Translation as Commentary and Commentary as Translation in Jain Literary Practice

John E. Cort[*]

The early modern period saw the Śvetāmbara Mūrtipūjaka and Digambara Jains of north and western India engage in the extensive translation into Bhasha[1] of classical texts from Sanskrit, Prakrit and Apabhramsha.[2] The Śvetāmbaras started earlier, as the earliest extant texts we can identify as translations into Bhasha in the genre known as *bālāvabodh*, which I discuss below, appeared in the fourteenth century. Translation activity among the Digambaras seems to have begun in the sixteenth century. By

---

[*] This chapter should be read in tandem with "Jain Multiple Language Use and Cosmopolitanism" (Cort forthcoming), as the two together combine to make a larger argument about Jain language use in medieval and early modern western and northern India. It should also be read in tandem with Nalini Balbir's excellent "Translating Sacred Scriptures: The Śvetāmbara Jain Tradition" (Balbir 2023), which came to my attention too late to be incorporated adequately into my chapter. Except where otherwise noted all translations are mine.

I thank Akshara Ravishankar and Tyler Williams for helpful comments on an earlier draft, and the two anonymous reviewers for their incisive feedback and suggestions.

[1] Commonly spelled *bhākhā* in early modern manuscripts; I use the modernised form Bhasha in conformity with current academic practice. In this chapter I avoid using "vernacular" as much as possible (and yet found that completely avoiding it was impossible). In recent scholarship on medieval and early modern South Asia "vernacular" has become over-used and under-theorised, to the point where I do not find it very useful except in its most general sense.

[2] In this chapter I do not address Sthānakavāsī or Śvetāmbara Terāpanthī literary practices. These communities do not appear to have been involved in translation before the twentieth century to anywhere near the extent of the Digambaras and Mūrtipūjakas; but the Sthānakavāsīs do appear to have relied extensively on the *bālāvabodh*s composed by the Mūrtipūjaka author Pārśvacandrasūri in the sixteenth century (Balbir 2023: 401–2); and see the important example of the Rajasthani translation of the canonical *Bhagavatī Sūtra* by Jayācārya (1804–1882), the fourth *ācārya* of the Terāpantha, as the *Bhagavatī Joṛ* (Balbir 2023: 408–9 and Dundas 2020: 753). Nor do I address literary practices of Digambara Jains in the Deccan and South India. For the remainder of the chapter, unless specified otherwise, when I refer to Śvetāmbaras I specifically refer to Śvetāmbara Mūrtipūjakas. In the interests of space I also omit detailed discussion of early modern north Indian Digambara genre of *bhāṣā vacanikā*s, which by the very title of the genre indicate the extent to which they are simultaneously vernacular renderings and commentaries on older Prakrit, Apabhramsha and Sanskrit texts, and in some cases even of Bhasha texts.

the middle of the nineteenth century[3] a large number of Jain doctrinal, devotional and narrative texts had been translated. Over the past century most of these Bhasha translations have been supplanted by translations into modern Gujarati and Hindi, and as a result they have received scant scholarly attention.[4] But the magnitude of this enterprise is truly noteworthy, and marks a major chapter in the global history of translation.

A Note on Language: Bhasha, Old Gujarati, Old Rajasthani, Maru-Gurjar

In this chapter I use Bhasha as a cover-all term for the literary vernacular language continuum used in late medieval and early modern western India, a period roughly encompassing the thirteenth into the nineteenth centuries, and a region that in contemporary terms stretched from south Gujarat to Haryana and east into the Hindi belt. Bhasha was not identical with the spoken language of any specific time or region. It was a literary language written and understood over a large region. While historians of language and literature say that Bhasha was not a grammatically singular language, nonetheless it constituted a single literary language continuum until the sixteenth century, and until the nineteenth century texts composed anywhere in the region were to a significant extent understandable by audiences and readers throughout the region.[5] Michael S. Allen (2022: 13) has aptly called this early modern literary language a "malleable, transregional language." The geographical reach of this language continuum can be seen in the vocabulary of the three major scholarly sources in which we find lists and discussions of *bālāvabodh*s and other Jain Bhasha texts from this medieval and early modern western India. Many individual *bālāvabodh*s are discussed in all three sources, but characterised by each source as being in a different

---

[3] The cut-off period for my discussion is when Jains started transitioning from handwritten manuscripts to mechanically printed books, and also started transitioning from Bhasha and other older linguistic registers to modern standard Gujarati and Hindi. These changes overlapped temporally to a significant extent, but it is not clear that they were mutually causative. This is an important matter to explore on another occasion. We also find that the use of the term *bālāvabodh* largely ends with the transition from manuscript to print culture.

