyaka*). They are typically meant for recitation and include a variety of materials: Prakrit formulas of high antiquity in their original language, possibly accompanied by a Gujarati paraphrase, along with hymns which are known independently and may be written in Prakrit, Sanskrit or vernacular, or even narratives. Thus, these manuscripts exhibit the interplay of literary forms and languages in an exemplary fashion. The description of such objects is a challenge: since they contain texts which also circulate on their own, they could be considered as MTMs *stricto sensu*, in which case the textual units would have to be catalogued separately as we normally do in all the cases analysed above, a hymn or a narrative being found in the corresponding thematic sections. This would result in a meaningless piecemeal deconstruction of the whole. In fact, such manuscripts are best described as units made of modular structures with modules of highly varying size,⁵⁴ some of them microscopic: this is why we have preferred to describe them as entities. This variety and this modularity are fundamental and inherent to these works. In practice, the ritual of confession and repentance which belongs to the ‘necessary duties’ (*āvaśyaka*) is a combination of gestures, recitation of formulas and chanting of prayers to the Jinas. One of the purposes of the vast number of hymns available in the Jain tradition is precisely to be used in this context. There are core units common to various manuscripts, but there are also variables which make every manuscript unique; for example, in the selection of hymns, their number and their language.

Among those liturgical manuscripts, frequently found hymns are the *Uvasaggahara-stotra*, a five-verse protective hymn in Prakrit addressed to the 23rd Jina Pārśvanātha and the *Samśārādāvāṇalastuti*, a four-verse Sanskrit hymn encouraging the devotee to turn away from the dangers of rebirth. However, any hymn which is more specific is liable to find a place within the ritual. These *Pratikramaṇa* manuscripts are not clones of each other. In order to pay full justice to their individual character, the cataloguer has to identify as precisely as possible the different constitutive elements with a label or to even quote sen-

⁵⁴ Cf. Maniaci 2000, 2003, and “‘Modularité’ et articulation du codex”, in Andrist / Canart / Maniaci 2013, 22–23.

tences (or their incipits) if there is no other solution.⁵⁵ In addition, the various monastic lineages that developed within Śvetāmbara Jainism in the Middle Ages tend to produce their own confession *cum* repentance manuals, so that the manuscripts may bear the mark of sectarian identity. One of them, kept at the British Library, includes in its final part a section on the procedure to be followed within the so-called Nāgorī Lunka, a branch of the aniconic school known as Lonkāgaccha, and mentions several names of its leading mendicants.⁵⁶ There have been disagreements among various schools regarding the inclusion or non-inclusion of some components within the repentance ritual: for example, some of the schools consider the recitation of prayers to subsidiary deities or local deities as inadequate, which their leaders thus reject. This has an impact on the modules comprising the manuscripts, which are thus not neutral. Including hymns that have been composed by these leaders is another way to highlight group identity or individual affiliation to a given group.

9.2 Florilegia

Among other modes for the increasing circulation of knowledge in the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries are florilegia in the medieval understanding of the word, i.e. systematic collections of extracts in order to illustrate certain themes or topics. In such manuscripts, the basic textual unit is the extract from a scripture deemed an authoritative carrier of truth. They follow each other within one and the same physical object. Such manuscripts are not MTMs *stricto sensu* because the included units are paragraphs from larger texts. Rather, they represent an extreme form of the phenomenon. From the twelfth century onwards, social and religious factors had led to the emergence of a multitude of sectarian movements within the broader entity 'Śvetāmbara Jainism'. Each group, known as *gaccha*, was headed by different monks. Although they all claimed to go back to Mahāvīra and his teachings, these groups (such as Tapā-gaccha, Kharatara-gaccha, Añcala-gaccha) gave birth to separate lineages, which distinguished themselves from each other mainly in points of practice. In the premodern period (sixteenth to seventeenth centuries), when Jain manuscript culture was at its highest level, debates between religious teachers were supported by precise

⁵⁵ See for example Balbir / Sheth / Tripathi 2006: Cat. No. 244 (I.O. San. 3400), dated V.S. 1603 (= 1546 CE) or any other manuscript in the same section. It is not possible to give more descriptive details in the context of the present essay.

