

# **World Sanskrit Conference**

## **Bangkok and Kyoto Papers in Jaina Studies**

edited by Nalini BALBIR and Peter FLÜGEL

**2017**

## Contents

Introduction	vii
<b>Nalini Balbir and Peter Flügel</b>	
<b>Canonical Texts</b>	
1. On the Meaning of AMg. <i>allīṇa, palīṇa</i> <b>Ayako Yagi-Hohara</b>	7
2. On the Meaning of <i>sambhoga</i> in Early Jainism and Buddhism <b>Haiyan Hu-von Hinüber</b>	15
3. Mahavīra's Body and the Buddha's Body <b>Yutaka Kawasaki</b>	31
4. About Rules for <i>bhikṣupratimā</i> in Vyavahārabhāṣya I <b>Yumi Fujimoto</b>	45
5. From Palm Leaf to Unicode: The Relationships between Modern Editions of Śvetāmbara Canonical Texts and the Manuscript Traditions <b>Royce Wiles</b>	55
<b>Philosophy</b>	
6. Kundakunda on the Modal Modification of Omniscient <i>jīvas</i> <b>Ana Bajželj</b>	97
7. Concealing Meaning in Inferential Statements: The Practice of <i>patra</i> in Jainism <b>Marie-Hélène Gorisse</b>	111
<b>Literature &amp; History</b>	
8. The Taraṅgavatī and History of Prakrit Literature <b>Andrew Ollett</b>	129
9. Jain Exegetical Strategies: The Example of Samayasundara's <i>Kalpalatā</i> <b>Nalini Balbir</b>	165
10. Jaina-Prosopography I. Sociology of Jaina Names <b>Peter Flügel</b>	187
<b>Appendix: The Jaina Sections at World Sanskrit Conferences</b>	269
<b>Contributors to this volume</b>	273

# Jaina-Prosopography I. Sociology of Jaina Names

Peter Flügel<sup>1</sup>

One of the main desiderata in Jaina Studies is the investigation of the social history of the Jaina tradition. The Jaina mendicant tradition exerted a lasting influence on Indian culture and society. It emerged in Magadha some two and a half thousand years ago, and spread to most parts of South Asia. In the process, it segmented into numerous competing schools, sects, and lineages, in complex interaction with local social and political configurations. Some of these traditions have been short-lived, while others still exist today. Since the inception of Jaina Studies as an academic field in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, considerable advances have been made towards the reconstruction of the history of these mendicant traditions, particularly through the analysis of monastic chronicles and inscriptions. The social history of Jainism remains, however, imperfectly understood.<sup>2</sup> This is because the principal sources, a vast corpus of unpublished and published bio-bibliographical data, extracted from manuscripts and inscriptions, still await systematic investigation.

The need for interlinking the available, but scattered information on the itinerant Jaina ascetics, their lineages, networks, and relationships to followers and patrons has long been felt. A great number of catalogues and conspectuses of relevant primary sources have and are being produced in pursuit of this aim.<sup>3</sup> Yet, the only attempt systematically to pull together data from different published sources to date remains Johannes Klatt's (2016) belatedly published *Jaina-Onomasticon*. Klatt's work offers a comprehensive compilation of the information available up to 1892, but makes no attempt at cross-referencing and interlinking the assembled data through indexes, since the onomasticon itself is a kind of index. The links are also too numerous, and would have required the creation of a second, supplementary volume, which, as far as one can tell, was not planned.<sup>4</sup> Klatt was mainly interested in producing a bio-bibliographical directory of individual names of persons, places, organisations, and literary works. His encyclopaedic list of proper names is accurately described as an *Onomasticon*. Due to the colossal amount of detailed information

---

<sup>1</sup> The presentation of an earlier version of this paper at the Jaina Panel of the 16th WSC in Bangkok 2015 and further research was rendered possible through Leverhulme Trust Research Project Grants RPG-2012-620 and RPG-2016-454. I am indebted to Nalini Balbir, Kornelius Krümpelmann, Katherine S.B. Keats-Rohan and J. C. Wright for their perceptive comments on drafts of this article, and to Willem B. Bollée, and Renate Söhnen-Thieme for significant observations and suggestions.

<sup>2</sup> M. U. K. Jain's 1975: 1 noted that although Jaina mendicants and householders "have preserved the important tenets of the tradition through tenacity and perseverance; but, side by side, they have left the scientific spirit and historical process inherent in its development untapped": "As a result its real and subtle import has been missed, more particularly its historical lineaments have been left obscure. This explains why Jaina historical studies are still in their infancy as compared with Buddhist studies." This verdict is still valid. It echoes earlier observations of Schubring 1935/2000 § 7: 10, 1944: vii ff., Velankar 1944: I, Raja 1949: i-ii, Raghavan 1968: i-ii, and others. The recognised gap in knowledge has prompted the publication of an increasing number of collective biographies or Who's Whos within the Jaina tradition, from the early 20<sup>th</sup> century onward, and of historical dictionaries such as Wiley 2004 (or Hinnells 1991 including entries on selected Jaina monks). The assembled biographical information still awaits systematic sociological analysis.

<sup>3</sup> K. C. Jain 2005/2010 I: vii-xv gives a good summary of the main body of "scattered" historical materials in a useful, collaboratively produced three-volume overview of the history of Jainism, supplementing earlier surveys of the Jaina social history by Sangave (1959) 1980 and Chatterjee (1978) 2000. Apart from overviews, specialised dictionaries and reference books, several encyclopaedias of Jainism have been published in recent years, to name but Singh 2001 and Bhattacharyya 2006, and one more is on its way (Jacobsen et al. forthcoming).

<sup>4</sup> Due to his tragic illness, Klatt was not able to complete his work. See Flügel 2016: 118ff., 2017a.

presented in this way, the work serves equally as a source book for Jaina collective biography as well as a proto-prosopography.<sup>5</sup>

The usefulness of meta-catalogues and meta-indexes, such as Klatt's, for prosopographical research has only recently become apparent, after the introduction of modern computer technology to Jaina Studies.<sup>6</sup> With the help of computers, the social and geographical contexts in which monastic lineages and support networks were formed, texts composed, temples and halls constructed, and socio-religious events arranged, can for the first time be systematically mapped out, and studied from different points of view, on the basis of already published meta-data, such as those collated by Klatt and subsequently produced catalogues of Jaina manuscripts and inscriptions, as well as the sizable biographical literature of the Jainas. A fresh look at this body of published data with the help of the new tool boxes of Digital Humanities has not been attempted as yet, though promising new analytical strategies abound.<sup>7</sup>

### 1. New Methodologies

In February 2017, a research project of the Centre of Jaina Studies at SOAS, *Jaina-Prosopography: Monastic Lineages, Networks, and Patronage*,<sup>8</sup> began to explore the relationships between Jaina mendicant lineages and their supporters, focusing on the nexus of monastic recruitment, geographical circulation of monks and nuns,<sup>9</sup> their biographies, literary works, and patterns of householder support and patronage of mendicant inspired religious ventures. The project is inspired by the overall vision to produce a comprehensive prosopographical database for the reconstruction of the social-history of the Jaina tradition. Electronic databases will permit the introduction of novel quantitative and qualitative sociological approaches to Jaina Studies, for instance for sociological analyses of the

<sup>5</sup> Keats-Rohan 2007c: 15-25 offers a useful characterisation of the differences between biography, genealogy, onomastics, sociography, and prosopography. An onomasticon has "a single entry for a single personal name, with appended references to numerous occurrences of it, whereas a prosopographical lexicon will contain as many entries for the same personal name as the research has indicated there are separate bearers of it, often distinguished by the addition of a number" (p. 25); "Collective or comparative biography is not based upon rigorously established selection criteria and the focus remains the individual. It is therefore not prosopography" (p. 144, cf. 150f.). According to the criteria provided, Klatt's *Jaina-Onomasticon* is a proto-prosopographical work.

<sup>6</sup> The first project intended for computer-based analysis was the project of K. Bruhn, C. B. Tripathi and B. Bhatt on a "Jaina Concordance and Bhāṣya Concordance," on which see Bruhn and Tripathi 1977. However, for "philological reasons," computers were not used after all. Pioneering in this respect were the "automatic" analyses of the Śvetāmbara canon by Ousaka, Yamazaki & Miyao 1994, Ousaka & Yamazaki 1996, Yamazaki & Ousaka 1999. Meanwhile, numerous electronic library catalogues, of varying depth and quality, have been produced by Jaina libraries, though none has been made available online, as yet. Exemplary is the manuscript catalogue of the *Acharya Shri Kailasagarsuri Gyanmandir* in Koba, which, however, still uses inconsistent spelling, and records biographic data in narrative form in an open field. For the first steps toward the development of a Jaina-Prosopography, see Flügel 2016: 125, 127.

<sup>7</sup> For instance the work of Bry 1977, Bruhn 1981: 40, Bourdieu 1979/1984, Thapar 1987, Collins 1989, 1998, Stoler, Miller & Eaton 1992, Pollock 2000, 2006, Hirschler 2011, Zysk 2012, Balbir 2014, Minkowski, O'Hanlon & Venkatkrishnan 2015. Apart from Bourdieu, few of the named authors have made use of analytical software.

<sup>8</sup> The three-year project is funded by Leverhulme Trust Research Project Grant RPG-2016-454. Peter Flügel and Kornelius Krümpelmann are the principal researchers and editors of the *Jaina-Prosopography* (JP) database. The data-model web-portal is being developed in collaboration with Michael Pidd and Katherine Rogers of the Digital Humanities Institute (DHI) at Sheffield University, which will host the resulting searchable online database at [www.dhi.ac.uk](http://www.dhi.ac.uk). Advisors to the project are J. C. Wright and Renate Söhnen-Thieme (SOAS), Burkhard Quessel (British Library), Yigal Bronner (Hebrew University of Jerusalem), and Karin Preisendanz (University of Vienna). The raw data will be shared with collaborating institutions and individuals, and follow-up projects. See Flügel 2017b, 2018.

<sup>9</sup> On itinerant social groups in India, see, for instance, Sopher 1968, Stein 1977, Pouchepadass 2003, Clémentin-Ojha 2009.

conjunction between monastic lineages and their social support networks, as documented in donative inscription and colophons of manuscripts, using network analysis, statistical methods, advanced digital technology and visualization techniques. It can be expected that computer-assisted prosopographical investigations will become an essential part of most future research in the socio-religious history of the Jaina tradition, once reliable and sufficiently populated databases have been produced.<sup>10</sup>

“New-style” prosopography<sup>11</sup> conducted with the help of relational databases<sup>12</sup> is a highly sophisticated research tool for studying patterns of relationships within well-defined groups of individuals, based on the collection, coding, and analysis of biographical data. It is a useful instrument for discerning trends and relations in large datasets that are not immediately visible, and particularly suited for the socio-historical study of groups, such as the Jains, where a vast amount of scattered biographical information is available, but only few detailed accounts of the lives of historical individuals. Jaina texts present biographical information in schematic formats, which are relatively easily adaptable to computer-supported analysis.<sup>13</sup> They focus on birth, family background, renunciation,

<sup>10</sup> Pioneering “prosopographical” or rather historical demographical studies of Christian monks and nuns in Europe have been conducted by Greatrex 1995, 1999 and by Oliva 1995, 1998, 1999. The latter constructed electronic databases for storing information on 585 nuns as well. See in particular the project *Who Were The Nuns? A Prosopographical study of the English Convents in exile 1600-1800* led by Caroline Bowden in 2008-2013: <https://wtn.history.qmul.ac.uk/analysis/>

Greatrex 1995: 1f. recognises the value of “transforming biographical data of specific individuals into prosopographical material apt for analysis,” and aiming “to produce post-mortem C.V.’s” (see Graevenitz 1980 on necrology as the historical foundation for the development of biography in Europe). Building on these and other sources, Greatrex 1999: 129-35, 139 investigates “the monastic career span of monks and priors, transfer from one monastery to another, apostate monks, and monks and their books” in eight Benedictine cathedral priories of the Province of Canterbury, 13<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> C. Several parallels in this study to quantitative analyses of Jaina monastic life (Flügel 2009) are worth investigating further: admission age (minimum: 18, exceptionally: 15), ordination age (minimum: 22); time between admission and priestly ordination (average: 4 ½ years); length of monastic careers (average: 25-50 years); apostates (only a handful), the fact that “the average monk priest often remained unnoticed in the priority accounts and registers for a period of three to five years before his first appointment for a responsible position in the community” (p. 132); time before appointment to monastics office (average: 6 years); relationship between monks and books: “monks who were authors, compilers, users, or copiers,” and had university education (p. 137). Notable is also the method of “rotation of office [...] to keep the monks alert and on their toes” (Greatrex 1995: 26).

Olivia 1995: 27 focuses on the “recruitment patterns and social composition, demographic fluctuations” in eleven female houses for nuns in the diocese of Norwich 1350-1540, using visitation records, clerical poll-tax lists, monastic accounts, etc. (p. 29). She demonstrates that “the vast majority of nuns came not from society’s socially elite families but from the [middle ranking] local parish gentry” (ib., cf. p. 41), and that “[w]ealth, then, could but did not affect the number of nuns a house would support” (p. 38), though relative lack of information lead to groups “of lesser social rank to be left out of this type of inquiry” (p. 33). The social rank was assigned by the author on the basis of set criteria, such as titles and property. The problems of producing historical estimates for monastic demography (pp. 34f.), as well as the results on local recruitment patterns, diversity of middle ranking social backgrounds, relatives in convents outside the diocese (pp. 35-55, extensively presented in Oliva 1998: 220--9), are echoed by Jaina monastic demography (Flügel 2006, 2009, 1996).

<sup>11</sup> The term of Bradley & Short 2005 (introducing their own “factoid” approach) was adopted by Keats-Rohan 2007b and others, and is now widely used.

<sup>12</sup> TEI language based text-processing is more useful for the encoding of primary texts. See *infra*.

<sup>13</sup> In line with his general differentiation between the “typical” and the “individual” in Jaina texts and iconography, Bruhn 1954, 1969, 2010: 129 distinguishes between “general motif (cliché)” (“name, names of parents, birthplace etc.”) and “individual motif” (“individual UH” = universal history, etc.). Dundas 2007: 63f. speaks of “a preprogrammed ‘genetic code’ determining public religiosity within Jain tradition” itself, to highlight the fact that the prevalence of “stereotyped themes and structures” in Jaina biography and hagiography is not to be interpreted as evidence for historiographies as being entirely “artificially crafted.” He argues that “there are only a relatively delimited number of significant events and situations which could actually be experienced by such a monk and be described in his biography,” while isolated idealised descriptions for instance of the “entry into the womb” of the soul of a monastic leader such as Hīravijayasūri can also be found. In contrast to the 5-6 *kalyāṇakas* of the Jinas, standard monastic biographies focus on birth (*janma*), experience

teachers, monastic offices, peregrinations, accomplishments & encounters, death, disciples, and supporters of mendicants. While the historical sources of the Jainas are centred on male mendicants, for the last 150 years, biographical information on Jaina nuns, Jaina laity, including Jaina women, is also increasingly being published. The project seeks to carefully integrate such pre-processed data from a variety of different, hitherto unconnected print publications and electronic sources, conduct some pilot studies, not least to test the new research tool, and prepare the ground for future uses of the data-base by other researchers.

So-called “new-style” prosopography should not be mixed up with “old-style” prosopography, that is, collective biographies and (proto-) prosopographical directories, such as Klatt’s (1892/2016),<sup>14</sup> which primarily focus on individuals rather than the relationships that connect them. Rather than distinguishing between “old-style-” and “new-style” prosopography, it seems more apt to contrast “*stage-one prosopography*,” producing collections of biographical data in different formats, with the more tightly formalised “*stage-two prosopography*,” using sets of defined variables for computer-supported investigations of relationships between individuals, objects, institutions, and places. However, “old-style” collective biographies are particularly useful sources for prosopographical databases, especially if they have been diligently produced.<sup>15</sup>

The specific aim of the SOAS project is to prepare the ground for the sociological investigation of Jaina monastic lineages and relationships between Jaina mendicants and lay-followers, by integrating and analysing previously unconnected evidence from different bio-bibliographical sources on Jaina mendicants, scribes, and sponsors, from early medieval times onward. Key questions of the project concern the social background of the Jaina mendicants, their lineages and networks, literatures, religious sites, and patrons, using the extensive, published and unpublished, records of Jaina libraries on monastic biographies and lineages. A major contribution of this project will be the mapping and analysis of socio-religious relationships on the basis of aggregated evidence from different bio-bibliographical data sources.<sup>16</sup> The first step for such an undertaking is the development of a new data-model, a second, the compilation of a comprehensive database, in this case starting with the data collated by Klatt, and, lastly, the uses of this wealth of information for different types of analyses, in particular the discovery of patterns of social relationships. An innovative data-model and comprehensive prosopographical database, developed in collaboration with the *Digital Humanities Institute* (DHI) at Sheffield University with good counsel of *The British Library*, *The Department of Digital Humanities*, *King’s College London*, *The University of Vienna*, and the *Acharya Shri Kailasasagarsuri Gyanmandir* in Koba, and other advisors,<sup>17</sup> will provide rich data for socio-historical

---

of indifference (*vairāgya*), initiation (*dīkṣā*), promotions up to the position of leader of the order (*paṭṭadhara*), death (*mahāprayāna*), and disciples (*śiṣya*).

<sup>14</sup> See also PIR, PCBE, Justi 1895.

<sup>15</sup> Keats-Rohan 2007c: 151 does not terminologically distinguish the two in these terms, in contrast to short biographical profiles for which she proposes to reserve the term “biogram,” but notes: “Of the two stages,” old-style- and new-style prosopography, “the first can stand alone, but the second cannot exist without the prior creation of the other: both are prosopography.”

<sup>16</sup> Data on members of “total institutions” (Goffman) such as monastic orders have always attracted statisticians, because sampling is relatively straightforward, as Greatrex 1995: 2f. confirms:

“Social, economic and religious groups such as these [Benedictine monastic communities] are all conducive to prosopographical study, once the nature and identity of the chosen subject have been clearly defined and the inherent limitations imposed by the type and amount of available evidence determined. The Benedictine monastic framework in its medieval setting represents few difficulties since it was a society held together by the Rule that had been laid down by the founder [...].”

The present study, however, goes beyond the monastic context by investigating links between mendicants of multiple lineages in history and links between mendicants and householders (and observers such as the researchers), as well as object such as literary works and religious sites.

<sup>17</sup> In particular Burkhard Quessel (BL), John Bradley (KCL), Karin Preisendanz, Himal Trikha (Vienna), Yigal Bronner (PANDIT), Kalpana Sheth (Ahmedabad), and J. C. Wright, Renate Söhnen-Thieme and Erich Kesse (SOAS).

analysis of monastic networks and patronage.<sup>18</sup> It is hoped that the open-access database will offer an unparalleled wealth of historical data for future projects on Jaina history and culture.

The re-use of data assembled in manuscript catalogues and compilations of inscriptions for systematic historical and sociological research is just beginning. Socio-bibliography<sup>19</sup> and Socio-epigraphy<sup>20</sup> in the age of electronic data promises to revolutionise the way in which manuscript catalogues are used. In digitised form the aggregate data embedded in expertly produced catalogues can be used for historical and sociological analysis on a large scale, once the information is transformed into prosopographical databases that can be used for a multitude of research projects. The approach requires interdisciplinary and international collaboration.

The sociology of Indian names is still in its infancy.<sup>21</sup> The present article explores theoretical and pragmatic solutions for two elementary difficulties, faced by all prosopographies and text-encoding initiatives, namely, the creation of standardised lists of names, and the accurate identification of individuals.<sup>22</sup> Its central concern is the analysis of the structure of Jaina names, particularly monastic names, which entail an entire sociology of the Jaina tradition, and require custom-made coding schemes to be accurately represented in a database. After analysing the classification of name-types in Jaina-scriptures, and methodological conundrums of coding Jaina householder and monastic names, a suitable coding scheme will be proposed, and a “naming formula” for Jaina monastic “full names” from the perspective of functional grammar. The study will finally show, taking the names of Mahāvīra as an example, that problems of identification of individuals on the basis of Jaina monastic names are similar to problems of identification in Jaina biography or the iconography of the Jinās.<sup>23</sup>

## 2. Old Sources

Notwithstanding the ever growing body of accessible primary sources, case-studies,<sup>24</sup> and general surveys of the history of Jainism,<sup>25</sup> the dearth of factual knowledge on the history of Jainism is still acutely felt. The study of the social history of the Jaina tradition, in

<sup>18</sup> An initial project seminar on 13-15 February 2017, organised by the *CoJS* and hosted by the *Acharya Shri Kailasasagarisuri Gyanmandir* in Koba, brought together research teams of SOAS (Peter Flügel, Kornelius Krümpelmann), Koba (Ācārya Ajayasāgarasūri), Ahmedabad (Kalpana Sheth), *Jain Vishva Bharati Institute* in Ladnun (Vandana Mehta, S. N. Bhardwaj), the *Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* in Pune (Amruta Natu), and *The Digital Humanities Institute* of the University of Sheffield (Michael Pidd, Katherine Rogers). The seminar focused on the development of a suitable data-model, offering enhanced analytical possibilities, while assuring compatibility with already existing digital manuscript catalogues, particularly the library catalogue of Koba, and prosopographical databases. See Flügel 2017b. The new prosopographical approach has since been adopted by Ajayasāgarasūri 2017: 26, but an initially planned collaboration with SOAS did not go ahead.

<sup>19</sup> Bry 1977. Her work was referred to by Bruhn 1981: 40 Fn. 62, in the context of a discussion of problems of categorisation of contents of publications in cases of “misleading titles.”

<sup>20</sup> A neologism here introduced. Salomon’s 1998: 224 observation still applies to South Asian Studies as a whole:

“Most urgent is the need for comprehensive computer databases of the now unmanageably vast published epigraphic material; very little has been done in this direction, and the need for it is growing constantly. [...] [S]pecialists in the several disciplines must continue to strive for better communication and cooperation. [...] For preliminary reports on the use of computers for the compilation of statistical data from inscriptions, see S. K. Havanur, ‘Analysis of Inscriptional Data Through Computer,’ *JESI* 14, 1987, 50-5; and Riccardo Garbini, ‘Software Development in Epigraphy: Some Preliminary Remarks,’ *JESI* 19, 1993, 63-79. Though potentially promising, such techniques have not yet been widely put into practice.”

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Horsch 1965, Kour 1982 & *infra*.

<sup>22</sup> <http://www.tei-c.org/release/doc/tei-p5-doc/de/html/CO.html#CONA>

<sup>23</sup> Bruhn 1969, 1985, 1986, 1995.

<sup>24</sup> E.g., Dundas 2007: 9.

<sup>25</sup> E.g., K. C. Jain 2005/2010.

particular, remains one of the principal lacunae in Jaina Studies. There is no lack of published sources. What is needed are conspectuses and databases, which can pull together scattered evidence, provided for instance by the numerous published modern Jaina collective biographies,<sup>26</sup> and sect- and caste histories,<sup>27</sup> of varying quality.<sup>28</sup> Two types of published or unpublished primary sources, containing historical information, are available in great quantity: (a) short inscriptions (*śilā-lekha*), engraved on stone-slabs, copper-plates, temple-walls, stone- or metal images, and altar-pieces, recording the date, names of the sponsors, and of the inspiring and consecrating monk (long inscriptions are rare),<sup>29</sup> and (b) manuscripts (*hastalikhita*), providing biographical information on teachers, disciples, achievements, and events in the life of a monk (and increasingly: nun).<sup>30</sup> The following literary sources offer testimonies in more or less reliable, albeit often clichéd and highly selective form: historical poems (*caupāi*, *dhāl*, etc.), songs (*gīta*, etc.), lists of teachers (*gurvāvalī*), succession-lists (*paṭṭāvalī*), biographies (*caritra*), eulogies (*praśasti*),<sup>31</sup> colophons (*puṣpikā*), also modern *Festschriften* (*abhinandana-grantha*), commemorative volumes (*smṛti-grantha*), diaries and letters,<sup>32</sup> *curricula vitae* (“bios”), captions under photos, recorded oral history, printed information, etc.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>26</sup> See Flügel 2010.

<sup>27</sup> See Babb 2004.

<sup>28</sup> E.g. S. K. Jain 1987.

<sup>29</sup> Classical compilations including Jaina inscriptions are Rice (and successors) 1886-1904, Burgess 1892, 1894, Guérinot 1908, Nahar 1918, 1927, 1929, Narasimhachar 1923, Sircar 1942, Joharāpurkara 1958, Somani 1982, Mahadevan 2003, among many other publications. Salomon 1998: 243 stresses the significance of Jaina epigraphic materials, though mainly as supplements to canonical evidence:

“The very abundant and relatively well-documented inscriptions of the Jainas (8.1.3.4), especially in western India of the medieval period, offer a rich fund of information for the study of Jaina religion, ethics, and especially monastic organization. [...] Inscriptions provide abundant details on the history of Jaina sectarian and monastic history and organization, in the form of the names, lineages, and positions of many Jaina clerics (cf. IC I.170). This data may be profitably used as a corroborative and supplementary source to information provided in the canonical literature.”

<sup>30</sup> Relevant bibliographical and bio-bibliographical meta-catalogues for manuscripts are Aufrecht 1891, 1896, 1903, Klatt [1892] 2016, Guérinot 1906, Jaina Śvetāmbara Kāmpharans 1909 (“based in part on the *Brhātippaṇikā*, a bibliographical list of Jain works compiled by an anonymous author in 1500 CE” (Kragh 2013: 10 Fn. 17)), Velankar 1944, NCC<sup>a-c</sup>. For printed books, see Tank 1917, C.L. Jain 1945, 1966, as well as the recent volumes by Mohajitavijaya, Vijaya Yugabhūṣaṇasūri & Ḍagalī 2015 and Aagam Pragya, Rohit Pragya & Vandana Mehta 2016 can be mentioned, as well as C. Potter’s electronic “Bibliography of Indian Philosophies Part IV: Secondary Literature: [J] Jainism,” also available through PANDIT (Bronner 2015ff.), which also incorporated the prosopographical datasets produced by projects championed by S. Pollock and D. Wujastyk ([http://users.ox.ac.uk/~prosop/directory/Modern\\_India.htm](http://users.ox.ac.uk/~prosop/directory/Modern_India.htm)), but does not offer historical data on the Jaina tradition. On *paṭṭāvalis*, see the overview of Deśāi, 1926 (I), 1931a (II), 1944 (III.1-2) as well as Darśanavijaya 1933, 1950, Darśanavijaya, Jñānavijaya & Nyāyavijaya 1952, 1960, 1963, 1983, Jinavijaya 1961, Hastimāla 1968, Śiva Prasāda 1999, 2000, 2009, and many other publications. The principal collections of Jaina *praśastis* to date are Śāh 1937, Jinavijaya 1943, Kāsalīvāla 1950, Mukhtar 1954, Śāstrī 1963. The Jaina *prabandha*-literature is another important source of historical information. See Deleu 1981: 61, Balbir 2012. The best collection of biographical information, on all mendicants of the Terāpanth tradition, is Navaratnamala 1981-2002.

<sup>31</sup> On this genre, see, for instance, Winternitz 1920/1983: 91f., and recently De Clercq 2010, Pollock 2013, Balbir 2014. The word *praśasti* is ambiguous. In the academic literature it is usually understood as designation for the eulogy or panegyric poem at the beginning of a manuscript or inscription. Often the term is explained as a poetic laudation of a venerable person sponsored by a “rich” or “royal” man (Wright 2014: 398). Yet, it can also designate an edict. In the Jaina literature it often refers to the author’s or scribe’s colophon. To distinguish colophon from eulogy the word *puṣpikā* is also used for the final section of a text or chapter containing information on author and/or scribe.

<sup>32</sup> See Strauch 2002: 15 on the genre of letters particularly in medieval Gujarat. Notable is the incomparable collection of letters and autobiographic statements of/on the Terāpanth *ācārya* Tulasī: Tulasī 1999, 2001, 2014 (vol. 1-25). Some of the “autobiographic” statements are pseudo-autobiographical as shown by Samanī Pratibhāprajñā 2014.

<sup>33</sup> Bruhn 1981: 30 Fn. 29, 39 proposed to treat literary genres such as these as “micro-genres.”



Jaina texts which contain historical information, whether transmitted through inscriptions, manuscripts, or oral history, focus almost exclusively on the biographies of individual Jaina mendicants, and on the histories of Jaina mendicant lineages, which in most cases can be reconstructed on the basis of such sources. Little coherent evidence is offered on the supporters of individual mendicants and mendicant traditions, and almost none on rivals and their supporters, on which little data for triangulation exists. Yet, to an extent, the social history of the Jaina laity and patrons can also be reconstructed on the basis of the extensive records on Jaina mendicant traditions. A great amount of reliable information on proper names, dates, and places pertaining to householders is scattered throughout the sources pertaining to Jaina monasticism. The records of the *gaṇas*, *gacchas* or *saṃpradāyas* of the Śvetāmbara tradition, for instance, which emerged from the 11<sup>th</sup> century, provide useful material on specific aspects of Jaina social history, not least on the families that offered children for initiation, and on prominent supporters and patrons. Donative inscriptions on temple walls, and on the numerous Jina images are particularly valuable sources for the links between mendicants and householders.<sup>34</sup> These published sources, valuable as they are for the history of South Asia in general, remain largely untapped, and await systematic analysis.

The question, whether or not to include a particular piece of information in a database does not pose itself for the prosopographer, because s/he is entirely reliant on the available primary and secondary sources, and cannot, and should not, decide, which information is accurate, and which is not, a decision which is at any rate difficult. All publications that contain relevant information, of whichever purpose or form, can be used as sources for a prosopographical database. Different types of Jaina collective biography can be distinguished as regards their purpose, mode of selection, and presentation of data. However, biographical directories produced for academic purposes, such as Narasiṃhācārya (1907, 1919, 1924, 1929), cannot be taken to be more reliable *per se* than didactic biographical collections, produced without source references by authors such as S. K. Jain (1975/1987) or Tank (1914, 1915, 1917, 1918), with the aim of inspiring public recognition for and pride in the/a Jaina community. A prosopographical database should record the entire range of relevant available information, especially data provided by primary sources. Statistical analysis may require re-coding of selected slices of data, of course, depending on the specific aims of a project at hand.

At the present stage of research, the main problem is no longer the lack of published primary and secondary sources, but the selective and de-contextualised nature of the transmitted information, as well as its sheer mass of published material. The main question is, how to systematically elicit information that is embedded, but largely invisible, in the available historiographical data? Required is not only the filling of gaps in the published record, but equally the interlinking of the already published pieces of information, in response to standard questions such as “who, what, where, when, and why,”<sup>35</sup> a variation of which can be found in the Digambara *ācārya* Vīrasena’s *Dhavalā*, demonstrating the

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Tambiah 1976/1977.

<sup>35</sup> Boethius’s seven standardised questions *quis, quid, cur, quomodo, ubi, quando, quibus auxiliis* (who, what, why, how, where, when, with what) were adopted by secular courts and by the Roman church as formulaic guides for lawyers, judges and confessors and later used in journalism and education. Both the legal and the grammatical “case” is etymologically linked to Latin *casus*, “a falling” or “event,” which has been derived from Proto-Indo-European \**kh<sub>2</sub>d-*, “to fall.” The interrogatives that can be derived from the sevenfold case system of Sanskrit (ADhy 4.1.2), mostly “k’s,” do not seem to have gained a forensic function comparative to the rhetorical questions derived from the case system of Latin. For all practical purposes, however, they play a comparable role. See Robertson 1946: 8ff., who traced the prehistory of the modern English, German etc. “five (or less or more)” “W’s” to the “seven” hypothetical questions concerning particulars in Greek rhetoric, notably Hermagoras’s list of questions known through the Latin work *De Rhetorica* of Pseudo-Augustine: *quis, quid, quando, ubi, cur, quem ad modum, quibus adminiculis*, which, via Cicero, were given the forensic role of determining “seven circumstances fundamental to the arts of prosecution and defense” in Boethius’s *De differentiis topicis*. On the role of the “W’s” in prosopographical research, see Brendler in Keats-Rohan 2007c: 170.

pervasiveness of such “doors of disquisition” (*anuyogadvāra*).<sup>36</sup> The main advantage of a dedicated analytical database of sufficient sophistication and size for Jaina Studies is that it allows the interconnection and triangulation of data extracted from different sources, Jaina and non-Jaina. A *Jaina-Prosopography* can also be linked with other databases, and in this way help eliciting further insight into historical processes, social relationships and milieus.

### 3. Preparing a Prosopographical Data-Model

How to create a multi-purpose prosopographical database of use for more than one project, and compatible with other databases? A number of pioneering efforts have already been undertaken, from the 19<sup>th</sup> century onward,<sup>37</sup> to establish aggregate datasets for South Asia Research, without the technological possibilities offered by new computer-supported prosopographical software, uses of which are still not seriously considered in standard Indological and historical research. An authoritative synopsis of the state of the art of prosopography in general has been offered by K. S. B. Keats-Rohan (2007c: 143f.),<sup>38</sup> who, first of all, clarifies the difference between “old-style” collective- and comparative biography, and “new-style” computer-supported prosopography. It also offers useful discussions of well-known pitfalls in “new-style” prosopographical research, and provides clear methodological guidelines for the creation of basic name registers, the bedrock of all good prosopography.

Accordingly, the main difference between bibliography, onomastica (name-directories), and collective biography, on the one hand, and modern prosopographical databases, on the other hand, is that the former are focused on the individual, whereas latter, in the first instance, a tool for an investigation of a social field, network, or group. According to this, widely shared, interpretation of the new meaning of “prosopography,” which is diametrically opposed to the older equation of “prosopography” and “collective biography” by writers such as Charle (2001), probably most “prosopological” databases in contemporary Indology / Oriental Studies are to be re-classified as “collective biography” and/or “bibliography,” or as “first-stage prosopography.”

If certain methodological requirements are not met, Keats-Rohan would wish to withhold the emblem “prosopography,” on general principle, though in practice matters are not black and white. Since much depends on the available data, money and time, it is only ever possible to accurately label the outcomes of large-scale information collection efforts at the time of their completion (if ever). A full prosopographical study is inevitably conducted in three steps: (1) Familiarisation with and systematic collection of ‘raw’ data. (2) Creation of a biographical dictionary or lexicon in form of a relational database, using excerpts from the initial qualitative dataset(s). (3) Statistical analysis, etc., in view of a chosen research question.

Because the *Jaina-Prosopography* is predicated on pre-existing published sets of qualitative data, only Keats-Rohan’s (2007c: 146f.) outline of the sub-routines of step two, the construction of a list of proper names, and analytical categories for the recording of significant qualities and relations, is here of interest:

<sup>36</sup> DṬ<sub>1</sub> 1/1.1.1 [v. 18] p. 34:

“kim kassa keṇa kattha va kevaciraṃ kadividho ya bhāvo tti |  
chahi añi[>u]oga-ddārehi savve bhāvā’nugamṭavvā || 18 ||

“(i) What is the subject or object (*kim*)? (ii) Who is the owner of the subject or object (*kasya*)? (iii) What is the cause or means to know about it (*kena*)? (iv) Where is it found (*kasmin*)? (v) What is its duration or lifetime (*kiyat-ciram*)? (vi) What are its varieties (*kati-vidham*)?” (DṬ<sub>2</sub> p. 18).

<sup>37</sup> For an indicative review, see Flügel 2018.

<sup>38</sup> For the history of prosopographical research methods, see Stone 1971, Cameron 2003, Eck 2003, Keats-Rohan 2007a, 2007b, Cabouret & Demotz 2014.

- a. Define the group or field of study;<sup>39</sup>
- b. Create an index of all names and name variants in the selected sources, including the names of “anonymous” individuals, which need to be listed in the same way as named individuals;<sup>40</sup>
- c. Create an index of persons (person register) from the index of names (name register) by way of an identity check;
- d. Create biographical data (name records) for each identifiable named or unnamed individual, in accordance with a set of pre-defined criteria (“questionnaire”);
- e. The rationale of which needs to be spelled out clearly.

Step d. is decisive for the prosopographical analysis - the transition from qualitative to quantitative analysis by coding information data in terms of a task-specific data-model:

“This requires that the data are broken up into small, atomic, units. Although this treatment will facilitate subsequent analysis, it means that the data are divorced from their original context in the source material. Wherever possible, therefore, the first requirement is a qualitative database containing transcripts or other relevant reproductions of the source material, independent of but linkable to the subsequent quantitative database” (Keats-Rohan 2007c: 147).

Step e., the explanation and documentation of the criteria informing the data-model, is equally significant. It is the second most important feature that distinguishes prosopography from bibliography and collective biography. The present article contributes to this task with regard to the Jaina-Prosopography. An important caveat is expressed by N. Bulst in this context: data from other sources can only with great caution be “mined” and imported into a custom-made prosopographical database, though the risk can be managed if proper precautions are taken:

“It is generally impossible to exploit straightforwardly older, and often also more recent, prosopographical catalogues, and still less analyses differentiated in quantitative terms based on such works, for the simple reason that the criteria of this or that catalogue are often opaque. For all statistical exploitation it is indispensable, for example, to know whether certain lacunae are due to gaps in the tradition, or to the absence of a systematic exploitation, or to a deliberate choice of data-entry. In short, the collection of prosopographical data presupposes a standardized taking of data that corresponds to the questions posed, while the catalogue subsequently established must give as explicitly as possible the criteria of selection and the lacunae in the base documentation, so that it can maintain some measure of usefulness in different contexts” (Bulst 1986, translated in Keats-Rohan 2007: 148).

Since the *Jaina-Prosopography* (JP) derives its data from already existing qualitative databases, not least the biograms<sup>41</sup> provided by Klatt (2016), it does not need to proceed in two steps, from a preliminary questionnaire resulting in summary biographical notices to an

---

<sup>39</sup> “A field exists where people are struggling over something they share” (Donald Broady, in Keats-Rohan 2007a: 21).

<sup>40</sup> “[T]he limit of an individual is that they must be mentioned in the primary sources and they must have at least one attribute – doing something, having something done to them or being described in some way: [...] unlike onomastics, prosopography copes happily with crowds of Anonymi” (D. Smythe, in Keats-Rohan 2007c: 152). Often the “descriptor” of relationship to others function as “proxy names” (pp. 153f.).

<sup>41</sup> A term discussed by Keats-Rohan 2007c: 150f.

analytical questionnaire,<sup>42</sup> but can move directly to the creation of an analytical questionnaire, whose categories serve also as the principal variables for statistical analysis.

The problem with this approach is that it relies entirely on cumulative pre-selections of information over which the prosopography has no control: (a) the selections made by the authors of the relevant Jaina-texts, (b) the selections and formatting decisions executed by the compilers and editors of the bibliographical, epigraphical, and biographical catalogues, and other publications used. Like all prosopographies, the JP is “entirely dependent on its sources” (Keats-Rohan 2007c: 147). The bias built into the available data cannot be avoided at this third stage of research.

The prosopographer has to make two fundamental selections him- / herself, namely (a) of the field of study, and (b) of relevant sources. Since there are limits of time and resources, eventually a selection of sources has to be made, even if initially the net has to be cast as wide as possible, within given parameters. Experience shows that the only practicable way is to use published primary sources, such as compilations of inscriptions, colophons or manuscript catalogues, that is, selections of already pre-selected prosopographical data.<sup>43</sup> The only approach that permits the discovery of meaningful patterns in sets of published data, apart from case-studies, micro-studies, conspectuses, and indexes,<sup>44</sup> are computerised explorations of cross-links, including data that does not seem to be immediately relevant. The advantage of the use of secondary sources is that larger quantities of information can be absorbed and computed in a set period of time.