[4] For example, none of the eighteen articles on Rajasthani and Hindi literature, totaling over 200 pages, in *Rājasthān kā Jain Sāhitya* (Nāhṭā et al. 2003) contains any discussion of translations as a genre, and in fact few make any mention of translations even in lists of the compositions by specific authors.

[5] See, among others, Bhāyāṇī (1973: 39; 1975: 1), Miśra (1989–99: 1, 1–15), Nāhṭā (1967: 19; 1974: 4–5), Orsini and Sheikh (2014: 7n10) and Sāṇḍesarā (1953a: 5–6, 1953b: 4).

language. Thus one and the same text is labelled as Old Gujarati (or more broadly Gujarati or Gurjar) by Deśāī and Koṭhārī in *Jain Gūrjar Kavio* (1986–1997; first edition 1926–31), as Maru-Gurjar by Miśra in *Hindī Jain Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihās* (1989–99; he uses Hindi in the title instead of Maru-Gurjar, further signaling the overlaps), and as Rajasthani by Vinayasāgar in *Khartargacch Sāhitya Koś* (2006). The use of these terms says more about the geographic location of the scholars within contemporary India, in which states and languages have become increasingly locked in a mutually defining embrace, than it does about the language of the source texts. The analysis of language differences and language shift is of great importance for scholars of historical linguistics,[6] who tend to identify multiple languages, dialects or registers within the Bhasha continuum. The authors of the texts themselves, however, almost universally simply used the term "Bhasha" to refer to the language in which they composed, and to distinguish it from Sanskrit and Prakrit. As a result, scholars are increasingly adopting this term as a way of signalling both the linguistic and literary continuities over a wide temporal and spatial range, and the ways that Bhasha was much more a pan-regional and even trans-regional literary language than a place-specific spoken vernacular dialect.

"Translation" in South Asia: Anuvād, Bhāṣā Kar-, Bhāṣā √Kṛ, Bhāṣāntar, Chāyā, Tarjumā

Scholars have noted that there is no pre-modern noun that can be used to translate "translation" in languages that originated in South Asia.[7] The noun used in contemporary north Indian languages for translation, *anuvād*, is clearly a nineteenth-century repurposing of an older technical Sanskrit commentarial term.[8] Another term for translation, *bhāṣāntar* (literally "between languages") is also a nineteenth-century coinage.

---

[6] For some of the many studies, see Bangha (2018, forthcoming), Bhayani (1973, 1988, 1999), Smith (1975).

[7] Cort (2015), Gopinathan (2000, 2006), Hatcher (2017), Mukherjee (1997), Trivedi (2006), Williams (2018, 2022), among others.
    The Arabic noun *tarjumah*, which came into north Indian languages as, for example, *tarjumā* in Hindi and *tarjumo* in Gujarati, complicates the assertion about the lack of a noun to translate "translation." Its usage, however, was somewhat restricted, and I have not come across the noun in any Jain context.

[8] Andrew Ollett (email, 30 September 2012) calls attention to an eleventh-century Sanskrit commentary by Harṣapāla on Pravarasena's Prakrit *Setubandha* in which the author stated that he translated the original into Sanskrit, using the verbal construction *saṃskṛtagirā tasyānuvādaḥ kṛtaḥ*. See Acharya (2006). While this further

I have come to think that the observation about the lack of a technical term for "translation" for the act of rendering a source text into a target language is a bit of a red herring.[9] As G. Gopinathan and other scholars note, anxiety about translation that led to great theorisation of the practice appears to be largely a phenomenon of the European literary and religious traditions, and arose out of the doubts raised about the translation of the Bible first from Hebrew into Greek, and then from Latin into medieval and modern European languages. This anxiety is not one shared with most literary traditions around the world. It is true that we do not find in the South Asian intellectual traditions a science or theory of translation, an *anuvāda-śāstra*. The lack of a single pre-modern noun to translate "translation," as well as the absence of a systematic theorisation of translation, does not, however, mean that South Asians have not been translating among languages for millennia. Nor does it mean that South Asian authors and intellectuals haven't thought about all that is involved in the act of transporting a text into a second language. While investigating the factors that led to the need to repurpose the older Sanskrit *anuvāda* to cover "translation" is surely a topic of interest in the study of South Asian modernity,[10] more helpful for our purposes is to look at the nouns and verbal phrases Jains have used over the past millennium for the practice of translation.

Early modern poets from many religious and literary traditions used variants of the phrase *bhāṣā kar-*, "to make [it] Bhasha," or *bhāṣā kah-*, "to say [in it] Bhasha," to describe their activity of translating a text from a classical language into Bhasha (Williams 2018: 103). For example, the seventeenth-century Digambara Banārsīdās concluded his Bhasha translation of the Sanskrit *Kalyāṇamandira Stotra*:

---

complicates any unqualified assertion about the presence or absence of the concept of "translation" in medieval South Asia, it seems to be an idiosyncratic instance that does not invalidate the general observation about "translation" and *anuvād*.