⁵⁶ Balbir / Sheth / Tripathi 2006: Cat. No. 274 I.O. San. 1564e.

references to specific manuscripts, which were considered by many as a source even more authoritative than oral teaching. In this time when ‘going by the book’ was common in sectarian disputes, several manuscripts were conceived as florilegia containing authoritative quotations from the canonical scriptures which were discussed in succession in the same codicological unit. Instances of titles given to such works are *Siddhāntālāpaka*, ‘Paragraphs (or Alineas, Articles) from the Jain Canon’, *Ālāpaka*, ‘Paragraphs’, *Nānāvicāratnasamgraha*, ‘Collection of various disputed points’, or the like.⁵⁷ These quotations follow each other in rather loose sequences or sometimes they are organized thematically. But there is nothing like the sophisticated type of organizing principles such as those one finds in the famous *Manipulus florum* by Thomas of Ireland (early fourteenth century). The genre of ‘questions and answers’ (*praśnottara*) authored by leading monastic intellectuals, where controversial issues were stated and discussed, is a by-product of this more general trend. It is a boundary case of MTM, where ‘text’ designates the smallest unit: a sentence or quotation.

10 Conclusions

This essay has been limited to significant examples of MTMs in Jain manuscript culture. In this particular environment, MTMs have several functions. One of the main ones is to accommodate texts in one or, more often, in various languages used and recognized by the tradition. Studying MTMs from the point of view of their contents, but also from their linguistic arrangement, might help to shed light on the complex ways in which knowledge was mediated and circulated either simultaneously or in succession. The absence of MTMs which would have potentially included all the canonical scriptures is meaningful and suggests that in Jain textual transmission relatively small units were, to some extent, considered viable. Finally, it would be rewarding to undertake comparisons between MTMs and MTEs (= Multiple Text Editions). There are arrangements of MTMs that are continued in printed form, but there are also printed editions with multiple texts that have not been attested in manuscript form. Such is the case precisely with the Śvetāmbara canon, which illustrates how evolutive the MTM phenomenon can be.

⁵⁷ British Library Or. 2137 (A), Or. 16132/3, Or. 5256; Pune 1948 (vol. XVII, Part 4a, Ser. No. 1329 *Siddhāntabola*, Ser. No. 1330 *Siddhāntavicāragāthā*).

Abbreviations and sigla

Ahmedabad	see Punyavijaya (1963-68).
BL	British Library; see Balbir, Sheth, Tripathi (2006)
Cambay	see Punyavijaya (1961, 1966)
Cambridge	see https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/
Paris	see Filliozat (1936)
Patan	see Dalal (1937)
Pune	see Kapadia, Hiralal Rasikdas (1935 ff.)
V.S.	Vikrama Saṃvat (remove 57 in order to get the year according to the Common Era)
Udine FP	see Balbir, Nalini (2019).

References

- Andrist, Patrick / Canart, Paul / Maniaci, Marilena (2013), *La syntaxe du codex. Essai de codicologie structurale* (Bibliologia: Elementa ad Librorum Studia Pertinentia, 34), Turnhout: Brepols.
- Balbir, Nalini (2006), 'Sur les traces de deux bibliothèques familiales au Gujarat (XV^e-XVII^e siècles)', in Henri Chambert-Loir / Bruno Dagens (eds), *Anamorphoses. Hommage à Jacques Dumarçay*. Paris: Les Indes Savantes, 325–352.
- Balbir, Nalini (2014), 'Réseaux religieux et familiaux dans les colophons des manuscrits jaina de l'Inde occidentale', in Nalini Balbir / Maria Szuppe (eds), *Lecteurs et copistes dans les traditions manuscrites iraniennes, indiennes et centrasiatiques – Scribes and Readers in Iranian, Indian and Central Asian Manuscript Traditions*. Rome: IPOCAN (= *Eurasian Studies* 12), 217–256.
- Balbir, Nalini / Sheth Kanhaiyalal V. / Sheth Kalpana K. / Tripathi Candrabhal Bh. (2006), *Catalogue of the Jain Manuscripts of the British Library (including Holdings of the British Museum and Victoria and Albert Museum)*. London: The British Library / The Institute of Jainology, 3 vols.
- Balbir, Nalini (2019), *Catalogue of the Tessitori Collection of Indian Manuscripts kept at the Vincenzo Joppi Civic Library*, Udine.
- Connolly, Margaret / Radulescu, Raluca (eds) (2015), *Insular Books. Vernacular Manuscript Miscellanies in Late Medieval Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cort, John E. (2005), 'Devotional Culture in Jainism: Mānatuṅga and His *Bhaktāmara Stotra*', in James Blumenthal (ed.), *Incompatible Visions: South Asian Religions in History and Culture. Essays in Honor of David M. Knipe*. Madison, University of Wisconsin, Center for South Asia, 93–115.
- Dalal, Chimantal Dahyabhai (1937), *A Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Jain Bhandars at Pattan*. Compiled from the Notes of the Late C.D. Dalal with Introduction, Indices and Appendices by Gandhi, Lachandra Bh. Baroda: Oriental Institute. Vol. 1: *Palm-leaf Mss.*
- Desai, Mohanlal Dalichand (1941), *Bhānucandra Carita by his Pupil Gaṇi Siddhicandra Upādhyāya*. Ahmedabad – Calcutta.
- De Simini, Florinda (2016), 'Śīvadharma Manuscripts from Nepal and the Making of a Śaiva Corpus', in Friedrich / Schwarke 2016, 233–286.