#### 4. Methodological Conundrums

Achieving consistency in the recording and coding of proper names, and unambiguously identifying individuals, is a precondition of any study of Jaina history. It is particularly

<sup>42</sup> Keats-Rohan 2007c: 148, 150.

<sup>43</sup> This conclusion was reached by A. H. M. Jones and H.-I. Marrou in their announcement of the project of producing a *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* (PLRE), published in three volumes by Jones, Martindale & Morris 1971, 1980, 1992 which supplements the, at the time, still unfinished *Prosopographia Imperii Romani* (PIR), which covers the earlier period.

“In order to establish the origins of the entries and to make certain that no reference to them are missed it will be necessary to collect many more names than will ultimately be published. After discussion it has been decided that it will be the only practical course to collect all references to personal names in literary sources. In dealing with inscriptions and papyri this would involve unnecessary labour and special instructions have been drafted” (Jones & Marrou 1950: 189).

As a supplement to Mommsen’s 1863ff. *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (CIL), PIR was envisioned by Theodor Mommsen 1874, 1895 in interaction with Adolf Harnack. The first three volumes were published by Klebs, von Rohden and Dessau 1897-8 and the last one by M. Heil in 2014. On the background to this “forgotten large-scale enterprise of the Prussian Academy of Science” see Rebenich 2003: 247-326, who produced a non-statistical “prosopography” (lit. “description of a face/person”) of one individual (Hieronymus) and his elite circle of friends and enemies (Rebenich 1992: 12). Like the earlier PIR publications, Jones and Marrou focused on the secular ruling classes, and excluded all clerics from the sample, while pointing to a parallel project on Christian-Prosopography by the French Institute of Byzantine Studies, the *Prosopographie Chrétienne du Bas-Empire* (PCBE) (1982 ff.), that took account of some of the relevant Roman data (on the history of the prosopography of religious officials in the Roman Empire, see the contributions in Cameron 2003 and Rüpke 2005):

“A committee has been set up under the auspices of the British Academy with the object of compiling a prosopography of the later Roman Empire (A.D. 284-641). Its object is to do for the later Empire what the *Prosopographia Imperii Romani* has done for the Principate, to provide the materials for the study of the governing class of the Empire. The majority of the entries will be persons holding official posts or rank together with the families, and the work will not include clerics except in so far as they come into the above categories. The French Institute of Byzantine Studies is simultaneously launching a Christian prosopography covering roughly the same period (A.D. 300-700) which will include all persons, whether laymen or clerics, who play a part in the history of Christianity” (Jones & Marrou 1950: 189).

<sup>44</sup> See for instance Winternitz 1910, Geldner (& J. Nobel) 1957.

significant in computer-supported prosopographical research. Investigations of relationships between individuals are predicated on the creation of a list of consistently formatted names to which all other prosopographical information is related, no least to enable statistical examination of selected variables with the help of analytical software and visualisation techniques.<sup>45</sup> Two sets of problems present themselves at this stage: (A) General problems connected with standardisation of data, particularly loss of potentially significant information due to excessive reduction of complexity,<sup>46</sup> and (B) specific problems related to the coding of Jaina names.<sup>47</sup>

### A. Coding Names

The general problem of translating raw data into analytical categories, without losing information that may turn out to be significant at a later stage of research or in different research contexts, has been aptly characterised by Schurer (1990: 77):

“The chief problem with assigning codes during the process of data entry is that one automatically loses all measure of flexibility. Since the real or true piece of information recorded in the record is substituted for a coded value, the way in which that information can be analysed is ultimately dependent on the coding scheme or classification substituted in its place. This means that if the code is going to act as a satisfactory substitute, when devising the coding classification the researcher has to correctly identify and anticipate all of the ways in which the information will be used in the course of subsequent analyses.”

Keats-Rohan (2007c: 171f.) warns that “when trying to account for name data making precise statements, as in the answers to a modern questionnaire, should be avoided” and stresses the need to remain close to the original evidence: “Variation or lack of variation form part of the evidence in relation to both the name itself and what it tells us about its bearer.” To avoid bias “[o]ften it is better to provide a prototype answer”:

“Success will depend on how well we incorporate contextual information into our registers. We need to remember that the data we extract represent both name forms - i.e. the functional parts of a naming system - and a statement of some sort about an individual person” (p. 172).

As far as the standardisation of relevant Jaina materials is concerned, the stock answer to these caveats<sup>48</sup> is that it is unlikely that much detail will be lost, since the great mass of

<sup>45</sup> Dion Smythe, in Keats-Rohan 2007: 170f. n. 96 observes, conversely:

“There are two cardinal sins for prosopographers: fission and fusion. In fission, a single individual in history is recorded as two (or more) separate individuals; in fusion, the opposite prevails: information about two or more individuals in the past is recorded under the heading for one individual.”

<sup>46</sup> Schurer 1990, Keats-Rohan 2007: 171ff.

<sup>47</sup> With regard to the statistical investigation of varieties of Jaina iconographical motifs, Bruhn 1986: 158 remains optimistic: “Apart from the question of reduction we can mention again that statistics may have - and normally does have - an opposite effect as well: it guarantees that the variety inherent in the material is fully explored.” The same point is stressed by Oliva 1998: 220 in a different context.

<sup>48</sup> Toynebee 1965 I: 327, in Rebenich 1997: 247:

“Since an early date in the present century an increasing number of students of Roman history have been spending increasing amounts of time, industry, and ingenuity in wringing the last available drop of inferential evidence out of these materials and in applying statistical methods of interpretation to their results. Their work has been invaluable, yet their findings have to be taken cautiously and examined critically. Able and active minds, reduced to a starvation-diet of knowledge, have fallen greedily upon the additional fare that the <prosopographical> approach to Roman history offers; and

available Jaina historical materials - inscriptions, colophons, chronicles - are already pre-formatted, and therefore ideally suited for “new-style” prosopographical research with the help of relational databases. Since the Jaina data are usually semantically thin, and relatively uniform, it will be hard to lose significant information, if the coding-system of custom-made sets of analytical variables<sup>49</sup> is sufficiently sophisticated, and close enough to emic classifications to cover most of the variation.<sup>50</sup>

The problem of coding names is, however, further complicated by the fact pointed out by Frege (1892),<sup>51</sup> Russell (1918),<sup>52</sup> and Gardiner (1940/1954: 66), that a proper name is not “necessarily a singular name” but usually a complex string of words of a primarily denotative function. Gardiner, nonetheless, adopted from John Stuart Mill<sup>53</sup> the concept of the intrinsic arbitrariness and meaninglessness of proper names:

“A proper name is a word or group of words which is recognized as having identification as its specific purpose, and which achieves, or tends to achieve, that

---

they have been under a constant temptation to read more into the evidence of this sort than can truly be found in it.”

<sup>49</sup> See contributions to Keats-Rohan 2007a: 102, etc.

<sup>50</sup> In 1894, Max Müller suggested to Moritz Winternitz to create an analytical index to the *Sacred Books of the East*, including some verbatim quotations, though some volumes of the SBE had yet to be published. Winternitz 1910: xi-xiv agreed, and it was decided that the index should not be a plain list but more of “a Manual of the History of Eastern Religions,” providing “a *scientific classification of religious phenomena*” rather than keywords based on modern evolutionary theories. The task of creating analytical indexes involves the same problems of categorization as the task of producing a prosopographical data-model, as the following example demonstrates:

“The student of religion will look in vain in this index for such terms as Animism, Fetishism, Tabu, Totemism, and the like. May not this be a useful warning that these terms refer only to theories and not to facts of religion? On the other hand, the student will be assured that everything he finds in this Index is a religious fact. [...] Moreover, many things [...] do not refer to religion at all, but to all kinds of matters of importance for the Antiquarian. This is in itself an important lesson to learn” (p. xiv).

Winternitz worked on the index between 1895-8 in Oxford, creating 10,000 slips, and then again, on and off, from 1900 till publication in 1910. Since some inconsistencies proved unavoidable, cross-references were used as much as possible to compensate for this (p. xiii). Moreover:

“It was necessary to make *sub-divisions* in such articles, and to arrange the passages under different *sub-headings*. It was this work of arranging and condensing the raw material that caused so much delay. Many slips had to be rewritten, and the volumes of the *Sacred Books* had constantly to be referred to, and numerous passages to be verified.

These sub-divisions and sub-headings required most careful consideration. It was not possible to make them according to one uniform scheme; they had to be chosen in each case differently as seemed most suitable for practical purposes. Sometimes it seemed to be more practical to make them according to the different religions, sometimes according to the subject-matter. Consistency could not be aimed at – the chief aim was practical usefulness. Sometimes it seemed more practical to arrange the passages under several sub-headings, sometimes it seemed preferable to collect them under one heading, indicating sub-division by dashes (-)” (Winternitz 1910: xii).

<sup>51</sup> Frege 1892/1986: 27/41:

“Die Bedeutung eines einzelnen Gegenstandes kann auch aus mehreren Worten oder sonstigen Zeichen bestehen. Der Kürze wegen mag jede solche Bezeichnung Eigenname genannt werden.”

<sup>52</sup> See Russell (1918) 1972/2010: 29 on proper names as “abbreviations for descriptions” of “complicated systems of classes or series,” and his later “bundle-theory” of description, influencing Wittgenstein 1953 § 79, Searle 1958, Maclean 2001: 44-7, 115-17, and others.

<sup>53</sup> Mill 1843/1872 I: 36 considered only denotative but not connotative meaning: “The only names of objects which connote nothing are *proper names*, and these have, strictly speaking, no signification.” The opposite view, that a proper name is based on the application of a truth-value to a thing, was expressed by Frege and Russell (who acknowledge that the relationship between signifier and signified is “willkürlich”). Frege 1892/1986: 36/50 emphasises that, if used as a proper name, a sign or sign-combination (appellation) necessarily connects a thought (sense) with an object (reference) through the application of the predicates “true” or “false”: “der bloße Gedanke gibt keine Erkenntnis, sondern erst der Gedanke mit seiner Bedeutung, d.h. seinem Wahrheitswert.” See also Kripke’s (1973) 2013: 4ff. discussion, Searle 1983/1989: 242, and Wolf 1985/2015: 31.

purpose by means of its distinctive sound alone, without regard to any meaning possessed by that sound from the start, or acquired by it through association with the objects thereby identified” (p. 73).

Lévi-Strauss (1962/1966: 200) responded with a “diametrically opposite” theory,<sup>54</sup> namely that proper names are an integral part of systems of codes, similar to Linnaean species names, as far as they function as categories in meaningful systems of classification.<sup>55</sup> According to him, the word or string of words constituting a personal name is “a means of allotting positions in a system admitting of several dimensions” (p. 187), which has at the same time an individualising and a generalising function: “just as an individual is part of the group, so an individual name is ‘part’ of the collective appellation” (p. 174).<sup>56</sup> Hence, “the same term can, depending only on its position in a context, play the part either of a class indicator or of an individual determinant” (p. 188): “In every system, therefore, proper names represent the *quanta of signification* below which one no longer does anything but point” (p. 215).<sup>57</sup> From the perspective of such an interpretation of naming as classification<sup>58</sup> it is easy to see that “[t]here is an imperceptible transition from names to titles, which is connected not with any intrinsic property of the terms in question but with their structural role in a classificatory system from which it would be vain to claim to separate them” (p. 190).<sup>59</sup> The personal name appears at the same time as the most concrete designator, with its “residue of unintelligibility - to which, in the last analysis, concreteness itself is reducible” (p. 172), and as the most elementary form of social classification.<sup>60</sup>

In contrast to Lévi-Strauss, Alford’s (1988) investigation of naming practices across cultures, based on the unrepresentative samples of the *Human Relations Area Files*, rightly or wrongly, distinguishes between “initial naming” (umbilical names) and “classification” (individualisation), in an attempt to differentiate the components of strings of words with naming function. It also analyses name changes and (non-) uses of names and role-terms. Alford notices, for instance, that small-scale societies tend to use primarily kinship-terms for the identification of individuals, rather than personal names, which do not locate an individual precisely within a social structure, and can be changed, often without consequence.<sup>61</sup> This is a significant observation, even taking into account the role of

<sup>54</sup> Without reference to Frege and Russell.

<sup>55</sup> Lévi-Strauss 1962/1966: 172:

“Thus we reach the final level of classification: that of individuation, for in the systems we are considering here individuals are not only ranged in classes; their common membership of the class does not exclude but rather implies that each has a distinct position in it, and that there is a homology between the system of individuals within the class and the system of classes within the superior categories. Consequently, the same type of logical operation links not only all the domains internal to the system of classification but also peripheral domains [...] [W]e are faced with a twofold paradox. We need to establish that proper names are an integral part of systems we have been treating as codes: as means of fixing significations by transposing them into terms of other significations.”

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Rosaldo 1984: 11: “From the vantage point of social designation Ilongot naming involves two major movements, one of individuation and the other of differentiation.”

<sup>57</sup> “The only words one does use as names in the logical sense are words like ‘this’ or ‘that’” (Russell (1918) 1972/2010: 29). See also Kripke (1973) 2013: 15 Fn. 15.

<sup>58</sup> It was also adopted by Bourdieu 1989. The term “para-system,” designating functions of suffixes in onomastic analysis (Harvalík 2015), is more limited in scope.

<sup>59</sup> “Einige Namen darf man also am ehesten mit Titeln vergleichen” (K. Birket-Smith, *Geschichte der Kultur* 1957: 333, in Gonda 1970: 57).

<sup>60</sup> Lévi-Strauss approach was evidently prefigured by A. Comte 1844 / 1865: 366:

“Again there is the institution of baptismal names, which though little thought of at present, will be maintained and improved by Positivism. It is an admirable mode of impressing on men the connection of private with public life, by furnishing everyone with a type for his own personal imitation.”

<sup>61</sup> While reflecting a preliminary stage of research, Alford’s 1988: 184f. coding system must be taken into account in the process of construction of any prosopographical data-model: 1. Name signalling social membership, 2. Parenthood, 3. Time of naming ceremony, 4. Name giver, 5. Technique of name selection, 6. Naming ceremonies regarding original name, 7. Naming ceremonies regarding subsequent names, 8. Family

classificatory kinship terms. The matter may appear in a different light, however, if titles are considered part of the full name of an individual. Lévi-Strauss (1962/1966: 183) points out that both proper names and kinship terms “used as terms of address are individual terms,” but function as group terms if “used as terms of reference.”<sup>62</sup>

Because of significant cross-cultural variation of the types and sequences of the components of full names,<sup>63</sup> Keats-Rohan (2007c: 166) concludes that it is generally not advisable to encode “the elements of a name set in terms of their order.”<sup>64</sup> As a solution to the problem of variation in both emic and etic terminology, if not the sequence of elements, she proposes to take “the” “given name” as the principal reference point, and relate all other name elements to it as “descriptors,” in no particular order:

“This gives us a straightforward basis for the setting out of our registers of name records: a field for name, representing the first or given name if it occurs, and the descriptor or descriptors, that is, any byname or other description relating to an individual. The minimum requirement for our purposes is that the description refers to an individual and permits us to identify that individual as such. Where homonyms are common and other means of individualization, such as date records or records indicating personal relationships, are lacking, there is no choice but to assume each record relates to a separate individual, however unlikely that is” (Keats-Rohan 2007c: 170).<sup>65</sup>

---

names, 9. Patronyms, 10. Great or sacred names, 11. Clan or lineage names, 12. Given names, 13. Types of semantic meaning of names, 14. Derogatory names, 15. Sextyping, etc.

<sup>62</sup> The cross-cultural anthropology of proper names draws mainly on the contributions in Hastings 1917 IX: 130-81, Gardiner 1940/1954, Lévi-Strauss 1962/1966: 200-50, Tooker & Conklin 1984, Alford 1988. Worth noting in this context is also the work of Lawson 1996, etc. Recently Bodenhorn and Vom Bruck 2006: 8 stressed, besides the individualising, limiting function of personal names, also the protecting, masking and boundary-transcending potential of naming practices:

“Names may reveal crucial information about gender, kinship, geographical origin, or religion. The potential for the name to become identical with the person creates the simultaneous potential to fix them as individuals and as members of recognized social groups. It is their detachability that renders names a powerful political tool for establishing or erasing formal identity, and gives them commodity-like value. And it is precisely their detachability that allows them to cross boundaries” (S. 3f.).

<sup>63</sup> In China and Japan, for instance, the family name comes first, and in Portugal and Spain two family names, derived from the father’s and the mother’s family, are the rule.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Bruhn 1969: 231 on “the trouble of establishing a *sequence* of divisions” in iconographic analysis.

<sup>65</sup> It is worthwhile citing Keats-Rohan’s 2007c: 176f. practical recommendations at length:

“Essentially we want to distinguish between a given name and any following descriptors, be they relationship terms, titles, bynames or surnames. Additional problems not so far mentioned include the unnamed or anonymous persons who are nonetheless recognizable as individuals, and the collectivities, such as ‘the monks of Abingdon’, who act as a single legal entity; the same entity is also expressed in the term ‘the church (or abbey) of Abingdon’. All of these need to be accommodated in our table, since this will form the basis for a subsequent analysis of the name records as distinct individual persons. Each row (the ‘answers’ to the ‘questions’ posed by the field names) should be unique, even if there is a duplicate value for the name. This uniqueness is normally enforced by a record number, often automatically entered by software such as Microsoft Access, which might be called Entry Number or Entry ID (identifier). The second field should be a Reference ID, locating the information in its source of origin. Subsequent fields will give the name information. We could use ‘Name’ to stand for the first or given name; it is shorter than ‘anthroponym’ or ‘forename’, the best alternatives. Further names are best described as Descriptor 1, Descriptor 2, and so on. If there is to be an onomastic or anthroponymic side to the work, adding a column coding the name record according to a system such as that used by *Genèse médiévale* would be valuable. For projects using the scarce data of the pre-modern world such an approach is strongly to be encouraged, given the wealth of information contained in name evidence. Since this is a register of name records from which individuals will be distinguished there is not much to be gained from attempting to analyse the name forms at this stage. What the name-records for each identified person reveal about office or family can be incorporated with far greater economy of effort and greater effectiveness into fields in a register of persons.



This is a very useful suggestion. Not entirely convincing, however, are Keats-Rohan's (2007c) terminological innovations, such as the proposed use of the ambiguous label "name" instead of "first or given name" (p. 177), because "personal name" "can nowadays refer to the whole name set" (p. 164). Equally confusing is the preference for "the term 'byname' or 'surname'" as being "more appropriate than 'family' name," particular in cases where two family names are part of the full name, as in Spain and Portugal (p. 166). Using empty categories such as "descriptor 1-n" avoids the imposition of de-contextualised pre-defined etic categories, but sacrifices analytical specificity, and hence prosopographical potential. It certainly does not solve the problem of developing and standardising context-sensitive categories for the distinction of types of name elements and of word sequences of proper names in South Asia. Essentially, a first-stage prosopographical database is created in this way, it seems, not a second-stage database, predicated on pre-defined analytical variables.

### Generic Names

In the *Jaina-Prosopography* database, the conundrum of producing capacity for quantitative analysis while retaining name variation evidence has been addressed in the same way as by most library catalogues, as well as the Text-Encoding-Initiative (TEI). A standardised generic name has been artificially created for each identifiable individual, in the said manner, to which all verifiable variations of given names, alternative names, and spelling variants, which are recorded as well, are linked.<sup>66</sup> Variations of proper names of locations, religious traditions and institutions, or castes, are registered in different ways. Names of places, regions, etc., are given in their "original" and "modern" forms, with "variants," while names of religious traditions and institutions, castes, lineages, etc., are given in a generic form and variants separately (e.g. the sect "Loṅkāgaccha" with variants "Luṅkāgaccha," "Lumpakāmata," etc.), taking advantage of the dual entry system for all taxonomic categories in the database, labelled by default "English" and "Hindi."<sup>67</sup> Proper names of lineages, exogamous group, monastic titles, etc., can not be translated in any unambiguous way, and are given in generic form and variants. Other taxonomic categories, such as "family relationship types" (e.g. "paternal grandfather / dādā," "maternal

---

As soon as we start to enregister our name data we will notice how slippery name evidence can be. Look again at the first charter and notice how two of those mentioned are assigned given names but described in terms of their relationship to someone else, 'his wife' 'my predecessor'. The 'faithful sons of the church' are an amorphous mass who need not concern us, but the Legate of the Holy Roman Church surely had a specific 'lord pope' in mind, since he refers to the authority of God, the pope and himself. If we shear Archbishop Ralph of the relational term 'my predecessor', we shall lose valuable information; so too if we simply enter the name Beatrice in her name record. With proper controls we can keep all the information together. One technique is to use the nesting techniques of text encoding. Applied to the opening our second charter [a narrative text related to British history] this would give something like this:

<name>Henry <descriptor>king of England</descriptor></name>, to <name> Maurice <descriptor>bishop of London</descriptor></name>, <name>Gilbert <descriptor>abbot of Westminster</descriptor></name>, <name>Hugh <descriptor> de Bochelanda</descriptor></name> and all his barons and ministers in France and England of London a thousand greetings."

<sup>66</sup> TEI-Tag-List with added emphasis: [www.tei-c.org/release/doc/tei-p5-doc/de/html/CO.html#CONA](http://www.tei-c.org/release/doc/tei-p5-doc/de/html/CO.html#CONA):

"Simply tagging something as a name is generally not enough to enable automatic processing of personal names into the canonical forms usually required for reference purposes. The name as it appears in the text may be inconsistently spelled, partial, or vague. Moreover, name prefixes such as *van* or *de la* may or may not be included as part of the reference form of a name, depending on the language and country of origin of the bearer. - Two issues arise in this context: firstly, there may be a need to encode a regularized form of a name, distinct from the actual form in the source to hand; secondly, there may be a need to identify the particular person, place, etc. referred to by the name, irrespective of whether the name itself is normalized or not."

<sup>67</sup> Databases in India usually define categories in Hindi, incorporating other Indic languages.

grandfather / *nānā*”) and “monastic relationship types” (e.g. “male teacher / guru,” “female teacher / *guruṇī*”) can and should be translated, both to facilitate data-entry, and to pre-structure the data pertaining to the analysis of relationships, and are given in generic English and a common Hindi forms. For each etic generic form, whether defined in Hindi or in English, a number of emic categories can be linked via the “add new” function of the *Jaina-Prosopography* database as in the above mentioned example of the Loṅkāgaccha.<sup>68</sup>

## B. Coding Jaina-Names

The coding of names cannot be attempted without taking into account emic naming practices and forms of classification. In this section, therefore, first the classical Jaina nomenclature is reviewed, and then problems of encoding names of Jaina householders and of Jaina mendicants, with particular consideration of the problem of name-changes during the life-course.

### Given Names and Full Names

Because the designations of Jaina monks and nuns are often composed of strings of words of different types and functions, it is advisable to differentiate between the elementary “given name” and the “full name,” including a given name, of the same denotative function. In the following, the term “given name” will be reserved for the former and the term “full name” for the latter.<sup>69</sup> Since in a Jaina monastic context, usually the “first given name,” bestowed by the family, is replaced by a “second-” or even “third given name,” a standardised form of the “last (known) given name” of an individual is entered as the “generic name” into the *Jaina-Prosopography*, which also records all prior names, including the “first given name.” The “last full name” of a monk or nun is effectively represented as combination of four variables: “given name,” “position,” “epithet,” and “nickname” or “byname.” Changes of position, etc., during the life-course are also recorded. In practice, there is no fixed sequence for these elements in the string of nouns and affixes that constitute the full name of a mendicant, though some sectarian customs are on record.<sup>70</sup>

#### a. Classification of Names in Jaina-Scriptures

In Jaina texts, the designation used for the types of karman that produce individual living beings is *nāma-karman*, not *nāma-rūpa* (“name and form”),<sup>71</sup> as in Vedic and Buddhist scriptures. *Nāma-karman* is understood to mean “[mind and] body-making karman,” rather than “Cerimonie der Namengebung (beim Kinde)” or “name-giving,” as Böhlingk and Roth (1865 IV: 111) and Monier-Williams (1899: 536, 1) have it, following examples in the

<sup>68</sup> The methodological problem of classifying variant spellings of proper names, synonyms, and homonyms is somewhat similar to the analysis of synonyms and antonyms in Jaina dogmatic, discussed by Bruhn 1987: 65, 74ff., 1993: 191f. under the label “cluster analysis” (a misnomer in the context of onomastics of proper names), which effectively also takes recourse to generic terms (cf. “basic term”) as designations for the underlying conceptual referent:

“The nucleus of a cluster is not a term but a fairly well defined concept, e.g. not *māna*, but ‘pride’ as expressed by terms like *māna* and *mada*. [...] There are centres such as pride, and there are conglomerations of words surrounding the centres. These words are subject to the semantic magnetism of the centres and take the shape of synonyms and antonyms, losing at the same time many of their original connotations.”

<sup>69</sup> The given name is not identical with the generic name in the *Jaina-Prosopography*, which, following the Jaina tradition and for practical reasons, treats group-indicators such as the affix *vijaya* as part of the generic name.

<sup>70</sup> See *infra*.

<sup>71</sup> Harvey 1995: 117 renders this as “mind-and-body.”

Hindu *Rāmāyaṇa*. For “name-giving ceremonies” Jaina texts only use the term *nāma-karaṇa*.

A full investigation of the Jaina theory of naming from the point of view of modern semantics and pragmatics would be highly rewarding. It is significant to note that the Jains have produced sophisticated onomastic classifications. The 5<sup>th</sup> century Śvetāmbara Jaina canonical text *Aṇuogaddārāṇi*, which tradition attributes to the monk Ajjarakkhiya-thera (Āryarakṣita-sthavira), distinguishes ten types of “names” (*nāma*), or rather “classifications” or “taxonomies,” and formally arranges them in terms of the number of their sub-types (1-10), yielding altogether 55 main categories:<sup>72</sup>

“What then is ‘name’? Name is ten-fold: unitary name, binary name, three-fold name, four-fold name, five-fold name, six-fold name, seven-fold name, eight-fold name, nine-fold name, ten-fold name.”

The enumerative form of presentation, used already in older canonical texts, such as the *Samavāya* and the *Thāṇa*, lends a superficial sense of coherence to heterogeneous materials. In view of the diverse contents of the classifications it is clear, however, that the intention of the author was to explain more or less exhaustively the types of names needed to describe all of that which is (*tattva*). Of particular interest are here the first two types of classification, *ega-nāma* and *du-nāma*, and the last type, *dasa-nāma*, which indicate how Jaina philosophers of the classical period approached the question of names and naming.

The term *ega-nāma*, “one-name,” or “one-fold-“ or “unitary classification,” designates the act of denoting every identifiable object there is with a single noun or “name,” whether it is a substance (*davva*), quality (*guṇa*), or mode (*pajjava*):

“What then is unitary name? Whatever names there are of substances, attributes, and modifications, their assigned designation is ‘name’ in the touchstone of scripture (*āgama*).<sup>73</sup> That then is unitary name” (AD<sub>1</sub> 209).<sup>74</sup>

Interestingly, the exposition of types of classification does not start with a distinction between proper names (*nomen proprium*) and appellations (*nomen appellativum*), but with the elementary act of naming (*nāma-nibandhana*).<sup>75</sup> An example

<sup>72</sup> AD<sub>1</sub> 208:

“se kiṃ taṃ ṇāme? ṇāme dasavihe paṇṇatte | taṃ jahā - ega-ṇāme<sub>1</sub> du-ṇāme<sub>2</sub> ti-ṇāme<sub>3</sub> cau-ṇāme<sub>4</sub> paṃca-ṇāme<sub>5</sub> cha-ṇāme<sub>6</sub> satta-ṇāme<sub>7</sub> atṭha-ṇāme<sub>8</sub> nava-ṇāme<sub>9</sub> dasa-ṇāme<sub>10</sub> |”

<sup>73</sup> It is remarkable that the text refers to the *āgamas*, that is, a canonised body of texts of which it is considered to be part by the later Śvetāmbara tradition.

<sup>74</sup> AD<sub>1</sub> 209:

“se kiṃ taṃ ega-ṇāme?  
ṇāmāṇi jāṇi kāṇi vi davvāṇa guṇāṇa pajjavāṇaṃ ca |  
tesim āgama-nihase nāmaṃ ti parūviyā saṇṇā ||17||  
se taṃ ega-ṇāme |”

Cf. Hanaki 1970: 62:

“Then what is one-named? The one-named (is explained in the following verse): Whatever names there are of substances, attributes and modifications have been assigned the designation of ‘name’ (used in singular number) in the touchstone of Āgama (scripture). This is one-named (that is, any thing in the world can be expressed by a ‘name’, all words being ‘names’ in essence).”

<sup>75</sup> The foundations of names are most extensively discussed by the Digambara *ācārya* Virasena in the section of his *Dhavalā-tīkā* labelled *Nibandhaṇāṇuyogaddāraṇ*, “Door of Disquisition on Foundation,” related to the six-fold *nikkheva* of *āvassaya* in DT 1/1.1.1 p. 10. The text explains the earlier application of the foundations of names and naming, and begins by listing the three kinds (*bheda*) of foundation for names (*nāma-nibandhana*) on which all their uses rest: “ṇibandhaṇam-atth’āhīhāṇa-paccaya-bheeṇa tivīhaṃ” (DT<sub>1</sub> 5/15 p. 2, line 3), that is, thing-meant, appellation, and definition (*artha-abhidhāna-pratyaya*).

Arguably, the distinction between *artha* and *pratyaya* anticipates the distinction between “reference” (*Bedeutung*, denotation, indicated object, truth-value) and “sense” (*Sinn*, meaning, expressed thought) in the

would be the name for “life” as such, that is, life (*jīva*) as a substance (*davva*), mentioned as one of the binaries under the following, second type of classification.

The term *du-nāma*, “two-name,” refers to any binary nomenclature, such as “mono-syllabic” (*ega’kkhara*) and “multi-syllabic” (*aṇega’kkhara*), or “life” (*jīva*) and “non-life” (*ajīva*). There are many individual kinds of “life” and “non-life.” They are distinguished by specific designations, amongst them “proper names” or “personal names” as we would nowadays say. Examples given of names for individual forms of life (*jīva-nāma*), that is, modes of the substance “life,” are the four personal names “Devadatta, Yajñadatta, Viṣṇudatta, Somadatta, etc.” (AD 214), and examples given for designations of individual non-living entities are the four words pitcher (*ghaḍa*), cloth (*paḍa*), mat (*kaḍa*), and chariot (*raha*) (AD 215).

For Āryaraksita, the most important binary is the distinction between “genus” (*visesa*) and “species” (*avisesa*) (AD 216.1-2), which implies a further distinction between “one” and “many,” as the great number of examples, illustrating the method of taxonomic classification, demonstrate.<sup>76</sup> To the genus “substance” (*davva*), for instance, belong the species “life” (*jīva*) and “non-life” (*ajīva*).<sup>77</sup> Rather than names of individual living or non-living entities, now names for types of life and of non-life are distinguished. *Jīva*, has four sub-types: hell-beings (*neraiā*), animals and plants (*tirikka-joni*), human beings (*manussa*), and gods (*deva*), which are further sub-classified (AD 216.3-18), as are the sub-types of *ajīva* in AD 216.19. The remaining five forms of being (*atthikāya*), besides *jīva*, and the sub-classifications of the first or the remaining five, matter (*poggala*), that is, the elementary atom (*paramāṇu*), occupying one space-point, and objects occupying two space-points (*du-paesa*), up to (*jāva*) infinite space points (*aṇanta-paesa*).

The fact that the principle of binary classification has been given a prominent place in the Jaina canon is worth noting. The description of the relationship between the distinctions “genus / species” and “life / non-life” further demonstrates that classical Jaina philosophy was familiar with the method of differentiating differences, that is, taxonomic classification, a method that requires switching perspectives at every level, since every species that can be further sub-classified functions also as a genus in its own right. The way in which proper names of individual living and non-living entities are placed in the taxonomic system demonstrates that a colloquial proper name was not treated as the most elementary form of classification, at least by Āryaraksita, as in the approach advocated by Lévi-Strauss.<sup>78</sup>

The difference between elementary names (*ega-nāma*) and designations for individual living or non-living entities may be explained in terms of Russell’s (1918/2010:

---

sense of Frege 1892/1986: 26/41, while *abhidhāna* refers to the word (*Ausdruck*) that expresses reference and sense. According to DṬ<sub>1</sub> 1/1.1.1 p. 19 (DṬ<sub>2</sub> p. 10), for instance, irrespective of the etymological meaning of the word, the term *māṅgala* stands for “auspiciousness” in eight senses: (i) one or (ii) many living entities (*jīva*), (iii) one or (iv) many non-living entities (*ajīva*), (v) one living and one non-living entity, (vi) many living entities and one non-living entity, (vii) one living entity and many non-living entities, (viii) many living and many non-living entities.

<sup>76</sup> The great significance ascribed to it is illustrated by the large number of examples given in AD<sub>1</sub> vv. 210-216.

<sup>77</sup> AD<sub>1</sub> 210, 213, 216:

“se kiṃ taṃ du-ṇāme? duvihe paṇṇatte | taṃ jahā [...]  
 ahavā duṇāme duvihe paṇṇatte | taṃ jahā - jīva-ṇāme<sub>1</sub> ya ajīva-ṇāme<sub>2</sub> ya | [...]  
 [1] ahavā du-ṇāme duvihe paṇṇatte | taṃ jahā - visesie<sub>1</sub> ya avisesie<sub>2</sub> ya |  
 [2] avisesie davve, visesie jīva-davve ya ajīva-davve ya | [...].”

<sup>78</sup> Lévi-Strauss 1962/1966: 161 emphasises that the logic of structural differentiation does not need to be homogenous:

“Starting from a binary opposition, which affords the simplest possible example of a system, this construction proceeds by the aggregation, at each of the two poles, of new terms, chosen because they stand in relations of opposition, correlation, or analogy to it. It does not, however, follow from this that the relations in question have to be homogeneous. Each 'local' logic exists in its own right. It consists in the intelligibility of the relation between two immediately associated terms and this is not necessarily of the same type for every link in the semantic chain.”

28f.) distinction between names “in the proper strict logical sense of the word,” that is, designations that “stand for an actual object,” and names, colloquially called “proper names,” that are from a logical point of view “abbreviations for descriptions,” that is, propositions asserting the unity of complex entities, which cannot be described exhaustively.<sup>79</sup>

The rest of the “three-fold” up to “ten-fold” “names” refer to classifications containing three to ten main sub-types. Of particular interest are the categories of the heterogeneous “ten-fold” nomenclature (AD 263),<sup>80</sup> which offers an analysis of different types of name-construction in the manner of modern onomastics:

Names determined according to

1. An existing quality (of the object) (*goṇṇa*)
2. A non-existing quality (*no-goṇṇa*)
3. First word (of a text) (*āyāṇa-pada*)
4. Opposite (meaning) (*paḍi-pakkha*)<sup>81</sup>
5. Predominance (of an element) (*pāhaṇṇa*)<sup>82</sup>
6. Beginningless doctrine (*aṇādiya-siddhamta*)<sup>83</sup>
7. Name (of another) (*nāma*)<sup>84</sup>
8. Part (of the object) (*avayava*)<sup>85</sup>
9. Association (with a substance, place, time, state) (*saṃjoga*)<sup>86</sup>
10. Standard (*pamāṇa*)<sup>87</sup>

The list anticipates modern onomastic analyses of Indic names, in particular point No. 10, which reflects naming-practices prevalent in ancient India, including the prescriptions for name-giving in the *Gṛhya-sūtras* and other Vedic texts.<sup>88</sup> Name-giving according to a norm or standard is said to be four-fold, according to the following *nikkheva* (AD 282), whose four elements suggest a “late-” or “post-canonical” date:<sup>89</sup>

<sup>79</sup> Russell 1918/2010: 16:

“All kinds of things to which we habitually give proper names are on the face of them complex entities: Socrates, Piccadilly, Rumania, Twelfth Night or anything you like [...]. They seem to be complex systems bound together into some kind of unity, that sort of a unity that leads to the bestowal of a single appellation.”

<sup>80</sup> AD<sub>1</sub> 263:

“se kiṃ taṃ dāsa-nāme? dāsa-vihe paṇṇatte | taṃ jahā – goṇṇe<sub>1</sub> no-goṇṇe<sub>2</sub> āyāṇa-padeṇaṃ<sub>3</sub> paḍipakkha-padeṇaṃ<sub>4</sub> pāhaṇṇayāe<sub>5</sub> aṇādiya-siddhamteṇaṃ<sub>6</sub> nāmeṇaṃ<sub>7</sub> avayaveṇaṃ<sub>8</sub> saṃjogenāṃ<sub>9</sub> pamāṇeṇaṃ<sub>10</sub> |”

<sup>81</sup> Names indicating the opposite of the real quality of an object, such as “cool fire” etc. (AD 267).

<sup>82</sup> Different types of ‘forest of \_\_\_ trees’ are listed as examples (AD 268).

<sup>83</sup> According to Tatia 1970: xxx: “when a word stands for an eternal principle.” The list of the six Śvetāmbara *atthi-kā[y]a*, or “fundamental facts,” that is, substances (*davva*), is mentioned as an example (AD 269).

<sup>84</sup> The name of father or grandfather for instance (AD 270).

<sup>85</sup> Things named after one of their parts, such as “winged,” a poet by a stanza, etc.

<sup>86</sup> The sub-classification is structured according to a canonical *nikkheva* (Skt. *nikṣepa*), a scheme of abstract standpoints. Many examples are given; for the names determined by association with a substance: for instance “ploughman,” etc.; for space: “born in India” (*bhāraha*), etc.; for time: “born in spring,” etc.; and for state (*bhāva*): “auspicious” (*pasattha*) and “inauspicious” (*apasattha*), examples being “knower” (*nānī*), “believer” (*daṃsaṇī*), “actor of good conduct” (*caritī*) for the former and “angry person” (*kohī*), etc., for the latter (AD 272-281).

<sup>87</sup> Another *nikkheva* is used for the presentation of four sub-types: *nāma’ppamāṇa*, *ṭhavaṇa’ppamāṇa*, *davva’ppamāṇa*, *bhāva’ppamāṇa* (AD 282).

<sup>88</sup> See Hilka 1910, Kane 1938, referred to in the next section. A systematic comparison remains a desideratum.

<sup>89</sup> Bhatt 1978/1991: 39: “The four standard determinants of the canonical *nikṣepa* are ‘*davva*’, ‘*khetta*’, ‘*kāla*’, ‘*bhāva*’. We designate as (canonical) *nikṣepas* such structures which have at least two of these determinants” (xvi). Bhatt translates the four terms as “substance, space, time, and non-physical nature” (ibid.), though D. D.

Names determined according to

- a. Generic name (*nāma-pamāṇa*) (e.g., *jīva*, *ajīva*, etc.)
- b. Arbitrary attribution / Representation (*ṭhavaṇā-pamāṇa*)
- c. Substance / Potential (*davva-pamāṇa*)
- d. Mode / Actual state (grammatical) (*bhāva-pamāṇa*)<sup>90</sup>

According to AD 12, the difference between a (generic) name (*nāma*) and an arbitrary attribution (*ṭhavaṇā*) is that “the name is life-long but the arbitrary attribution can be temporary or life-long” (Hanaki 1970: 3).<sup>91</sup>

“The *nāma-nikkheva* is used to examine whether a word is a meaningless (*arthaśūnya*) proper noun, or in a sense which is untrue (*ayathārtha*) of the word (being not satisfied with the etymology), or in a sense which is true (*yathārtha*) of the word [VBh 848]. [...] [A term] as a meaningless proper noun can be assigned to any object - living (e.g. person), non-living (e.g. a thing) or a mixture of living and non-living (i.e. a garden). [...]