Another example that complicates a simple statement that there was no concept of "translation" in medieval South Asia is the use of the term *anuvād* by Jñānadeva to describe what he was doing in his *Jñāneśvarī* as a vernacular commentary on the *Bhagavadgītā* (Ketkar 2019). Christian Novetzke (2016: 222–23) has said, "One can speak of the *Jñāneśvarī* as a 'translation' only in the loosest sense of this term. The word *transfer* would be more appropriate than *translation* to convey the purported intentions of the author."

9   I am here using "translation" in the primary sense given to the noun by the Oxford English Dictionary: "The act or process of translating a word, a work, etc., from one language into another." As I argue in this chapter, however, upon closer investigation we quickly find that we need to complicate our understanding of the process.

10   Hatcher (2017) is an essential beginning to such an inquiry.

The wise Kumudacandra made this *Kalyāṇamandira*.
Banārsī said it in Bhasha, for the sake of pure right faith.[11]

Banārsīdās and Kuṅvarpāl concluded their Bhasha translation of the *Sūktimuktāvali* in similar fashion:

It is called the *Sūktimuktāvalī*, and it has twenty-two chapters.
In total extent the text has one-hundred verses.
The pair of friends Kuṅvarpāl and Banārsī are like-minded.
They did the text in Bhasha, in verses of various meters.[12]

A third example comes from the Digambara Hemrāj Pāṇḍe, also in the seventeenth century, who concluded his Bhasha translation of the Sanskrit *Bhaktāmara Stotra* in a similar manner:

Hemrāj made the *Bhaktāmara* in Bhasha for the sake of well-being.
Whoever recites it in the right spirit will attain the land of liberation.[13]

Finally, the eighteenth-century Digambara Daulatrām Kāslīvāl announced in the very first verse of his Bhasha translation of Raviṣeṇa's Sanskrit *Padmapurāṇa* that he was translating it—literally speaking it—into Bhasha: "I speak the Bhasha *Padmapurāṇ* according to what I have heard."[14] He repeated this in the conclusion to his translation:

The *Padmapurāṇa* is a highly auspicious text . . .
this is it in Bhasha . . .
the original done by Ācārya Raviṣeṇa
was made into Bhasha according to what I heard.[15]

Daulatrām was very explicit that he translated the Sanskrit text composed by Raviṣeṇa. His composition was not simply another telling of the Rāma story within the vast multilingual current of Rāma texts, such

---

[11]   *yaha kalyāṇamandira kiyau kumudacandra kī buddhi /*
       bhāṣā kahata banārsī kārana samakita suddhi //
       Kalyāṇamandira Stotra (Cort 2015: 84).
[12]   *nāma sūktimuktāvalī dvāviṃśati adhikāra /*
       śataśloka paramāna saba iti granthi vistāra //
       kuṅvarapāla banārsī mitra jugala ikacitta /
       tinahiṃ granthi bhāṣā kiyo bahuvidha chanda kavitta //
       Sūktimuktāvali (Cort 2015: 85).
[13]   *bhāṣā bhaktāmara kaiyau hemarāja hita heta /*
       je nara paḍhaiṃ subhāvasauṃ te pāvaiṃ śivakheta //
       Bhaktāmara Stotra (Cort 2015: 88)
[14]   *bhāṣā padmapurāṇakī bhāṣūṃ śruti anusāra.*
       Padmapurāṇ Bhāṣā maṅgalācaraṇ 1b; p. 1.
[15]   *padmapurāṇa mahāśubha grantha . . .*
       bhāṣārūpa hoya jo yeha . . .
       bhāṣā kīnī śruti anusāra
       raviṣeṇācāraja kṛtasāra.
       Padmapurāṇ Bhāṣā colophon 6–7; p. 606.

as the Bhasha *Rām Rās* of the fifteenth century Brahm Jindās (Clines 2022) or the Bhasha *Sītācarit* written in the mid-seventeenth century by Rāmcand Bālak (Plau 2018). We can also see Daulatrām's express intention that he was translating Raviṣeṇa's original text (what he called the *sār*) when we compare his translation to the *Pārśva Purāṇ* of his contemporary, the Digambara Bhūdhardās. The latter author also called his text a Bhasha, but in the introduction made no mention of any earlier author or text that he was translating:

> Having worshipped all the worship-worthy beings, according to my limited under-standing
> I made the Bhasha *Pārśvapurāṇa*, for the welfare of myself and others.[16]

He confirmed this in the conclusion, when he simply said that he had consulted prior versions of the narrative, but did not specify that he was translating any one of them:

> Bhūdhar inspected earlier narratives and made himself familiar with them.
> This compilation is bound in Bhasha. It was done in Agra city.[17]