- Filliozat, Jean (1936), 'État des manuscrits de la collection Emile Senart', in *Journal Asiatique*, janvier-mars: 127–143.
- Friedrich, Michael / Schwarke, Cosima (eds) (2016), *One-Volume Libraries: Composite and Multiple-Text Manuscripts* (Studies in Manuscript Cultures, 9), Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.
- Friedrich, Michael / Schwarke, Cosima (2016), 'Introduction – Manuscripts as Evolving Entities', in Friedrich / Schwarke 2016, 1–26.
- Kapadia, Hiralal Rasikdas (1935, 1936, 1940, 1948, 1954, 1952, 1957, 1962, 1967, 1977, 1987, 1988), *Descriptive Catalogue of the Government Collections of Manuscripts deposited at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1916-*. Vol. 17.1a, 1935 [Āgamika literature] — 17.2a, 1936 [Āgamika literature (with palaeographical appendices)] — 17.3a, 1940 [Āgamika literature] — 17.4a-c, 1948 [Āgamika literature, Miscellaneous, Ritualistic works, Suppl.] — 17.5, 1954 [Āgamika literature, 10 Appendices + Indices to vols 1-4] — 18.1, 1952 [Logic, Metaphysics, etc.] — 19.1, 1957 [Hymnology, Śvetāmbara works] — 19.1.2, 1962 [Hymnology, Śvetāmbara & Digambara works along with Appendices I-X] — 19.2.1, 1967 [Narratives, Śvetāmbara works] — 19.2.2, 1977 [Narratives, Śvetāmbara works] — 19.2.3, 1987 [Narratives, Śvetāmbara works] — 19.2.4, 1988 [Narratives, Digambara].
- Kapadia, Hiralal Rasikdas (1937), 'Foliation of Jaina Mss. and Letter-Numerals', in *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, 18, 2: 171–186.
- Kapadia, Hiralal Rasikdas (1938a), 'The Jaina Manuscripts', in *Journal of the University of Bombay*, 7, 2 (September): 2–30.
- Kapadia, Hiralal Rasikdas (1938b), 'Outlines of Palaeography (with special reference to Jaina Palaeographical Data and their Evaluation)', in *The Journal of the University of Bombay*, 6, 6 (May): 87–110.
- Kapashi, Vinod (2007), *Nava Smaraṇa. Nine Sacred Recitations of Jains*. Edited by Signe Kirde. Mumbai: Hindi Granth Karyalay.
- Krause, Anett (2013), *Katalog der Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig. Neue Folge, Band III. Die Jaina-Handschriften und weitere indische Handschriften*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Nawab, Sarabhai (1961), *Pūrvācārya viracita Mahāprabhāvika Navasmarāṇa* (mūl, gujarātī bhāṣāṃtar, viśṭṭ vivecan, nav pariśiṣṭo ane cār so bār citro sahit). Ahmedabad.
- Online Library of Digitized Sanskrit and Prakrit Manuscript Catalogues on <https://wujastyk.net/mscats/>
- Punyavijaya, Muni (1961, 1966), *Catalogue of Palm-leaf Mss. in the Śāntinātha Jaina Bhaṇḍāra. Cambay*, Baroda: Oriental Institute, vol. 1, 1961; vol. 2, 1966.
- Punyavijaya, Muni (1963–68, 2003), *Catalogue of Sanskrit and Prakrit Manuscripts in the L.D. Institute of Indology*, Ahmedabad, Ahmedabad: Vol. 1-4, 1963-68; Vol. 5 and 6, 2003.
- Saptasmarāṇa* with Jinaprabhasūri's commentary: Acharya Shri Kailassagarsuri Gyanmandir, Koba, Manuscript No. 13707.
- Saptasmarāṇa* with Samayasundara's commentary. Surat, 1942.
- Schubring, Walther (1944), *Die Jaina-Handschriften der Preussischen Staatsbibliothek. Neuerwerbungen seit 1891*. Unter der redaktionellen Mitarbeit von Günther Weibgen. Leipzig: Harrassowitz.
- Tripathi, Candrabhal (1975), *Catalogue of the Jaina Manuscripts at Strasbourg*. Leiden: Brill.
- Williams, Tyler W. (2014), *Sacred Sounds and Sacred Books: A History of Writing in Hindi*. PhD thesis, Columbia University.