The *ṭhavaṇā* [sic]-*nikkheva* serves the purpose of ascertaining whether a word is used either for such real-like things as a painting, a clay-model, a carving, and a sculpture, or for such imaginary article as a piece of fossil [...]. Such representations may be made temporarily or on a permanent basis” (Tatia 1970: ix).<sup>92</sup>

The *nikkheva* “arbitrary attribution,” designating the process of representing an object by a sign or symbol, offers a seven-fold sub-classification, which details different types of “proper names” (AD 284), illustrated by many historical examples (AD 285-291).

- i. Name of a lunar mansion (*nakkhatta-nāma*)<sup>93</sup>
- ii. Name of a god (*devaya-nāma*)
- iii. Name of a family (*kula-nāma*)
- iv. Name of (heretical) religious school (*pāsaṃḍa-nāma*)<sup>94</sup>
- v. Name of a (social) group (*gaṇa-nāma*) (e.g. Malla)
- vi. Name given to ensure survival (*jīviyāheu-nāma*) (e.g. Avakaraa, “(child) taken from the dust bin”)
- vii. Name given according to one’s wish (*ābhippāu[<i>ya</i>-nāma*)

The names referring to one or other of the six substances (*davva*), referred to by the third *nikṣepa*, that is, matter, time, etc., are not illustrated by examples. The “names classified by

---

Mālvaṇiyā in a review suggested as a better translation for *bhāva* “modification,” which is equally problematic. See also Alsdorf 1973/2001: 456/258 on the so-called “post-canonical *nikṣepa*” (Bhatt), which has mainly the form: “*nāma*, *sthāpanā*, *dravya* and *bhāva*”, “designation [...] pictorial or material representation [...] the material, concrete, non-mental aspect [...] the mental, psychical, spiritual, religious one” (ibid.), in contrast to the earlier scheme for instance in Utt 24.6.7 (p. 460/262). Alsdorf concluded his survey with a question: “Shall we conclude that *nāma* and *sthāpanā* were a later invention, that their addition to the older *Uttarādhyayana* *nikṣepa* caused the omission of *kṣetra* and *kāla* which were afterwards re-introduced, though not compulsorily?” (ibid.). In Bhatt’s 1987: 15ff. general catalogue, the category *nāma* is only found in the *Ṭhāṇa* in a handful of cases.

<sup>90</sup> DṬ<sub>1</sub> 1/1.1.1 p. 10 has six *nikṣepas*: “so vi chavviho, ṇāma<sub>1</sub>-ṭṭhavaṇā<sub>2</sub>-davva<sub>3</sub>-guṇa<sub>4</sub>-khetta<sub>5</sub>-kāla<sub>6</sub>-bhāva<sub>7</sub> maṅgalam-idi.”

<sup>91</sup> AD<sub>1</sub> 12: “*nāma-ṭṭhavaṇānaṃ ko paiviseso? ṇāmaṃ āvakahiyaṃ, ṭhavaṇā ittiriya vā hojjā āvakahiya vā |*”

<sup>92</sup> Cf. Tatia 1970: xxviii-xxxi.

<sup>93</sup> In Vedic times, a *nakṣatra*-name was given to a child in accordance with the particular constellation at birth.

<sup>94</sup> AD<sub>1</sub> 288: *samaṇaya* (commentary: *niggaṃtha*, *sakka*, *tāvasa*, *geruya*, *ājīva*), *paṃḍuṃgaya*, *bhikkhū*, *kāvāliyaya*, *tāvasaya*, *parivvāyaga*. Cf. Hanaki 1970: 101.

their grammatical state” (*bhāva-pamāṇa-nāma*),<sup>95</sup> finally, are divided into four sub-categories (AD 293):

- i. Grammatical compounds (*samāsa*)
- ii. Nominal terminations (*taddhita*)
- iii. Verbal roots (*dhātu*)
- iv. Etymologies (*nirutta*)

Names derived from seven types of compounds are detailed in AD 294-301, culminating in the so-called “single stem-compound” (*ekkasesa*), that is, a remaining stem, that denotes the meaning of two or more stems. An example given is the word *purisa*, which designates at the same time “one man / human being” and “all men / human beings” (man as a class), as much as the words “silver coin” (*karisāvaṇa*) and “corn” (*sāli*) denote as much one as well as all silver coins or corns (AD 301).<sup>96</sup>

Linguistically, single-stem compounds are “common nouns” or “nomina appellativa,” which denote any member of a class. They can be considered as illustrations for Russell’s (1918/2010: 29) argument, that what in common parlance are “proper names” are in reality “abbreviated (ambiguous) descriptions.”<sup>97</sup>

Eight type of nominal terminations, such as *tithayara-māyā*, are listed, producing the following types of names (AD 302-310):

- i. Name of a profession (in general) (*kamma-nāma*) (e.g., “one who is cutting leaves,” etc.)
- ii. Name of someone engaged in handicraft (*sippa-nāma*) (e.g., “basket-maker,” etc.)
- iii. Name expressing reverence (*siloya-nāma*) (e.g., “ascetic [*samaṇa*],” “brāhmaṇa [*māhaṇa*],” “guest [*savvātihī*],” etc.)
- iv. Name expressing a relation (*saṃjoga-nāma*) (e.g., “king’s father in law [*raṇṇo saurae*],” etc.)
- v. Name expressing physical nearness (*samīva-nāma*) (e.g., “mountain-village,” etc.)
- vi. Name expressing authorship (*saṃjūha-nāma*) (e.g., “Taraṃgavatikāra,” etc.)
- vii. Name expressing rulership, power, wealth (*īsariya-nāma*)<sup>98</sup> (e.g., “Lord of king’s,” etc.)
- viii. Name expressing progeny (*avacca-nāma*) (e.g., “mother of a tīrthaṅkara,” etc.)

Finally, five examples for words designating verbal roots are given (e.g., “bhū,” etc.) (AD 311), and seven examples for names formed according to etymology (e.g., “*bhramara* (bee)” because “it wanders (*bhramati*) and makes noise (*rauti*),” etc.) (AD 312).

<sup>95</sup> Tatia 1970: xxxii reads “essence (here ‘summary’)” and Hanaki 1970: 102 “essence.”

<sup>96</sup> AD<sub>1,2</sub> 263: “jahā ego puriso tahā behave purisā jahā behave purisā jahā ego puriso”: “As is one man, so are many men; as are many men, so is one man.”

<sup>97</sup> Russell (1918) 1972/2010: 29 (cf. pp. 79f., Frege 1892/1986: 28/42 Fn. 2):

“The names that we commonly use, like ‘Socrates’, are really abbreviations for descriptions; not only that, but what they describe are not particulars but complicated systems of classes or series. A name in the narrow logical sense of a word whose meaning is a particular, can only be applied to a particular with which the speaker is acquainted, because you cannot name anything you are not acquainted with. You remember, when Adam named the beasts, they came before him one by one, and he became acquainted with them and named them. We are not acquainted with Socrates, and therefore cannot name him. When we use the word ‘Socrates’, we are really using a description.”

<sup>98</sup> Since these occupational names / titles frequently feature in inscriptions the sub-divisions listed in AD 309 are worth mentioning in Hanaki’s 1970: 106, here slightly modified, translation:

“King of kings (*rāisara*), protégé of the king, police chief or revenue officer (*talavara*), governor (*māḍambīa*), family-head (*koḍumbīa*), man of property (*ibbha*), trader (*setṭhī*), caravan leader (*sathavāha*), and military general (*seṇāvāī*).”

A variation of the ten-fold nomenclature (*dasa-nāma*), which again has ten sub-types, can be found in Ācārya Vīrasena's 9<sup>th</sup> century *Dhavalā-ṭikā* (DT). The DT distinguishes, in this context, four types of names (*nāma-bheda*) or signs (*saṃjñā*):<sup>99</sup> generic names (*jāi*), proper names (*davva*), attributes (*guṇa*), and names expressing an action by means of a verbal noun (*kiriyā*), the examples for which overlap with those given in AD 263 ff. for the ten-fold nomenclature. The contents of the one-fold to nine-fold nomenclatures mentioned in the AD are not reflected in this important Digambara text.<sup>100</sup>

The sub-categories of the “ten-fold name” classification of the AD offer useful emic paradigms for the development of a questionnaire for the Jaina-Prosopography. However, the “unitary-” up to “nine-fold name” classifications are either too general or too specific, and include categories which are not relevant for prosopographical research.

Last, but not least, the Jaina scholastic literature on names and naming distinguishes three “serial orders of names” (*nāma-āṇupuvvī*):<sup>101</sup> regular sequence (*puvva-āṇupuvvī*), reverse sequence (*paccha-āṇupuvvī*), and irregular sequence (*aṇ-āṇupuvvī* or *jattha-tattha-āṇupuvvī*).<sup>102</sup> These terms can be used for the analysis of strings of names.

## b. Encoding Jaina Householder-Names

Historians facing the task of assigning a unique designator to a particular Jaina mendicant or householder are typically confronted with four difficulties: (a) name changes during the

<sup>99</sup> DT<sub>1</sub> 1/1.1.1 p. 17f. mentions four causes or reasons (*nimitta*) for naming, “jāi-davva-guṇa-kiriyā” (e.g., giving a benedictory name, or *nāma-maṅgala*, based on the intention of the bestower alone):

“There are four types of causes - (i) class, (ii) substance, (iii) quality, and (iv) action. A class is defined as a generality due to vertical or oblique similarities. (These are eternal properties irrespective of the modal changes of the system). Human-ness and cow-ness are two examples of classes.

There are two types of substances: (i) combinatorial (*sanyoga*) and (ii) intrinsic or inherent (*samavāya*). A combinatory substance is produced by mixing, conjunction, or joining, of two or more independently existing substances. The intrinsic or non-combinatory substance is inseparably connected with the substance.

The quality is defined as that property of substance which may be mutually opposed or nonopposed with respect to modes etc. (The word opposed here should be taken to mean different. Thus, the quality is sometimes different from the subject or non-different from it with respect to changeability or permanence).

The action is defined as the motion or vibration (subtle or gross) in the substance.

The class-based names are exemplified by cow, men, earthen-pot, cloth, column, and bamboo-stick etc. The names of combinatory substances are exemplified by terms like *danḍī* (staff-bearer), *chatrī* (umbrella-bearer), *maulī* (crowned) etc. (Here, man and substance, like the stick etc. independently exist before the combination). The examples of intrinsic names are ‘*kāṇa*’ (one-eyed man), ‘*kubarā*’ (hump-backed man), ‘*galagaṇḍa*’ (man with goiter) etc. (The characteristics mentioned here are inseparable from the body of the man).

The quality-based names are ‘*kr̥ṣṇa*’ (black), ‘*rudhira*’ (red, like blood). The action-based names are - ‘*gāyaka*’ (singer), ‘*nartaka*’ (dancer) and the like which involve action or motion.

There are no causes other than these four which lead to the tendency of naming any object” (DT<sub>2</sub> pp. 9f., cf. AD 208ff., Varṇī 1997: 582f.).

<sup>100</sup> DT<sub>1</sub> 1/1.1.1 p. 75:

“nāmassa dasa ṭṭhāṇāṇi bhavaṃti | taṃ jahā, goṇṇa-pade<sub>1</sub> ṇo-goṇṇa-pade<sub>2</sub> ādāṇa-pade<sub>3</sub> paḍivakkha-pade<sub>4</sub> aṇādiya-siddhaṃta-pade<sub>5</sub> pādhaṇṇa-pade<sub>6</sub> nāma-pade<sub>7</sub> pamāṇa-pade<sub>8</sub> avayava-pade<sub>9</sub> saṃjoga-pade<sub>10</sub> cedi |”

The keywords are explained in DT<sub>1</sub> pp. 75-79, cf. AD<sub>1</sub> vv. 263-312. See also Tatia 1970: xxxii.

<sup>101</sup> AD<sub>1</sub> 93 has *nāma-āṇupuvvī* as the first of ten types of series, the first four of which correspond to the canonical *nikkheva* (Skt. *nikṣepa*).

<sup>102</sup> The three sub-types of the series in AD<sub>1</sub> 207 (“*puvvaṇupuvvī<sub>1</sub> pacchāṇupuvvī<sub>2</sub> aṇāṇupuvvī<sub>3</sub>*”) and DT<sub>1</sub> 1/1.1.1 p. 74 (“*puvvaṇupuvvī<sub>1</sub> pacchāṇupuvvī<sub>2</sub> jatthattatthāṇupuvvī<sub>3</sub>*”) are identical, despite the fact that an attempt has been made by Vīrasena to distinguish his series by using the word *yatra-tatra*, “anywhere whatever,” instead of *aṇ-āṇupūrvī*, “non-sequence.”



life-course, (b) alternative names, (c) variant spellings, and (d) the frequent occurrence of homonyms, which render the identification and labelling of historical personalities notoriously difficult. These four fundamental obstacles for the consistent coding of names, can be discussed under two, already mentioned, headings: (1) problems of standardisation of names, (2) problems of identification of individuals.<sup>103</sup> The remainder of this article will address different aspects of the analysis and coding of Jaina proper names.

Keats-Rohan (2007c: 172) states, that “[t]he solution to problems presented by name data is specific to the particular sources being used and the use to which the researcher wished to put the data.” This is evidently true. The *Jaina-Prosopography* nonetheless aims at a high degree of standardisation to render interaction of the resulting data-set with library-catalogues and research-oriented databases such as PANDIT or PERSO-INDICA possible. This can only be achieved by adopting a method of standardisation which remains, on the one hand, as close as possible to the emic terminology, which can be in turn grouped under analytical categories as required by a specific research project,<sup>104</sup> and, on the other hand, replicates categories that are widely shared across existing data-bases, and compatible with emic categories.

While culturally specific characteristics of names has been explored from the 19<sup>th</sup> century onwards,<sup>105</sup> predominantly from an etymological point of view, the semantical and socio-linguistic analysis of names and their uses is still in its infancy.<sup>106</sup> For the componential analysis of Indic names, the works of Hilka (1910: 46ff.), Ranganathan (1934: 241ff.), and Sharma (2005) are paradigmatic. Hilka (1910) distinguishes two main groups of Indic names: (a) simple names, with a single stem, and (b) bi-partite full names (*zweiteiliger Vollname*), produced by the amalgamation of two meaningful elements, which are often shortened again in a second step. He finds simple names mostly associated with persons of low status.

Hilka contrasts the predominantly di-morphic Indic naming system with the tri-nominal naming system (*praenomen, nomen, and cognomen*) of the upper strata of classical Rome,<sup>107</sup> which focussed on hereditary, status-indicating family names (*nomen*), noting that the first element of the di-morphic Indic system should ideally be a name and the second element a verb (p. 46). In the Vedic texts, basic variations of this type are derived from the grammatical possibilities of forming compounds:<sup>108</sup> noun + noun, adjective + noun (e.g. *mahā-vīra*), noun + adjective, noun + participle perfect passive (e.g. *jina-datta*), noun + verb, verb + noun, particle at the beginning of the name, numeral + noun (47-55). Nicknames or sobriquets (*Kosenamen*)<sup>109</sup> are generally interpreted by Hilka as shortened forms of full names (hypocorism) (e.g. *vīra*). They can also be created by means of added suffixes (p. 62).<sup>110</sup> Reversals of elements of the full proper name are observed to be very common, as well as homonyms - which are often products of synonymic name variation (p. 71) -, bynames as honorifics (*biruda*) added to common names, especially to royal names (p. 72f.), and sequential variation of the elements of composite names or name-elements

<sup>103</sup> For the general problem, see Strawson 1959/2011: 15-31.

<sup>104</sup> On the application of the category “patronage,” for instance, see Flügel 2018.

<sup>105</sup> For Indic materials, see for instance Gubler 1903, Hilka 1910, Heimann 1931, Hoffmann 1941, Ranganathan 1934/1945, Chakrabarti 2013.

<sup>106</sup> Useful paradigms are offered by Lévi-Strauss 1962/1966: 184 and Maxwell 1985.

<sup>107</sup> Represented in the prosopography of Rüpke 2005/2008, 2007: 5 in the sequence of modern bibliographies: first *nominon gentile*, then other *nomina, cognomina, praenomina*.

<sup>108</sup> Emeneau 1978: 114.

<sup>109</sup> “Eigentliche Spitznamen und so auf eine Einmaligkeit zurückdeutende Namen sind in Indien selten” (Heimann 1931: 153).

<sup>110</sup> Heimann 1931: 141:

“In Indien ist eine Kürzung nur möglich, wenn sie durch Fortlassen des lediglich unterstreichenden Suffixes oder des nur metaphorisch gebrauchten Beinamens erfolgt (vgl. unsere obigen Beispiele für die Fortlassung von -Varman, -Deva, -Śarman, -Nātha, -Vardhana, -Sinha und Śrī-).”

leading to a great variety of names.<sup>111</sup> Notably, women used to be named after their husband (p. 148).

Heimann (1931: 142) criticised Hilka for associating particular names or elements thereof with particular social classes (*varṇa*),<sup>112</sup> while disregarding the case of royal names which tend to draw on all types of names, not least typical components of *brāhmaṇa* names (e.g. <sup>2</sup>*deva*) and typical components of *vaiśya* names (e.g. <sup>2</sup>*gupta*). She argues that in India all names and name-elements carry meaning, need to be investigated etymologically, and show characteristics more of bynames (or rather: epithets) than of individualising names,<sup>113</sup> as in ancient Iran.<sup>114</sup> This is illustrated with reference to the popular designations for the two principal “founders of religion” in India: the “Buddha” and the “Jina” or “Mahāvīra,” and even more so by their bynames (p. 144).<sup>115</sup> This perceived feature is seen to be responsible for the numerous homonyms, which create as much difficulty for the historian of South Asia as the unresolved problems of distinguishing individual names and *gotra*-names, as well as patronyms and *gotra*-names (p. 145).<sup>116</sup> Rulers, of course, came from all strata of Indian society and it is therefore a well-known problem to position *kṣatriya*-practices unambiguously in a theoretically conceived caste-hierarchy. In view of the same rules of name-formation in the *Gṛhya-sūtras*, first investigated by Hilka (1910) and Kane (1938), Kous (1980: 17) comes to similar conclusions as Hilka:

<sup>111</sup> Heimann 1931: 154:

“Jedes indische Wort ist zerlegbar in Präfix, Stamm und Suffix. Jeder indische Verbstamm ist durchschaubar in all seinen Abwandlungen durch Kausativ-, Desiderativ-, Intensivbildung, Präsens- und Perfektreduktion, durch seine konsonantischen und vokalischen Veränderungen im An-, Mittel- und Auslaut. All diese Zerlegungs- und Veränderungsmöglichkeiten macht sich die indische Etymologie zunutze.”

<sup>112</sup> Kous 1980: 17, however, made similar suggestions as Hilka: “The most probably reason for laying down such hard and fast rules seems to be that Aryans were not willing to mix with non Aryan people who used to have the names restricted by Manu.”

<sup>113</sup> “Sie sind durchweg mehr Bei- als [Eigen-] Individualnamen” (Heimann 1931: 143):

“[D]as Individuum hebt sich nicht als Einzelnes heraus und, wenn es anschaulich hervortritt, so erscheint es als Mitglied eines oder mehrerer Verbände, die sich im Kosmischen decken und überschneiden” (p. 155).

<sup>114</sup> Justi 1895: 132b.

<sup>115</sup> Horsch 1965: 240 explains the interpretation of the Jina’s byname *Nāyaputta* (Skt. “Nāthaputra”) sociologically:

“Hiermit vergleiche man den Beinamen Jinas «Nāthaputta» und Gosālas, Gründer des Ājīvika-Ordens, «Makkhaliputta». In der Sanskritversion und in der tibetischen Übersetzung bleibt kein Zweifel, daß die Mutter gemeint war: Maskarin, Sohn der Gosālī; Sañjayin, Sohn der Vairatī; Nirgrantha, Sohn der Jñātī.”

He argues: “Wie uns scheint, liegt in dieser Betonung der Abstammung mütterlicherseits eine pejorative Absicht der Buddhisten” (ib., Fn. 36).

<sup>116</sup> Kane 1938: 241 concludes his review of Vedic naming-practices:

“Throughout the Vedic literature, the names given to a person were his own secular name[, a secret name (*guhya-nāma*),] and one or more other names derived either from his father’s or grandfather’s name, or from his gotra or from a locality or from the name of his mother. [...] Most of the names of authors whose views are mentioned by such an ancient work as Yāska’s *Nirukta* are either gotra names or patronymics e.g. Āgrāyaṇa, Aupamanyava, Audumbarāyaṇa, Kautsa, Gārgya, Maudgalya, Vārśyāyaṇi, Śakāyana, Śakalya, Sthaulāṣṭhivi, though a few like Carmaśiras and Śakapūṇi are probably individual names.”

The texts mention that the given name is bestowed to protect from evil spirits, a second name to increase prosperity etc. A typical name would combine GN+FN+GoN, e.g. the king named Sutvan Kairiśi Bhārgāyaṇa (pp. 226f.). Often, the second name would be an epithet derived from the father’s name: “We find that sometimes the same speaker is referred to by his own name, sometimes by his gotra name and sometimes by a name which is patronymic” (p. 228).

“The most probable reason for laying down such hard and fast rules seems to be that Aryans were not willing to mix with the non-Aryan peoples who used to have the names restricted by Manu. It is, perhaps, from here itself that the seeds for distinctive characteristics of different Indic names were shown. [...] The social status of the person to be named was also a determining factor for selection of a name.”

Sangave (1980: 294f.) observed that there are very few names that are typical for the Jaina householders; usually given names of renowned mendicants, and names of gods and goddesses of the Jaina pantheon, such as the *yakṣīs* Ambikā, Padmāvati, etc.,<sup>117</sup> and that the family names of the Jainas generally correspond to the naming systems prevalent in a particular region of India. Notably, “[I]n South India the common practice of writing a name of a person is the order of first the name of the native place, then the name of his father and then his name,” e.g. “Y. J. Padmarajiah stands for Yelekyathanahalli Jinadattappa Padmarajiah.”<sup>118</sup>

To date, European prosopography has hardly taken any notice of the important regulatory work done in South Asia, where it is plain for every librarian that European classifications of names do not work in situ, and that a clear approach needs to be agreed as to how to deal with significant regional variations such as these. Apart from variant spellings of names, particularly problematic are (a) the varying sequences of name-components, and (b) the varying forms and unclear classification of “family names,” which can be altogether absent, or can be classed in not always clearly identifiable ways as *kuṭumba-*, *kula-*, *gotra-*, *jāti-* or *dharma-*names, which prevents for instance the creation of consistent rules for cataloguing authors of books. Yet, already in 1961, the *International Conference on Cataloguing Principles* (ICCP) in Paris agreed a *Statement of Principles* for cataloguing which was published in a number of updated editions from 1963 onward. Its key principle is that the choice of entry-word for personal names in an alphabetical catalogue of books “is determined as far as possible by *agreed usage* in the country of which the author is citizen” (NaP 1996: ix, emphasis added).<sup>119</sup> A prior meeting of the *Indian Association of Special Libraries and Information Centres* (IASLIC) in 1961 in Calcutta on the *Rendering of Indic Names* based its deliberations largely on the relevant chapters of S. R. Ranganathan’s (1934/1945: 201-45) classical deductive work *Classified Catalogue Code*, an updated version of which still serves as the *National Cataloguing Code* in India.<sup>120</sup> For the disambiguation of homonyms it recommends local libraries to add as “a further individualising element” the birth date of the author in brackets, especially in cases of “one-worded names” (p. 241f.), also known as “idionyms.”

Accordingly, in the 1996 edition of ICCP-Principles, the official guidelines for India (NaP 1996: 92-7) accept the principle of “common usage” and adopt a region / language specific approach that permits the greatest flexibility within the overall westernised frame of scientific cataloguing authors’ surnames first and given names and additional name elements second.

<sup>117</sup> See also Hilka 1910: 104-7 and Heimann 1931: 144 on the prevalence of “dharma-names.” Kane 1938: 244 noted that in the Vedic tradition, “The name derived from a deity was originally derived from the deity presiding over the nakṣatra of birth. Later on the names of gods were directly used as the names of individuals, though this appears to have been originally forbidden.”

<sup>118</sup> Traditionally the caste name followed. See Ranganathan 1934/1945 below. Jaina families also sometimes use the modern place-holder of the caste name: “Jain.”

<sup>119</sup> The main delegates from India at the conference were Mr. Sen Gupta and S. R. Ranganathan. According to Koul 1980: 31, their main source was a working paper of Sen Gupta, and the article by Fazul Elaih. See Faḏal-Ilāhī, Khūrshīd, Anīs & Qaṣar, S. Ibne-Ḥasan 1961.

<sup>120</sup> Bhattacharyya 1974 narrates the history of cataloguing and classification in modern Indian libraries with a focus on Ranganathan’s work.

Analytically, however, for Hindi, Gujarati and Marathi as well as Assamese, Bengali and Oriya four name elements are distinguished in the document (personal name / given name, father's personal name, surname, pen name) and three name elements which are added: (a) as prefixes or suffixes (honorific titles: Mr., Śrī, etc.), (b) titles and qualifications, etc. (Śāstrī, Caudharī, Gosvāmī, etc.), (c) religious titles (Ācārya, Paṇḍita, Svāmī, etc.). The ICCP-Principles avoid prescribing a non-split form of compounded elements of a given two-worded personal name to avoid the mistaken categorisation of the second element as the surname (e.g. Rāmdās, not Rām Dās), because in reality this often happens.<sup>121</sup> It is acknowledged that in South Asia a wide variety of name patterns exist, from single-element (or: personal- or idionymatic-) name systems, which are globally widespread and usually di-thematic, that is, made of two combined stems,<sup>122</sup> to a two-element (or: bi-nominal) name system, that is, an idionym combined with a so-called surname, often a hereditary family name. It is further stated that often only the personal name and the father's name occur and are combined in any sequence, etc.<sup>123</sup> As far as the sequence of words in is concerned, Ranganathan (1934/1945: 206) laconically notes that, globally and also in India, “[e]very conceivable sequence is found in a Name-of-Person among the Given Name, the Family Name, and the common nouns, and the auxiliary words.” For the purpose of modern catalogue templates, the ICCP-Principles recommend: for single personal names (e.g. Rājendra Prasād) to enter the direct sequence of words, and for bi-nominal names the “preferred or best known form, usually the last part of a name, a surname” (NaP 1996: 94).

For South Indian names, in Kannada, Telegu, Tamil and Malayalam, made up of three or four components (name of place / house or origin, father's personal name, personal name, caste / family name),<sup>124</sup> five typical combinations of elements are mentioned, usually utilising initials for the first components of the name and ending with the personal name (e.g. S. R. Ranganathan = PN+FN+PN). It is recommended that the main catalogue entry should be the personal name, combined with initials (e.g. Ranganathan, S. R.) (p. 95).

In Punjabi, finally, names are said to be usually combinations of a monothematic personal name combined with an additional complementary word (e.g. Surjīt Singh), which is sometimes supplemented by a family- or a place name, and religious honorific terms (e.g. Jñānī or Gyani) or titles at the end of the name. Interestingly enough, it is recommended to catalogue the full name, as in South India starting with the personal name element, not with a family name or with a “complementary word” such as “Singh,” which is certainly outside of India often taken for a family name and - following the now standard modern European model - mentioned first in the sequence of catalogued name elements. In view of the development of consistent global standards for cataloguing names, Kous (1980: 21) concludes: “for cataloguers the family name is the only solace.”

The objectively unsolvable question whether all family names should be treated as *gotra* names was answered in the affirmative by Ranganathan, who projected their origin indiscriminately into the prehistoric time of the *īsis*, while Benoyendra Sengupta<sup>125</sup> was “of the view that surnames in the earliest period of Indian history were generally unknown for

<sup>121</sup> In a note it is specified:

“The titles *Acharya*, *Pant*, *Pandit*, *Sastri* or *Shastri*, *Svami* or *Swami*, *Chaudhari*, *Naik*, *Pandeya*, *Patnaik*, *Pradhan*, *Set*, *Shah*, *Takur*, and *Vaid* or *Vaidya*, if used after a given name, may be used as surnames. If used before a given name they sometimes become part of a given name. All titles prefixed to a given name are not included in headings provided it has been determined that the titles are not in fact the given name or part of it” (NaP 1996: 94).

<sup>122</sup> See Grafflins 1983: 395 on the prevalence of “two-character given names” over “one-character given names” in China. The former “consist of a marker element (with demonstrable semantic content) plus an individual element (identical in nature to the one-character given names analyzed syntactically above).”

<sup>123</sup> For the anthroponymic terminology see Clark 1992: 456f.

<sup>124</sup> Emeneau 1978: 126f. also points to the addition of titles after the caste name, and to considerable variation. Nowadays, the caste name is often dropped or, among Jains, replaced with the descriptor of the religion “Jaina.”

<sup>125</sup> Sengupta 1961/1969, etc.

the reason that the caste system was not formed, hereditary professions did not crystallise and land ownership was not in practice. Hindus were known by their personal names. [...] They sprang up gradually either by the disintegration of the compound proper or personal names by use of an attached compound word” (Kous 1980: 19). Like Sankalia (1941-2, 1949: 152-7) in his earlier work on the names in inscriptions of Gujarat, Kous (1980: 20-2), in a summary tract on *Indic Names*, retracing the present dominance of “the English model” of naming in the north and east of India, points out that in U.P. “family names came into vogue in the nineteenth century” qua imitation only.<sup>126</sup> Most, but not all, family names, known as *kuṭumba-*, *kula-* or *gotra-nāma*, are different from the Vedic *gotra* names, going back to the lineages of Brahmanical *ṛṣis*.<sup>127</sup> They can be distinguished in most cases, because they derive from village-, occupational-, or ancestral names, or from names of events:<sup>128</sup> “They are patronymics of one kind or the other. Names of sub-castes were made to answer surnames. [...] the family name is made the last word in a name. [...] the name is broken into two parts. But after independence a tendency has started to drop the family name. At the same time the given name left behind continues to be written in the split form, as two distinct forms. But people remember them as a single word.”<sup>129</sup> The development is illustrated by the following example: Sriman Narayan [given name] (+ Aggarwal [caste- / family-name (dropped)]). Kous (1980: 23) also points to significant changes in Maharashtrian and Gujarati names, of which, from a pre-nineteenth century perspective, not

<sup>126</sup> Sankalia 1949: 154 juxtaposes the currently dominant practice of “mentioning our first name and then the father’s” which “originated by contact with Western Culture” with contrasting practice amongst Rajasthani Jains from the Caulukya period on: “Now if the ‘u’ indicating ‘son of’ [-utta, -u] drops out in usage, then the father’s name comes first, and then that of the son, leaving no indication of the fact. But the society [Rajputana Jains], in which this usage is prevalent, forgetting the original practice would give the father’s name first and then of the person concerned” (p. 153).

<sup>127</sup> A still useful discussion from a contemporary anthropological perspective of the “speculative” classical indological literature on the history and semantic transformations of the Vedic term *gotra*, by Kosambi 1950 and Brough 1953 for instance, which is often used as a paradigm for all types of “*gotras*” in Indian history, see Madan 1962: 61f., who highlights that the word *gotra* acquired multiple usages and that there are “non-Brahmanic *gotra*[s]” (p. 66). He concludes that nowadays the rule of exogamy alone defines a *gotra*: “The Brahmanic *gotra*, then, is not based upon kinship or descent, and is not a grouping in its own right. For men it is at best a category of people, sharing a common name, who *may* be agnatically related and *may* not, therefore, intermarry” (p. 75). The thrust of his argument, pointing to the rhetorical adaptation of a Vedic term to different contexts, is echoed by Mahadevan 2011: 89, and, for *gotra/gotta* names in Pāli and Buddhist Sanskrit literature, by Seyford-Ruegg 1974, von Hinüber 1978. On the “more general sense” of *gotra* in the Jaina theory of *gotra-karman* (the result of pride) see Bruhn 1993: 171 and Wiley 1999.

<sup>128</sup> For lists of *gotras* of the castes of the adherents to Jainism, partly created through group conversion by Jaina *ācāryas*, see for instance Nahar 1918, 1927, Hīrālāla 1923, Sangave 1980, K. C. Jain 1975, A. Nāhaṭā & B. Nāhaṭā 1978.

<sup>129</sup> Sankalia 1949: 156 makes the following observations on Jaina caste- and family names:

“In the Caulukya period we also have the earliest reference in Gujarat to the functional [Fn 1: must have already been there from 1<sup>st</sup> c. AD] and ‘regional’ ‘sub-castes’, as well as professional and other designations which have now been turned into surnames. Many of the present sub-castes such as *Porvād*, *Dharkaṭṭa*, *Osvāla*, *S’rimāla* were originally, as *S’rimālis* are even now, regional sub-castes, giving no indication as to the *varṇa* of the people. And probably many of the *Porvāds* and other families - originally foreigners, *Śaka*, *Gurjjara*, etc. belonging to central Asian tribes as their name-endings show - were first *Kṣatriyas* and then *Vaṇikas*. But it must be noted that in this period these were not endogamous groups, as marriage between *Prāgvāṭas*, *Moḍhas*, *Oisavālas* are recorded. Later these groups prohibit marriages among themselves. Now once again *Porvāds* and *Moḍhas* intermarry.”

He points out that many personal names are inspired by religious affiliation and personal deities. As reflected in personal names, “the cults of Rāma, Hanumān and Gaṇeśa are comparatively recent; that of Gaṇeśa not earlier than the 9th century and of Rāma-Hanumān definitely post-13th century” (p. 155). Further: “Political and religious causes which were responsible for bringing about the new additions to the already existing stock of names and suffixes seem to develop during the first 300 years of Muslim rule in Gujarat.” Similarly, Sankalia 1949: 181 highlights that the personal names from the earliest inscriptions are “mostly inspired by the new faiths, Jainism and Buddhism, or the existing Rudra and Nāga cult.”

the last, but “the first word should be the entry word” for a catalogue. He concludes: “It is futile to seek for an all India pattern of Indic names of person” (p. 24), and simply lists different regulations in different codes for cataloguing Indic names (pp. 29-32).

Components of contemporary Indic names have been analysed, for instance, by D. D. Sharma (2005: 78ff.) who uses the following analytical categories: CN = clan (*gotra*)<sup>130</sup> / caste / tribe / name, FN = father’s name, GN = given name, Matronym = name derived from mother’s name, MN = mother’s name, Patronym = name derived from father’s name, PN = place name, SN = surname, YN = yājñika name (of a Brahmin, derived from a special sacrifice performed).<sup>131</sup> His componential analysis of North Indian names (pp. 131-64, cf. Southern Indian names pp. 211-31) distinguishes mono-morphic- (basic stem + free formative element) and poly-morphic names (two-five stems + formative element), gender differentiator / indicator allomorphs (inherent gender of words, suffixes), and, in the manner of Hilka (1910),<sup>132</sup> and of the Jaina nomenclature, explores different combinations, such as synonymic combinations (e.g. Śiva-śaṅkara).<sup>133</sup> In the modern period he observes a shift from religious to secular names, from semantics to novelty, from denotative to abstract, and the “shedding of second components” of names for instance in contexts of address or for reasons of economy, e.g. Maheśa (-candra / -kumāra) or Madhu (-rānā), which in certain cases eliminates the caste indicator. Deletion and modification of names (Devendra -> Deven), adopting husband’s family name and of pan Indian given names (dropping of middle name, or generic gender marker, etc.), revival of obsolete ancient names.

Since most family names have no recognisable “Jaina” features, in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, at the time of growing communalist sentiment, Jaina laity in North India elected either to add the label “Jain” or “Jainī” to their name or to replace the family-name with one of these two unambiguous designators of religious affiliation.<sup>134</sup> The concept of “Jain unity” was an innovation of Jaina lawyers created in the context of British colonial rule post 1857, to secure recognition of the interests of “the Jaina community,” on the one hand, and to overcome the combined problems of “casteism” and “sectarianism” amongst the supporters of the Jaina tradition. Prior to this, religious affiliation of individual Jaina householders was mainly to one or other individual mendicant, mendicant lineage or *bhaṭṭāraka* seat. At the level of the lay following, religious and sectarian affiliation was not reflected in naming practices other than in the preference for certain given names. Sectarian affiliation was, after all, an individual choice.<sup>135</sup> Communal forms of religiosity, whether organised or unorganised, were not reflected in family names. Though some castes, such as the Osavāla, Śrīmālī, Huṃbaḍa or Chaturtha, are comprised almost entirely of Jains, and caste names served as indirect indicators of religious affiliation (the large majority of Jaina-Osavāla support one or other Śvetāmbara tradition), sect-castes were not marked by special names.

The increasing preference for the family names “Jain” or “Jainī” and for “Jaina marriages,” originally amongst members of the mixed Hindu-Jaina Agravāla caste from Hariyāṇa, has significant implications for prosopographical research. On the one hand, the task of the prosopographer is facilitated, because standardised family names and religious identifiers are provided. On the other hand, much information is lost, because the social

<sup>130</sup> Cf. Madan 1962.

<sup>131</sup> Sharma 2005: 82f. identifies four name elements, and eight name patterns, composed of two-four elements, in the literature of the Vedic period. Name elements: 1) GN, (2) Patronym, (3) Matronym, (4) CN. Name patterns: 1) GN+PN, (2) GN+FN, (3) GN+MN, (4) GN+FN/MN+CN, (5) GN+FN/MN+CN+YN (only for Brahmins), (6) GN+CN, (7) GN+PN, (8) GN+PN+YN.

<sup>132</sup> Not mentioned in the bibliography.

<sup>133</sup> Emeneau 1978: 114f. points out that the implication of the grammatical rule that in dvandva compounds “the first term is that which commands more respect” for compound names has not been explored by the grammarians. Evidently, the second member is often dropped. He comes to the widely shared conclusion that names do not need to make semantic sense.

<sup>134</sup> Flügel 2005: 3.

<sup>135</sup> Sociologically, as a religion of the individual, Jainism is a “sect.”

background of an individual is rendered invisible, that is, family, caste, region, language, and likely sect affiliation. The resulting proliferation of homonymic family names creates similar problems of individual identification as in the monastic sphere, a problem that is compounded by the fondness for the use of acronyms for given names amongst contemporary Jains. If a person of the name “S. Jain” is referred to, the inevitable question is: “Which S. Jain?” The issue is by no means trivial. It is well known that members of castes that are ranked low in traditional status classifications nowadays often prefer acronyms and/or religious names to avoid being instantly judged and unfavourably placed in the social system. This is not the case amongst Jainas, who tend to be “middle class,” socially and economically. Before the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the avoidance of overt religious group-labels amongst Jainas seems to have been motivated both by the lack of a sense of social identity as “Jains,” or as “Mūrtipūjakas” or “Sthānakavāsins,” and by the perceived need for anonymity under Śaiva or Muslim rule.<sup>136</sup> In addition to modern religious communalism, the preference for de-individualisation of family and personal names amongst contemporary Jaina householders has two further aspects. One is the universal, doctrinally informed preference for the typical rather than the individual in the Jaina tradition, and for the absorption of the latter under the former, which Bruhn (1954: 118, 1969: 229, 499) highlights in his studies of Jaina narratives and Jaina iconography.<sup>137</sup> The other is the new use of the status attribute “Jain” as a brand name in business (“Jain motors,” “Jain university,” etc.), which has become an issue of contention within the community. At the same time, decreasing role of religion in everyday life is evident today, and an increase of marriages across religious boundaries, especially amongst university educated young Jains, which may lead to a reduction of the use of the label “Jain” as a family name in future.