The verbal formula was not restricted to renditions of texts from classical languages into Bhasha, but was also used in Prakrit and Sanskrit to describe the act of translating from Prakrit into Sanskrit, as seen in the several versions of the story of the fourth- or fifth-century Śvetāmbara Siddhasena (Cort 2015: 64–5; Dundas 2020: 745; Granoff 1989–90, 1991). Siddhasena was a Brahmin who became a Jain monk, and who wanted to render the Prakrit texts into Sanskrit. The other monks thought that this was a moral offence to the integrity of the teachings of Mahāvīra, and sentenced Siddhasena to wander incognito for many years. The story of Siddhasena and his desire to translate the scriptures is told in at least five medieval Prakrit and Sanskrit texts. The authors do

---

16   *sakalapūjya pada pūjakaiṃ alpabuddhi anusāra /*
     bhāṣā pārśvapurāṇa kī karauṃ svapara hitakāra //
     Pārśva Purāṇ 1.14; p. 2.

17   *pūraba carita vilokikai bhūdhara buddhi samāna /*
     bhāṣā baddha prabandha yaha kiyo āgare thāna //
     Pārśva Purāṇ 9.325; p. 91.
     Bhūdhar's phrase for his translation, "bound in Bhasha" (*bhāṣā baddha*), is quite striking; I have not seen it used by other Jain authors (although that is probably indicative more of the relatively small number of translations I have been able to see than anything else). A century before Bhūdhar, Tulsīdās used the same phrase to describe his translation of the story of Rāma into Bhasha as the *Rāmcaritmānas*: "That same tale I will set in common speech" (*Rāmcaritmānas* 1.31.1c, translation by Philip Lutgendorf [2016: 73]). The original reads: *bhāṣābaddha karabi maiṃ soī*. This usage signals the need for more research into the uses of *bhāṣā kar* and its variants in different contexts of time, place, genre and literary tradition.

not use any technical term for "translation," but simply have Siddhasena say that he wanted to "make the texts Sanskrit" or "make the texts into Sanskrit." The texts use forms of the Prakrit verb √*kara* and the Sanskrit verb √*kṛ*, meaning "to do, to make," and then use the noun "Sanskrit" (or "Sanskrit *bhāṣā*") in either the accusative or locative case.

In the 1134[18] Prakrit *Ākhyānamaṇikośavṛtti* by Āmradevasūri, Siddhasena says, "I make all the scripture into the Sanskrit language."[19] The twelfth-century Prakrit *Kahāvalī* by Bhadreśvarasūri has Siddhasena say something very similar: "I make [all] the scripture Sanskrit."[20] In the 1277 Sanskrit *Prabhāvakacarita* by Prabhācandra, we read that Siddhasena "wants to make the scripture Sanskrit."[21] In both the Sanskrit *Kuḍuṅgeśvaranābheyadevakalpa* in the 1333 *Vividhatīrthakalpa* by Jinaprabhasūri and the 1349 Sanskrit *Prabandhakośa* by Rājaśekharasūri, Siddhasena says, "I make all the scriptures Sanskrit."[22] We thus see a clear acknowledgement of the act of translating, even though the texts do not use any specific technical noun for "translation."

There is one other way that we find an explicit reference to the practice of translation in medieval and early modern manuscripts. Many Prakrit texts (and Prakrit portions of multiple language dramas) were accompanied by a Sanskrit word-for-word trot, known as a *chāyā* (literally "shadow"), so that a reader or audience inadequately familiar with the one or more Prakrits involved could follow the text.[23] The earliest known *chāyā*, in Rājaśekhara's *Bālarāmāyaṇa*, dates from the early tenth century, and *chāyā*s are found in many manuscripts copied over the past millennium (Leclère 2022: 109). In Brahminical circles they were largely restricted to dramas, since these were the only texts that incorporated a significant amount of Prakrit. In many instances a *chāyā* was a simple word-for-word trot, and so the simplest form of translation, but this was not always the case. Leclère (2022: 115) observes, "translating and commenting were similar processes." Authors of *chāyā*s added short additional comments explaining the implications in the text of a word

---

[18] Unless noted otherwise, all dates are CE, not VS.
[19] *siddhaṃtaṃ savvaṃ pi hu karemi bhāsāe sakkayāe ahaṃ. Ākhyānamaṇikośavṛtti* 57.32; p. 172.
[20] *karemi sakkayaṃ [savvaṃ] pi siddhaṃtaṃ. Kahāvalī*, Vol. 2, p. 341.
[21] *siddhāntaṃ saṃskṛtaṃ kartum icchan. Prabhāvakacarita* 8.109; p. 58.
[22] *sakalān apy āgamān ahaṃ saṃskṛtān karomi. Vividhatīrthakalpa*, p. 88; *Prabandhakośa*, p. 18.
[23] As Sheldon Pollock (2006: 105n69) notes, there has been almost no scholarship on the genre of the *chāyā*; the one exception is Basile Leclère's 2022 study. This is another lacuna in the history of translation in South Asia.

or phrase. The placement of a *chāyā* in a manuscript also echoed the techniques copyists used to distinguish the root text from commentary (Leclère 2022: 117–18).