### c. Encoding Jaina Mendicant-Names

A major obstacle to the unambiguous identification of individuals in traditional Jaina settings are conventional or prescribed name-changes, that is, reference-shifts,<sup>138</sup> not only among householders, after marriage or adoption, but most significantly during the career of a Jaina mendicant. Most mendicant orders bestow a new name on neophytes at the time of their consecration (*dīkṣā*), and again during inaugurations to high office.

To mark the change of status from householder to mendicant,<sup>139</sup> in most Jaina traditions today, the head of the order bestows a new monastic name on the neophyte at the time of his *sāmāyika-cāritra-dīkṣā*, the first of two “initiation” and “ordination” ceremonies that are separated only by a few weeks or months. The customary name-change was criticised by the 15<sup>th</sup> century “protestant” Śvetāmbara Jaina reformer Loṅkā (TK 3), with reference to the fact that it is not evident in the Āgamas.<sup>140</sup> In most non-image-venerating Jaina orders the so-called “birth-name” (*janma-nāma*) or first “given name” is maintained as “root name” (*mūla-nāma*), even after initiation. Only in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the custom of changing names began to be adopted by the *a-mūrtipūjaka* traditions as well, at least in the Pañjāb Lavajī Rṣi Saṃpradāya (and in the Śvetāmbara Terāpanth).<sup>141</sup> However, two

<sup>136</sup> Cf. Williams 1963: xix.

<sup>137</sup> See *infra*.

<sup>138</sup> Cf. Wolf 1985/2015: 38.

<sup>139</sup> As in Catholic orders, apart from the Jesuits and Redemptionists. See Heimbucher 1907: 21.

<sup>140</sup> The reasons for Loṅkā’s criticism are presently not known. At stake is mainly the question of the quasi-Hinduistic “second birth,” indicated by the name-change, that is, the dis-/continuity between the statuses of householder and mendicant, which, according to Umeśa Muni 1974: 53f., is described in a text by Dharmadāsa named *Dharmadāsa nī Utpatti*. Controversially discussed is in the Sthānakavāsī literature the question of the continuing validity of the vows taken by a lay-person after initiation (Flügel forthcoming b).

<sup>141</sup> Birth-names (*janma-nāma* or *mūla-nāma*) or childhood-names (*śiśu-nāma*) are rarely mentioned in the old *paṭṭāvalis*. Some arbitrarily selected examples nevertheless indicate the trend toward name-changes: Ācārya Rāmalāla and Ācārya Sohanalāla - no name-change; “Tapasvī” Nihālacanda - birth-name: Īsvaraḍāsa;

examples from the milieu of the contemporary Terāpanth Śvetāmbara mendicant order illustrate the fact that considerable variation of name-giving practices exist, even within one and the same mendicant tradition, despite occasional attempts to standardise name-giving procedures within individual mendicant traditions.

The birth name of the present leader of the Śvetāmbara Terāpanth, Ācārya Mahāśramaṇa (b. 1962) was “Mohan Dūgaṛ.” At the point of initiation in the year 1974, a position description (*pada-nāma*) and a given name (*śramaṇa-nāma*), forming the word group “Muni Muditakumāra,” “Monk ‘Joyful Prince’,” was bestowed upon him by the reigning Ācārya Tulsī (1915-1997). In 1989, the administrative position of *mahāśramaṇa*, “great worker / ascetic,” was created for him, when he was appointed as an assistant to Ācārya Tulsī (1914-1997) and to his dedicated successor Yuvācārya Mahāprajña (1920-2010).<sup>142</sup> From now on, he was known as “Mahāśramaṇa Muditakumāra.”<sup>143</sup> After Ācārya Tulsī’s death in 1997, Ācārya Mahāprajña appointed him as his own dedicated successor, or *yuvācārya*, and bestowed the designation “Yuvācārya Mahāśramaṇa” upon him, “Junior Teacher ‘Great Ascetic.’” On Mahāprajña’s death in 2010, he was finally consecrated by the fourfold community as “Ācārya Mahāśramaṇa.” Altogether, three name-giving (*nāma-karaṇa*) and four monastic consecration ceremonies (*padābhiṣeka* or *padābhirohaṇa*) produced a sequence of three different given names (one householder and two monastic given names), and of four named monastic positions: Mohan Dūgaṛ -> Muni<sub>1</sub> Muditakumāra -> Mahāśramaṇa<sub>2</sub> Muditakumāra -> Yuvācārya<sub>3</sub> Mahāśramaṇa -> Ācārya<sub>4</sub> Mahāśramaṇa. The predecessor of Ācārya Mahāśramaṇa, Ācārya Mahāprajña, underwent only one change of his given name and two changes of monastic title. His birth name was “Nathamala Chorāḍiyā.” At initiation he was given the name “Muni<sub>1</sub> Nathamala.” A change to Mahāprajña’s given name was only made at the time of his elevation to the position of *yuvācārya* by Ācārya Tulsī who, in recognition of Muni Nathamala’s extraordinary academic achievements, bestowed the honorific designation “Yuvācārya<sub>2</sub> Mahāprajña” upon him, “Junior Teacher ‘Great Wisdom.’” Finally, he was consecrated as “Ācārya<sub>3</sub> Mahāprajña.”

In both cases, the first stages of the development were not pre-planned. Even the name-changes during the later progression in the monastic hierarchy were not based on canonical or customary rules, because no such rules exist, except for the dropping of the family name (*kuṭumba-*, *kula-* or *gotra-nāma*) at the point of initiation,<sup>144</sup> which nowadays is practiced in all Jaina mendicant traditions, but was not the case in early Jainism.<sup>145</sup> Even today, the given name is sometimes retained by a mendicant throughout life, at least in the *a-mūrtipūjaka* traditions.

Wiley (2004: xvi) highlights the fact that the names of Jaina mendicants tend to be changed at the occasion of a new initiation into a different order, which holds true even for the *a-mūrtipūjaka* traditions. She cites the well-known case of the Sthānakavāsī Muni Ātmārāma (1836-1896), whose childhood name Ātmārāma (“Dattī”) Kapūra (given on advice of a Brāhmaṇa)<sup>146</sup> was simply changed into Muni Ātmārāma at the point of initiation into the Gaṅgārāma Jīvarāja Saṃpradāya in 1853. In 1875/6, he joined the group of Ācārya Buddhivijaya (Sthānakavāsī name: Būṭerāya) of the Vijaya Śākhā of the Tapā-gaccha under the new name “Muni Ānandavijaya” which, after his promotion in 1886, was changed to “Ācārya Vijayānandasūri,” by way of a new title combined with a reversal of the sequence

---

Pravartaka Śāntisvarūp - birth-name: Dīvānasimha; “Yogīrāja” Phūlacanda - birth-name: Harisimha; etc. (Flügel forthcoming b).

<sup>142</sup> Many new monastic positions were introduced in the Jaina tradition in the post-canonical period (*pañnyāsa*, etc.), particularly in modern times. Most prolific in this respect was Ācārya Tulasī of the Terāpanth.

<sup>143</sup> The earlier, comparable positions of *mantrī*, “minister,” and of *nikāya saciva*, “minister for a section of the organisation,” had been abolished for the time being.

<sup>144</sup> Cf. Monier-Williams 1899: 536 on *nāman*, “personal name,” as opposed to *gotra-nāma*, “family name,” etc.

<sup>145</sup> See *infra* the section on the names of Mahāvīra.

<sup>146</sup> The Kapūra *gotra* belongs to the Khattrī (from Skt. *kṣatriya*) caste. For details, see Vallabhavijaya 1902: 33-5.



of the given name and the honorific affix and group designation “*vijaya*,” which indicates membership in one of the two branches (*śākhā*) of the Tapā-gaccha. Together, title, given name, and group membership indicator form the core tri-partite composite name of the male members of this tradition. The reason for shifting the determinant “*vijaya*” from back to front, which is typical for the Vijaya-Śākhā, is not entirely clear, and may be just an established convention. Vijayānandasūri is popularly known under the designation “Ātmānanda,” a nickname which combines his Tapā-gaccha and Sthānakavāsī names, no doubt to clearly distinguish him from Ācārya Ātmārāma “Panjābī” (1882-1962) of the Sthānakavāsī Pañjāb Lavajī Rṣi Sampradāya. Sometimes, however, he is also referred to as “Ātmārāma”<sup>147</sup> or as “Ātmāvijaya.”<sup>148</sup>

The problem, under which designation this monk should be listed in a bibliography or collective biography was addressed in different ways by different authors. Klatt (2016: 223, 225, 773) was evidently still in two minds about the identity of this monk. In his *Jaina-Onomasticon*, he has two entries to “Ātmārāmājī Ānandavijayajī” and to “Ānandavijaya Ātmārāma,” the second entry only referring to the first, but no entry to “Vijayānandasūri.” The question, which of the different names should be used for the name-index therefore did not arise. In her *Historical Dictionary of Jainism*, Wiley (2004: xvi-xvii) offers biographical information under his last, rather than under his first or his intermediate monastic designation: “In this dictionary, the entry is found under Vijayānandasūri, Ācārya. However, elsewhere his name could be indexed as Ānandasūri, Ācārya Vijaya.” As to the placement of the affix *vijaya*, the approach is inconsistent. In the case of “Hiravijayasūri, Ācārya,” it has not been moved to the front of the *ācārya*’s given name Hīra (p. 96), in accordance with common Tapā-gaccha practice.<sup>149</sup> Yet, not in accordance with common practice is the entry “Jaya, Ācārya (Muni Jītmal),” which lists an abbreviated variant of the epithet “Jayācārya,” “Victorious Teacher,” instead of the name of Ācārya Jītamala (Jītmal), which, admittedly, is also frequently done by participants (p. 106).

Dundas (2002: 297 Fn. 77), in his discussion of the affixes *vijaya* and *sūri*, regards the custom of shifting the affix *vijaya* at the time of promotion to the position of *ācārya* to the beginning of the name as a “fairly recent custom” within the Vijaya-Śākhā, but in a later study of his refers to many early examples, where the following options for referring to the Tapā-gaccha monk “Ācārya Hiravijayasūri” are recorded: “Hiravijaya” and “Hiravijaya Sūri.” Dundas (2007: 273f.) settled on “Hiravijayasūri,” to be able “to refer to the teacher even before his promotion.” Yet, he generally uses the standard form for “Vijayacandrasūri,” “Vijayānandasūri,” and others. Noting that “[s]cholars generally drop the title “*ācārya*,” and also frequently omit the “*sūri*” component of the teachers name, or separate it out,” a mixed approach is also favoured: the official title is dropped, but the title *sūri* maintained, at least in the case of Ācārya Hiravijayasūri, because the term *sūri* is interpreted as a “honorific” synonym of *ācārya* (p. 13). This raises the question why the same status should be referred to twice, given that “\*Hiravijayācārya” would also be possible as a short form of the name. Earlier jainological studies interpreted the title “*sūri*” predominantly as a designation for an *ācārya* who is a *primus inter pares*,<sup>150</sup> that is, not only a “teacher,” but also, and primarily, a “leader of the order” (*paṭṭadhara*). For “the lower monastic ranks,” Dundas omits administrative and honorific titles altogether, and writes for example “Devavimala” instead of “Devavimala-gaṇin.”

<sup>147</sup> Vallabhavijaya 1902.

<sup>148</sup> For details, see Flügel (forthcoming b).

<sup>149</sup> The present author was not able to locate any reference to a Vijayahīrasūri in a preliminary survey.

<sup>150</sup> The word *sūri*, “learned man,” is not exclusively used as honorific replication of the office-title *ācārya*, “teacher,” but also to differentiate the leader of the order from other *ācāryas* in monastic traditions, such as the Tapā-gaccha, that have more than one: “An *Āchārya* who has risen to the head of his *gachchha* or *śākhā*, is called a *Sūri*” (Hoernle 1890: 234). “The *sūri* is the chief of a *gaṇa*, *gaṇādhipati*. *Sūri* explained as *yuga-pradhāna* in Gaṇadhara-sārdha-ṣṭaka, as *ācārya*, ib. verse 42” (Klatt 1892 / 2016: 915). For inconsistency in the sources, see also Dundas 2007: 13f.

Though titles such as *ācārya* or *sūri* are technically part of the official name of a monk or nun, they are commonly dropped in academic publications, just like academic titles or the honorific suffix °*jī*, from *jīva*: “long live,”<sup>151</sup> and the prefix or suffix *śrī*, “fortune,” a name of Lakṣmī. The affixes °*jī* and *śrī* seem to be relatively recent features of North Indian inscriptions.<sup>152</sup> They can be bracketed together with other conventionalised “epitheta ornantia,” such as *mahārāja*, “great king,” or the “auspicious” numbers 108 or 1008 that are frequently added to Jaina mendicant names, without fulfilling individualising roles. Yet, functionally, they are more than ornaments. Their main function is to serve as generalised gender-neutral indicators of praiseworthy high personal status. The fact that no respectable person would employ honorific affixes self-referentially demonstrates that their use as indicators of the inferiority of the addresser to the addressee makes little sense outside a performative context.<sup>153</sup> In other words, de-personalised epitheta ornantia are schemata that are used to frame contexts of asymmetrical interaction.

The Jaina-Prosopography handles name changes during the life-course with the help of the following rules:

- a. Given names are treated as points of reference for additional components of composite full names.
- b. If a sequence of given names is evident, then the last given name is used as point of reference.
- c. Thematic components of composite names: titles, bynames, and honorifics are entered separately.
- d. Affixes and epitheta ornantia are dropped.
- e. As points of reference for variant names of individuals generic names are artificially created.
- f. In cases of identical generic names artificial differentiating labels are added separately.

Accurate data-entry as regards monastic names thus presupposes an analysis of the developmental history and components of full names.

## 5. Origin of the Custom of Changing Names at the Point of Monastic Initiation

The monastic naming system of the last centuries differs from the secular naming systems in India mainly because of the removal of family, clan or caste designations, which is sometimes accompanied by a change of the given name at the point of initiation (*sāmāyika-cāritra-dīkṣā*). This was not always the case. Originally, Jaina mendicants did not change their names at the point of initiation. They were mainly known under the names given by the family, and by their *gotra*-names. Mahāvīra and the *gaṇadharas*, too, evidently did not change their names after (a) simply going forth (*pravrajyā*), as in the case of Mahāvīra, (b) entering the mendicant community (*pravrajita*), or (c) after ordination (*upasthāpanā*). Like the Buddha and his monastic entourage, they are mainly known under

<sup>151</sup> Wilson 1855: 239, Turner 1966-89: 288. Cf. Monier-Williams 1899: 422.

<sup>152</sup> Sankalia 1949: 156f.:

“[T]he suffix *-jī* in names such [as] Nāgī, Bhīmī had not yet appeared. The social, political and religious causes which were responsible for bringing about the new additions to the already existing stock of names and suffixes seem to develop during the first 300 years of Muslim rule in Gujarat. For both these suffixes appear in the names occurring in inscriptions of the 16th-17th century.”

<sup>153</sup> Gonda 1959: 7 in his discussion of “formulaic or petrified epithets (or, in German, stehende Epitheta)” points out that they are “not necessarily ornaments and superfluidities” (p. 10), citing R. M. Meyer (Deutsche Stilistik 1906: 51), who argues that it is the function of all “bynames” to orientate the listener (reader) in a particular way toward a person or object (“den Hörer sofort in eine bestimmte Stellung zu den genannten Personen oder Gegenständen zu bringen”) (p. 9).

their birth- (*janma*), such as Iṃḍabhūi (Indrabhūti), family- (*kula*) and/or exogamous group- (*gotra*) names, such as Kāsava (Kāśyapa) or Goyama (Gautama), and by their epithets. The paradigm are the names of Vaddhamāṇa, who is mainly known under his two principal epithets as “Bhagavan Mahāvīra,” which were probably preferred in the scriptures to clearly distinguish the mendicant stage of his life from his householder stage:

“The name of Mahāvīra is an attribute inspired by profound reverence and traced back to the gods. The curtailed form is Vīra. *samaṇa*, as he is said to have called himself, is as far from being a proper name as is, for instance, ‘the Son of Man.’ His civil name is Vaddhamāṇa, ‘the prospering one’, which in the texts, however, is interpreted as ‘the promoter’. The verb *vaddhai* does not occur, but only *vaddhai* leading up to the by far less frequent form Vaḍḍhamāṇa (Āyār. II, 15, 12; Samav. 151a). As a member of the clan of the Nāya Mahāvīra is called *Nāya (putta)* (Viy. 323b), as a *Kāśyapa Kāsava* (a.o. Utt. 2; Dasav. 4), after the town of Vaiśālī, in whose sphere of influence he was born, by the name *Vesāliya* (Sū. I 2, 3 end; Utt. 6 end), and *Videhe-dinna* after his native country (Āyār. II 15, 17; Jñac. 110). He is addressed as *bhante*” (Schubring 1935/2000 § 17: 32, with added emphasis).

Instructive is the glance at T. W. Rhys-Davids’s (1899: 193f.) typology of appellations for Buddhist monks in the Pāli canon, which, is applicable to the names of mendicants in the Śvetāmbara Jaina canon as well, as Schubring’s synopsis indicates. Rhys-Davids identified eight types of address in Buddhist scriptures of which Nos. 3-6 can be classified as family and secular occupational names, Nos. 2, 1 and 8 as personal name, and distinguishing nickname and epithet (e.g. *Gaya-Kassapa*), and No. 7 as a category for epitheta ornantia:

1. A *nickname* arising of some personal peculiarity [...].
2. A *personal name*, called in Pāli the *m ū l a - n ā m a*. [...]. Such as *T i s s a* [...] *B h a d d i y a* [...] *Ā n a n d a* [...] *A b h a y a* [...].
3. *The name of the Gotta or gens*, what we should call the surname or family name. These are usually patronymic in form; such as [...] *M o g g a l l ā n a*, *K a s s a p a* [...].
4. *The name of the clan*, called in Pāli *K u l a - n ā m a*, such as *S a k k a* [...] *L i k k h a v i* [...].
5. *The name of the mother*, with *p u t t a* (son) added to it [...] [T]he mother’s name is never a personal name; but always taken from the clan, or from the family to which she belonged. [...].<sup>154</sup>
6. *The name of the position in society*, or the occupation, of the person addressed. [...].
7. A mere *general name of courtesy* or respect, not containing any special application to the person addressed – such as *b h a n t e*, *ā v u s o*, *a y y e*, &c.
8. Lastly there is the *local name*, never used in addressing a person, but prefixed or added to the *m ū l a* or *g o t t a* name, in narrative sentences, to distinguish between two or more people of the same name.

Kane (1938: 236f.) additionally observed “examples of Buddhist names derived from *nakṣatras*,” such as “the well-known name of Moggaliputta Tissa (from *Tiṣya*) in which a *gotra* name and a *nakṣatra* name are both combined.” Notably, no monastic titles are listed by Rhys-Davids (1899) under forms of address. The reasons for this can be inferred from the following statements:

<sup>154</sup> This observation also applies to the *purohita* Bhrgu’s wife *Vāsiṣṭhī* in Utt, 14.29.

“The Buddha addresses members of his own clan, whether members of his Order or not, by their personal names [...]. The same holds good of the junior members of the Order, but some at least of the more distinguished among them are always addressed by him either by their g o t t a, or by their mother’s, name (compare Moggalâna, Kakkâna, Kassapa, Gotamî, Sâriputta)” (p. 195).

“From the usage referred to, as followed by the Buddha and others, it would seem that the g o t t a name was considered as more honourable than either of the personal names, and also than the descriptive general name or title of p a r i b b â g a k a (wandering mendicant, recluse). Even the title B r â h m a n a was dropped for the g o t t a name in the case of a recluse” (p. 196).

Rhys-Davids concluded from his preliminary observations that since *gotra* names were of Brahmanical origin, the clans from which the Buddhist monks originated must have “adopted them from the Brahmans”:

“All that we can fairly conclude is that the clans claimed, by the very use of these names, to be descended from the same ancestors as the Brahmans, who also bore the names: and that the claim was admitted to be well founded. As shown above, even Brahmans use these g o t t a names of non-Brahmans” (p. 196).

However, he also points to a number of unsolved problems, which he planned to address in a future *Pâli Onomasticon*, which, however, never appeared:

“There are a number of problems, both as to general principles and as to details that still remain, in this matter of names, unresolved. Is Âlâra, for instance, a nickname or a m û l a - n â m a; is Kâlâmo a g o t t a name or a clan name? To what classes of the people was the use of g o t t a names limited, and what is the historical explanation of this limitation? Were there as many as a dozen clan names in Magadhâ and Kosalâ combined? What was exactly implied by the clan-name, the K u l a - n â m a? The word g o t t a probably had the same meaning, when the *Pitakas* were composed, as g o t r a has in the later law books written by the priests. How comes it then that the number of gottas referred to is so very small? Are there much more than a score altogether? What light does the meaning of the m û l a and g o t t a names throw on the religious conceptions and social customs of the people?

I hope to return to these and similar questions when I can find time to publish my *Pâli Onomasticon*, of the names in the *Pitakas* and in the older inscriptions” (ibid.).

Particularly interesting is Rhys-Davids remark on apparent differences between Buddhist and Jaina conventions of monastic address:

“The Buddha usually addresses ascetics, not as paribbâgaka, but by the g o t t a name [...] and everybody addresses the Buddha by his g o t t a name, as Gotama. [...] This custom of addressing people by their gotta name, no doubt a common one in certain cases, was expressly forbidden to *Niganthas* (Jacobi ‘*Gaina-Sûtras*,’ II, 305). They called their own Order a g o t r a (ibid. 321, 327), and apparently thought it worldly to recognise the existence of any other” (p. 195).

Contrary to this preliminary observation,<sup>155</sup> it appears that early Jaina mendicants only very rarely called their own monastic groups *gotra*, “clan” or “lineage” of spiritual descendants of Mahāvīra,<sup>156</sup> though the use of quasi kinship-group categories such as *kula* or *parivāra* (family) was and still is common. At the same time, *gotra* names, such as Gautama, continued to be used as forms of address and self-reference of mendicants.<sup>157</sup> The reasons for preferring given names or epithets and discouraging the use of *gotra* names, in certain contexts, must therefore be sought elsewhere. A clue might be Rhys-Davids (1899: 196) observation, that *gotra* names were “considered as more honourable than either of the personal names, and also than the descriptive general name or title of p a r i b b â g a k a.” According to the early canonical texts, Jaina mendicants did not change their names at the point of initiation, and were still known under their names given by the family and by their *gotra*-names. It was therefore apparently deemed necessary to fashion monastic rules to explicitly discourage pride in one’s descent (*gotra*) “like a brahmin” (Sūy<sub>2,3</sub> 1.2.2.1).<sup>158</sup> In other words, the existence of these rules noted by Rhys-Davids seems to indicate that the emphasis on humility was stronger in the early Jaina texts than in the corresponding Buddhist texts.

In view of this rule, which escaped Rhys-Davids, one can also speculate that the subsequent introduction of specific monastic names, clearly emphasising the change of religious status, might have been motivated by the desire to highlight the difference between monks and laity, especially after the creation of the concept of the “fourfold community,” or/and (at the same time) to socially homogenise the members of the monastic community and hence further detach them from the influence of particular social milieus. The question, why the custom of a name change at the point of initiation became current can, however, not be clearly answered at this stage.

It is also not entirely clear when the custom of changing names at the point of initiation has been introduced to signify the change of status from householder to mendicant.<sup>159</sup> No prescriptions for initiation ceremonies are found in the rules and regulations for Jaina mendicants in the Chedasūtras and the Niryuktis nor elsewhere in the Śvetāmbara Siddhānta.<sup>160</sup> The only exception are the narrative legends on the circumstances of world-renunciation of the Jinas and of the paradigmatic descriptions of the ceremonies of monastic initiation (Pkt. *pavvāṇa*, Skt. *pravrajana*) of prince Megha and princess Mallī in NDK chapters 1 & 8.<sup>161</sup> Even there, no indication of name changes are evident. Since the founder of the non-iconic Jaina tradition, Loṅkā, explicitly questioned the practice of changing names during *dīkṣā*, it must be assumed that the custom emerged between the time of the advent of the *gaccha*-traditions in the 9<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup> century or as late as the 15<sup>th</sup> century, when Loṅkā tried to re-orientate the codes of conduct of the Jaina mendicant orders toward the text of the early Śvetāmbara scriptures.<sup>162</sup>

<sup>155</sup> See further: Seyford-Ruegg 1974: 207, von Hinüber 1978: 329, 331f.

<sup>156</sup> Sūy<sub>2</sub> 1.13.9, 1.14.20.

<sup>157</sup> For example in the story of the monk Sañjaya:

“sañjao nāma nāmeṇaṃ, tahā goteṇaṃ goyame |  
gaddabhāli mamāyariyā, vijjācaraṇapāragā ||” (Utt<sub>1</sub> 18.22)

“My name is Sañjaya; I belong to the Gōtra of Gōtama;

my teacher is Gardabhāli, who is conversant with the sacred lore and good conduct” (Utt<sub>2</sub> 18.22).

<sup>158</sup> Bollée’s 1988: 46f. German translation. Cf. Jacobi 1895: 253.

<sup>159</sup> “Der Namenswechsel bedeutet ein Aufgeben der früheren Persönlichkeit“ (R. Thurnwald, Des Menschengeistes Erwachen, Wachsen und Irren, 1951: 169, in Gonda 1970: 55 Fn. 12).

<sup>160</sup> Deo 1956: 216.

<sup>161</sup> Deo 1956: 142, 466. Their naming ceremonies (*nāma-karaṇa*) after birth are carefully recorded in the NDK, as are the naming ceremonies of Mahāvīra, referred to with the expression *nāma-dhijja/-dhejja* (Skt. *nāma-dheya*). See infra. On aspects of ancient Indic naming practices, see AD<sub>1-4</sub> vv. 284-286.

<sup>162</sup> Loṅkā, in Flügel 2008: 272, 235: “3. *nāma phevavai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*” “3. To change the name (to give a different name at the time of initiation), whose tradition is that?” In early Jaina inscriptions monasti names are mostly flagged up by the addition of status indicators: *aryya*, *gaṇi*, etc.

It is a fact that collective names or name elements that serve as institutional- or group identifiers,<sup>163</sup> officially bestowed at naming ceremonies, have become important elements of the full name of a Jaina monk or nun in contexts of sectarian competition. Instead of *gotra*- and clan-names, identifiers of the monastic tradition, order and/or branch/lineage are used, besides general identifiers for the status of “monk” and “nun.” Group designations as such, °*gana*, °*gaccha*, or °*sampradāya*, are never used as composites of personal names, only indicators of sectarian affiliation, such as typical given names or titles, or branch-labels. To use an expression of Bourdieu (1989: 23), through name changes and the incorporation of group identifiers and titles of official positions into the full personal name, “what existed up until then only as a *collectio personarium plurium*, a collection of varied persons, a purely additive series of merely juxtaposed individuals,” is transformed into an “instituted form.”<sup>164</sup>

There are evidently parallels to name-giving practices in the secular sphere. Within the parameters of the general framework of the new monastic naming formats that were introduced in the medieval period, the following summary observations of Sankalia (1949: 153) on key features of Jaina family names in the inscriptions in Gujarat of the Caulukya period might be taken as descriptions of monastic naming practices as well:

- “(i) There was a tendency to give names from a certain set of names, or having certain endings.
- (ii) That grandfather’s or ancestor’s name was usually not repeated.
- (iii) That when several daughters and sons were there, each was given a different name as far as possible.
- (iv) That distinction was made by the addition of feminine termination ī or ā, by giving a distinct name with or without the addition of the devī.”

Centralised Jaina mendicant orders adopted royal naming practices. After ascent to the throne, a king usually acquired the title °*rāja* and a byname or epithet.<sup>165</sup> A tendency towards fixed combinations of name-elements, including epitheta, has been observed, for instance, by Schmiedchen (2014: 40) amongst the Rāṣṭrakūṭa rulers, though many epithets ending on the suffixes °*varṣa* or °*tuṅga* were shared by all members of the ruling family (p. 44 Fn. 49) and seem to have functioned primarily as dynastic markers. Epithets usually preceded the main name of the king (given by birth) which was succeeded by the title °*rāja* (e.g. Akāla-varṣa Kṛṣṇa-rāja). There was a tendency for certain epithets such as °*vallabha*, “dear, desired,” to become emblems of rulership, and for recording only the main byname as a placeholder for the full name in dynastic lists, which leads to problems of identification for historians (p. 41).

Proper names are used in all societies and are therefore considered as a cultural universal. But the number and types of name components that are employed varies considerably.<sup>166</sup>

<sup>163</sup> Cf. Keats-Rohan 2007c: 156.

<sup>164</sup> Through the recitation of the *sūri-mantra* at the point of initiation, the neophyte is absorbed into the line of succession and the line of succession incorporated by him/her.

<sup>165</sup> On royal epithets in the *Uvavāiṃya* (Skt. *Aupapātika*), see Bollée 1978.

<sup>166</sup> G.P. Murdock, according to Alford 1988: 1f. See the categories for personal names and related subjects in the Topics Covered by the Outline of Cultural Materials-List of the Human Relations Area Files: <http://hrf.yale.edu/resources/reference/outline-of-cultural-materials/#id551>

#### “551 PERSONAL NAMES

Proper names of individuals (e.g., given names and/or surnames, patronyms, number and variety, meanings, circumstances of use); gender and status differences; special name usages (e.g., nicknames, aliases, teknonymy); name taboos and avoidances; etc.

#### Related Terms

Names as souls 774 ANIMISM

Kinship terms 601 KINSHIP TERMINOLOGY

## 6. Structure of Jaina Monastic Names

Most Indologists and Anthropologist take the intrinsically meaningful nature of at least certain components of names as a basis for their historical or sociological analyses. In Indology, the meaning of names is mostly understood in terms of etymology. Certain names are also broadly associated with specific social classes, lineages, or *gotras*.<sup>167</sup> In the case of Jain tradition, the monastic nomenclature implies a complete sociology of Jaina monasticism.<sup>168</sup> The understanding of the naming practices and the uses of names or elements of names in different contexts, as forms of designation, address, or signification, offers an instant insight into the structure and function of Jaina mendicant orders. Because the components of full names reflect the functional requirements of standard social situations of monastic life, they permit inferences as to the typical motivations underlying patterns of selection or invention of recurring components of names. The study of the ways in which identifiers of the individual person and of significant social relationships are combined and marked in culturally and socially specific “naming formulas,”<sup>169</sup> such as full Jaina monastic names, therefore promises key insights in the structure of the social unit concerned and the role of the individual within it.

Socio-onomastic analyses of official and unofficial naming practices, name-models, combined with componential analysis and frequency analysis,<sup>170</sup> and investigation of the variety of monastic institutions, roles and careers, are a precondition for the construction of prosopographical data-models. The present study attempts to fulfil this requirement by reconstructing the core “naming formula” implicit in Jaina monastic naming practices. With the help of a database, based on an analytic questionnaire, whose core elements as far as sociology of Jaina names is concerned will be outlined in this section, a statistical investigations of historical and regional variations and sectarian preferences will become possible.

In addition to the two main types of given names: birth names (*janma-* or *mūla-nāma*) and monastic names (*śramaṇa-nāma*), and their variants and alternative names (*anya-nāma*), diverse types of differenters (*viśeṣaṇa*), that is, discriminative appellations, words used to identify a specific individual and place it in a social context are strung together in Jaina chronologies and other historical documents to create the full name of a mendicant, which is further adorned with linguistic ornaments of non-specific nature. The full monastic name comprises as additional elements: titles, epithets, bynames, group indicators, epitheta ornantia, etc., which together with the two-element personal-name constitute the full naming string.

Jaina names have not yet been systematically investigated. Yet, it is known that a relatively restricted repertoire of proper names is used in monastic contexts. Although occasional attempts to establish controlled vocabularies on the whole do not seem to have been successful, certain names are preferred in individual mendicant traditions. Popular are the names of founders of sectarian (sub-) traditions or of other renowned monks or nuns, who are celebrated as role-models in a particular mendicant lineage. For insiders, names such as these serve as indicators of sectarian affiliation as well. As a consequence of the

---

Titles 554 STATUS, ROLE, AND PRESTIGE  
 Naming 553 NAMING  
 Dynastic lists 173 TRADITIONAL HISTORY  
 Incorporal property 424 INCORPORAL PROPERTY”

<sup>167</sup> See Hilka 1910 *supra*.

<sup>168</sup> Despite numerous contributions on onomastics of proper names, monastic names in South Asia have not been subject of specialised studies. Cf. Schopen 1996/2004. Studies on the social implications of monastic names in Europe by Geuenich 1976, focus primarily on historical linguistic and onomastic features, which also dominate in edited volumes such as Geuenich, Haubrichs & Jarnut 1997, Geuenich & Runde 2006, which do not contain studies on monastic names.

<sup>169</sup> See *infra*.

<sup>170</sup> Blanár 2004: 158, 161.

practice of re-using the names of idealised Jaina mendicants a great number of homonyms is created in the Jaina tradition, given the restricted body of common Jaina name prototypes, preventing the identification of an individual mendicant through the given name alone. In many cultural contexts homonyms are markers of social communality.<sup>171</sup> In the Jaina context, they overlap with religious affiliation and group-membership /-following.<sup>172</sup>

Because of the great number of homonyms among monastic proper names there is a tendency toward an accumulation of epithets and bynames, which qualify the homonymous name and render the unique identification of individuals possible.<sup>173</sup> Epitheta, in turn, tend to have the tendency to turn into synonyms (*ekārtha*) and finally into proper names in their own right (e.g. “Mahāvīra”).<sup>174</sup> The elements and structures of the full names or rather “referring phrases” or “referring strings”<sup>175</sup> of Jaina mendicants need to be investigated in greater detail.

The following etic categories are used in the *Jaina-Prosopography* for the classification of emic differencers, that is, the components of the full names of Jaina mendicants that specify distinguishing features (*viśeṣa*). What exactly the inconsistently used terms “epithet,” “honorific,” “title,” and “byname” designate needs to be defined explicitly in each study. In Sanskrit they can all be labelled as *upādhis*. Hence the Sanskrit and Hindi labels added in brackets of the following definitions are only indicative. The *Jaina-Prosopography* uses the category “honorific / epithet” for publicly / officially recognised honours and the category “byname / nickname” as a residual category for specifiers of individual attributes which are used to identify a person:<sup>176</sup>

- i. Monastic Position (*pada*, etc.) - designation of the official role (ceremonially bestowed)
- ii. Epithet / Honorific (*biruda*, etc.) - personal attribute (unceremonially & ceremonially bestowed)
- iii. Title (*upādhi*, etc.) - qualification, official honour, academic title (ceremonially bestowed)
- iv. Byname / Nickname (*upanāma*, etc.) - discriminative appellation (popular attribution)

In India, most *given names* have a binary structure.<sup>177</sup> Monastic names are not different in this respect. Amongst the Jaina, monastic given names are generally constituted through the combination of two name elements: a root name and a supplementary term (Amara-jī, Amara-candra, etc.). Like the bi-nominal species names of the Linnaean nomenclature, they combine a fixed stem (antecedent) with a variable additional element (consequent), which supplements the antecedent. To the first element, the “stem” or “root

<sup>171</sup> Emeneau 1978: 114, Grafflins 1983: 395.

<sup>172</sup> Cf. Grafflins’s 1983: 389 theory, “that homonymy in the Chinese case is an inherently “horizontal” phenomenon, system features being shared by members of the same bio-logical generation.”

<sup>173</sup> See Gonda 1959: 220ff. on the “accumulation of attributes,” of epithets (p. 230), etc. (pp. 185, 171, 226). Cf. Bruhn 1993: 179 on terminological dynamism in Jaina dogmatic semantics: “tendency to accumulate synonyms.”

<sup>174</sup> See Gonda 1959: 23: “In all those cases the supposition does not seem too bold that simple nouns or phrases which ‘originally’ were substantives, were as appositions added to nouns or names or used instead of names and in the course of time developed into adjectives or proper names.”

<sup>175</sup> According to Geach’s 1962: 47ff. theory of “referring phrases,” “a proper name may itself count as a one-item list” and “a proper name and a list of several names are mutually replaceable”: “If ‘a1, a2, ...’ is a list of all things called ‘A’, then these substitutions can be made for ‘A’” (p. 169).

<sup>176</sup> Hilka 1910: 64 regards “Beinamen” as “vom übrigen Namenssystem etwas abseits stehen[d];” “Inwieweit Einfluss des T o t e m i s m u s bei der Namenwahl vorliegt, wird schwer zu entscheiden sein” (p. 114). In the present text, by contrast, bynames are defined as individualising attributes.

<sup>177</sup> See Hilka 1910: 47ff. on frequent combinations of substantives and adjectives, etc.



word” (“Stamm” or “Wurzelwort”) of the given name (e.g., *jina*°, *ṛṣabha*°, *nemi*°),<sup>178</sup> a second element or concomitant word (*upapada*)<sup>179</sup> is attached, but remains subordinate to the first element. Popular supplementary words are, for instance: °*candra* (moon), °*dāsa* (servant, devotee), °*kumāra* (boy, prince), °*lāla* (beloved),<sup>180</sup> °*malla* (brave man), °*nātha* (protector, ruler), °*rāma* (the Hindu/Jaina god Rāma), °*simha* (lion) - the last four being classical components of bi-nominal given names of rulers.<sup>181</sup> Commonly used concomitant words in the names of nuns are: °*devī* (goddess), °*kāntā* (beloved), °*kumārī* (virgin, unmarried girl),<sup>182</sup> °*vyoti* (light), or °*matī*<sup>183</sup> (mindful of \_\_, respectful for \_\_) or °*vatī* (°*vantī*) (possessing the quality of \_\_).

Most one-word or two-word monastic root names bestowed at the point of initiation carry a programmatic meaning.<sup>184</sup> They either highlight ideal attributes promoted by Jaina teachings (*nomen est omen*),<sup>185</sup> for example *abhaya*°, *amara*°, *deva*°, *dharmā*°, *guṇa*°, *kṣamā*°, *siddha*°, *vinaya*°, etc., or are names of the religious heroes of the tradition, for example *jina*°, *ṛṣabha*°, *padmāvati*°, *mahāvīra*, etc.). Because names such as these tend to be preferred by Jaina families in the context of selecting birth names (*janma-nāma*) as well, the religious affiliation of a Jaina lay-person can be inferred to some extent from the given name.<sup>186</sup> It could be assumed that a person that has already a birth name with Jaina religious connotations, a name change at the time of initiation would not be absolutely necessary.

A recognisably “Jaina” name is, however, not regarded as an essential attribute of monkhood. Many Jaina mendicants have names that are associated with Hindu gods or goddesses, for instance *śiva*°, as in *śiva-muni*, *indra*°, as in *indra-bhūti*, *gaṅgā*°, as in *gaṅgā-devī*, or *rādhā*. During the Mughal period, in North-India names with Arabic and Persian roots began to be used as names for Jaina mendicants as well.<sup>187</sup> For instance *iqbāl* (A., “prosperity”) as in *iqbāl-cand* (*ikabāla-canda*), *khazān*° (A. *khizāna*, “treasury”), as in *khazān-cand* (*khajāna-canda*), *javāhar* (A. *javāhir*, “jewel”), as in *javāhar-lāl* (*javāhara-lāla*), °*bakhs* (P., “given”), as in *rām-bakhs* (*rāma-bhakśa*), *vazīr* (A., “minister”) as in *vazīr-cand* (*vajīra-canda*), f. *khūbā* (P. *khūb*, “virtue”), as in *khūbām*, etc. The choice

<sup>178</sup> The 22<sup>nd</sup> *tittha(m)kara* Ariṭṭha-*nemi* (Skt. Ariṣṭha-*nemi*), for instance, generally known as “Nemi,” became Nemi-*nātha*.

<sup>179</sup> Monier-Williams 1899: 201:

“n. a word standing near or accompanying another to which it is subordinate (either a subordinate word in a compound [but not in a *bahu-vrīhi* compound] generally forming the first member, or a discriminative appellation at the end of proper names, as *varman*, *śarman* &c; or a preposition, particle &c prefixed to a verb or noun; or a secondary word of any kind which is governed by or limits the general idea contained in the principal word.”

<sup>180</sup> Skt. *lālya*, cf. Per. *lāl*. See Footnote 256.

<sup>181</sup> Hilka 1910: 144 compares °*malla*, etc., with other title and bynames of rulers, such as °*rāja*, °*vallabha*, etc.

<sup>182</sup> Alternatively °*kaṃvarī* or °*kaṃvara*, °*kuṃvarā*, °*kuṃvārā*. Today the final name elements °*kaṃvara*, °*kuṃvara*, and °*kuṃvārā* are only used in the Sthānakavāsī tradition as designations for nuns. Because of their overwhelming prevalence in the two traditions, they function as sect indicators for the Sthānakavāsī Gaṇeśarāma- and the Govindarāma Daulatarāma traditions (Flügel forthcoming).

<sup>183</sup> In the place of °*matī* the texts use almost always the form °*matī*, perhaps reflecting feminine name endings on °*ī* elsewhere. Cf. Hilka 1910: 150: “Frauennamen sollten auf ā oder ī auslauten” (S. 18). Intentional deviations from the grammatical norm such as this can also be explained sociologically, by pointing to the need (a) for a clear distinction of gender, and (b) of making a name of an individual uniquely recognisable through idiosyncratic spelling, i.e. in response to the problem of homonymy. Cf. Nübling, Fahlbusch & Heuser 2012: 86f.

<sup>184</sup> Buddhist literature speaks therefore about “*dharmā*-names.”

<sup>185</sup> To become like one’s name: *nāma-sama*.

<sup>186</sup> See Hilka 1910: 104ff., Emeneau 1978: 114).

<sup>187</sup> In many other Jaina socio-religious contexts Persian vocabulary was used. Especially terms from the legal and administrative sphere were imported. For instance *mukhtār* (*mukhatāra*) (A. “the chosen one,” “minister,” “agent,” etc.) was occasionally used instead of *gaṇāvachchedaka* in the Sthānakavāsī Pañjāb Saṃpradāya. The word *hāzarī* (A. *hāzīrī*, “presence”) was used for a now defunct enforcing compulsory monastic assembly of the Terāpanth.

of language for names was evidently influenced by the desire to partake in the prestige of the dominant language of the time and region.

The name stem can be frequently used as a designator on its own. Concomitant words mainly function as (group) specifiers and embellishments. Since only the root word of the name is fixed, the final element can be freely chosen and is frequently varied (e.g., *deva-rāma* = *deva-dāsa* = *deva-candra*, etc.).<sup>188</sup> Perhaps this is also done in order to accentuate the clichéd “multi-faceted personality” of the bearer of the name in a way not unlike the practice of indicating the eminence of an individual through the juxtaposition of a whole string of names and titles. Because the second element of bi-nominal Jaina monastic names is rarely stable, it cannot, like a Vedic epithet, serve as an “attributive adjective added to distinguish between the species of the same genus” (Gonda 1959: 8 Fn. 4). The individuating function of a second element is limited, if it is not stable. In his assessment of the role of *bahuvrīhi* compounds in descriptions of name-giving in the Ṛgveda, by contrast, Gonda (1959: 21) comes to the conclusion that “[m]any *bahuvrīhis* are, already in the earliest documents, proper names” (“round-eyed,” “wolf-minded,” etc.), and “used as more or less fixed epithets.” He states: “What interests us most is that compounds or complex phrases may be used in the same way” (22f.).

There is no sharp distinction between an epithet and a classifier.<sup>189</sup> A referring string can be a combination of proper names (*nomina propria*) and common nouns (*nomina appellativa*), if the distinction continues to be recognised as meaningful at all. The use of nouns in the string of words designating a particular Jaina mendicant often places the person into classes of participants, such as type of monastic position, monastic group, status class, gender category, etc. Proper names that are frequently used in certain monastic traditions function as indicators of group membership. They can therefore be treated as classifiers as well, besides or in place of specific affixes fulfilling this function.<sup>190</sup> Dependent clauses of bi-nominal given names can also have this function. The relative social status within society (venerable mendicant / householder) and within the monastic order is reflected in different types of titles. Positioned either before or after the “given” name are also the administrative-, honorific-, and academic titles that a mendicant “acquires” during the course of a monastic career. They reflect individual achievements, and became part of the composite full name as well. Given names, office designations, academic titles, and also some honorific titles, are all bestowed in official ceremonies. This distinguishes them generally from nicknames and bynames, and certain honorifics, which emerge spontaneously in popular discourse as designations and identifiers of individuals. Yet, because honorifics are often protected titles chosen from a fixed repertoire, an individual can only be unequivocally identified with the help of a combination of nouns indicating different functions with a social semantic topography only within a specific context.

The accumulation of recognised attributes as part of the official names of senior mendicants (*sthavira*), facilitates their identification. This progressive individualisation of the full name is significant, because, in accord with the pursuit of the Jainas toward de-individualisation,<sup>191</sup> many monastic given names are selected from a relatively short list of popularly preferred designations, which inevitably leads to a proliferation of homonyms. Besides other components of full names supplementing given names, such as designations

<sup>188</sup> On synonymic name changes cf. Bühler EI I: 70, in Hilka 1910: 71: “The Hindus care little about the form of a name provided the sense remains the same.”

<sup>189</sup> Halliday 2004: 320. Cf. *supra*.

<sup>190</sup> Amongst the Terāpanth nuns for example: °*yaśā* (beauty), °*prajñā* (wisdom), °*prabhā* (splendour), °*vibhā* (radiance) (personal communication: Samañī Pratibhāprajñā, London 10.5.2013). The concomitant word °*prabhā* is also popular in the Sthānakavāsī tradition, particularly in the line of Mahāsati Melo of the Pañjāb Saṃpradāya.

<sup>191</sup> Bruhn 1954: 98. In a similar way, Gonda 1959: 10 contrasts the preference in ancient (Indian) idealistic poetry for epithets of a “general and typical” nature and for “fixed epithets” with the modern partiality for new and “realistic and individualistic adjectives.”

of monastic positions, titles, and bynames/nicknames, epithets permit the disambiguation of homonyms and hence onomastic individualisation, and hence contribute to fulfilment of the key function of any naming system. In this way, “Kavi” Upādhyāya Amar Muni (Amaramuni) (1902-1992) (Manoharadāsa Saṃpradāya/Vīrāyatan) can be distinguished from “Kaviratna” Amar Muni “Pañjābī” (1913-1953) (Pañjāb Saṃpradāya), and from “Sāhitya Samrāt” “Āgama Ratnākara” “Jaina Dharma Divākara” Uttara Bhāratīya Pravartaka Amar Muni (1936-2008) (Pañjāb Saṃpradāya). In colloquial language, short names are frequently used for the identification of mendicants. In the case of famous individuals, often epithets are employed.<sup>192</sup> Vardhamāna came to be known as “Mahāvīra” and Gautama as the “Buddha.” In the same way, the prominent Sthānakavāsī monk “Jaina Divākara” Muni Cauthamala (Chautmal) (1877-1950) (Mannālāla Hukmīcandra Saṃpradāya) is known as “Divākaramuni,” or simply as “Divākara,” or “Day-Maker,” amongst his disciples. Because several mendicants have been bestowed with the popular epithet “Jaina Divākara,” context determines which monk is referred to.

The following functions, constituting the “social space”<sup>193</sup> within which a Jaina mendicant is located, are defined with the help of his/her full monastic name. They are reflected in the questionnaire of the Jaina-Prosopography,<sup>194</sup> supplemented by variables concerning the social background of a mendicant or householder, his/her works, and social network. The following overview shows that the principle dimensions of the hierarchically structured social space relevant for Jaina mendicants is the distinction of mendicant / laity, gender, monastic group (implying region & dominant language), office, and threefold seniority (age, initiation, education). The “Jaina social space” defining the roles of monks and householders within the wider society carves out a particular social niche that affects only certain dimensions of the social identity of an individual.

- i. Given name
- ii. Status indicator (male / female x mendicant / householder)
- iii. Group indicator (sect, order, lineage)
- iv. Position indicator (rank in monastic administrative hierarchy)
- v. Educational status indicator (rank in educational hierarchy)
- vi. Seniority indicator (Other protected titles / forms of address: monastic relationship indicators, etc.)
- vii. Other titles (qualifications, awards, etc.)
- viii. Honorific (un- / ceremonially recognised individual achievement)
- ix. Byname (popularly recognised individual characteristic)
- x. Epitheta ornantia (defining relative position of addressee and addresser)
- xi. Other descriptors / specifiers (monastic relationship indicators, etc.)

The functions that are most important for the Jaina-Prosopography and for the reconstruction of a typical Jaina monastic “naming formula” are indicators (“descriptors”) of social position and of individual attributes: status indicators, group indicators, position indicators, relationship indicators, titles / qualifications, epithets / honorifics, and bynames / nicknames, plus *epitheta ornantia*, positioning the addresser in a lower status-position vis-à-vis the addressee.

**Status Indicators:** Designations that indicate the general status of a “monk” or a “nun” are to be distinguished from other indicators specifying the position of a monk or nun within the monastic order. In terms of AD<sub>1,2</sub> 305, a word indicating membership within a mendicant order is at the same time a name expressing reverence (*śloka-nāma*). Yet, the status indicator *muni* fulfils or can fulfil multiple functions. Though the

<sup>192</sup> Cf. Bollée 2002: 97.

<sup>193</sup> Bourdieu 1979, 1989.

<sup>194</sup> The fully tested data-model will be published in an article under the title “Jaina-Prosopography III.”

Jaina-Prosopography treats the designation *muni* invariably as an position indicator, in the Śvetāmbara context, the use of °*muni* (instead of *sādhu*, etc.) as the second part of a dimorphic proper name can also function as an group indicator (broadly: membership of the Sthānakavāsī or Terāpanth tradition).<sup>195</sup> This possibility is also conditioned by the above-mentioned fact that, amongst Sthānakavāsī traditions, frequently the root of the given name becomes the root of the monastic name, which leaves one slot of the generally di-morphic name to be filled. In general, this is done by variably adding position indicators or honorifics (Amara° -> Amara-muni, Amara-candra, etc.). Because householder and monastic names not always differ, certainly not always in the Sthānakavāsī context, the position designator *muni* is in such cases effectively treated as part of the given name. As status- and position indicators designations such as *muni* or *sādhu* can also be put in front of the root name (Amarmuni / Amaramuni = Muni Amara [rare] = Muni Amara-candra / Amara-candra).<sup>196</sup>

**Group Indicators:** In the Śvetāmbara tradition, the use of the word *muni* as prefix or suffix is nowadays restricted to the Sthānakavāsī and Terāpanthī traditions. It thus functions automatically as an indicator of membership in the *a-mūrtipūjaka* Śvetāmbara tradition. A similar role is fulfilled by the already discussed affix *vijaya* (conquest, victory) in the context of the Vijaya-śākhā of the Tapā-gaccha, and by the suffixes °*sāgara* (ocean) in the Sāgara-śākhā, °*nandī* (joy), °*candra* (moon), °*kīrti* (fame) or °*bhūṣaṇa* (ornament) in the Digambara Mūla-saṃgha,<sup>197</sup> as well as possibly °*hasti* (elephant), °*mītra* (friend), etc., in some of the lineages mentioned in the *sthavirāvali* lists in the Āgamas.<sup>198</sup> The honorific affix °*ṛṣi* (or: °*rikh*: seer) is generally employed by the lineages of the Lavajī Ṛṣi-Tradition (e.g. today's Mālavā Ṛṣi Gaṇa = Ṛṣi Saṃpradāya), and usually written as a separate word, probably to avoid using *saṃdhi* and more generally Sanskritisation in the largely vernacular literature of the tradition (Ṛṣi Lava, Jñāna Ṛṣi, etc., but also: Ṛṣirāma). The Pañjāb Lavajī Ṛṣi tradition is an exception. It never used the suffix °*ṛṣi*, likely because the *yatis* of the older, now defunct, Uttarārdha Loṅkāgaccha of Lahore had already employed it as a sect indicator, hence rendering it useless as a distinguishing characteristic of the Lavajī Ṛṣi tradition in North India. The full range of affixes of Jaina monastic names, forming “parasystems”<sup>199</sup> in a wider sense (some of which Hilka 1910: 64 associated with “totemism”) deserves an independent study.

<sup>195</sup> Muni Vinayacanda (in Jauharī 1946: 95) wanted to turn this custom into a compulsory practice.

<sup>196</sup> Cf. Hilka 1910: 71 on the reversal of the elements in full names.

<sup>197</sup> *Mūla-Saṃgha-Paṭṭāvalī*, according to Hoernle 1891: 350. Cf. Hilka 1910: 74. Schubring 1935 § 30: 46 Fn. 6 writes:

“Mindestens der Nandi-s[amgha]. war in *gaṇa*, *gaccha* und *vali (bali)* geteilt, und seine Angehörigen führten als zweites Namensglied die Wörter *candra*, *kīrtideva*, *bhūṣaṇa* und *nandī*” (S. 46), adding:

“Ep. Carn. 2, 123. In den Paṭṭāvalī IA 20, 350; 21, 71 fehlt das Wort *deva*. Die Kennworte sind beim Senas.: *rāja*, *vīra*, *bhadra*, *sena*; beim Siṃhas.: *siṃha*, *kumbha*, *āśrava*, *sāgara*; beim Deva-s.: *deva*, *datta*, *nāga*, *tunga* (IA 21, 69; dort *langa* st. *tunga*)” (ibid., Fn. 6, the English translation 1962/2000: 63 is not quite accurate here).

Name elements such as °*candra*, °*kīrti*, etc., are not a monopoly of the Mūla-saṃgha. They were used by other *gacchas* as well. The evidence indicates, however, that the Mūla-saṃgha (for instance), seems to have regulated name-giving procedures in order to create a sense of identity amongst members.

<sup>198</sup> “Whether all monks with *hasti* ending names belong to one line or not is to be investigated” (U. P. Shah 2004: 176 Fn. 24).

<sup>199</sup> Harvalík 2015: 39:

“In word-formation theory, parasystems are secondary systems created on the basis of the core system of appellatives and fulfilling special functions in communication – proper names, terminology and expressive common nouns. The parasystem is manifested strongly in word-formation, i.e. in the creation of specific expressions, which is why the specific word-formation of parasystem units is often termed parasystemic formation.”

Typical is the “specific, variable and relatively free combination of affixes with bases or of two components, and the related use of peripheral word-formation means and processes without a necessary support in formally identified common nouns, but always within the intentions of the language or dialect” (p. 41).

In contrast to monks, Śvetāmbara nuns do not seem to add “lineage indicators”<sup>200</sup> to their given names. However, functional equivalents for the “status indicator” *muni* exist that are typical for Sthānakavāsī nuns, and hence function as “tradition indicators,” such as *satī* (virtuous woman),<sup>201</sup> *mahā-satī* (great nun) or *śramaṇī*, *mahā-śramaṇī* (great female ascetic), which are used besides the common term *sādhvī*. They are also not attached to the name stem as affixes, but usually placed as separate words before the given name. This observation equally applies to the term *sādhvī-pramukhā* (chief nun), which is used in the Terāpanth tradition as a synonym for the office title *pravartinī*, which designates the position of the leader of the nuns within a Jaina mendicant order.

**Position Indicators / Administrative Titles:** Designations of monastic position are generally placed before the root name, as in the case of Indic kings. This is general practice in official documents, though sometimes, especially in Sanskrit texts, titles such as °*ācārya* are added to the given name as suffixes (e.g. Suśīlācārya). Sometimes, but rarely, the suffix °*samrāt* (sovereign) is used as an honorific title to distinguish the reigning *ācārya* from other *ācāryas* within a mendicant tradition or from group leaders of a confederation of traditions. It is likely that the frequently used title *sūri* is used in similar ways.

When a common monk or nun has been promoted, the new administrative title is placed in front of the given name. Generally, the common status indicators “monk” (*muni*, *sādhvī*, etc.) and “nun” (*satī*, *sādhvī*, etc.) are not replaced but retained (e.g. Pravartinī Sādhvī Pārvaṭī). In the *amūrtipūjaka* traditions, after promotion, the word *muni* is often moved behind the root of given name, sometimes replacing the previous second component, and thereby becoming part of the given name (e.g. Pravartaka Muni Sumana = Pravartaka Sumanamuni). In this way, short names can emerge, through the replacement of the second component of a di-morphic given name. The term *muni* now functions mainly as a tradition indicator, somewhat similarly to the affix *viṣaya* in the Tapā-gaccha naming system, while the act of displacement is performed in a diametrically opposite way. A multiple use of the designation *muni*, as a status indicator and as a tradition indicator, is usually excluded (e.g. \*Muni Śivamuni). Customary rules such as these, pertaining to the creation of affixes, are constitutive of parasystems.

A strictly controlled vocabulary exists for the limited number of office-bearers in organised Jaina mendicant orders, fulfilling supervisor functions over common monks and nuns. The canonical texts of the Śvetāmbara frequently present the following standard list: *ācārya*, *upādhyāya*, *pravartin*, *sthavira*, *gaṇin*, *gaṇadhara*, *gaṇāvacchedaka*,<sup>202</sup> and for nuns: *gaṇinī*, *pravartinī*, *sthavirā*, *gaṇāvacchedinī* (Āyāra<sub>1,2</sub> 2.1.10.1, BK 3.14, etc.). One can find further, often sect-specific, designations, frequently in the idiom of regional languages. Many of the presently bestowed innovative office titles emulate designation of modern political and administrative positions, such as *mantrin* (minister), *salāhakāra* (adviser), *upācārya* (deputy group leader), *yuvārāja* (crown-prince) or *yuvācārya* (young teacher), *upapravartaka* (f. *upapravartinī*) (deputy supervisor).<sup>203</sup>

**Monastic Relationship Indicators:** The use of “honorific kinship terms” (Emeneau 1978: 114), such as “*dādā-guru*”, “grandfather-teacher,” has been canonised in the Kharatara-gaccha with reference to the first *ācāryas* of the order, which became the focus of a sectarian cult.

However, the term *dādā-guru*, and other quasi-kinship terms, are not only use as honorifics, that is, as classificatory terms, but also to indicate relative positions and relationships between mendicants within *guru-śiṣya* lineages. The expression “*dādā-guru*” literally designates the “teacher’s-teacher,” relative to the “disciple’s-disciple” (*para-śiṣya*) or “grandson-disciple” (*pautra-śiṣya*), who, if more than one, are, in Hindi, ranked as *baṛā- / chotā-paraśiṣya*, “great- / small disciple’s-disciple,” etc. As such, “*dādā-guru*” can only

<sup>200</sup> Cort 1991: 663).

<sup>201</sup> On the term *satī*, see Leslie 1991, Kelting 2006.

<sup>202</sup> Āyāra II.1.10: “āyārie vā uvajjhāe vā pavattī vā there vā gaṇī vā gaṇahare vā gaṇāvaccheie vā.”

<sup>203</sup> See Flügel 1995-96: 131, 2000: 92.

be meaningfully employed by a limited set of mendicants of a lineage, who are the *dādā-guru*'s disciples. This and similar relationl terms such as *dādāguru / prapautra-śiṣya*, “great-grandparent-teacher / great-grandson-disciple,” (*baṛā- / choṭā-*) *guru-bhrātr / -bhā*, “(great / small) guru-brother,” that is, disciple of the same guru, etc.<sup>204</sup> According to the classification of AD, these are all names expressing a relation (*saṃjoga-nāma*).

**Titles / Qualifications:** Besides traditional and modern administrative titles, traditional and modern academic titles, such as *paṇḍita*, Doctor, Master of Arts, are also included in the full name. Although secular academic titles are rejected by orthodox mendicants, they are increasingly popular among nuns, many of whom renounced the world because of educational opportunities offered by a monastic lifestyle. There is no fixed rule, but usually the academic title seems to be placed behind the monastic office title to indicate the priority of the monastic sphere (e.g. *Samaṇī Dr Pratibhā Prajñā*).

An official title is often, but not always, like an award, ceremonially bestowed in a public function by the leader of the order to honour a monk or nun by adding a special attribute to the name. One of the most distinguished honours for Jaina monks is the bestowal of the epithet *Yugapradhāna* (“Main Person of the Age”), which is very rarely conveyed to any individual monk. It overlaps with the category of “honorific titles,” but belongs to a select group of attributes that are strictly controlled. It is bestowed in a ceremony known as *Yugapradhāna Alaṃkaraṇa Samāroha*.<sup>205</sup>

**Honorifics / Epithets** (*biruda*, etc.) are titles, sometimes conventionalised, that are added to the given name that express special qualities, attributes or achievements of an individual mendicant. They play a great role in the monastic nomenclature.<sup>206</sup> Without them, it would be difficult to distinguish monks or nuns sharing the same given name, such as *Ācārya Hemaçandra*, and *Ācārya Hemaçandra “Maladhārin,” “The Dirty One.”*<sup>207</sup> As emblems of honour, they also ratify status differentials between mendicants in terms of criteria that cut across the traditional hierarchies of seniority qua biological- and monastic age, textual knowledge, and administrative position.<sup>208</sup> A common example is “*tapasvin*,” “ascetic excelling in the practice of penance.” There are two basic types of epithets: official epithets, ceremonially bestowed by the leader of the order, and unofficial epithets, which are variably attributed to a mendicant by his/her followers, ceremonially or unceremonially.

There seems to be no established controlled vocabulary in any of the Jaina mendicants orders for ceremonially bestowed epithets which recognise the achievements or characteristic positive attributes of an individual, and became part of the official full name as an *epitheton constans*, or “fixed epithet.” Generally, honorifics are bespoke for a particular individual. As a rule, Sanskrit words are preferred. Some of the more frequently used epithets, such as *bahu-śruta* (Pkt. *bahu-suya*), “Very Learned,” are already evident in the Vinaya texts of the canon (Vav 3.3). One can infer from this that conference of epithets was strictly regulated from early on.

The procedures of conferral vary from sect to sect. In the *Sthānakavāsī* traditions today, the ceremonial bestowal of honorifics in recognition of outstanding deeds are also performed by local lay communities, not only, as in the case of the centrally-organised *Śvetāmbara Terāpanth*,<sup>209</sup> by the *ācārya*, who nonetheless possesses the exclusive right to

<sup>204</sup> Note that the word “guru” is used in two ways: literally, as a designation of a “teacher” in the field of education, and more generally, as a designation for a (sub-) group-leader (*gaṇadhara*, etc.) and disciples initiated by him (with permission). Despite the fact that quasi-kinship relationships such as *guru-śiṣya* links resemble father-son relationships, the terms “father” (*pitṛ*) and “son” (*putra*), and feminine equivalents, are avoided. In general, feminine designations mirror the masculine terms.

<sup>205</sup> Cf. Hilka 1910: 72f., 144 on “bynames” of Indian rulers; and Dundas 2007: 35, 195 Fn. 109 on the use of the Sanskrit word *viruda* or *biruda* in the context of the *Tapā-gaccha*.

<sup>206</sup> For Vedic epithets, see Gonda 1959.

<sup>207</sup> One of the fundamental rules for Jaina mendicants demands abstinence from washing for protection of the water-beings (*āp-kāya*).

<sup>208</sup> See the classification of ten types of *theras* in *Thāṇa* 10.136.

<sup>209</sup> Flügel 1995-6: 156.

bestow official monastic titles, a set repertoire of which has been established by Ācārya Tulasī.

**Bynames / Nicknames / Sobriquets:** Honorifics that are formally conveyed by lay communities, overlap with bynames / nicknames / sobriquet, which tend to emerge spontaneously, either in the form of fluctuating popular attributions, through shortened forms of full names, or in the context of problems of identification of particular individuals, through a reference to the place or region of origin, etc. Nicknames generally highlight particular attributes or abilities that are publicly recognised. Because they are not centrally controlled status indicators, deriving their social currency from the authority of the head of the order and sect, their popularity fluctuates. As a consequence, not all bynames and nicknames of a mendicant, if any, are included in official records, although they are also considered to be part of the full name. Many nicknames are semantically honorifics.<sup>210</sup>

**Epitheta Ornantia:** In addition, or alternative to *muni*, the gender-neutral *epitheton ornans* and status indicator *mahā-rāja* (“great king” = monk or nun) is used in all Jaina traditions as an optional postposition. Its purpose as a status indicator is to mark the elevated position of a mendicant in society, which is also underlined by the conventional referential use of the *pluralis majestatis*. The words *mahārāja* (great king) or *mahārājādhirāja* (paramount king) are rarely used as a preposition in name lists, to distinguish monks clearly from kings. In its role as an *epitheton ornans*, it does not function as an attribute, only as an embellishment, and as an expression of respect. To all proper names of human beings, gods, and hell-beings, even book-titles and place names, the honorific particle °*jī* is conventionally added in a similar way, as well as the affix *śrī*, which can also be used as a symbol of royalty. Exceptions are names such as Lavajī (Lavjī Rṣi), where the suffix °*jī* has become a fixed component of the given name and necessary for the identification of the person (the name “Lava” has no recognition value amongst participants).

A componential analysis of the typical elements of a full Jaina monastic name results in the following Jaina monastic “naming formula,” representing all possible elements and possible positions of elements. Located at the centre of the string of words constituting the multi-dimensional full name is the, usually di-morphic, monastic given name, which is sometimes combined with a group indicator, and framed by ornamental honorifics.<sup>211</sup> Within the constraints of the given language and grammatical rules, honorifics and position indicators are generally placed in front and bynames/nicknames behind the given name. Yet, neither the sequencing of the components of a monastic full name is regulated, nor the degree of completeness of name elements used in a formal act of referencing.<sup>212</sup>

Honorific + Position + *Affix* + GIVENNAME (=/+ GroupIndicator) + *Affix* + StatusIndicator  
+ Byname

Individual monastic “naming-formulas” or “name-types” vary slightly from tradition to tradition, and historically. They share, however, a common repertoire of elements which are combined in a variety of ways. Names are structured sequences of

<sup>210</sup> Hilka 1910: 72f.

<sup>211</sup> The method of componential analysis of name-schemata evidently overlaps with frame- and slot- (“*sthāna*”) filler analysis, introduced into Jainology by Bruhn 1983: 41-3, 48-51, modifying Bruhn’s 1969: 230ff. earlier analysis of patterns of “formulas.” Bruhn 1986: 153 stresses the importance of this move from the analysis of styles and classes to varieties & sub-varieties: “we did not at the time find a systematic approach for the description of motifs with an involved morphology.” Garland bearers, for instance, were seen as purely decorative, though they “function as attributes.”

<sup>212</sup> A purely theoretical maximal pattern of name elements and typical positions would for instance look as follows: HT+EO+ET+AT+HA-GN-NZ (GI)-HA+SI+EO (e. g. Yugapradhāna “Bahuśruta” “Paṇḍita” Ācārya Śrī-Vardhamāna-Muni-Jī Mahārāja Jayapuriyā).

different types of nouns. Since their basic form is a series,<sup>213</sup> they can be analysed as systems of relationships, like the Jina images studied by Klaus Bruhn (1969). The given root name, like the Jina image, is almost featureless. It is an empty signifier, a general form, which functions merely as an index for a particular focal individual. Like a Jina image, the given name is placed at the centre of the naming formula - the series of words - and flanked by different types of schematically framed slots for attributes and embellishments with performative function, which in the present case are not iconographical but linguistic. Usually, the given name in the centre is accompanied by a group indicator and flanked by name components for the identification of the social position and of peculiar characteristics which distinguish the named individual from other individuals of the same given name.<sup>214</sup> Individual attributes comprise links to particular localities or events or specific abilities, achievements or features of personality.

### Classificatory and Relational Functions of Names

The Jaina method of composition of individual full names by way of “combination” and “variation” seems to correspond to “non-creative form-principles” which Bruhn (1969: 249-59) contrasted, in an iconographic context, with creative form principles such as “transformation” and “fusion.” An important, yet underexplored, aspect of naming remains the relationship between taxonomy and pragmatics. The above discussion of both individualising and ornamental honorifics, used referentially or as forms of address, has shown that, *in situ*, personal names always implicate not only social classifications but also relationships. Outside pragmatic contexts, names are arbitrary labels, as pointed out by J.-S. Mill, who reached this conclusion after abstracting “proper names” from all meaningful semantic and pragmatic circumstances, despite the fact that all names, even wilful designations,<sup>215</sup> are predicated on naming relationships, that is, acts of indexication, performed from certain standpoints.<sup>216</sup>

This fact, that all names and naming formulas function as contextual frames, and hence have pragmatic implications, has not escaped the Jaina monk Āryarakṣita, who, in addition to classificatory terms (AD 285ff., etc.), included in his comprehensive list of name-types (AD 302-310) expressions of relationship, such as reverence (*siloya-nāma*), (kinship) relationship (*saṃjoga-nāma*), physical nearness (*samīva-nāma*), authorship (*saṃjūha-nāma*), relation of rulership, power, or wealth (*īsariya-nāma*), and relation of progeny (*avacca-nāma*).

Lévi-Strauss (1962/1966: 200) cites the interesting observation of R. Thurnwald (1916), that, from a logical point of view, designations of social relationships could be placed between “generalising proper names” and “individualising pronouns,” if only to highlight that all proper names also have generalising functions:

“Some ethnographers have approached the problem of proper names from the angle of kinship terms:

‘Logically, terms of relationship may be regarded as ranking between proper names and pronouns. They occupy a position between both and might be called individualized pronouns or generalized proper names’ (Thurnwald [1916 Bánaro Society], p. 357).

But if this transition is likewise possible it is because from the ethnological point of view, proper names always appear as terms which are generalized or have a

<sup>213</sup> Not unlike the types of series distinguished in AD. See *supra*.

<sup>214</sup> Following the rather minimalistic use of the term by Bruhn 1969: 240 here.

<sup>215</sup> See *supra* AD 291 on the “name given according to one’s wish” (*ābhīppāiya-nāma*) that is, a given name.

<sup>216</sup> This is how Kripke’s 1972 famous baptism paradigm can be read. Cf. Searle 1983/1989: 243 on “parasitic references”: “object called N in my community or my interlocutors.”



generalizing function. In this respect they do not differ fundamentally from the names of species.”

Adding to this, one might say that, in context, the “meaning” of a name, in the sense of G. Frege, comprises not only semantic but also pragmatic implications.<sup>217</sup> The reification of relations through the act of naming is one of them.

## 7. Jaina Naming Practices from the Perspective of Functional Grammar

The most important function of a name is to identify an individual. In the case of the intentionally de-individualising Jaina monastic names this is, in a decontextualized form, generally only possible by adding descriptions of characteristic attributes, ascribed or achieved, often statuses with corresponding role expectations. Full Jaina monastic names manage to pinpoint an individual in this way by expanding the “given name” through the addition of further “descriptors,” to use Keats-Rohan’s term, that is, epithets, titles, bynames, group membership indicators, etc., which form chains of words of different function. Most descriptors are various types of attributive (or adjunct) nouns, including substantives designating relationships, and particles of similar function. In the footsteps of Frege (1892/1986: 27/41), Russell (1918) 1972/2010: 29), and Gardiner (1940/1954: 66), the philosopher Geach (1962: 169) introduced the expression “referring phrase” (p. 47) to capture the denotative functions of such strings of words, arguing that “a proper name may itself count as a one-item list” and that “a proper name and a list of several names are mutually replaceable *salva congruitate*.” In essence, this has already been argued by the Jaina canonical passage AD 209. The linguist Halliday (1985: 192) preferred to speak of “nominal groups,” to highlight the fact that such “chains of modification” of a “head word” are grammatically connected through apposition, and not in any syntactical way: “a group is an expansion of a word, a phrase is a contraction of a clause” (p. 159). However, a nominal group is not without grammatical structure. Because it is constituted by a relationship between a “primary-” or “dominant element” (the “head word” or “thing”) and “secondary-” or “dependent elements” (“modifiers”), the type of interdependence of the words can be either paratactic or hypotactic (p. 195).<sup>218</sup> Halliday suggests that the structure of a nominal group “evolves” from the head word through processes of ascription (elaboration, extension, enhancement, projection) (p. 196), and that from an “experiential” perspective it appears as a relationship between a “thing” and its “attributes.”<sup>219</sup> The

<sup>217</sup> For a socio-linguistic approach, see Flügel 2010.

<sup>218</sup> Halliday 1985: 195:

“We will refer to the members of a pair of related clauses, in paratactic or hypotactic relation, as PRIMARY and SECONDARY. The primary is the initiating clause in a paratactic structure, and the dominant clause in a hypotactic; the secondary is the continuing clause in a paratactic structure and the dependent clause in a hypotactic.”

“Parataxis is the linking of elements of equal status. Both the initiating and the continuing element are free, in the sense that each could stand as a functioning whole. Hypotaxis is the binding of elements of unequal status. The dominant element is free, but the dependent element is not. Parataxis and hypotaxis define a kind of structure that we have called ‘univariate’, to distinguish it from the multivariate structures that we find anywhere else. A multivariate structure is a configuration of different functional relationships” (ibid.).

<sup>219</sup> Halliday, Kirkwood & Matthiessen 1999/2000: 183:

“Experientially, there is a ‘carrier’ - the Thing - and there are ‘attributes’ - Epithets and other modifiers. However, participants are construed not only experientially but also logically, which means that the Thing (typically) serves as a Head that can be modified by successive attributes and that this modifying relation is inherently ascriptive. [...] That is, participants are construed as things that can accrue attributes.”

Halliday 1985: 167:

“The element we are calling ‘Thing’ is the semantic core of the nominal group, it may be a common noun, proper noun or (personal) pronoun.”



the epithets “Lord” and “Mahāvīra,” the composite name “Śramaṇa Bhagavān Mahāvīra” was created “by the gods.” Jacobi’s (1884) translation does not clearly identify the three different agents that bestow the three types of “names” (*nāma*), or “sequence of names” (*nāma-ānupūrvī*),<sup>222</sup> to Mahāvīra, namely parents, society, and gods (~rulers), but Mette’s (2010: 272) translation does. In our terminology, the three types of descriptors can be designated as: birth name, mendicant status indicator,<sup>223</sup> and honorific epithet (which effectively became the monastic name of Vardhamāna). Interestingly, in contrast to other passages in the canon, the term *kāsava* (“Kāśyapa”), indicating *gotra* membership, is not categorised as a “name”:

“The Venerable Ascetic Mahāvīra belonged to the Kāśyapa gotra. His three names have thus been recorded: by his **parents** he was called **Vardhamāna**<sub>1</sub>, by universal joyful **consent** (he was called) **śramaṇa**<sub>2</sub> (i.e. Ascetic), because he sustained dreadful dangers and fears, the noble nakedness, and the miseries of the world; the name **Venerable Ascetic Mahāvīra**<sub>3</sub> has been given to him by the **gods**” (Āyāra<sub>2</sub> II.15.15, tr. based on Jacobi 1884 with added emphasis).<sup>224</sup>

A second, frequently cited passage offers a series of 8-10 designators, depending on whether the word *bhagava* (Lord, the Venerable) and the repetition of the name *videha* are counted or not, which indicate the social background of the “Ascetic Lord Mahāvīra” before his renunciation.

“In that period, in that age, the Ascetic<sub>1</sub>, the Venerable<sub>2</sub> Mahāvīra<sub>3</sub>, a **Nāya**<sub>4</sub>,<sup>225</sup> Son of the Nāya<sub>5</sub>, Grown out of the Nāya-Clan<sub>6</sub>,<sup>226</sup> a **Videha**<sub>7</sub>, Gift to Videha<sub>8</sub>,<sup>227</sup> Noble

<sup>222</sup> In the terminology of the AD.

<sup>223</sup> According to Schubring 1935 § 137: 158, the use is more epithetic.

<sup>224</sup> Āyāra<sub>1</sub> II.15.15:

“Samaṇe bhagavaṃ Mahāvīre Kāsavagotte. tassa ṇaṃ ime tinni nāmadhejjā evam āhijjanti: amṃāpiusaṃtie Vaddhamāṇe<sub>1</sub>, sahasammuidīe Samaṇe<sub>2</sub>, bhīmahayabheravaṃ orālaṃ acelayaṃ paṛisahaṃ sahai tti kaṭṭu devehiṃ se nāmaṃ kayavaṃ Samaṇe Bhagavaṃ Mahāvīre<sub>3</sub>.”

In line with most Jaina text editions, Mette 2010: 272 translates the expression *saha-sammuiyāe* (based on Skt. *muditā*) as “mit allgemeiner freudiger Zustimmung” (by universal joyful consent). Jacobi, whose translations have been used but modified here, renders *saha-sammuidīe* tentatively as “because he is devoid of love and hate.” He did not change the translation of *saha-sammuiyāe* in JC<sub>2</sub> 108 (below), but changed the position of the semi-colon. Āyāra<sub>2</sub> II.15.15:

“The Venerable Ascetic Mahāvīra belonged to the Kāśyapa gotra. His three names have thus been recorded by tradition: by his parents he was called Vardhamāna<sub>1</sub>, because he is devoid of love and hate; (he is called) Sramaṇa (i.e. Ascetic), because he sustains dreadful dangers and fears, the noble nakedness, and the miseries of the world; the name Venerable Ascetic Mahāvīra has been given to him by the gods.”

A variation can be found in JC<sub>1</sub> 108 (differences to Āyāra<sub>1</sub> II.15.15 highlighted):

“Samaṇe bhagavaṃ Mahāvīre Kāsave gotteṇaṃ. tassa ṇaṃ tao nāmadhijjā evam āhijjanti. taṃ jahā: amṃā - piu - saṃtie Vaddhamāṇe<sub>1</sub>, sahasammuiyāe Samaṇe<sub>2</sub>, ayale bhaya-bheravānaṃ paṛisahovasaggānaṃ khamtī-khame paḍimānaṃ pālage dhīmaṃ arai-rai-sahe davie viriya-sampanne devehiṃ se nāmaṃ kayavaṃ: Samaṇe Bhagavaṃ Mahāvīre<sub>3</sub>.”

JC<sub>2</sub> 108 (emphasis added):

“The Venerable Ascetic Mahāvīra belonged to the Kāśyapa gotra. His three names have thus been recorded: by his parents he was called Vardhamāna; because he is devoid of love and hate, he is called Sramaṇa (i. e. Ascetic); because he stands fast in midst of dangers and fears, patiently bears hardships and calamities, adheres to the chosen rules of penance, is wise, indifferent to pleasure and pain, rich in control, and gifted with fortitude, the name Venerable Ascetic Mahāvīra has been given him by the gods.”