*Chāyā*s were attached to Jain texts in a wide range of genres, since Prakrit remained a valued language of composition for Jains into the early modern period, especially among Śvetāmbara authors. In many Śvetāmbara cases, an author composed a short text in Prakrit verse (*gāthā*) in recognition of the prestige of the language for Jains as highly appropriate for religious subjects. The Prakrit text then served as the foundation for an extensive commentary in Sanskrit, sometimes by the original author himself, and sometimes by a disciple. The Sanskrit commentary in some cases began after each Prakrit verse and its *chāyā*. Here is one example of a *chāyā*, on the opening verse of the *Śrāddhavidhi* written in 1450 CE by the Tapā Gaccha Ācārya Ratnaśekharasūri:[24]

> *sirivīrajiṇaṃ paṇamia suāo sāhemi kimavi saḍḍhavihiṃ /*
> *rāyagihe jagaguruṇā jaha bhaṇiyaṃ abhayaputtheṇaṃ //*
>
> *śrīvīrajinaṃ praṇamya śrutāt kathayāmi kimapi śrāddhavidhim /*
> *rājagṛhe jagadguruṇā yathā bhaṇitaṃ abhayapṛṣṭena //*

A problem, however, is that we have no idea who wrote this *chāyā*. The same *chāyā* appears in several printed editions of the text, but is missing from others. Nor is it found in a manuscript of the text copied in 1896 CE and now in Ahmedabad and available online.[25] Was it written by a medieval or early modern commentator or copyist, or was it written by a twentieth century editor? Was it written by Ratnaśekharasūri himself, but not included in all manuscripts? We do not know. Leclère writes that this is a common problem with *chāyā*s. There is little if any direct evidence that the authors themselves wrote them, and they seem to have been added to manuscripts by commentators and copyists in an accretive process. The undated medieval manuscript of Devabodha's twelfth-century drama *Satyavratarukmāṅgada* on which Leclère bases his study gives evidence of multiple people being involved in the *chāyā* process. Some *chāyā* passages are incorporated into the body of the manuscript, while others are found as marginal notes, and in some places one *chāyā* passage corrects an earlier one. Despite the problem of

---

[24] *Śrāddhavidhi* 1.1; p. 2 (2005 ed.).
[25] L.D. Institute of Indology, ms. 423. http://www.ldindology.org/manuscripts/listing-page-of-manuscripts/22478

authorship, however, we can identify the *chāyā* as a medieval genre of translation, in which the target text closely follows the source text.[26]

Translation and Commentary

In my 2015 tentative exploration of early modern Digambara Jain translation practice, "Making it Vernacular in Agra: The Practice of Translation by Seventeenth-century Digambar Jains," I noted almost in passing, "'translation' in many ways is simply a mode of 'interpretation' in another language, and hence blends into the genre of 'commentary'" (Cort 2015: 94). A noteworthy feature of the *bālāvabodh* as a Jain genre of translation, as we will see, is that a significant majority of them are simultaneously commentaries of one form or another.[27] This observation may seem obvious to anyone who has read any of these texts, but is of sufficient importance in the study of translation history in South Asia that it warrants a special discussion.

Almost all commentaries in classical Brahminical literary traditions were *intra*lingual, from Sanskrit to Sanskrit, in contrast to the many *inter*lingual commentaries we find in Jain literature. This is not surprising, given the extent to which Brahminical language practices highly prioritised Sanskrit monolingualism, whereas for nearly two thousand years the Jains have privileged multilingual practice, and viewed monolingualism as an intellectual and literary shortcoming (Cort forthcoming). Brahmin intellectuals were shaped by Mīmāṃsā theories of language, according to which Sanskrit is the only language appropriate for reli-

---

[26] The ways that *chāyā*s bear evidence of decisions by copyists that are arguably editorial corroborates the comments made by Tyler Williams in a roundtable discussion on book history at the conference "Opening the Archive: Scholars and Monks in a Moment of Change," held at the Neubauer Collegium for Culture and Society, University of Chicago, on 23 March 2023. Williams observed that the scribe of a hand-copied manuscript often employed similar intellectual processes as the editor of a printed edition of a text. He asked provocatively, "Can we therefore call a hand-copied manuscript an 'edition'?"