<sup>225</sup> In his translation, Jacobi inserts the explanatory word “Kshatriya” here, without brackets. See Footnote 229. From 1988 onwards Bollée translates: “Nāga.”

<sup>226</sup> Jacobi does not translate the compound *nāya-kula-nivvatte* (Skt. “jñāṭṛ-” *kula-nirvṛtta*), likely because it repeats more or less what in his view was said already about *nātaputta*. JC<sub>1</sub> 110 (see Footnote 230) has *nāya-kula-caṃde*, “moon of the clan of the Jñāṭṛ,” which he does translate.

of Videha<sub>9</sub>,<sup>228</sup> Prince of Videha<sub>10</sub>, lived thirty years under the name of 'Videha'" (Āyāra<sub>2</sub> II.15.17, emphasis added).<sup>229</sup>

Notably, the birth-name *vaddhamāṇa* is replaced here by the referring string *samaṇe bhagavaṃ mahāvīre*, with *mahāvīra* as the head-word. Four further Prakrit designations for Mahāvīra, *videha-diṇṇa*, *nāya-kula-nivvatta /-camda*, *videha-jacca* and *videha-sūmāla*, only occur at two places in the canon: in Āyāra II.15.17, and, in a variation of the same text, in JC 110.<sup>230</sup> The style of this text is panegyric, which explains the repetitive form of presentation, if not the peculiar method of reiterating the two principal additional designators *nāya* and *videha* respectively 3 and 4-5 times, each time adding a different piece of further information in the second clauses of the compound words. Arguably, the underlying method is to present a further extended chain of post-modifications of the already qualified "head-word:" here the former epithet "Mahāvīra" rather than "Vardhamāna":

The Ascetic + Lord + Mahāvīra + A Nāga + One from Videha + Gift + Noble + Prince

Nominal groups comprising all key designations of Mahāvīra, such as *Jiṇa Samaṇa Vaddhamāṇa Mahāvīra Nāyaputta*, "Conqueror - Ascetic - Increasing One - Great Hero - Son of the Nāga-Clan," are not evident in the texts, but modern constructions. The number and sequence of attributive nouns in a nominal group is however not fixed, certainly not in the Jaina sources. Hence nothing prevents us from re-arranging the string of words in the form of a logical-semantic sequence of pre-modifications of the head-word, expanding from right to left.<sup>231</sup>

	EPITHET	EPITHET	EPITHET/POSITION	BYNAME	GIVEN NAME
"WHICH?"	Bhagavat	Mahāvīra	Śramaṇa	Nāyaputra	Vardhamāna
	ε	δ	γ	β	α
	←				

<sup>227</sup> Jacobi must have assumed that the expression *videha-diṇṇe*, though masculine nominative singular, refers to Videhadattā, one of the names of the mother of Mahāvīra. Schubring 1935 § 17: 27, by contrast, lists the term as one of the "names" of Mahāvīra. See Mehta & Chandra 1972: 708 for both options. *Videha-diṇṇe* could also be rendered as "Son of Videha" (rather than "Son of Videhadattā") as suggested by W. Bollée (personal communication 22.9.2017).

<sup>228</sup> Pkt. *jacca* = Skt. *jātya*. Hence, the expression can be translated as "Noble-" or "Best of Videha."

<sup>229</sup> Āyāra<sub>1</sub> II.15.17:

"teṇaṃ kāleṇaṃ samaṇaṃ samaṇe bhagavaṃ Mahāvīre<sub>1</sub> nāte<sub>2</sub> Nāyaputte<sub>3</sub> nāyakulanivvatte<sub>4</sub> videhe<sub>5</sub> Videhadinne<sub>6</sub> videhajacce<sub>7</sub> videhasūmāle<sub>8</sub> tisaṃ vāsāiṃ videha tti."

Jacobi's translation of Āyāra<sub>2</sub> II.15.17:

"In that period, in that age the Venerable Ascetic Mahāvīra, a *Gñātri* Kshatriya, *Gñātriputra*, a Videha, son of Videhadattā, a native of Videha, a prince of Videha, lived thirty years amongst the householders under the name of 'Videha.'"

<sup>230</sup> JC<sub>1</sub> 110 has the following variation (differences to Āyāra<sub>1</sub> II.15.17 highlighted). Jacobi indicates what he considers to be personal designations by using capital letters, thus seemingly excluding *videha* and *videha-sūmāla* / *-sumāla* (printing error?). The text does not have the repetitive "name of Videha" of Āyāra II.15.17 at the end:

"samaṇe bhagavaṃ Mahāvīre dakkhe dakkha-painne padirūve āliṇe bhaddae vinīe Nāe Nāyaputte Nāya-kula-camde videhe Videhadinne Videhaj'acce videha-sūmāle tisaṃ vāsāiṃ videhamṣi [...]."

JC<sub>2</sub> 110:

"The Venerable Ascetic Mahāvīra - clever, with the aspirations of a clever man, of great beauty, controlling (his senses), lucky, and modest; a *Gñātri* Kshatriya, the son of a *Gñātri* Kshatriya; the moon of the clan of the *Gñātris*; a Videha, the son of Videhadattā, a native of Videha, a prince of Videha - had lived thirty years in Videha [...]."

<sup>231</sup> Halliday 2004: 332 Fn.:

"In previous editions the Postmodifier also was brought into the scope of the logical representation. But this appears to complicate the description without adding further to its explanatory power."

The fact that Vardhamāna's epithet *mahāvīra*, "great hero," was from early on used as his principal designation as well, standing in, as it were, for the then non-existent monastic given name, conventionally bestowed in most Jaina mendicant traditions today, shows that some of the descriptors are exchangeable, can stand alone, and thus have equal value. As suggested by the table, the relationship between these terms might therefore better be described as paratactical rather than hypotactical. Yet, individually, none of the nouns is specific enough to serve as an unambiguous identifier. Only the combination of two or three renders the unambiguous identification of the individual possible. Modern textbooks therefore usually refer to "Vardhamāna Mahāvīra," an artificial construction, not found in the old texts. So far, in the literature only questions concerning individual names, such as Mahāvīra's, taken as synonyms, have been discussed. With the single exception of Klaus Bruhn (1954 ff.), the semantic and pragmatic functions of series of terms, such as nominal groups, has not been considered as yet.<sup>232</sup>

In the early biographical texts, the various known descriptors of Vardhamāna are not presented as groups of nouns. Most words appear in isolation.<sup>233</sup> This caused considerable "uncertainty of the *jina*'s name in the ancient canonical texts" (Mette 1991: 134). In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, a debate waged amongst scholars, whether or not the individual designations actually refer to one and the same person, and whether the designated persons were Buddhist or a Jaina, until H. Jacobi (1879) resolved the issue conclusively. Another question was whether expressions such as "the ascetic," "son of Videha," or "great hero" are proper names or not.

Implicitly following Schubring's (1935 § 17: 26f.) somewhat unsystematic distinction between "civil names," "names," "short names," "attributes," "group names," and "appellatives" (ibid., § 137: 158 / 248f.), Mette (1991: 132f.) was the first to make an oblique attempt to classify descriptors into "proper names of people," "proper names of groups," "appellatives" and "epithets." However, there is still considerable confusion as to the precise function of the designations of Mahāvīra in the literature – not to speak of other full names. In contrast to Āyāra II.15.17, which arguably uses the word "name" in the sense of the AD as a designation for a "classification," for Schubring (1935 § 17: 26f. / 2000: 32), "*samaṇa*, as he [Mahāvīra] is said to have called himself, is as far from being a proper name as is, for instance, 'the son of man'." He includes, however, as implicitly does Jacobi (1884), the words *vesāliya* and *videha-diṇṇa* under Mahāvīra's "names." Mette (1991: 133f.), describes the designations *samaṇa* and *brāhmaṇa* for the *jina* as "appellatives," and only *nāyaputta* / *nāyasūya*, *kāsava*, and *vaddhamāṇa* as "names," although Schubring already described some of them as designators of group membership. *Nāya* in Āyāra II.15, however, is identified as the "name of his clan (*kula*)" rather than as personal name. Two uses of the word *mahāvīra* are noted: as an "epithet" and as a "proper name."

The Jaina sources offer more than the above mentioned five best-known designations of the presumed last or perhaps only Jaina prophet.<sup>234</sup> The name of the exogamous group (*gotta*) to which Mahāvīra is said to have belonged, *kāsava*, is also used as a proper name in the sense of "the one from the group x." Other common forms of (self-)

<sup>232</sup> Bruhn 1954, 1976 § 6:

"Jaina iconography mainly consists of series: 24 Jinas (p. 33), 24 symbols, 24 attending goddesses, 24 attending gods (p. 34), 16 Mahāvīdyās. The Jina motif is very similar to the Buddha motif, but any of the 24 Jinas could become an object of worship and there was considerable emphasis on the series as such."

<sup>233</sup> "The phenomenon of changing names (*Kāsava*, *Nāyaputta* and *Vaddhamāṇa* are never mentioned side by side in the old sources) awakes attention, because it is possible that the Jain movement had not yet made the decisive step to the formation of a 'real' religion at the time of the earliest Buddhism. It was also not concerned with a single founder personality in this sense" (Mette 1991: 133).

<sup>234</sup> See the debate between on the one hand Jacobi 1879: 5 who, like Colebrooke, saw Pārśva as the "real founder" of the Jaina tradition, a view echoed by Schubring 1935 § 3: 5, and on the other hand Leumann 1934: i, Bruhn 1969, Dundas 1992/2002: 19, 32, Bhatt 1993: 85, etc., who regard Mahāvīra as "the actual founder of Jainism" (Bruhn 1969: 2).

address used in the early texts are *samaṇa* (“ascetic,” apparently Mahāvīra’s self-designation), *araha*, *arahaṃta* (Skt. *arhat*, *arahanta*, “venerable being”) or *arihaṃta* (Skt. *arihanta*, *arihantar*, “destroyer of enemies,” here: karman), *bhagavaṃ* (“lord”), *bhagavaṃ loya-nāha* (“lord ruler of the world”), *vesāliya* (“one from (the town) Vaiśālī”), and *videha-diṇṇa* (“gift to (the) Videha (country)” / “son of Videha”).<sup>235</sup>

The exact meaning of a single term, mentioned in isolation, can at best be inferred on the basis of contextual information, or by comparison with other texts. Even the descriptors of the position of the Jaina “prophets” or teachers of salvific knowledge, such as *tittha(m)kara*, *titthagara*, *titthayara* (“ford-maker”), *jīna* (“conqueror,” here: of karman), or *araha*, are unspecific. They are used in other Indian religious traditions as well. While the relationship between the individual designations remains unclear outside literary or pragmatic contexts, the combination of descriptors, the number and peculiar nature of epithets, bynames, and designations of position, modifying the given name permit the unequivocal identification of an individual, independent of context. This fact explains why extensive list of epithets have been constructed for renowned religious leaders.

A Śvetāmbara list of officially 32 but actually 27-41 different epithets of Mahāvīra, depending on how one counts, has been canonised in the Uvavāiya;<sup>236</sup> though more epithets of the Jinās can be found in the Jaina scriptures, not to mention the detailed descriptions of his physical and mental attributes in other texts.<sup>237</sup>

FORTY EPITHETS OF MAHĀVĪRA IN THE UVAVĀIYA					
1	Āigara <ādikara>	Founder	21	Jiṇa <jina>	Conqueror
2	Titthagara <tīrthakara>	Ford-maker	22	Jāṇaya <jāpaya> <sup>238</sup>	Communicator
3	Sahasambuddha <svayam-sambuddha>	Self-enlightened	23	Tiṇṇa <tīrṇa>	One who has crossed
4	Purisottama <puruṣōttama>	Supreme person	24	Tāraya <tāraka>	One who helps crossing
5	Purisa-sīha <puruṣa-siṃha>	“Lion” among men	25	Mutta <mukta>	Liberated
6	Purisa-vara-puṇḍarīya <puruṣa-vara-puṇḍarīka>	“White lotus” among men	26	Moyaya <mocaka>	Liberator
7	Purisa-vara-gaṃḍhahatthī <puruṣa-vara-gandhahastin>	“Rutting elephant” among men	27	Buddha	Enlightened
8	Abhaya-daya <abhaya-dāyaka>	Giver of fearlessness	28	Bohaya <bodhaka>	Enlightener
9	Cakkhu-daya <cakṣu-dāyaka>	Giver of insight	29	Or 22-27: Arihā <arhat> &	Venerable
10	Magga-daya <mārga-dāyaka>	Giver of the path	30	Or 22-27: Kevalī <kevalin>	Omniscient
11	Saraṇa-daya	Giver of refuge	31	Savvaṇṇū <sarvajña>	All-knowing

<sup>235</sup> See Schubring 1935 § 17: 26f. W. Bollée, e-mail 22.9.2017: “a curious term,” prefers the second possibility, and points to the name of Mahāvīra’s mother Videhadīṇṇā.

<sup>236</sup> Uvav<sub>1</sub> 16(a) ~ Uvav<sub>2</sub> 17 ~ Uvav<sub>3</sub> 19.

<sup>237</sup> See the lists of names in Schubring 1935 §§ 14, 17: 21, 26f., Mehta & Chandra 1972: 575f., Mette 1991: 132-4. Besides Āyāra II.15.15 & 17, JC 108 & 110, the most extensive list of “32” descriptors of Mahāvīra in the Śvetāmbara canon - Leumann 1883 speaks of “attributes” - is given in Uvav<sub>2</sub>. (Compare the “32” *mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇas* of the Buddha.) Some of the expressions comprise compounds of up to 7 members (enumeration added):

“teṇaṃ kāleṇaṃ teṇaṃ samaeṇaṃ samaṇe Bhagavaṃ Mahāvīre āigare<sub>1</sub> titthagare<sub>2</sub> sahasambuddhe<sub>3</sub> purisottame<sub>4</sub> purisa-sīhe<sub>5</sub> purisa-vara-puṇḍarīe<sub>6</sub> purisa-vara-gandhahatthī<sub>7</sub> abhaya-dae<sub>8</sub> cakkhu-dae<sub>9</sub> magga-dae<sub>10</sub> saraṇa-dae<sub>11</sub> jīva-dae<sub>12</sub> dīvo<sub>13</sub> tāṇaṃ<sub>14</sub> saraṇaṃ<sub>15</sub> gaī<sub>16</sub> paīṭṭhā<sub>17</sub> dhamma-vara-cāuranta-cakkavattī<sub>18</sub> appaḍihaya-vara-nāṇa-damsaṇadhare<sub>19</sub> viyaṭṭha-chaume<sub>20</sub> jīṇe<sub>21</sub> jāṇae<sub>22</sub> tiṇṇe<sub>23</sub> tārae<sub>24</sub> mutte<sub>25</sub> moyae<sub>26</sub> buddhe<sub>27</sub> bodhae<sub>28</sub> [statt der letzten 8 Attribute kvacid: arihā jīṇe kevalī] savvaṇṇū<sub>29</sub> savva-darīsī<sub>30</sub> sivam-ayalam-aruyam-aṇantam-akkhayam-avvābāham-apuṇarāvattagaṃ<sub>31</sub> siddhigai-nāmadhejjaṃ ṭhāṇaṃ sampāviukāme<sub>32</sub>.”

<sup>238</sup> “jāṇaya nomen agentis vom Causativst. jāṇay, dessen ṇ von jīṇ aus eingedrungen ist, für \*jāvay = jāpay 16. Das KŚ. hat jāvaya. Der Comm. erklärt falsch jñāpakah” (Leumann 1883: 120).

	<śaraṇa-dāyaka>				
12	Jīva-daya <jīva-dāyaka>	Giver of (meaningful) life	32	Savva-darīsī <sarva-darśin>	All-seeing
13	Dīva <dvīpa> <sup>239</sup>	“Island” (in the ocean)	33	Siva <śiva>	Peaceful <sup>240</sup>
14	Tāṇa <trāṇa>	Protection	34	Ayala <acala>	Immovable
15	Saraṇa <śaraṇa>	Refuge	35	Aruya <aruja>	Painless
16	Gaī <gati>	Mover (transmigration)	36	Ananta <ananta>	Eternal
17	Paiṭṭhā <pratiṣṭhā>	Support	37	Akkhaya <akṣaya>	Immortal
18	Dhamma-vara-cāuranta-cak kavaṭṭī <dharma-vara-cāuranta-cakr avartin>	Supreme religious emperor of the four directions	38	Avvābāha <avyābādha>	Unobstructed
19	Appaḍihaya-vara-nāṇa-dams aṇadhara <apratihata-vara-jñāna-darśa nadhara>	Possessor of unobstructed supreme knowledge and insight	39	Apunārāvattagaṃ <a-punar-āvartaka>	Not-again-reborn
20	Viyaṭṭa-chauma <vyāvṛtta-chadma>	Free from delusion	40	Siddhigai-nāmadhejja ṭhāṇa sampāviukāma <siddhagati-nāmadhe ya sthāna samprāptukāma>	Destined to reach the state of tranquillity named place of perfection

The structure of the list is clear, while an exploration of its genesis may produce further insights:<sup>241</sup> (1-3) description of Mahāvīra’s pivotal role as self-enlightened founder of the *tīrtha*; (4-7) ornamental panegyric metaphors; (8-12) enumeration of his main “gifts” to the world; (13-17) and his further contributions; (18-20) idealised personal attributes (*dharma-cakravartin*, etc.); (21-28) a list of attributes, beginning with *jina*, which according to the commentary can be replaced with the three generic epithets: *jina* (overlapping with No. 21), *arhat*, and *kevalin* (according to Leumann’s manuscript, the three can be inserted anywhere, resulting in *jina* being mentioned twice), clearly listing attributes associated with the three terms, interestingly in No. 25-30 in form of three pairs of terms describing first one of Mahāvīra’s personal achievements and then his bestowal of the same on others; (31-32) the qualities of omniscience reiterated again in different terms; (33-40) a single compound linking seven attributes of the liberated soul (*siddha*), the state of which Mahāvīra was destined to reach. Broadly speaking, the first half of the list comprises names indicating the position and contributions of Mahāvīra, and the second half features names reflecting progress on the path towards the state of salvation.

Notable is the first descriptor, “*ādikara*,” “first maker, creator,” because it seems to demonstrate that the compiler(s) of the list wanted to present Mahāvīra as founder, not as reformer, of the Jaina *tīrtha*. However, because of the ambiguity of the word *tīrtha*, No. 2 in the list, it remains unclear what exactly he created: the Jaina doctrine, the monastic order, or the fourfold Jaina community, or both. As regards the question, whether Pārśva or Mahāvīra was the “real founder” of the Jaina tradition, Bruhn’s (2003: 74f.) conclusion seems realistic: “Perhaps we do not know anything reliable about the two personalities.”

<sup>239</sup> Could also be *dīpa*, “light.”

<sup>240</sup> It is difficult to select the most appropriate translation: “fortunate” or “auspicious” are other likely possibilities, as well as “liberated,” which appeared already in the list.

<sup>241</sup> Compare Griffiths 1994: 60-6 on the traditional lists of epithets of the Buddha, such as:

“(1) thus-gone (*tathāgata*), (2) worthy (*arhat*), (3) fully and completely awakened (*samyaksambuddha*), (4) accomplished in knowledge and virtuous conduct (*vidyācaraṇasampanna*), (5) well-gone (*sugata*), (6) knower of worlds (*lokavid*), (7) unsurpassed guide for those who need restraint (*anuttaraḥ puruṣadamyasārathiḥ*), (8) teacher of gods and humans (*śāstā devamanuṣyānām*), (9) awakened (*buddha*), (10) blessed (*bhagavat*)” (p. 60).

According to the categories of the *Jaina-Prosopography*, the names of Vardhamāna mentioned in the Śvetāmbara canon can be classified as follows, taking into account the dual function of designators such as *mahāvīra* (bestowed “by the gods”) and *śramaṇa* (bestowed “by general consent”):

GIVEN NAME	Vardhamāna, Mahāvīra
POSITION / STATUS INDICATOR	Śramaṇa, Tīrtha(ṇ)kara
HONORIFIC / EPITHET	Bhagavat, Mahāvīra, Jina, Abhayadāyaka, etc.
TITLES / QUALIFICATIONS	Svayasāmbuddha, Kevalin, Arhat, Ādikara, Siddha, etc.
BYNAME / NICKNAME	Kāśyapa, Nāga, Videha, Vaiśālīka, Śramaṇa etc.
EPITHET ORNANS	Puruṣōttama, Dharmacakravartin, etc.

### 9. De-/Individualisation in Jaina Practices of Naming and Iconographic Representation

Jaina naming practices have much in common with the Jaina practices of iconography representation of individuals. The similarities have been pointed out by Klaus Bruhn (1954, 1969 ff.), who extended the methodologies he developed during the course of his investigation of plot structures and biographical trajectories in Jaina universal histories to the study of representations of the Jinas in Jaina art and iconography. His main insights flow from the question of the relationship between the “typical” and the “individual,” or between “generic attributes” (*Gattungsattribute*) and “personal attributes” (*Individualattribute*) in Jaina biography and iconography. Broadly speaking, the approach is taxonomic, rather than pragmatic, resembling the approaches of Linnaeus or Āryarākṣita, though the latter’s discourse is not taken into account.

Already in his first book publication, Bruhn (1954: 118) points to the characteristic emphasis on the typical in Jaina literature, and a corresponding tendency toward de-individualisation. The transformation of an individual into a type, as demanded by Jaina soteriology as well as aesthetic and social conventions, can be achieved in two ways, he argues: by “division” and by “multiplication” (p. 134). Bruhn (1983: 40) later preferred the terms “categorization” and “multiplication plus repetition.” Categorization is achieved by the absorption of similar items under one label, for instance through the elimination of synonyms, hence yielding a reduction of the number of designations by way of generalisation: “similarity can be reinforced through generalisation of certain features.” Multiplication, by contrast, “is connected with the fabrication of names and the construction of a chronological frame (different representatives of the type in different periods).”<sup>242</sup> Both techniques are intent to relativise the ideal function of proper names to serve as re-individualising designations.

To account for similar processes of integration and multiplication of terminology in Jaina dogmatic, Bruhn (1981: 26) proposes a general model, namely the tendency to explain a single, general term through two or more other terms, that is, through a process of specification which in functional grammar is similarly described as a process of

<sup>242</sup> Bruhn 1983 § 11, 2010: 161 notices that lists with a high number of names (which by virtue of being mentioned in Jaina texts become “Jaina names”), such as the epithets of Mahāvīra, are located particularly in the canonical *Samavāya* and in the texts of the post-canonical Jaina universal history.

For different types of Jaina name-lists, see Schubring’s 1944 catalogue, which distinguishes persons in myth and history (legendary- & historical persons: chronicles & lists, individual) “(B)”, in Hymns (Jinas & name-lists), legendary & historical) “(E)” and in Legends (singular persons & groups) “(H).” One section deals with “Names (Attributes) of the Jinas” in the genre of the *nāma-stotra / -stavana* (pp. 233-6)



“modification” or “expansion” of the “head-words” of nominal phrases through progressive attribution:

“Generally speaking, a large vocabulary was useful to mark communal differences, to meet the requirements of metre (and rhetorics), to add an esoteric tinge to the language, and so on. Such a vocabulary was developed by coining new words, by changing the morphology (or meaning) of existing words, or by popularizing rare words. But multiplicity of terms is different from inflation of the vocabulary. [...]

There is firstly a strong tendency to ‘explain’ a given term in a way which can only be characterized by several different expressions of modern language: explicate, unfold, develop, evolve, subdivide, classify. [...] Here, the *explicandum* is a single term, while the *explicans* consists of two or more terms. In addition to that there may be a third element of varying character. For this element we use the expression intervening term (singular) or *intervening terms* (plural).”

The procedure of explanation requires the creation of links with related terms, attributes, synonyms, or antonyms, etc., either through the invention of new terms or through the equation with already existing terms.<sup>243</sup> By being repetitively linked with other terms, Bruhn claims, words can become semi- or well-defined terms and hence rise in status. The “status” or significance of a term is defined functionally, via the quantity and quality of links (“explication” through semantic networks) and characteristic structure, which can change and hence also enhance plurality. Bruhn speaks of the “dynamism of chains,” that is, degrees of extension, sub-division, changes of sequence, etc. He refers to the work of A. Dundas and V. Propp. Yet, the general theory of the structure of explanation and prediction, with reference to general laws (intervening terms) and antecedent conditions has been described by Hempel and Oppenheim (1948: 137f.).<sup>244</sup>

Personal names can be analysed in a somewhat similar ways. Through the practice of erasing birth names at the point of monastic initiation and bestowing uniform names of cultural heroes, too “the individual is absorbed into the typical.”<sup>245</sup> Individuality, if needed for identification, is marked through the addition of supplementary attributes to the general given name, such as the name of the region of origin or an epithet. The evolution of sequences of nouns forming individual full names share with the production of a multiplicity of terms through processes of explication that the meaning of the uniform root

<sup>243</sup> Bruhn 1981: 27 given two examples: 1) *explicandum*: ignorance (*avidyā*), *intervening terms*: delusion, etc. (*moha*, etc.), *explicans*: death/ birth, etc. (*mṛtyu* / *janma*, etc.), (2) *explicandum*: right belief (*samyaktva*), *intervening terms*: violations of rules (*aticāra*), *explicans*: doubt, etc. (*śaṅkā*, etc.).

<sup>244</sup> Bruhn was certainly aware of the theoretical literature of his day, but avoids all references to it.

<sup>245</sup> Pott 1870: 119:

“Von der Wichtigkeit der Personen - Namen legt wohl das beste Zeugniß der Umstand ab, dass im Grunde ja erst mit dem empfangenen Einzelnamen der Mensch gleichsam der Allgemeinheit, worin er ohne den Namen verschwimmen würde, entrückt und zu einer, zu dieser bestimmten Sonder-Persönlichkeit wird. [...] Wo, wie in Sibirien, der Gefangene zur blossen namenlosen Nummer herabgedrückt ist: da hat er in Wahrheit auch aufgehört, mindestens bürgerlich - eine Person zu sein.”

According to Pott 1870: 121, the emperor of China had, “so lange er regiert, gar keinen Eigennamen.” This points to the phenomenon that the ideal ruler suppresses his personal inclinations and becomes identical with his role: as much as a person is an institution in one case (cf. Gehlen 1949/2007), the ideal king is identified with the society itself, that he governs and represents.

For Bruhn 1995: 260, who after all was the first to analyse the phenomenon of typification in Jainism, nonetheless, “the psychology of the creation of nameless Jina.s [...] is a mystery;” mainly because “[i]n Jaina hymnology and ritualistic literature the emphasis is on the individual Jina rather than on the abstract category of the twenty-four Jina.s.” The ritually important *Namaskāra* is indeed addressed to abstract entities, while the *Caturvīṃśatīstava* is addressed to the 24 named Jinas. Cort 2002: 738 concludes a study of the Jaina ritual veneration of *tapas*: “Jain bhakti involves a personal and enthusiastic attitude of devotion and loyalty toward the ideological principles that define their religious tradition.”

name is progressively specified with the help of strings of additional terms, referring to distinguishing features acquired by an individual through its life-course. This “progressive indexication”,<sup>246</sup> and the “dynamism of terms” explain the evolution and changes in the strings of words of a primarily denotative, individualising function, which in this essay are called “full names.”

With recourse to Keats-Rohan’s (2007c: 170) distinction between “given name” and “descriptors” as the minimum requirement for identification a famous dictum by Hempel and Oppenheim (1948: 152) can thus be paraphrased as follows:

“By the *explanandum*, we understand the single term describing the phenomenon to be explained (not that phenomenon itself); by the *explanans*, the class of those terms which are adduced to account for the phenomenon.”

Conversely, in the terms of Hempel and Oppenheim, through the presence of antecedent condition, such as certain attributes linked to a particular proper name, one can predict the likelihood of the emergence of a phenomenon, which thus, “is explained by subsuming it under general laws, i.e., by showing that it occurred in accordance with those laws, by virtue of the realization of certain specified antecedent conditions.”

With regard to the typical components of Jaina monastic names one can thus observe two processes: on the one hand, the fabrication of a limited set of conventionalised religious names, also through processes of re-interpretation (the name “R̥ṣabha,” for instance, is not intrinsically a “Jaina” name, but came to be seen to be one), and, on the other hand, the application of these names combined with specifying attributes, not only in the context of the monastic community, but also of the lay community.<sup>247</sup> This twofold process of reduction of the variety of given names and multiplication of a controlled set of Jaina names results in the construction of a culturally-specific naming system.<sup>248</sup>

Bruhn’s methodological innovations can hence be fruitfully extended to the analysis of naming practices, starting from his insight that the iconographic identification of an individual Jaina mendicant “depends on the character of the attribute, on the system where it occurs, and on the [...] type to which it belongs” (p. 243).<sup>249</sup> A similar perspective can be employed in the analysis of Jaina nominal groups, a fact which Bruhn only noted in passing.<sup>250</sup> The identification of “sectarian styles” leading to a “corpus of naming formulas” or “name types,” not unlike the analysis of iconographic types presented by Bruhn (1969:

<sup>246</sup> See Balcerowicz 2003: 44f. on progressive indexication in Jaina logic through a fixed series of conditionally valid viewpoints (*naya*), or “context indicators,” which gradually specify the relevant context in a controlled way.

<sup>247</sup> It is often said, that the only reason why wealthy Jaina merchants so extensively sponsor the construction of temples, more than anything else, is to enshrine their personal name for eternity. But what is in one name if it cannot easily be distinguished from another?

<sup>248</sup> The same effect has also been intentionally produced in other religions. Emeneau 1978: 114 compares “theophoric” names in Hinduism (less so in Vedic texts) and Christianised Europe:

“European-derived cultures, where, to some degree or other in the various sub-cultures, the nucleus of the system of personal names is derived from the names of the founders and saints of Christianity or from the scriptural personages of its predecessor Judaism (‘theophoric’ is here used in an extended, but justifiable, sense). [...] The general theophoric basis of the naming system within Hindu India, whether Sanskrit and pan-Indic or local and non-Sanskrit, is most striking.” “Local differences of stress within the theology, the mythology, and the cult, produce local differences in the details of the naming system” (p. 115).

<sup>249</sup> See Bruhn’s 1981: 229f. classification of “types of types”: Formula (specific rendering of a motif: number of cases, repetition if not exact copying), Figure-type, Image-type (Jina: characteristics, a.b., 1.2 consecutive subdivision), Composition-type (Form-type, Motif-type).

<sup>250</sup> In a discussion of naming practices in the context of donative inscriptions, which often mention the given name of the depicted individual, Bruhn 1969: 59, 261 proposed the following distinctions for further analysis:

“Persons known from other sources, Political leaders, Prominent monks, Persons *not* known from other sources, Names accompanied by an important title, Names mentioned more than once”

229-32),<sup>251</sup> would be an interesting outcome of the investigation of name-lists,<sup>252</sup> analyses with statistical tools, the advantage of which Bruhn also noted.<sup>253</sup> Amongst other questions, it will be interesting to record which components of the full name are preserved in Jaina inscriptions and colophons, which demand contraction (or telescoping) of the full official and unofficial name of a monk due to restrictions of space.

### 10. Procedures Adopted by the Jaina-Prosopography Project

The main focus of the *Jaina-Prosopography* is to prepare a database that permits the study of social relationships between persons. For good reasons,<sup>254</sup> information on living individuals will be excluded. Its principal contribution in qualitative terms is the conceptualisation and testing of the so-called questionnaire, that is, the categories used to define significant relations, both in emic and in etic terms, without losing significant complexity represented in the data. Important indirect social markers for subsequent social analysis, to be carefully modelled for the system, are sect indicators such as group-specific homonymy, or degrees of institutionalisation / centralisation reflected in the degree of complexity of a monastic naming system. Arguably, the introduction of specific monastic names, titles, and epithets, and monastic conventions for name changes reflect the need for hierarchical distinction: (a) from society as a separate religious community (lay names), (b) from laity as separate entity within the four-fold community, and (c) from common mendicants, in the context of centralised monastic orders with elaborate administrative hierarchies. The essay demonstrated that self-effacing homonymy has at the same time the function of creation of religious identity and status, but prompts the creation of unofficial bynames for the unavoidable purposes of individualisation. The orthodox maintenance of birth names with an added title as the second element of the root name also points to a particular segment of the spectrum of Jaina sectarian traditions, as much as synonymic titles, creation of a multiplicity of sect specific-names, etc. A special case are the full names of female mendicants, which tend to be less extended than male names, reflecting the relatively lower degree of publicly recognized individualisation and hence lower status of nuns within mendicant communities.<sup>255</sup>

Obviously it is a matter of interpretative choice, how information in the primary and secondary sources is dealt with, in view of a particular set of research questions. Second-stage prosopography uses published sources such as meta-catalogues, onomasticons, dictionaries, and thematic studies, which generally follow closely the evidence in original sources and refrain from imposing new formats of standardisation.<sup>256</sup> Hence, it is necessary to record and publish not only the criteria for standardization and non-standardisation, but

<sup>251</sup> Cf. Bruhn 1969: 216, 221 on iconographic “corpuses of formulas”, “‘real units’ of classification” “selected” by religious (and artistic) agents “according to their taste” and his use of the terms “form-principle” “element,” “position,” and “composition” for the analysis of iconographical “frames” (p. 13).

<sup>252</sup> Bruhn 1981: 36f. also points to the desirability of investigating “naming clichés / formulas,” forms of “classification” (pp. 34f.), even to the “sociobibliography” of book titles (p. 40). See Footnote 19.

<sup>253</sup> See Footnote 47.

<sup>254</sup> Lawson 1996.

<sup>255</sup> On “hierarchical individualisation,” see Flügel forthcoming a.

<sup>256</sup> To cite at least one recent indological study, Schmiedchen 2014: 14 decided to pragmatically adopt the rendition of names in her sources, despite the resulting incoherence:

“Die Schreibung der Namen folgt in der Regel den jeweils zitierten Quellen, auch wenn dies zu einer gewissen Uneinheitlichkeit führt. Herrscher-, Vasallen- und Beamtentitel werden immer dann, wenn sie sich direkt auf eine konkrete Person beziehen und vor dem Namen stehen, wie letztere(r) mit großem Anfangsbuchstaben und nicht kursiv geschrieben.”

Given the enormous problems of dealing with names and technical vocabulary in inscription and the need of re-assessment of material published in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, indicated by Hinüber 2004: 309-11, this is the safest strategy, which, however, should not prevent using published material for prosopographical analysis, as long as all variants in the sources are preserved.

also notes on individual cases.<sup>257</sup> In the Jaina-prosopography all variations and corresponding sources are being recorded in the process of creating lists of proper names of persons, works, locations, and institutions. In a second step, data will need to be cleaned and listed variants of personal names, etc., as much as possible, identified and linked to the artificially standardised observer's identifiers of individuals, which evidently can be designated in different ways.

In the JP as in the TEI this is achieved by the introduction of generic personal names, artificially created by the researchers on the basis of the latest recorded name, with homonyms being automatically distinguished by the ID-Number of each record. Most field names or variables for investigation are designated by default both in English and in Hindi (or other Indic) labels in the taxonomy of the database to facilitate discriminative judgement on individual cases. For the same purpose, in all cases, tested paradigms have been selected and entered into the system. In the case of monastic names, the generic names are given in Sanskrit, as far as possible. In many cases such artificial Re-Sanskritisation is not advisable, nor is it necessary,<sup>258</sup> since recorded variants can also be searched/filtered out.<sup>259</sup> An ideal JP name-list would take into account names of participants and of observers, since Jaina discourse includes participants, participant-observers,<sup>260</sup> and non-participant observers. Because this time-consuming extension would go beyond the brief of the project, it was decided not to pursue this route. Since the purpose of prosopographical analysis is primarily sociological, not onomastic, affixes and *epitheta ornantia* have either been ignored or included in the generic names (almost exclusively sect indicators, such as °*vijaya*). Position and status indicators such as °*sūri*, by contrast, have been recorded separately. For the said reasons, switches of sect indicators from the back to the beginning of a given and other variations in the sequence of the elements of the nominal group, are being ignored. Self-designations in the sources of membership of *gotra*, *kula*, *kuṭumba*, and other social categories, are preserved, and the classification of conflicting or ambiguous information, derived from multiple referents of terms such as *kula*, is generally left undecided. These, and other, editorial decisions are being recorded in a document named "editorial notes." In the same way, the principal technical features of the database have been documented by the Digital Humanities Institute in Sheffield. The data-model and editorial notes will be

<sup>257</sup> Keats-Rohan 2007c: 179f.

<sup>258</sup> Emeneau 1978: 116f.:

"This Sanskritic system of forming names, over time, ceased to be clothed in Sanskrit forms. They became Middle Indo-Aryan in shape in the Pali and Prakrit texts, and then appeared in modern vernacular forms. Baṃbhādatta (= Brahmādatta), Saṇaṃkumāra (= Sanatkumāra), Viṇḥusirī (= Viṣṇuśrī) are familiar in Jain texts in Prakrit, as are also in Marathi documents such Marathi names as Viṭṭhaladeva (Viṭṭhala = Viṣṇu plus suffix -la) and Mhāirbhāṭa (= Mahāirbhāṭa). Hindi *lāl* 'beloved' (Turner, 1966, entry 11030, <Sanskrit *lālya*-) takes the place of Sanskrit *kānta*- in such names as Rāmlāl (= Sanskrit Rāmakānta) [...]. [117]

But re-Sanskritization could take place at all periods, either in part or completely. Jain Baṃbhādatta has Sanskrit *-datta* instead of the expected Prakrit *-dinna* or *-diṇṇa*; the Pali Jataka texts have Brahmādatta, which is Sanskritized in all details. Such re-Sanskritization has gone so far that in spelling at least, most names look as if they were Sanskrit, but in fact the spelling usually falsifies the vernacular pronunciation; e.g., Sanskrit vowels have their Bengali pronunciation in Bengali names; short a at the end of a stem is zeroed (Dinakara > Marathi Dinkar); etc.

In the northwestern area where Islam has introduced much Perso-Arabic into the common vocabulary, resulting in Urduized Hindi (or Panjabi, etc.), there have been recorded Hindu names of hybrid form, in which an Urdū form calques part of the Sanskritic name; e.g., Temple 1883, p. 16) records in the Panjab that Bakhsh 'granted' replaces *-datta* in Rām Bakhsh, Devī Bakhsh, Gur Bakhsh (this last presumably a Sikh name), and Ghulām 'slave' replaces *-dāsa* in Ram Ghulām. In Hindi there appears, for example, Jawāharlāl, in which the Perso-Arabic *jawāhar* 'jewel' replaces *maṇi* 'jewel' or *motī* 'pearl' (Motīlāl, Maṇīlāl)."

<sup>259</sup> Through this procedure the JP becomes part of an official discourse: "When a man 'gets on', or achieves importance through prosperity or contact with government (e.g., in a court case, whether as prisoner or as witness), his name style takes on formality" (Emeneau 1978: 121).

<sup>260</sup> Distinct only by degrees of institutionalised reflexivity.

published in a separate publication. For particular research questions data can and must be recorded.<sup>261</sup>

Once primary or secondary data have been transformed in a transparent way into prosopographical data, and rationalised through data-checking, statistical description and investigation of interrelationships between selected variables with the help of imaging and other technology can be undertaken. A prosopographical database can also be used in other ways: as an onomasticon, an index, a bibliography or a *catalogus catalogorum*.