[27] I start by using "commentary" also in a basic sense found in the Oxford English Dictionary: "a systematic series of comments or annotations on the text of a literary work." This term, too, we find to be much more complex upon closer investigation. In contrast to "translation," where we are faced with an absence of an indigenous South Asian term, in the case of "commentary" we are faced with a surplus. In Sanskrit, for example, the following terms all can be applied to one form of commentary or another: *ṭīkā, ṭippaṇa, bhāṣya, vṛtti, vivṛtti, vivaraṇa, vārttika, vyākhyā,* as well as others. While some terms have very specific definitions in one or another school of hermeneutics, they do not retain any one meaning in all contexts, and many commentarial texts are titled and even self-titled by more than one term.

gious and ritual texts.[28] While one might argue that even monolingual commentary is a form of translation, as it involves a transposition of content from a source to a target text, in this chapter I want to restrict "translation" to multilingual literary activity, in which the source and target texts are in different languages. I do not want to elide all differences between "translation" and "commentary," and I think that most Jain authors also saw these as separate if overlapping literary processes.

The monopolistic hold of Sanskrit on Brahmin intellectual and literary culture began to fracture in the early centuries of the second millennium CE, the beginning of what Sheldon Pollock (2006) has called "the vernacular millennium." But it wasn't until the middle of the millennium that we start to see a significant number of translations from Sanskrit into vernacular languages.[29] Very few of these translations were strict word-for-word or even sentence-for-sentence or verse-for-verse translations. In some instances the translator omitted portions of the source text from his vernacular translation. A good example of this is the *Gītā Bhāṣā* of Theghnāth discussed by Akshara Ravishankar (forthcoming).[30] This otherwise little-known author composed his text in Gwalior around 1500 CE. While much of *Gītā Bhāṣā* is a verse-for-verse translation of the *Bhagavad Gītā* from Sanskrit into Bhasha, at key points he omitted and reshaped the text in order to bring into focus his own agenda on the need to develop an ascetic understanding of the problematic nature of human embodiment.

More often than contraction, in early modern translations of Sanskrit texts into Bhasha we find authors expanding upon the original. A good example of this is the *Vairāgya Vṛnd*, a translation of Bhartṛhari's Sanskrit *Vairāgya Śataka* by the Niranjani author Bhagvāndās, written in 1673 in what is now Rajasthan (Williams 2018). Like Theghnāth, except by expansion rather than compression, Bhagvāndās's translation "does much more than simply explicate or elaborate upon its source text—it transforms it into a different kind of composition" (Williams 2018: 104). Bhagvāndās translated the one hundred verses of Bhartṛhari's century, and included another twenty verses from the other two centuries, the *Nīti Śataka* and the *Śṛṅgāra Śataka*. Manuscripts of Bhartṛhari's poems vary widely in content and order. Bhagvāndās chose to divide them into five chapters (*prakāś*), and framed some of them in the genre of dialogue (*saṃvād*) between guru and disciple, a literary device not

---

[28] On this point see Dundas (1996, 1998, 2020) and Granoff (1991).
[29] That this was also the period that saw an increasing number of translations from Sanskrit into Persian is probably not a coincidence.
[30] See also her dissertation (Ravishankar 2024).

found in the Sanskrit source. Instead of a text of seemingly unordered verses on the joys and frustrations of renunciation, Bhagvāndās wrote a text that laid out a spiritual path to detachment and wisdom. In some verses his translation subtly altered the meaning to fit his own thesis. He also expanded Bhartṛhari's text, using 293 Bhasha verses to translate and explicate the 120 Sanskrit verses. Williams locates Bhagvāndās's *Vairāgya Vṛnd* within a growing number of early modern Bhasha texts that in similar fashion straddled the line between translation and commentary. Williams titled his article "Commentary as Translation." It could just as easily have been "Translation as Commentary."

If we want better to understand translation practice in early modern South Asia, as materials from the classical cosmopolitan languages of Sanskrit, Prakrit and Apabhramsha were translated into the emerging Bhasha of north and western India, we need to pay attention to the many ways that commentary and translation were interdependent. The Jain texts I discuss in this chapter were part of a much larger trans-sectarian (and also secular) literary development. But as is so often the case in scholarship on South Asia, the Jain evidence brings something different to our attention. Theghnāth, Bhagvāndās and other Hindu authors were doing something new by transforming commentary from an intralingual genre (Sanskrit commentary on Sanskrit root text) to an interlingual one (Bhasha commentary on Sanskrit root text). For the Jains, however, the simultaneous practice of commentary and translation was nothing new. For a thousand years they had been writing Sanskrit commentaries on Prakrit and Apabhramsha texts (and before that Prakrit commentaries on Prakrit texts); now they added Bhasha to the languages involved in the process, as they wrote Bhasha commentaries on Prakrit, Sanskrit and Apabhramsha texts.[31]

Genres of Medieval and Early Modern Jain Translation

In a study of the translation of Sanskrit texts into Old Javanese, Thomas M. Hunter distinguishes between two modes of translation. One of these he calls the "poetic mode." Literary stylists developed this mode as they "strove to develop the Old Javanese language into a sophisticated literary dialect comparable to the Sanskrit used for the 'court epics' (*kāvya*) of India" (Hunter 2011: 9). Hunter (2011: 14) notes that this mode of transla-