Everyone interested to contribute to or to link datasets with the JC or to use the Jaina-Prosopography as a tool for analysis or follow-up projects is invited to do so in consultation with the editors and hosts of the database, who will have to monitor the standardisation of data-input. The Leverhulme Trust funded *Jaina-Prosopography* database is intended as an online resource for common use as a public utility.

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources

- AD<sub>1</sub> Aṇuogaddārāiṃ (Anuyogadvārāni). In: Siri-Devavāyaha-Viraiyaṃ Nandisuttam Siri-Ajjarakkhiya-Thera-Viraiyāiṃ Aṇuogaddārāiṃ. Sampādakā: Muni Puṇyaviḷaya, Paṇḍita Dalasukha Mālavaniyā & Paṇḍita Amṛtalāla Mohanalāla Bhojaka, 57-205. Bambaī: Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, 1968 (Jaina-Āgama-Granthamālā 1).
- AD<sub>2</sub> Aṇuogaddārāiṃ (Anuyogadvārāni). English Translation by Taiken Hanaki. Vaishali: Prakrit Jain Institute Research Publications, 1970 (Prakrit Jain Institute Research Publications 5).
- AD<sub>3</sub> Aṇuogaddārāiṃ (Mūlapāṭha, Sanskr̥ta Chāyā, Hindī Anuvāda, Tulanātmaka Tīppaṇa Tathā Pariśiṣṭoṃ Se Yukta). Vācanā Pramukha: Gaṇādhipati Tulasī. Sampādaka-Vivecaka: Ācārya Mahāprajña. Lāḍanūṃ: Jaina Viśva Bhārati Samsthāna, 1985/1996 (Niggaṃthaṃ Pāvayaṇaṃ).
- AD<sub>4</sub> Anuyogadvārasūtra. Pūrvārddha & Uttarārddha. Ātma-Jñāna-Pīyūṣa-Varṣiṇī Hindī Tīkā Samanvita. Mūlapāṭha-Sanskr̥ta Chāyā, Padārthānvaya, Anuvāda Evaṃ Vivecana. Vol. 1-2. Vyākhyākara: Salāhakāra Jñāna Muni. Sampādaka: “Vidvada Manīṣī” Muni Nemīcandra. Rājapura (Pañjāb): Śāligrāma Jaina Prakāśana Samiti, 1990.
- ADhy Aṣṭādhyāyī, by Pāṇini. In: Böhtlingk 1887.
- Āyāra<sub>1</sub> Āyāra (Ācārāṅga). In: Jacobi 1882.
- Āyāra<sub>2</sub> Āyāra (Ācārāṅga). In: Jacobi 1884: 1-213.
- BK Kappa (Brhatkalpa). In: Schubring 1905, 1910.
- DN Dīghanikāya. In: T. W. Rhys-Davids & C. A. F. Rhys-Davids 1899, 1910, 1921.
- DT<sub>1</sub> Dhavalāṭīkā, of Vīrasena. In: Chakkaṃḍāgame (Ṣaṭkhaṃḍāgame). Bhagavat-Puṣpadanta-Bhūtabalipraṇīta Vīrasenācārya-Viracita-Dhavalāṭīkā-Samanvitaḥ. Khaṇḍa 1-6, Pustaka 1-16. Granthasampādaka: Hīrālāla Jaina. Sahasampādakau: Phūlacandra Siddhāntaśāstrī & Paṇḍita Bālacandra Siddhāntaśāstrī. Solāpura: Jaina Saṃskṛti Saṃrakṣaka Saṃgha, 2000 (Jīvarāja Jaina Granthamālā).
- DT<sub>2</sub> Dhavalāṭīkā, of Vīrasena. In: Śrī Bhagavat Puṣpadatta Bhūtabali Praṇīta Ṣaṭkhaṃḍāgame. ŚrīVīrasenācārya Viracita Dhavalā Tīkā Sahita. Prathama Khaṇḍa: Jīvasthāna. Satprarupaṇā – 1. Aṅgrezī Anuvādaka: Nandalāla Jaina.

<sup>261</sup> Flügel 2018 on problems of coding “patronage” relationships.

- Sampādaka: Aśoka Kumāra Jaina. Rūrkī: Siddhāntācārya Paṇḍita Phūlacandra Śāstrī Phāuṇḍeśan & Śrī Varṇī Digambara Jaina Saṃsthāna, 2004.
- DV Dasaveyāliya (Daśavaikālika). In: Schubring 1932.
- JC<sub>1</sub> Jīnacariya (Jīnacaritra). In: KS<sub>1</sub>. Jacobi 1879: 33-76.
- JC<sub>2</sub> Jīnacariya (Jīnacaritra). In: KS<sub>2</sub>. Jacobi 1884: 217-285.
- JC<sub>3</sub> Jīnacariya (Jīnacaritra). In: Mette 2010: 11-55.
- KS<sub>1</sub> Kalpasūtra (Jīnacaritra, Sthavirāvalī, Sāmācārī). In: Jacobi 1879: 31-176.
- KS<sub>2</sub> Kalpasūtra (Jīnacaritra, Sthavirāvalī, Sāmācārī). In: Jacobi 1884: 215-311.
- NDK Nāyādhammakahāo (Jñātadharmakathā). In: Sacitra Jñātrādharmakathāṅga. Mūla-Pāṭha, Hindī-Aṅgrezī Anuvāda Sahita. Bhāga I-II. Pradhāna Sampādaka: Upapravartaka Amara Muni. Sampādaka: Śrīcanda Surānā “Sarasa.” Dillī: Padma Prakāśana, 1996-1997.
- Sam Samavāo (Samavāya). In: Aṅgasuttāṇi 1. Vācanā Pramukha: Ācārya Tulasī. Sampādaka: Yuvācārya Mahāprajña, 825-954. Dvītiya Saṃskaraṇa. Lāḍanūṃ: Jaina Viśva Bhāratī Saṃsthāna, 1974/1992.
- Sūy<sub>1</sub> Sūyagaḍo (Sūtrakṛtāṅga). In: Aṅgasuttāṇi 1. Vācanā Pramukha: Ācārya Tulasī. Sampādaka: Yuvācārya Mahāprajña, 251-486. Dvītiya Saṃskaraṇa. Lāḍanūṃ: Jaina Viśva Bhāratī Saṃsthāna, 1974/1992.
- Sūy<sub>2</sub> Sūyagaḍo (Sūtrakṛtāṅga). In: Jacobi 1895: 233-435.
- Sūy<sub>3</sub> Sūyagaḍo (Sūtrakṛtāṅga). In: Bollée 1977, 1988.
- Utt<sub>1</sub> Uttarajjhayaṇāṇi (Uttarādhyayana). Mūlapāṭha, Saṃskṛta Chāyā, Hindī Anuvāda, Tulanātmaka Ṭippaṇa. Vācanā Pramukha: Ācārya Tulasī. Sampādaka: Ācārya Mahāprajña. Trītiya Saṃskaraṇa. Lāḍanūṃ: Jaina Viśva Bhāratī, 1967.
- Utt<sub>2</sub> Uttarajjhāyā (Uttarādhyayana). In: Jacobi 1895: 1-232.
- Uvav<sub>1</sub> Uvavāiya (Aupapātika). In: Leumann 1883.
- Uvav<sub>2</sub> Uvavāiya (Aupapātika). In: Lalwani 1988.
- Uvav<sub>3</sub> Uvavāiya (Aupapātika). In: Uvaṅgasuttāṇi. 4, 1: Ovāiyaṃ, Rāyapaseṇiyaṃ, Jīvājīvābhigame. Vācanā Pramukha: Ācārya Tulasī. Sampādaka: Yuvācārya Mahāprajña, 1-81. Lāḍanūṃ: Jaina Viśva Bhāratī, 2002 (Niggamaṭhaṃ Pāvayaṇaṃ).
- Vav Vavahāra (Vyavahāra). In: W. Schubring (& C. Caillat) 1966: 29-91.
- Ṭhāṇa Ṭhāṇa (Sthānāṅga). Mūla-Pāṭha, Saṃskṛta Chāyā, Hindī Anuvāda Tathā Ṭippaṇa. Vācanā Pramukha: Ācārya Tulasī. Sampādaka Vivecaka: Muni Nathamala. Lāḍanūṃ: Jaina Viśva Bhāratī, 1976.

### Secondary Sources

Aagam Pragya, Samani, Samani Rohit Pragya & Vandana Mehta (Comp. & Eds.). *Bibliography of Jaina Literature. Jaina Canons and their Commentaries, Non-Canonical Original Texts and their Commentaries*. Vol. 1-2. Ladnun: Jain Vishva Bharati Institute, 2016.

Ajayasāgarasuri, Ācārya. “Vi. Saṃ. 2072nā Pālītāṇāṇā Tapāgacchīya Śramaṇa Sammelanaṇā Ṭharāva Pramāṇe Jñānabhaṇḍāro Aṅge Vimarśātmaka Avalokana Jaina Saṅghīya.” *Premagaṅgā* 12, 140 (2017) 23-27.

Alford, Richard D. *Naming and Identity. A Cross-Cultural Study of Necessity*. New Haven: Human Relations Area Files, 1988.

Alsdorf, Ludwig. "Nikṣepa - A Jaina Contribution to Scholastic Methodology." *Journal of the Oriental Institute Baroda* 22 (1973) 455-463 (Reprint: *Kleine Schriften*. Hg. Albrecht Wezler, 257-265. 2. Auflage. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2001).

Aufrecht, Theodor. *Catalogus Catalogorum. An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit Works and Authors*. Part I-III. Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus 1891, 1896, 1903 (New Edition: Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1962).

Balbir, Nalini. "Introduction." In: N. Balbir, K. V. Sheth, K. K. Sheth & C. B. Tripathi 2006a: 17-254.

----- . "Sur les traces de deux bibliothèques familiales jaina au Gujrat (XVe-XVIIe siècles)." *Anamorphoses. Hommage à Jacques Dumarcay*. Eds. H. Chambert-Loir & B. Dagens, 325-352. Paris, 2006b.

----- . "Genealogical Discourse and Jain Sectarian Promotion." *Mantri-Karmacandra-Vaṃśāvalī-Prabandha and the Kharataragaccha.* *Jaina Studies. Proceedings of the DOT Panel in Marburg, Germany*. Ed. Jayandra Soni, 33-63. Delhi: Aditya Prakashan, 2012.

----- . "Réseaux religieux et familiaux dans les colophons des manuscrits jaina de l'Inde occidentale." *Eurasian Studies* 17, 1-2 (2014) 217-256.

Balbir, Nalini, Kanhaiyalal V. Sheth, Kalpana K. Sheth & Chandrabhal B. Tripathi. *Catalogue of the Jain Manuscripts of the British Library. Including the Holdings of the British Museum and the Victoria & Albert Museum*. Vol. 1-3. London: The British Library & The Institute of Jainology, 2006.

Balcerowicz, Piotr. "Some Remarks on the Naya Method." *Essays in Jaina Philosophy and Religion*. Ed. Piotr Balcerowicz, 37-70. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 2003.

Bhatt, Bansidhar. *The Canonical Nikṣepa. Studies in Jaina Dialectics*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978 (Indologica Berolinensa 5)

----- . "Study of the Word: Nikṣepa and Other Derivatives in the Śvetāmbara Jaina Canon." *Akten des Melzer-Symposiums 1991*. Hg. W. Slaje & Ch. Zinko, 15-53. Graz: Leykam, 1992.

----- . "Ācāra-Cūlās and -Niryukti. Studies II (Mahāvīra-biography)." *Jain Studies in Honour of Jozef Deleu*. Eds. Rudy Smet & Kenji Watanabe, 85-121. Tokyo: Hon-No-Tomoshia, 1993.

Bhattacharyya, G. "Contribution to Cataloging and Classification." *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science. Volume 11 - Hornbook to Information*. Executive Editors: Allen Kent, Harold Lancour & Jay E. Daily. Assistant Editor: Willaim Z. Nasri, 353-406. New York: Marcel Dekker, 1974.

Bhattacharyya, N. N. *Jainism. A Concise Encyclopaedia*. New Delhi: Manohar, 2009.

Blanár, Vincent. "Pragmalinguistische Methoden der Namenforschung." *Namenarten und ihre Erforschung. Ein Lehrbuch für das Studium der Onomastik*. Herausgegeben von Andrea Brendler & Silvio Brendler, 153-171. Hamburg: BAAR, 2004.

Bodenhorn, Barbara & Gabriele Vom Bruck. "'Entangled in Histories': An Introduction to the Anthropology of Names and Naming." *An Anthropology of Names and Naming*. Eds. Gabriele Vom Bruck & Barbara Bodenhorn, 1-30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Böhlingk, Otto. *Pāṇini's Grammatik. Herausgegeben, übersetzt, erläutert und mit verschiedenen Indices versehen.* Leipzig: Verlag von H. Haessel, 1887.

Böhlingk, Otto & Rudolph Roth. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch.* Band IV. St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1865.

Bollée, Willem B. *Studien zum Sāyagāḍa. Die Jainas und die anderen Weltanschauungen vor der Zeitenwende. Textteile, Nijjutti, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen.* 2 Bände. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1977, 1988 (Schriftenreihe des Südasiens Instituts der Universität Heidelberg 24 & 31).

-----, "On Royal Epithets in the Aupapātikasūtra." *Journal of the Oriental Institute of Baroda* 27, 3-4 (1978) 95-103.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste.* Translated by Richard Nice. London: Routledge, (1979) 1984.

-----, "Social Space and Symbolic Power." *Sociological Theory* 7, 1 (1989) 14-25.

Bourin, Monique (ed.). *Genèse médiévale de l'anthroponymie moderne: études d'anthroponymie médiévale.* Tours: Université François Rabelais, 1988ff. (Études d'anthroponymie médiévale).

Bradley, John & Harold Short. "Texts into Databases: The Evolving Field of New-Style Prosopography." *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 20 (Supplement) (2005) 3-24.

Brendler, Silvio. "Klassifikation der Namen." *Namenarten und ihre Erforschung. Ein Lehrbuch für das Studium der Onomastik.* Herausgegeben von Andrea Brendler & Silvio Brendler, 69-92. Hamburg: BAAR, 2004.

Bronner, Yigal. *Pandit. A Prosopographical Database for Indic Texts.* 2015-: <http://www.panditproject.org/>

Brough, John. *The Early Brahmanical System of Gotra and Pravara. A Translation of the Gotra-Pravara-Mañjari of Puruṣottama-Paṇḍita.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953

Bruhn, Klaus. *Śīlāṅkas Cauppaṇṇamahāpurisacariya. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Jaina-Universalgeschichte.* Hamburg: De Gruyter, 1954 (Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 8).

-----, *The Jina-Images of Deogarh.* Translated by Michael McDonald. Leiden: E. J. Brill, (1964) 1969 (Studies in South Asian Culture 1).

-----, "Classification in Indian Iconography." *German Scholars on India. Vol. II.* Hg. Botschaft der BR Deutschland, 26-50. Bombay: Nachiketa Publications, 1976 (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office).

-----, "Āvaśyaka-Studies I." *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus (Gedenkschrift für Ludwig Alsdorf).* Hg. Klaus Bruhn & Albrecht Wezler, 11 49. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1981 (Alt- und Neuindische Studien 23).

-----, "Repetition in Jaina Narrative Literature." *Indologica Taurinensia* 11 (1983) 27-75.

-----, "The Identification of Jina Images." *Berliner Indologische Studien* 1 (1985) 149-176.

-----, "The Analysis of Jina Images." *Berliner Indologische Studien* 2 (1986) 133-174.

-----, "The Concept of Māna (Pride) in Jaina Dogmatics." *Jain Studies in Honour of Jozef Deleu.* Eds. Rudy Smet & Kenji Watanabe, 163-206. Tokyo: Hon-No-Tomosha, 1993.

-----, "The Grammar of Jina Iconography I." *Berliner Indologische Studien* 8 (1995) 229-283.

-----, "The Mahāvratas in Early Jainism." *Berliner Indologische Studien* 15/16/17 (2003) 3-98.



-----, "Early Jaina Iconography (an Overview)." *Berliner Indologische Studien* 19 (2010) 123-169.

Bruhn, Klaus & Candrabhal Tripathi. "Jaina Concordance and Bhāṣya Concordance." *Beiträge zur Indieforschung. Ernst Waldschmidt zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet.* Hg. Herbert Härtel, 67-80. Berlin: Museum für Indische Kunst, 1977.

Bry, Ilse. *The Emerging Field of Sociobibliography*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1977.

Bulst, Neidhart. "Zum Gegenstand und zur Methode von Prosopographie." *Medieval Lives and the Historian. Studies in Medieval Prosopography. Proceedings of the First International Interdisciplinary Conference on Medieval Prosopography, University of Bielefeld, 3-5 December, 1982.* Eds. N. Bulst & J.-Ph. Genet, 1-16. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Western Michigan University, 1986.

Burgess, James A.S. (Ed.). *Epigraphia Indica*. I-II. Calcutta. 1892, 1894.

Cabouret, Bernadette & François Demotz (Eds.). *La prosopographie au service des sciences sociales*. Lyon, 2014 (Collection études et recherches sur l'Occident romain 44).

Caillat, Colette. *Les expiations dans le rituel ancien des religieux jaina*. Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard, 1965.

-----, *Atonements in the Ancient Ritual of the Jaina Monks*. Translated by Mr Jones, Mr & Mrs McKenna, & Mr Whitehouse. Ahmedabad: L. D. Institute of Indology, 1975 (L. D. Series No. 49).

Cameron, Averil (Ed.). *Fifty Years of Prosopography. The Later Roman Empire, Byzantium and Beyond*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Chakrabarti, Samiran Chandra. *Proper Names of Persons in Vedic Literature*. Kolkata: Rabindra Bharati University, 2013.

Charle, C. "Prosopography (Collective Biography)." *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. Eds. Neil J. Smelser & Paul B. Baltes, 12236-12241. Oxford: Pergamon, 2001.

Chatterjee, Asim Kumar. *A Comprehensive History of Jainism*. Second Revised Edition. Volume 1-2. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, (1978) 2000.

Clark, Cecily. "Onomastics." *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. Ed. Richard M. Hogg, 452-489. London: Routledge, 1992.

Clémentin-Ojha, Catherine & Sharad Chandra Ojha. "The Royal Patronage of Roving Ascetics in Mid-Nineteenth Century Rajputana." *Patronage and Popularisation, Pilgrimage and Procession. Channels of Transcultural Translation and Transmission in Early Modern South Asia. Papers in Honour of Monika Horstmann*. Ed. Heidi R. M. Pauwels, 149-166. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009.

Collins, Randall. "Toward a Theory of Intellectual Change: The Social Causes of Philosophies." *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 14, 2 (1989) 107-140.

-----, *The Sociology of Philosophies. A Global Theory of Intellectual Change*. Cambridge/Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1998.

Comte, Auguste. *Discours sur l'esprit positif. Première partie. Chapitre premier: loi de l'évolution intellectuelle de l'humanité ou loi des trois états.* Paris, 1844.

----- . *A General View of Positivism.* J. H. Bridges. London: Trübner & Co., 1856

Cort, John E. "Singing the Glory of Asceticism: Devotion of Asceticism in Jainism." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 70, 4 (2002) 719-742.

Darśanavijaya, Muni (Tripuṭī) (Col.). *Paṭṭāvalī Samuccayaḥ.* Sampādaka: Jñānavijaya (Tripuṭī). Bhāga 1-2. Vīramgāma: Cāritra Smāraka, 1933, 1950 (Cāritra Smāraka Granthamālā 22 & 44) (Reprint: Mumbaī: Jinaśāsan Ārādhanā Trast, 1996).

Darśanavijaya, Muni, Muni Jñānavijaya & Muni Nyāyavijaya (Tripuṭī Mahārāj). *Jaina Paraṃparāno Itihāsa.* Bhāg 1-4. [Vol. 1] Mumbaī: Bhīkharabhāi Bhūdarabhāi Śāh & Amadavād: Candulāl Lakhubhāi Parīkh, 1952; [Vol. 2-3] Amadavād: Candulāl Lakhubhāi Parīkh, 1960, 1964; [Vol. 4] Mumbaī: Pañkajkumār H. Śāh, 1983 (Cāritra Smāraka Granthamālā 51, 54, 56, 60).

De Clercq, Eva. "On Jaina Apabhraṃśa Praśastis." *Acta Orientalia* (Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae) 63, 3 (2010) 275-287.

Deleu, Jozef. "A Note on the Jain Prabandhas." *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus (Gedenkschrift für Ludwig Alsdorf).* Hg. K. Bruhn & A. Wezler, 61-72. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1981 (Alt- und Neuindische Studien 23).

Deśāi, Mohanalāla Dalīcanda (Saṃgrāhaka ane Saṃprayojaka). *Jaina Gūjara Kavio.* Mumbaī: Jaina Śvetāmbara Conference Office, 1926 (I), 1931a (II), 1944 (III.1-2) (Second Revised Edition 1986-1997: Saṃśodhita-Saṃvardhita Bījī Āvṛttinā Sampādaka: Jayanta Koṭhārī. Bhāga 1-10. Mumbaī: Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya [1986 (I: 12th-16th C.), 1978 (II: 17th C.), 1987 (III: 17th C.), 1988a (IV: 18th C.), 1988b (V: 18th C.), 1989 (VI: 19th-20th C. & Non-Jaina Works), 1991 (VII: Index Vol. I-VI), 1997a (VIII: Deśī – Folksongs & Personages in Jain Tales), 1997b (IX: Gurupaṭṭāvalī & Rājāvalī), 1997c (X: Apabhraṃśa & Sanskrit)]).

Dogra, Ramesh C. "Notes on Hindi Names." *Journal International Library Review* 8, 3 (1976) 327-347.

Dundas, Paul. *The Jains.* Second Revised Edition. London: Routledge, 2002.

----- . *History, Scripture and Controversy in a Medieval Jain Sect.* London: Routledge, 2007 (Routledge Advances in Jaina Studies 2).

Eck, Werner (Ed.). *Prosopographie und Sozialgeschichte. Studien zur Methodik und Erkenntnismöglichkeit der kaiserlichen Prosopographie.* Kolloquium Köln 24. - 26. November 1991. Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 1993.

----- . "Eine prosopographische Datenbank oder die PIR in computergestützter Form." *Datenbanken in der Alten Geschichte.* Eds. M. Fell et al., 82-90. St. Katharinen: Scripta Mercaturae, 1994.

----- . "The Prosopographia Imperii Romani and Prosopographical Method." *Fifty Years of Prosopography. The Later Roman Empire, Byzantium and Beyond.* Ed. Averil Cameron, 11-22. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003 (Proceedings of the British Academy 118).

Eichler, Ernst, Gerold Hilty, Heinrich Löffler, Hugo Steger & Ladislav Zgusta (Eds.). *Namenforschung / Name Studies / Les noms propres. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik / An International Handbook of Onomastics / Manuel international d'onomastique.* 3 Vols. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1995-1996.

Emeneau, Murray Barnson. "Personal Names of the Coorgs." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 96, 1 (1976) 7-14.

-----, "Towards an Onomastics of South Asia." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 98, 2 (1978) 113-130.

Fazal-Ilāhī, Khūrshīd, Anīs & Qaṣar, S. Ibne-Ḥasan. "Cataloguing of Oriental Names." *Quarterly of the Pakistan Library Association* 2, 1 (1961) 5-16.

Fleet, John Faithfull. "Some Records of the Rashtrakuta Kings of Malkhed: The Appellations of the Rāshtrakūṭas of Mālkheḍ." *Epigraphia Indica* 6 (1901-2) 167-198.

Flügel, Peter. "The Ritual Circle of the Terāpanth Śvetāmbara Jains." *Bulletin D'Études Indiennes* 13-14 (1995-1996) 117-176.

-----, "Protestantische und Post-Protestantische Jaina Reformbewegungen: Zur Geschichte und Organisation der Sthānakavāsī I." *Berliner Indologische Studien* 13-14 (2000) 37-103.

-----, "The Invention of Jainism: A Short History of Jaina Studies." *International Journal of Jain Studies (Online)* 1, 1 (2005) 1-14.

-----, "The Unknown Lonka: Tradition and the Cultural Unconscious." *Jaina Studies*. Eds. Colette Caillat & Nalini Balbir, 181-279. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 2008 (Papers of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference 9).

-----, "Jain Monastic Life: A Quantitative Study of the Terāpanth Śvetāmbara Mendicant Order." *Jaina Studies - Newsletter of the Centre of Jaina Studies* 4 (2009) 24-29.

-----, "Power and Insight in Jaina Discourse." *Logic and Belief in Indian Philosophy*. Ed. Piotr Balcerowicz, Piotr, 85-217. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 2010.

-----, "Praising the Living, Remembering the Death: Sociology of the Jaina Festschrift." Paper Delivered at DOT, 31. Deutscher Orientalistentag, Panel: Jaina Studies, Marburg 23.9.2010.

-----, "Life and Work of Johannes Klatt." *Johannes Klatt's Jaina-Onomasticon*. Eds. Peter Flügel & Kornelius Krümpelmann, 9-164. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2016 (Jaina Studies 1).

-----, "Johannes Emil Otto Klatt (1852–1903). Forgotten Chronicler of Jainism and Bibliographer of Oriental Literature: Letters to Albrecht Weber 1874–1882, Ernst Kuhn 1881–1889, Charles Rockwell Lanman 1889 and Ehrhardt Karras 1891, with Curricula Vitae, and a Complete Bibliography of Johannes Klatt's Works." *Berliner Indologische Studien* 23, 1 (2017a) 1-76.

-----, "Jaina-Prosopography: Monastic Lineages, Networks and Patronage." *Jaina Studies – Newsletter of the Centre of Jaina Studies* 12 (2017b) 25-26.

-----, "Klaus Bruhn (22.5.1928 - 9.5.2016)." *Jaina Studies - Newsletter of the Centre of Jaina Studies* 12 (2017c) 40-44.

-----, "Jaina-Prosopography II. 'Patronage' in Jaina Epigraphic and Manuscript Catalogues." *Gift of Knowledge. Patterns of Patronage in Jainism*. Eds. Christine Chojnacki & Basile Leclère. Bangalore, 2018.

-----, "Hierarchical Individualism: Jainism and Individualisation-Paradigms." *Religious Individualisation in Historical Perspective*. Vol. IV. Ed. Jörg Rüpke et al. Erfurt: Max Weber Centre, University of Erfurt (Forthcoming a).

-----, *Sthānakavāsī Śvetāmbara Jaina-Traditionen in Nordindien. Manoharadāsa-, Lavajī Rṣi-, Harajī- und Jīvarāja-Sampradāya*. Protestantische und Post-Protestantische Jaina-Reformbewegungen V. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (Forthcoming b).

Frege, Gottlob. "Sinn und Bedeutung." *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik* (N. F.) 100, 1 (1892) 25-50 (Reprint: *Funktion, Begriff, Bedeutung*. Hg. Günther Patzig, 40-65. 6. Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1986).

Gardiner, Alan [Henderson]. *The Theory of Proper Names. A Controversial Essay*. London: Oxford University, 1940/1954.

----- . *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*. Volume I-II. London: Oxford University Press, 1947, 1968.

Geach, Peter Thomas. *Reference and Generality. An Examination of Some Medieval and Modern Theories*. Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1962.

Gehlen, Arnold. *Die Seele im technischen Zeitalter. Sozialpsychologische Probleme in der industriellen Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, (1949) 1957/2007.

Geldner, Karl Friedrich (Tr.). *Der Rig-veda... Vierter Teil. Namen- und Sachregister zur Übersetzung, dazu Nachträge und Verbesserungen*. Aus dem Nachlass des Übersetzers hrsg., geordnet und ergänzt von Johannes Nobel. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957 (Harvard Oriental Series 36).

Geuenich, Dieter. *Die Personennamen der Klostersgemeinschaft von Fulda im früheren Mittelalter*. München: Fink Verlag, 1976 (Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften 5).

Geuenich, Dieter, Wolfgang Haubrichs & Jörg Jarnut. *Nomen et gens. Zur historischen Aussagekraft frühmittelalterlicher Personennamen*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997 (Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde. Ergänzungsbände 16).

Geuenich, Dieter & Ingo Runde. *Name und Gesellschaft im Frühmittelalter. Personennamen als Indikatoren für sprachliche, ethnische, soziale und kulturelle Gruppenzugehörigkeiten ihrer Träger*. Hildesheim: Olms Verlag, 2006 (Deutsche Namenforschung auf sprachgeschichtlicher Grundlage. Beiträge der "Henning-Kaufmann-Stiftung zur Förderung der Deutschen Namenforschung auf Sprachgeschichtlicher Grundlage" 2).

Gonda, Jan. *Epithets in the R̥gveda*. 's-Gravenhage: Mouton, 1959 (Disputationes Rheno-Trajectinae 4).

----- . *Notes on Names and the Name of God in Ancient India*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing, 1970 (Verhandlungen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, AFD. Letterkunde Nieuwe Reeks 75, 4).

Grafflin, Dennis. "The Onomastics of Medieval South China: Patterned Naming in the Lang-Yeh and T'ai-Yüan Wang." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 103, 2 (1983) 383-398.

Graevenitz, Gerhart von. "Geschichte aus dem Geist des Nekrologs. Zur Begründung der Biographie im 19. Jahrhundert." *Deutschen Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 54 (1980) 105-170.

Greatrex, Joan. "Prosopography of English Benedictine Cathedral Chapters: Some Monastic *Curricula Vitae*." *Medieval Prosopography* 16, 1 (1995) 1-26.

----- . "Prosopographical Perspectives, or What Can be Done with Five Thousand Monastic Biographies?" *Medieval Prosopography* 20 (1999) 129-145.

Griffiths, Paul J. *On Being Buddha. The Classical Doctrine of Buddhahood*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994 (Toward a Comparative Philosophy of Religions).

Gubler, Theophil. *Die Patronymica im Alt-Indischen*. Inaugural-Dissertation Basel 1902. Gedruckt: Göttingen, 1903.

Guérinot, Armand Albert. *Essai de bibliographie Jaina. Répertoire analytique et méthodique des travaux relatifs au Jainisme. Avec planches hors texte*. Paris: Musée Guimet, 1906 (Annales du Musée Guimet 22).

----- . *Répertoire d'épigraphie Jaina. Précédé d'une esquisse de l'histoire du jainisme d'après les inscriptions*. Paris: E. Leroux, 1908 (Publications de L'École Française D'Extrême-Orient 10).

Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood. "Language in a Social Perspective." *Educational Review* 23, 3 (1971) 165-188 (Reprint: *Language and Society*. Ed. Jonathan J. Webster. London: Continuum, 2007, pp. 43-64 (Collected Works 10)).

----- . *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold, 1985.

----- . *An Introduction to Functional Grammar. Third Edition*. Revised by Christian M.I.M. Matthiessen. London: Hodder Arnold, 2004.

Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood & Christian M.I.M. Matthiessen. *Construing Experience through Meaning. A Language-based Approach to Cognition*. London: Continuum, 1999/2000.

Harvalík, Milan. "Word-Formation Aspects of Proper Names - Word-Formation or Name-Formation?" *Name and Naming. Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Onomastics. Conventional/Unconventional in Onomastics, Baia Mare, September 1-3, 2015*. Ed. Oliviu Felecan, 37-43. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Mega / Editura Argonaut, 2015.

Harvey, Peter. *The Selfless Mind. Personality, Consciousness and Nirvana in Early Buddhism*. Richmond: Curzon Press, 1995.

Hastīmāla, Ācārya (Col.). *Paṭṭāvalī Prabandha Saṃgraha*. Saṃkaliyatā & Saṃśodaka: Ācārya Hastīmāla. Sampādaka: Narendra Bhanawat. Jayapur: Jaina Itihāsa Nirmāṇa Samiti, 1968.

Heimann, Betty. "Zur indischen Namenskunde." *Studia Indo-Iranica: Ehrengabe für Wilhelm Geiger zur Vollendung des 75. Lebensjahres. 1856- 21. Juli-1931*. Hg. Wilhelm Wüst, 139-155. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1931.

Heimbucher, Max Josef. *Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche*. 2. Auflage. 3 Bände. Paderborn: F. Schöningh, (1897) 1907.

Hempel, Carl G. & Paul Oppenheim. "Studies in the Logic of Explanation." *Philosophy of Science* 15, 2 (1948) 135-175.

Hilka, Alfons. *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der indischen Namengebung. Die altindischen Personennamen*. Breslau: M. & M. Marcus, 1910 (Indische Forschungen 3).

Hinnells, John R. (Ed.). *Who's Who of World Religions*. London: Macmillan, 1991.

Hinüber, Oskar von. "Gotrabhū: Die sprachliche Vorgeschichte eines philosophischen Terminus." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 128, 2 (1978) 326-332.

----- . "Book Review: Njammasch, Marlene 'Bauern, Buddhisten und Brahmanen: das frühe Mittelalter in Gujarat'." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 47 (2004) 308-320.

Hīrālāla, Hansarāja Lālana. *Jaina Gotra Saṃgraha. Prācīna Jaina Itihāsa Sahita*. Jāmanagar: Jaina Bhāskarodaya Printing, 1923.

Hirschler, Konrad. "Reading Certificates (*samā'āt*) as a Prosopographical Source: Cultural and Social Practices of an Elite Family in Zangid and Ayyubid Damascus." *Manuscript Notes as Documentary Sources*. Eds. Andreas Görke & Konrad Hirschler, 73-92. Beirut: Ergon Verlag Würzburg in Kommission, 2011 (Beiruter Texte und Studien 129).

Hoernle, August Friedrich Rudolph. "The Pattavali or List of Pontiffs of the Upakesa-Gachcha." *The Indian Antiquary* 19 (1890) 233-242.

-----, "Two Pattavalis of the Sarasvati Gachcha of the Digambara Jains." *The Indian Antiquary* 20 (1891) 341-361.

Hoffmann, Karl. *Altindische Namen mit -ṇḍ-*. Dissertation, München, 1941.

Horsch, Paul. "Soziologisches zur altindischen Namenskunde." *Asiatische Studien / Études Asiatiques* 18-19, 1-4 (1965) 227-246.

Indian Association of Special Libraries and Information Centres. *Indic Names, Including Proceedings of the Seminar on the Rendering of Indic Names Held at Calcutta, December 30, 1960-January 1, 1961*. Calcutta: IASLIC, 1961 (IASLIC Special Publication 2).

Jacobsen, Knut A. (Editor-in-Chief) & John E. Cort, Paul Dundas & Kristi Wiley (Associate Editors). *Brill's Encyclopedia of Jainism*. Leiden: E. J. Brill (forthcoming).

Jacobi, Hermann. "The Kalpasūtra of Bhadrabāhu Edited with an Introduction, Notes, and a Prākṛit-Saṃskṛit-Glossary." *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 7, 1 (1879) 1-173.

-----, *The Āyāraṃga Sutta. Of the Çvetāmbara Jains*. Ed. Hermann Jacobi. Part I. – Text. London: Published for the Pali Text Society by Henry Frowde, 1882 (Pāli Text Society Vol. 1).

-----, *Jaina Sūtras*. Part I. SBE XXII. Ed. Max Müller. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1884.

Jain, Anupam (Col.). *Digambara Jaina Sādhu-Sādhvīyom Ke Varṣāyoga - 2000 Kī Sūcī*. Indaur: Akhila Bhāratīya Digambara Jaina Mahilā Saṃghaṭhana, 2000ff.

Jain, Bābūlal "Ujjavala" (Col.). *Samagra Jaina Cāturmāsa Sūcī*. Bombay: Akhila Bhāratavarṣīya Samagra Jaina Cāturmāsa Sūcī Prakāśana Pariṣad, 1979ff.

Jain, Chhote Lal. *Jaina Bibliography*. With a Foreword by Kalidas Nag. Calcutta: Satis Chandra Seal, Honorary General Secretary, Bhāratī Jaina Pariṣat, 1945 (Jaina Bibliography Series 1).

-----, *Chhotelal's Jaina Bibliography. Edited, Re-arranged, Revised and Augmented in Collaboration with the Author by Satya Ranjan Banerjee*. Second Revised Edition. New Delhi: Vir Sewa Mandir, 1966/1982.

Jain, Kailash Chand. "Jaina Castes and their Gotras in Rajasthan." *Contribution of Jainism to Indian Culture*. Ed. R. C. Dwivedi, 263-269. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1975.

-----, *Jaina Dharma Kā Itihāsa*. I-III. Nāī Dillī: Dī. Ke. Printavarlḍa, 2005.

-----, *History of Jainism*. Volume 1-3. Volume 3 Consisting of Chapters by A.H. Nizami, K.C. Jain, Surendra Gopal, S.S. Nigam & Prakash Jain. New Delhi: D.K. Printworld, (2005) 2010.

Jain, Manoj R. et al. (Sampādaka Maṇḍala). "Prastuta Hastaprata Sūcīgata Sūcanāom Kā Spaṣṭikaraṇa." In: *Padmasāgarasūri* 2008 1.1.7: vi-x.

- Jain, Muni Uttam Kamal. *Jaina Sects and Schools*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing, 1975.
- Jain, Satish Kumar (Comp.). *Progressive Jains*. Second Edition. New Delhi: Shramana Sahitya Sansthan, (1975) 1987.
- Jaina Śvetāmbara Kāmpharans. *Jaina Granthāvalī*. Prasiddha Kartā. Mumbaī: Jaina Śvetāmbara Kāmpharans, 1909.
- Jauharī, Durlabha Tribhuvana (Prayojaka). *Sādhu-Sammelana Kā Itihāsa*. Sampādaka: Cimmanasiṅha Loḍhā. Saṃśodhaka: Paṇḍita Śobhācandra Bhārilla. Byāvara: Cimmanasiṅha Loḍhā (Mainejar, Śrī Mahāvīra Priṅṅ Pres), 1946.
- Jinavijaya, Muni (Ed.). *Jaina Pustaka Praśasti Saṃgraha. A Collection of Praśastis and Colophons of Ancient Manuscripts Preserved in the Jain Bhandaras at Patan, Cambay, Jaisalmer, and Other Places*. Volume 1 Part I. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1943 (Singhi Jain Series 18).
- . *Vividhapaṭṭāvalīsaṃgraha*. Bambaī: Singhī Jaina Śāstra Śikṣā Pīṭha, 1961 (Singhī Jaina Granthamālā 53).
- Joharāpurkara, Vidyādhara P. (Comp.). *Bhaṭṭāraka Saṃpradāya*. Prakāśaka: Gulābacanda Hirācanda Doṣī. Solāpura: Jaina Saṃskṛti Saṃrakṣaka Saṃgha, 1958.
- Jones, Arnold Hugh Martin & Henri-Irénée Marrou. “Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire.” *The Journal of Roman Studies* 40, Parts 1-2 (1950) 189.
- Jones, Arnold Hugh Martin, John Robert Martindale & John Morris (Eds.). *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*. Volume 1-3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971, 1980, 1992.
- Justi, Ferdinand. *Iranisches Namensbuch*. Marburg: N.G. Elwertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1895.
- Kane, Pandurang Vaman. “Naming of a Child or a Person.” *Indian Historical Quarterly* 14 (1938) 224-244.
- Kapadia, Hiralal Rasikdas: *Descriptive Catalogue of the Government Collection of Manuscripts Deposited at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Volume XVII: Jaina Literature and Philosophy. Part V: Agamika Literature (Ten Appendices)*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1954.
- Karttunen, Klaus. *Who Was Who in Western Indology. Including South Asian, Iranian, and Tibetan Studies. A Biographical Dictionary*. (Unpublished manuscript).
- Kāsalivāla, Kastūracanda (Comp.). *Praśasti-Saṃgraha*. Jayapura: Digambara Jaina Atiśaya Kṣetra Mahāvīrajī, 1950.
- Kattner, Ellen. “Seven Men, Six Women: Names and the Socio-Cosmic Order of Maliku (Minicoy Island).” *The Anthropology of Values. Essays in Honour of Georg Pfeffer*. Eds. Peter Berger, Roland Hardenberg, Ellen Kattner & Michael Prager, 162-179. New Delhi: Dorling Kindersley, 2010.