---

[31] See also M. Jain (2002: 163–68) for a good discussion of the intertwining of commentary and translation in early modern Digambara Jain Bhasha literature.

tion can aptly be called "transcreation," adopting the term first coined by P. Lal (1996) and which the editors of this volume have also adopted. The other mode of translation he calls the "commentarial mode." He explains this mode of translation as follows (2011: 13):

> From at least the mid-first millenium CE it became customary for Indian teachers and commentators to compose extensive commentaries on pre-existing literary, philosophical or theological works that in the simplest form presented glosses on the often-difficult phrasing or lexemes of the original . . . An analysis of early pedagogical texts of the Old Javanese tradition . . . shows that the "glossing" type of Indian commentary was taken as a model for these texts, but that the Sanskrit glosses of the Indian tradition were replaced with glosses in Old Javanese.

These two modes of translation do not form a binary. Rather, they form "two poles in a continuum of the art of translation in the context of multiple language use that register two different sociocultural orientations" (2011: 14). One pole prioritises a linguistic and literary project that makes connections with the prestigious transnational literary tradition that Pollock terms the Sanskrit cosmopolis, and the other pole emphasises a project that reformulates those transnational influences in terms of local characteristics.

We can fruitfully apply this distinction to the study of Jain translations. Some translations of Sanskrit and Prakrit poetical works were in Bhasha verse, such as the *Bhāṣā Bhaktāmara Stotra* by the seventeenth-century Digambara layman Hemrāj Pāṇḍe quoted above. These were translations in the poetic mode. Most translations, however, were in Bhasha prose, and in fact the Jains played a significant but generally overlooked role in the development of Bhasha prose that laid some of the foundation for later Gujarati and Hindi prose.[32] These were translations in the commentarial mode.

Digambara prose translations were known by the overlapping terms *bhāṣā vacanikā*, *bhāṣā ṭīkā*, *vacanikā* and *bhāṣā*, although there was no real significant difference among them, and some authors used all of them for the same text.[33] A *bhāṣā vacanikā* often (but not always) included the Sanskrit original, or else a Sanskrit translation if the original was in Prakrit or Apabhramsha. The author of the *vacanikā* provided the meaning (*arth*) of the original in Bhasha, sometimes as a translation

---

[32] For discussions of Gujarati prose in the context of the history of the development of the Gujarati language, see Bhāyāṇī 1976 and Sāṇḍesarā 2001. For a discussion of a single Digambara prose author, Daulatrām Kāslīvāl, and his contribution to the development of Hindi prose, see M. Jain 2002.

[33] A very few Digambara authors also called their prose translations *bālāvabodh* and *bālbodh*. Hardly anything has been written on this Digambara genre of commentarial translation. Aleksandra Restifo (2023) has also discussed the genre.

at the sentence level, other times as a word-for-word gloss (*śabdārth*). In some cases he followed this with an extended meaning (*bhāvārth*) in Bhasha, into which he might insert additional Sanskrit *śloka*s.

Harivallabh Bhāyāṇī (1976: 667) has written that there were actually three genres of early modern Śvetāmbara prose translations, although we need to understand "prose" in a flexible manner. Prose (*gadya*) encompassed writing that was not in metrical verse (*padya*). That does not mean that it involved grammatically complete sentences (*vākya*), which were regularly found in only one of the three genres, the *bālāvabodh* (which also involved verse, especially in opening benedictions [*maṅgal*] and concluding colophons [*prastāvnā*]).

An *auktik* presented a Sanskrit grammar in a Bhasha setting, in a manner not unlike a contemporary presentation of Sanskrit grammar in a book intended for English- or German-speaking students.[34] The oldest extant example is Saṅgrāmasiṃha's *Bālaśikṣā*, which is a Bhasha presentation of the Kātantra school of Sanskrit grammar (Jinvijay 1968). It was composed in Patan in 1280.

A *ṭabo* (Gujarati) or *ṭabā* (Hindi) was a word-for-word Bhasha gloss on the original. Nalini Balbir (2019: 14) has given a concise definition of the genre:

> the root-text is often written in large script and in the original Sanskrit or Prakrit. The Gujarati [Bhasha] is a word to word translation, which is laid out in the form of compartments and is often emphasized through dividers. It results into a bilingual document. This is useful both for understanding the original, and it also functions as a tool for learning the language.