Kelting, Mary Whitney. "Thinking Collectively About Jain Saṭīs." *Studies in Jaina History and Culture. Doctrines and Dialogues*. Ed. Peter Flügel, 181-207. London: Routledge, 2006 (Routledge Advances in Jaina Studies 1).

Khera, Krishan Lal. *Directory of Personal Names in the Indian History from the Earliest to 1947. Based on The History and Culture of the Indian People by Dr. R.C. Majumdar and A.D. Pusalker et al. [1951-1977]*. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 2002.

Keats-Rohan, Katharine S. B. (Ed.). *Family Trees and the Roots of Politics. The Prosopography of Britain and France from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century*. Oxford Prosopography Conference 1995. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1997.

-----, "Prosopography and Computing: A Marriage Made in Heaven." *History and Computing* 12, 1 (2000) 1-11.

-----, (Ed.). *Prosopography Approaches and Applications. A Handbook*. Oxford: Prosopographica et Genealogica, 2007a (Occasional Publications of Linacre Unit for Prosopographical Research / Linacre College Oxford Unit for Prosopographical Research - Prosopographica et Genealogica 13).

-----, "Introduction." In: Keats-Rohan 2007a: 2-32 = 2007b.

-----, "Biography, Identity and Names: Understanding the Pursuit of the Individual in Prosopography." In: Keats-Rohan 2007a: 139-181 = 2007c.

Klatt, Johannes. *Specimen of a Literary-Bibliographical Jaina-Onomasticon*. [Fifteen of the Fifty-Five Pages Corrected by Ernst Leumann. With a Preface in German by Albrecht Weber.] Leipzig: O. Harrassowitz, 1892.

-----, *Jaina-Onomasticon*. Eds. Peter Flügel & Kornelius Krümpelmann. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2016 (Jaina Studies 1).

Klebs, Elimar, Paul von Rohden & Hermann Dessau (Comp.). *Prosopographia Imperii Romani Saec. I. II. III*. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Berolini: Reimer, 1897-1898.

Kosambi, Damodar Dharmanand. "On the Origin of Brahmin Gotras." *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 26, 1 (1950) 21-80.

Koul, Ram Krishan. *Indic Names. A Documentation List*. New Delhi: Seemant Prakashan, 1980.

-----, *Sociology of Names and Nicknames of India. With Special Reference to Kashmir*. Srinagar, Kashmir: Utpal Publications, 1982.

Kragh, Ulrich Timme. "Personal Biography in Jain Literature." *Śramaṇa* 62, 1 (2011) 103-127.

-----, "Localized Literary History: Sub-Text and Cultural Heritage in the Āmer Śāstrabhaṇḍār, A Digambara Manuscript Repository in Jaipur." *International Journal of Jaina Studies (Online)* 9, 3 (2013) 1-53.

Kripke, Saul. "Naming and Necessity." *Semantics of Natural Language*. Eds. Donald Davidson & Gilbert Harman, 253-355, 763-769. Dordrecht: Reidel, 1972 (Reprint: Cambridge/M.: Harvard University Press, 1980).

-----, *Reference and Existence. The John Locke Lectures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, (1973) 2013.

Lalwani, Kustur Chand. *Uvavāiṃya Suttaṃ (Aupapātika Sūtra)*. Original Text with Hindi & English Translation. Hindi Translation: Rameshmuni. Jaipur: Prakrit Bharati Academy, 1988.



- Lawson, Edwin D. "The Onomastic Treasures of the CIA." *Names* 44, 2 (1996) 154-164.
- Leumann, Ernst. *Das Aupapâtika Sûtra, erstes Upânga der Jaina. I. Theil. Einleitung, Text, Glossar*. Herausgegeben von der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft. Leipzig: G. Kreysing, 1883 (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 8, 2) (Neudruck: Nedeln / Lichtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1966).
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *The Savage Mind*. [Translation by Sybil Wolfram Revised by Julian Pitt-Rivers.] London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, (1962) 1966.
- Leslie, Julia. "A Problem of Choice: The Heroic *Satī* or the Widow-Ascetic." *Problems of the Dharma. Rules and Remedies in Classical Indian Law*. Ed. Julia Leslie, 46-61. Panels of the VIIth World Sanskrit Conference, Ed. Johannes Bronkhorst. Vol. IX. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991.
- Macdonnell, Arthur Anthony & Arthur Berriedale Keith. *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*. London: John Murray, 1912.
- Madan, Triloki Nath. "Is the Brahmanic Gotra a Grouping of Kin?" *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 18, 1 (1962) 59-77.
- Mahadevan, Iravatham. *Early Tamil Epigraphy. From Earliest Times to the Sixth Century A.D.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2003 (Harvard Oriental Series Vol. 62).
- Mahadevan, Thennilapuram P. "The Ṛṣi Index of the Vedic Anukramaṇī System and the Pravara Lists: Toward a Pre-History of the Brahmins." *Electronic Journal of Vedic Studies* 18, 2 (2011) 1-139.
- Malalasekera, George Peiris. *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*. Vol. I: A - Dh, Vol. II: N - H. London: John Murray, 1937, 1938.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. *Die Personennamen in der Ṛgveda-Saṃhita. Sicheres und Zweifelhafes*. München: Verlag der Bayrischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2003.
- Maxwell, Allen R. "Kadayan Personal Names and Naming." *Naming Systems. 1980 Proceedings of The American Ethnological Society*. Ed. Elisabeth Tooker (Harold C. Conklin: Symposium Organizer), 25-39. Washington, D.C.: The American Ethnological Society, 1984.
- Mehta, Mohan Lal & K. Rishabh Chandra. *Prakrit Proper Names*. Vol. I-II. Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute, 1970, 1972.
- Mette, Adelheid. "The Synchronism of the Buddha and the Jina Mahāvīra and the Problem of Chronology in Early Jainism." *The Dating of the Historical Buddha / Die Datierung des historischen Buddha. Part 1*. Hg. H. Bechert, 132-137 (Symposium zur Buddhismusforschung 4, 1). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991b (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen).
- , *Erlösungslehre der Jains. Legenden, Parabeln, Erzählungen*. Berlin: Verlag der Weltreligionen im Insel Verlag, 2010.
- Mill, John Stuart. *A System of Logic. Ratiocinative and Inductive*. 2 Volumes. 8<sup>th</sup> Edition. London: Longmans, Green, Reader & Dyer, 1843/1872.

Minkowski, Christopher. “Nilakantha’s Teachers and Gurus, Part 1: Laksmāna Pandita.” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens und Archiv für indische Philosophie* 55 (2015) 33-76.

Minkowski, Christopher, Rosalind O’Hanlon & Anand Venkatkrishnan. “Social History in the Study of Indian Intellectual Cultures?” *South Asian History and Culture* 6, 1 (2015) 1-9.

Mohajitavijaya, Muni (Āśīrvādādātā), Vijaya Yugabhūṣaṇasūri (Mārgadarśaka) & Niravabhāi Bhūpendrabhāi Ḍagalī (Saṃśodhaka-Saṃkalanakāra). *Āgama Prakāśanasūcī. Ahamadāvād: Gītārtha Gaṅgā*, V.S. 2071 (2015 CE).

Mommsen, Theodor et al. (Eds.). *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Berlin, 1863ff. URL: [http://cil.bbaw.de/cil\\_en/index\\_en.html](http://cil.bbaw.de/cil_en/index_en.html)

Mommsen, Theodor. “Mommsen’s Application to the Berlin Academy.” Mommsen 31.5.1874. In: Eck 2003: 21-22.

----- . “Bericht über die Prosopographie der Römischen Kaiserzeit.” *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaft zu Berlin*, Erster Halbband, Januar bis Mai (1895) 47.

Monier-Williams, Monier (Comp.). *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. New Edition, Greatly Enlarged and Improved Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1899 (Reprint: New Delhi: Marwah Publications, 1986) = MW.

Mukhtār, Jugala Kīśora (Comp.). *Jaina Grantha Praśasti Saṃgraha*. Part I. Sarasava. 1954.

Müller, Edward. “Pali Proper Names.” *Journal of the Pali Text Society* (1888) 1-107 (Reprint: *A Glossary of Pali Proper Names*. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1989 (Bibliotheca Indo Buddhica 64).

Mylius, Klaus. *Wörterbuch Ardhamāgadhī-Deutsch*. Wichtracht: Institut für Indologie, 2003.

Nahar, Puran Chand [Nāhara, Pūraṇa Canda]. *Jaina Inscriptions. Part I. (Containing Index of Places, Glossary of Names of Śhrāvaka Castes and Gotras and Acharyas with Dates)*. Collected and Compiled by Puran Chand Nahar. Calcutta: B. L. Press, 1918 (Jaina Vividha Shāstra Mālā 8) [Reprint: Delhi, Indian Book Gallery, 1983].

----- . *Jaina Inscriptions. Part II. (Containing Index of Places, Glossary of Names of Śhrāvaka Castes and Gotras and Acharyas with Dates)*. Collected and Compiled by Puran Chand Nahar. Calcutta: Vishwavinode Press, 1927.

----- . *Jaina Inscriptions. Part III: Jaisalmer. (Containing Index of Places, Glossary of Names of Śhrāvaka Castes and Gotras and Acharyas with Dates)*. Collected and Compiled by Puran Chand Nahar (Vakil, High Court, Calcutta, Member, Asiatic Society of Bengal, Bihar & Orissa Research Society, Bhandarkar Institute, Poona, Jain Swetambar Education Board, Bombay; Hon[orary] Correspondent, Archaeological Department, Government of India, &c.). Calcutta: Viswavinode Press, 1929.

Nāhaṭā, Agaracanda & Bhanvaralāla Nāhaṭā. *Jainācārya Pratibodhit Gotra Evaṃ Jātiyām. Pālītāṇā: Jinaharisāgarasūri Jñāna Bhaṇḍāra*, V.S. 2035 (1978 C.E.).

NaP = *Names of Persons. National Usages for Entry in Catalogues*. Fourth Revised and Enlarged Edition. München: K. G. Saur, (1963) 1996 (UBCIM Publications N.S. 16).

Narasimhācārya, Ramanujapuram Rao Bahadur. *Karṇāṭakakavīcarite [Lives of Kannada Poets, 14th-19th C.]*. Bangalore, 1907 & Supplement (Revised & Expanded Edition. Vol. I [Written with Nephew S.G. Narasimhācārya]: To the End of the 14th C., 1924/2005, Vol. II: 15th-17th C., 1919, Vol. III: 18th-19th c., 1929; Reprint: Beṅgaḷūru: Kannaḍa Sāhitya Paṛiṣattu, 2005).

Narasimhachar, Ramanujapuram Anandan-pillai Rao Bahadur (Ed.). *Epigraphia Carnatica. Vol. II. Inscriptions at Śravaṇa-Belgoḷa*. Revised Edition. Bangalore: The Mysore Government Press, 1923 (Mysore Archaeological Series).

Navaratnamala, Muni (Comp.). *Śāsana Samudra*. Vol. 1-18. Published by Uttamcand Sethia. Kalkattā: Jaina Śvetāmbara Terāpanthī Mahāsabhā Prakāśana, 1981-2002.

NCC<sup>a</sup> = UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS. *New Catalogus Catalogorum. A Complete Up-to-date Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit and Allied Works and Authors*. Published under the authority of the University of Madras. Vol. 1. Editor-in-chief: Kuppaswami Sastri. Madras: University of Madras, 1937 (Provisional Fasciculus).

NCC<sup>b</sup> = UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS. *New Catalogus Catalogorum. An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit and Allied Works and Authors*. Published under the Authority of the University of Madras. Editor-in-chief: Vol. 1: C. Kunhan Raja (1949), Vol. 1 Revised Edition: Venkatarama Raghavan (1968); Vol. 2-5: Venkatarama Raghavan (1966, 1967, 1968, 1969); Vol. 6-11: K. Kunjunni Raja (1971, 1973, 1974, 1977, 1978); Vol. 11: K. Kunjunni Raja & N. Veezhinathan (1983); Vol. 12-13: N. Veezhinathan (1988, 1991); Vol.14: N. Veezhinathan & E.R. Rama Bai (2000); Vol. 15-36: Siniruddha Dash (2007a, 2007b, 2007c, 2007d, 2007e, 2011a, 2011b, 2011c, 2011d, 2011e, 2011f, 2013a, 2013b, 2013c, 2013d, 2013e, 2013f, 2013g, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c, 2014d. Madras: University of Madras, 1949-2014 (Madras University Sanskrit Series Vols. 18, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62).

NCC<sup>c</sup> = UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS: *Catalogues, Lists, etc., Used in the New Catalogus Catalogorum with the Abbreviations Used for Them*. Madras: University of Madras, 1984.

Nirvānasāgara, Muni et al. (Sampādaka Maṇḍala). “Prākkhathana.” In: Padmasāgarasūri 2003 1.1.1: 5-11.

-----, “Ācārya Śrī Kailāsasāgarasūri Jñānamandira mem Granthālaya Sūcanā Praṇālī mem Prayukta Vividha Avadhāraṇem Kṛti Kī Avadhāraṇā.” In: Padmasāgarasūri 2003 1.1.1: 13-21.

Njammasch, Marlene. *Bauern, Buddhisten und Brahmanen. Das frühe Mittelalter in Gujarat*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2001 (Asien- und Afrika-Studien der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin 2).

Nübling, Damaris, Fabian Fahlbusch & Rita Heuser. *Namen. Eine Einführung in die Onomastik*. Tübingen: Narr, 2012.

Oliva, Marilyn. “Counting Nuns: A Prosopography of Late Medieval English Nuns in the Diocese of Norwich.” *Medieval Prosopography* 16, 1 (1995) 25-55.

-----, *The Convent and the Community in Late Medieval England. Female Monasteries in the Diocese of Norwich, 1350-1540*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1998.

-----, “All in the Family? Monastic and Clerical Careers among Family Members in the Late Middle Ages.” *Medieval Prosopography* 20 (1999) 161-180.

Ousaka, Yumi, Yamazaki, Moriichi & Masahiro Miyao. "Automatic Analysis of the Canon in Middle Indo-Aryan by Personal Computer I." *Literary and Linguistic Computing (Oxford)* 9, 2 (1994) 125-136.

Ousaka, Yumi & Moriichi Yamazaki. "Automatic Analysis of the Canon in Middle Indo-Aryan by Personal Computer II." *Literary and Linguistic Computing (Oxford)* 11, 1 (1996) 9-17.

Padmasāgarasūri, Ācārya (Āśīrvāda Na Preraṇā). *Kailāsa Śrutasāgara Granthasūcī. Jaina Hastalikhita Sāhitya. Descriptive Catalogue of Jain Manuscripts. Khaṇḍa 1.-1.1.16. Gandhinagar: Kailāsa Śrutasāgara Jñānamandira, Mahāvīra Jaina Ārādhana Kendra, Koba Tirtha, 2003-2013.*

PANDIT. See Bronner 2015ff.

Pāṇini. *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. See Böhtlingk 1887.

PCBE = *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire, 1. Mandouze, André. Prosopographie de l'Afrique chrétienne (303-533)*. D'après la documentation élaborée par Anne-Marie La Bonnardière. Avec la collaboration de Claude-Hélène Lacroix, Serge Lancel, Henri Irénée Marrou, Charles Munier, Elisabeth Paoli-Lafaye, Stan-Michel Pellistrandi, Charles Pietri, Françoise Pontuer. Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1982 (Études d'antiquités africaines 1982, Volume 2).

PERSO-INDICA. See Speziale & Ernst 2010.

PIR = *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*. Berlin 1897-2015 (Various editors).

PLRE = Jones, Arnold Hugh Martin, John Robert Martindale & John Morris. *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*. Volume 1-3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971, 1980, 1992.

Pollock, Sheldon I. "Sanskrit Knowledge Systems on the Eve of Colonialism." *National Endowment for the Humanities, 2000: Proposal*: <http://www.columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pollock/sks/proposal.html#prosopography>  
-----, *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men. Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.  
-----, "Prašasti and its Congeners: A Small Note on a Big Topic." *Rājamahimā. C. Rajendran Congratulatory Volume*. Ed. N. K. Sundareswaran, 21-39. Calicut: University of Calicut Press, 2013 (Calicut University Sanskrit Series 51).

Pott, August Friedrich. *Die Personennamen, insbesondere die Familiennamen und ihre Entstehungsarten*. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1853/1859 [Reprint: 1968].  
-----, "Eigennamen in ihrem Unterschiede von Appellativen, und mit der Namengebung verbundener Glaube und Sitte." *Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 24 (1870) 110-124.

Pouchepadass, Jacques. "Itinerant Kings and Touring Officials: Circulation as a Modality of Power in India, 1700-1947." *Society and Circulation. Mobile People and Itinerant Cultures in South Asia, 1750-1950*. Eds. Claude Markovits, Jacques Pouchepadass & Sanjay Subrahmanyam, 240-274. New Delhi, Permanent Black, 2003.

Pratibhāprajñā, Samañī. “Autobiographical and Biographical Accounts of Ācārya Tulasī.” *16th Jaina Studies Workshop: Jaina Hagiography and Biography*, London: SOAS, 21.3.2014 <https://www.soas.ac.uk/jainastudies/events/jainahagiography/>

Pulgram, Ernst. “Historisch-soziologische Betrachtung des modernen Familiennamens.” *Beiträge zur Namensforschung* 2 (1950-51) 132-165.  
-----, “Theory of Names.” *Beiträge zur Namensforschung* 5 (1954) 149-196.

Puṇyavijaya, Muni (Comp.). *Catalogue of Sanskrit and Prakrit Manuscripts*. Vol. I-IV. Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute, 1963-1968.

Puṇyavijaya, Muni (Comp.). *Catalogue of Gujarati Manuscripts*. Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute, 1978.

Puṇyavijaya, Muni, Paṇḍita Dalasukha Mālavaniyā & Paṇḍita Mohanalāla Bhojaka. “Introduction: Importance of the Jaina Āgamas and their Publication.” In: AD<sub>1</sub>: 1-76.

Raghavan, Venkatarama. “Preface to the Second Revised Edition.” *New Catalogus Catalogorum. An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit and Allied Works and Authors. Volume One. Revised Edition*. Published under the Authority of the University of Madras. Editor-in-chief: Vol. 1: Venkatarama Raghavan Madras: University of Madras, 1968 (Madras University Sanskrit Series 30).

Raja, C. Kunhan. “Preface.” *New Catalogus Catalogorum. An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit Works and Authors*. Vol. 1. Editor-in-chief: C. Kunhan Raja, i-ii. Madras: University of Madras, 1949 (Madras University Sanskrit Series 18).

Raja, K. Kunjunni. “Preface.” *New Catalogus Catalogorum. An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit Works and Authors*. Vol. 6. Editor-in-chief: K. Kunjunni Raja. Madras: University of Madras, 1971 (Madras University Sanskrit Series 31).

Ranganathan, Shiyali Ramamrita (Assisted by Arashanapalai Neelameghan). *Classified Catalogue Code*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Bombay: Asia Publishing House, (1934) 1945 (Ranganathan Series in Library Science 2).

Rebenich, Stefan. *Hieronymus und sein Kreis. Prosopographische und sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1992 (Historia 72).

-----, *Theodor Mommsen und Adolf Harnack. Wissenschaft und Politik im Berlin des ausgehenden 19. Jahrhunderts. Mit einem Anhang, Edition und Kommentierung des Briefwechsels*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1997.

Rhys-Davids, Thomas William (Part II: & Caroline A. F. Rhys-Davids). *Dialogues of the Buddha. The Dīgha-Nikāya Translated from the Pāli*. Part I-III. Sacred Books of the Buddhists. Vol. I-IV. Translated by Various Scholars and Edited by Max Müller: Vol. II & T.W. Rhys-Davids: Vol. III & IV. London: Henry Frowde, 1899, 1910, 1921.

Rice, Benjamin Lewis (Ed.). *Epigraphia Carnatica*. Vol. I-XII. Mangalore: Mysore Government Press, 1886-1905 (Mysore Archaeological Series).

Robertson, D. W. Jr. “A Note on the Classical Origin of ‘Circumstances’ in the Medieval Confessional.” *Studies in Philology* 43, 1 (1946) 6–14.

Rosaldo, Renato. “Ilongot Naming: The Play of Associations.” *Naming Systems. 1980 Proceedings of The American Ethnological Society*. Ed. Elisabeth Tooker (Harold C.

Conklin: Symposium Organizer), 11-24. Washington, D.C.: The American Ethnological Society, 1984.

Rüpke, Jörg. "A Prosopographical Data Base of Cultic Personnel in Ancient Rome." *Revue Informatique et Statistique dans les Sciences Humaines* 30, 1-4 (1994) 127-137.

-----, *Fasti sacerdotum. die Mitglieder der Priesterschaften und das sakrale Funktionspersonal römischer, griechischer, orientalischer und jüdisch-christlicher Kulte in der Stadt Rom von 300 v. Chr. bis 499 n. Chr. Unter Beifügung einer CD zur Erschließung des prosopographischen Materials von Bernd Nüsslein. Unter Mitarbeit von Helmut Pannke.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2005 (Potsdamer altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 12) [Translation by David Richardson: Oxford University Press, 2008].

-----, *Römische Priester in der Antike. Ein biographisches Lexikon.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2007.

Russell, Bertrand. *The Philosophy of Logical Atomism.* London: Routledge, (1918) 1972/2010.

Salomon, Richard. *Indian Epigraphy. A Guide to the Study of Inscriptions in Sanskrit, Prakrit, and the Other Indo-Aryan Languages.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Sangave, Vilas A. *Jaina Community.* 2nd Revised Edition. Bombay: Popular Prakashan, (1959) 1980.

Sankalia, Hasmukh Dhirajlal. *The Archaeology of Gujarat (Including Kathiawar).* Bombay: Natwarlal & Co., 1941.

-----, "Cultural Significance of Personal Names in the Inscriptions of Deccan." *Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute* 3 (1941-2) 349-391.

-----, *Studies in the Historical & Cultural Geography and Ethnogeography of Gujarat (Places and Peoples in Inscriptions of Gujarat: 300 B.C.-1300 A.D.).* Poona: Deccan College, 1949.

Śarmā, Vinod. "Prakāśa-Paramparā." *Prācī Se Utarā Prakāśa: Śramaṇa Śreṣṭha Rājarṣi Muniśrī Sumatiprakāśa jī Mahārāja Ke Mahāvvyaktitva Ko Samarpita Abhinandana Grantha.* Digadarśaka: Yuvācārya Viśāla Muni. Pradhāna Sampādaka: "Yuvāmanīṣī" Abhiṣeka Muni. Pradhāna Sampādaka: Vinod Śarmā, 1-130. Naī Dillī: Taponidhi Abhinandana-Grantha Prakāśana Samiti, 2009.

Sastri, Kuppaswami. "Preface." *New Catalogus Catalogorum. A Complete Up-to-Date Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit and Allied Works and Authors.* Published under the Authority of the University of Madras. Vol. 1. Editor-in-chief: Kuppaswami Sastri, v-vii. Madras: University of Madras, 1937 (Provisional Fasciculus).

Śāstrī, Paramānanda Jaina (Sampādaka). *Jaina Grantha Praśasti Saṃgraha.* Dvitiya Khaṇḍa. Dillī: Vīra-Sevā-Mandira-Sosāitī, 1963.

Schmiedchen, Annette. *Herrschergenealogie und Religiöses Patronat. Die Inschriftenkultur der Rāṣṭrakūṭas, Śilāhāras and Yādavas (8. bis 13. Jahrhundert).* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2014 (Gonda Indological Studies 17).

Schopen, Gregory. "What's in a Name: The Religious Function of the Early Donative Inscriptions." *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, (1996) 2004, pp. 382-394.

Schubring, Walther. *Das Kalpa-sūtra. Die alte Sammlung jainistischer Mönchsvorschriften. Einleitung, Text, Analysen, Übersetzung, Glossar.* Indica 2. Hg. E. Leumann. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1905 (Reprint: *Kleine Schriften.* Hg. Klaus Bruhn. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1977: 1-69).

----- . "The Kalpa-Sūtra. An Old Collection of Disciplinary Rules for Jaina Monks [English translation of the revised German translation by J.A.S. Burgess]." *The Indian Antiquary* 39 (1910) 257-267.

----- . *The Dasaveyāliya Sutta.* Ed. Ernst Leumann. Translated, with Introduction and Notes, by Walther Schubring. Ahmedabad: The Managers of the Sheth Anandji Kalianji, 1932 (Reprint: *Kleine Schriften.* Hg. Klaus Bruhn. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1977: 109-130).

----- . *Die Lehre der Jainas. Nach den alten Quellen dargestellt.* Berlin: Walter De Gruyter & Co., 1935.

----- . *Die Jaina-Handschriften der Preussischen Staatsbibliothek. Neuerwerbungen seit 1891.* Unter redaktioneller Mitarbeit von Günther Weibgen. Beschrieben von Walther Schubring Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1944 (Verzeichnis der Handschriften im Deutschen Reich. Teil 3: Die Handschriften der Preußischen Staatsbibliothek, N.F., Reihe 1: Die orientalischen Handschriften, Bd. 1).

----- . *The Doctrine of the Jainas. Described after the Old Sources.* Translated from the Revised German Edition by Wolfgang Beurlen. Third English Edition. With Three Indices Enlarged and Added by Willem Bollée and Jayandra Soni. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, (1962) 2000.

Schulze, Wilhelm. *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen.* Vorgelegt in der Sitzung vom 16. März 1900. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1904 (Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse. Neue Folge 5, 2).

Schurer, Kevin "The Historical Researcher and Codes: Master and Slave or Slave and Master." *History and Computing. 3. Historians, Computers and Data. Applications in Research and Teaching.* Eds. E. Mawdsley et al., 74-82. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990.

Searle, John R. "Proper Names." *Mind* 67, 266 (1958) 166-173.

----- . *Intentionality. An Essay in the Philosophy of Mind.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983/1989.

Sengupta, Benoyendra. "Rendering of Indic Names-of-Person in Catalogue Entries." *Report, International Conference on Cataloguing Principles, Paris 1961.* London: Bingley, 1969, pp. 327-347.

Seyford-Ruegg, David, "Pāli Gotta/Gotra and the Term Gotrabhū in Pāli and Buddhist Sanskrit." *Buddhist Studies in the Honour of I. B. Horner.* Eds. Lance Cousins, Arnold Kunst, & K. R. Norman, 199-210. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1974.

Shāh, A.M. (Comp.). *Jaina Sāhitya Pradarśana Śrī Praśastisaṃgrahaḥ.* Dvītiyo Vibhāgaḥ. Ahmedabad: Jaina Sāhitya Pradarśana Samiti, 1937.

Shah, Umakant Premanand. "Correlation of Jaina Inscriptions with Sthavirāvalīs." *Jambū-jyoti (Munivara Jambūvijaya Festschrift).* Eds. Madhusudan A. Dhaky & Jitendra B. Shah, 163-178. Ahmedabad: Sharadaben Chimanbhai Educational Research Centre, 2004.

Sharma, D. D. *Panorama of Indian Anthroponomy. An Historical, Socio-Cultural & Linguistic Analysis of Indian Personal Names.* New Delhi: Mittal Publications, 2005.

Sharma, Tej Ram. *Personal and Geographical Names in the Gupta Inscriptions*. Delhi: Naurang Rai, 1978.

Singh, Nagendra Kumar (Ed.). *Encyclopaedia of Jainism*. 30 Volumes. New Delhi: Anmol Publications, 2001.

Sircar, Dinesh Chandra (Ed.). *Select Inscriptions Bearing on Indian History and Civilization. Volume I. From the Sixth Century B.C. to the Sixth Century A.D.* Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1942.

----- . *Indian Epigraphy*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1965.

----- . *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1966.

Śiva Prasāda. "Nāgapurīyatapāgaccha Kā Itihāsa." *Śramaṇa* 50, 1-3 (1999) 107-121.

----- . *Tapāgaccha Kā Itihāsa. Bhāga I Khaṇḍa I*. Vārāṇasī: Pārśvanātha Vidyāpīṭha, 2000.

----- . *Jaina Śvetāmbara Gacchoṃ Kā Saṃkṣipta Itihāsa*. Khaṇḍa 1-2. Sūrat: Ācārya Oṃkārasūri Jñānmandira, 2009.

Somani, Ram Vallabh, *Jain Inscriptions of Rajasthan*. Jaipur: Rajasthan Prakrit Bharati, 1982.

Sopher, David E. "Pilgrim Circulation in Gujarat." *The Geographical Review* 58, 3 (1968) 392-425.

Sörensen, Sören. *An Index to the Names in the Mahābhārata. With Short Explanations and a Concordance to the Bombay and Calcutta Editions and P.C. Roy's Translation*. London: Williams & Norgate, 1904 [Reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1963].

Speziale, Fabrizio & Carl W. Ernst. *Perso-Indica. An Analytical Survey of Persian Works on Indian Learned Traditions*. 2010-: <http://persoindica.net/about-aims-method>

Stein, Burton. "Circulation and the Historical Geography of Tamil Country." *Journal of Asian Studies* 37, 1 (1977) 7-26.

Stone, Lawrence. "Prosopography." *Dædalus* 100 (1971) 46-79.

Strawson, Peter F. *Individuals. An Essay in Descriptive Metaphysics*. London: Routledge, 1959/2011.

Tambiah, Stanley J. *World Conqueror and World Renouncer. A Study of Buddhism and Polity in Thailand against a Historical Background*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1976) 1977.

Tank, Umrao Singh. *Jaina Historical Studies*. Agra: The Atmanand Jain, 1914.

----- . *Brief Sketches of Distinguished Osvals and Osva Families*. No. 1. Delhi: Ratan Singh Bhandari, 1915.

----- . *A Dictionary of Jaina Biography. Part I-A*. Arrah: The Central Jain Publishing House, 1917 (Library of Jaina Literature 7).

----- . *Some Distinguished Jainas*. Agra: The Atmanand Jain, 1918 [Revised and enlarged edition of Tank 1914].

Tatia, Nathmal. "General Editor's Introduction." In: AD<sub>2</sub> (1970): v-xlix.

Tewari, Shital Prasad. *Cultural Heritage of Personal-Names and Sanskrit Literature*. With a Foreword by K. V. Ramesh. Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan, 1982.



Thapar, Romila. *Cultural Transaction and Early India. Tradition and Patronage*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1987.

*The Imperial Gazetteer of India. Vol. XXV. Index*. New Edition. Published under the Authority of His Majesty's Secretary of State for India in Council. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909.

Thurnwald, Richard. *Bánaro Society. Social Organization and Kinship of a Tribe in the Interior of New Guinea*. Lancaster, Pa.: The New Era Printing Company, 1916 (Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association 3-4).

Toynbee, Arnold Joseph. *Hannibal's Legacy. The Hannibalic War's Effects on Roman Life*. Volume 1-2. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Tulasī, Ācārya. *Ācārya Tulasī Ke Patra*. Vol. 1-3. Sampādikā: Sādhvī Kanakaprabhā. Cūrū: Ādarśa Sāhitya Prakāśana, 1999 (Tulasī Vādmaya 1-3).

-----, *Merā Jīvana Merā Darśana. Ātmakathā / Ācārya Tulasī*. Sampādikā Sādhvīpramukhā Kanakaprabhā. Cūrū Rājasthāna: Ādarśa Sāhitya Saṃgha Prakāśana, 2001.

-----, *Tulasī Vāṅgamaya*. [Collected Works in 108 Volumes: 1-25: Autobiographical Literature (Ātmakathā Sāhitya), 26-52: Prose Literature (Gadya Sāhitya), 53-72: Discourse Literature (Pravacana Sāhitya), 73-89: Poetic Literature (Kāvya Sāhitya), 90-93: Sanskrit Literature (Sanskṛta Sāhitya), 94-102: Letters & Messages Literature (Patra Sandeśa Samvāda Sāhitya), 103-108: Proverbs & Sayings Literature (Sūkta Sāhitya)]. Sampādikā: Sādhvī Pramukhā Kanakaprabhā. Nāī Dillī: Ādarśa Sāhitya Saṃgha, 2014.

Turner, Ralph Lilley. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. London: Oxford University Press & SOAS, 1966-1989.

Umeśa Muni, Pravartaka "Aṇu." *Śrīmad Dharmadāsajī Mahārāja Aura Unakī Mālava-Śiṣya-Paramparāṃ*. Ratalāma: Dharmadāsa Jaina Mitra-Maṇḍala 1974.

Usener, Hermann. *Götternamen. Versuch einer Lehre von der Religiösen Begriffsbildung*. Bonn: Verlag von Friedrich Cohen, 1896 (Dritte Unveränderte Auflage. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag G. Schulte-Bulmke, 1948).

Vallabhavijaya, Muni. "Tapāgacch-Ācārya-Śrīmada-Vijayānandasūriśvarājī Prasiddha-nāma Ātmārāmajī Mahārājajī Jainī-Sādhu-Kā Janma-Caritra." *Tattvanirṇayaprāsāda: 36 Stambha*. Prastāvanā, Upodghāta, Granthakarttākā, Saṃpūrṇa Janmacaritra Aura Bahutasī Tasvīre (Chabī), Raṅgīna Vaṃśavṛkṣa Vagairaha Ke Sātha Jaina Śvetāmbara Tapagacchācārya ŚrīmadVijayānandasūri (Ātmārāmajī) Viracita. Saṃśodhanakarttā: Muni Vallabhavijaya. Prasiddhakarttā: Amaracanda Pt. Paramāra, 33-83. Mumbaī: Induprakāśa Jāītaṣṭāṃk Kaṃ. Lī. Meṃ Chāpakara Prasiddha Kiyā, 1902.

Varṇī, Jinendra (Comp.). *Jainendra Siddhānta Kośa*. Part I-V. 5<sup>th</sup> Edition. Nayī Dillī: Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha Prakāśana, 1971/1997-8 (Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Jaina Granthamālā 40).

Velankar, Hari Damodar (Comp.). *Jinaratnakośa. An Alphabetical List of Jaina Works and Authors*. Vol. 1. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1944 (Government Oriental Series Class C No. 4).

Velze, Jacob Anton Van. "Names of Persons in Early Sanskrit Literature." Utrecht: Utrecht Tipp. Ass., 1938.

Weber, Albrecht. *Verzeichniss der Sanskrit- und Prâkrit-Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*. Zweiter Band. Erste, Zweite & Dritte Abtheilung. Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin. Fünfter Band. Berlin: A. W. Schade, 1886, 1888, 1891 [Outer cover: 1892].

Wiley, Kristi L. "Gotra Karma: A Contrast in Views." *Approaches to Jain Studies. Philosophy, Logic, Rituals and Symbols*. Eds. N. K. Wagle & Olle Qvarnström, 113-130. University of Toronto: Center for South Asian Studies, 1999.

----- . *Historical Dictionary of Jainism*. Lanham, Maryland: The Scarecrow Press, 2004.

Williams, Robert Hamilton Blair. *Jaina Yoga. A Survey of the Medieval Śrāvakācāras*. London: Oxford University Press, (1963) 1983.

Willman-Grabowska, Helena de. "Noms des persons dans le Çatapatha Brāhmaṇa." *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à M. J. Vendryes*. Paris, 1925, pp. 373-390.

Wilson, Horace Hayman. *A Glossary of Judicial and Revenue Terms and of Useful Words Occurring in Official Documents Relating to the Administration of the Government of British India, from the Arabic, Persian, Hindustānī, Sanskrit, Hindī, Bengālī, Uṛiya, Marāṭhi, Guzarāthī, Telugu, Karnāta, Tamiḷ, Malayālam and other Languages. Compiled and Published under the Authority of the Honorable the Court of Directors of the East-India Company*. London: W. H. Allen, 1855.

Winternitz, Moritz. *History of Indian Literature*. Vol. 1-2. Translated by Śrīdhara V. Ketkar & Helen Kohn and Revised by the Author. Calcutta: University of Calcutta, (1904, 1908) 1927, 1933; Vol. 3.1-2. Translated by Subhadra Jhā. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, (1913) 1963, (1922) 1967/1985 (one volume).

----- . *History of Indian Literature*. Vol. 1-3. A New Authoritative English Translation by V. Srinivasa Sarma. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, (1908-1920) 1981/1996, 1983/1999.

----- . (Comp.). *A General Index to the Names and Subject-Matter of The Sacred Books of the East*. With a Preface by A. A. Macdonell. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Logische Untersuchungen*. Werkausgabe Band 1. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, (1946) 1984.

Witzel, Michael. "Aryan and non-Aryan Names in Vedic India. Data for the Linguistic Situation, c. 1900-500 B.C." *Aryan and Non-Aryan in South Asia: Evidence, Interpretation and Ideology*. Proceedings of the International Seminar on Aryan and Non-Aryan in South Asia, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. October 1996. Eds. Johannes Bronkhorst & Madhav M. Deshpande, 25-27. Cambridge: Harvard University Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, 1999. <http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~witzel/Lingsit.pdf>

Wolf, Ursula. "Einleitung." *Eigennamen. Dokumentation einer Kontroverse*. Hg. U. Wolf, 9-41. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1985/2015.

Wright, Samuel. "From Praśasti to Political Culture: The Nadia Raj and Malla Dynasty in Seventeenth-Century Bengal." *Journal of Asian Studies* 73, 2 (2014) 397-418.

Yamazaki, Moriichi & Yumi Ousaka. *A Word Index and Reverse Word Index to Early Jain Canonical Texts [Texte imprimé]. Āyāraṅga, Sūyagaḍa, Uttarajjhāyā, Dasaveyāliya and Isibhāsiyāim*. Tokyo: Chūō Academic Research Institute, 1999.

Zysk, Kenneth. "The Use of Manuscript Catalogues as Sources of Regional Intellectual History in India's Early Modern Period." *Aspects of Manuscript Culture in South India*. Ed. Saraju Rath, 253-287. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2012.

### **Websites**

China Biographical Database Project (CBDB)

<https://projects.iq.harvard.edu/cbdb>

<http://www.dh2012.uni-hamburg.de/conference/programme/abstracts/prosopographical-databases-text-mining-gis-and-system-interoperability-for-chinese-history-and-literature.1.html>

Human Relations Area Files: Cultural information for education and research

<http://hraf.yale.edu/>

Monastic Matrix: A scholarly resource for the study of women's religious communities from 400 to 1600 CE

<https://monasticmatrix.osu.edu/monasticon>

Phillips, Diane. "Correspondence analysis." 1995:

<http://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU7.html>

Prosopography Research. Modern History Research Unit, University of Oxford

<http://prosopography.modhist.ox.ac.uk/index.htm>

Standards for Networking Ancient Person Data (SNAP-DRGN)

<https://snapdrgn.net/>

TRISMEGISTOS: An interdisciplinary Portal of Papyrological and Epigraphical Resources formerly Egypt and the Nile Valley (800 BC-AD 800). Now Expanding to the Ancient World in General

<http://www.trismegistos.org/>