Ṭabo comes from the Sanskrit *stabaka*, "bud," based on its visual appearance in a manuscript. The source text was written in larger letters, and the *ṭabo* in smaller letters in a line above the source text, with each explanatory word above the Sanskrit or Prakrit original, looking like a row of small flower buds (Sāṇḍesarā 2001: 275; Mālvaṇiyā 1980: 5; Desāī 1990: 6). As Keśavrām K. Śāstrī (1993: 60) has observed, this style of writing results in a text "which cannot be said to be pure prose."

Balbir (2020: 775) notes further that *ṭabo*s "range from word-to-word paraphrases, often equivalent to translations, to extensive and in-depth discussions bringing in innovative material that still needs to be explored." It thus overlapped with the third and most prominent genre of Śvetāmbara prose translation, the *bālāvabodh*. This overlap is further emphasised by Sāṇḍesarā (1953b: 7), but in terms of elements of a *ṭabo* being included in a *bālāvabodh*. He writes,

---

34 See also Sāṇḍesarā (2001: 283–84) on the genre of *auktik*.

the person who taught a *bālāvabodh*, but whose knowledge of the text was limited, would write a *stabak* to help him remember the material in his teaching. On each page three or four lines of the root text would be written in large letters, and below each line in smaller letters the meaning would be written, so that the teacher could easily explain the deeper significance (*bhāv*) of each word.

Bālāvabodh

Bālāvabodh literally means "instruction for a child," but in usage means something more like "introductory Bhasha textbook."[35] While *bāl* literally means "child," Bhogīlāl Sāṇḍesarā (1953b: 7-8; 2001: 276–77) explains that it refers not to physical age, but to level of education and understanding.[36] For this reason, Sitamshu Yashaschandra (2003: 577n18) labels the genre "handbook for students" and "handbook for beginners," and Paul Dundas (2020: 752) calls a *bālāvabodh* "informing the inexperienced."[37] Harivallabh Bhāyāṇī (1980: 5) amplifies on this, saying that *bālāvabodh*s served as textbooks to teach basic information on the principles of Jainism to both newly initiated mendicants and to laity. When one remembers that the majority of mendicants were initiated at a very young age, often between the ages of five and ten, then one sees that the term *bāl* is quite appropriate here. A *bālāvabodh* would have been very suitable for such a young mendicant to read, at the same time that he was taking his first steps in Sanskrit and possibly Prakrit, but had not yet developed the skills to read independently in either of those languages. We get a sense of the use of *bālāvabodh*s for study by laity in the colophons to two *Upadeśamālā Bālāvabodh*s. The source text was the Prakrit *Upadeśamālā*, a famous didactic text composed by Dharmadāsagaṇi in the fourth or fifth century. It was the subject of half a dozen commentaries in Prakrit and Sanskrit, and then at least four Bhasha *bālāvabodh*s. One of these was written by the Tapā Gaccha Ācārya Somasundarasūri in 1429, "to be useful to all people."[38] Fourteen years later, in 1443, the laywoman Rūpāī arranged to have a

---

[35]   There is a deep need for further research into this genre, which is important for understanding medieval and early modern Śvetāmbara Jain literary culture, as well as the development of Bhasha prose, translation and commentary in western and north India.

[36]   Kumārpāḷ Desāī (1990: 5–6) makes the same point, probably based on Sāṇḍesarā.

[37]   I find Yashaschandra's and Dundas's English translations of *bālāvabodh* preferable to that of Balbir (2020: 775): her "instruction for the ignorant" seems overly judgmental to my ear, and misses the extensive role these texts played as textbooks.

[38]   *sarvajanopayogī. Upadeśamālā Bālāvabodh* Vol. 2, p. 151.

manuscript (now in Ahmedabad) of it copied so that she could study it.[39] Another *bālāvabodh* on the *Upadeśamālā* was written by the Koraṇṭa Gaccha Ācārya Nannasūri in Cambay in 1487. That same year his disciple Guṇavardhana made a copy of the *bālāvabodh* (now in London) for study by the laywoman Maṇakā (Dave 1935: 1).[40]

The earliest Jain *bālāvabodh*s preceded Hindu Bhasha prose commentaries by several centuries, and the term is generally understood to apply only to Jain texts (Sāṇḍesarā 1953b: 7). The Śvetāmbara usage of the term, and writing of Bhasha prose commentaries, seem to predate Digambara Bhasha prose also by several centuries. The earliest extant Bhasha *bālāvabodh* is the *Ṣaḍāvaśyaka Bālāvabodh* by the Kharatara Gaccha Ācārya Taruṇaprabhasūri, which he finished in 1355 (Sāṇḍesarā 2001: 278; Śāstrī 1993: 61; Bhāyāṇī 1980: 12; Pandit 1976). It was composed in the Tughluq provincial capital of Anahilla Pattana for a Jain layman named Balirāja. It quickly became a popular text; the oldest extant manuscript (now in Bikaner) was copied by Paṇḍita Mahipāka, also in Anahilla Pattana, in 1356, just a year after Taruṇaprabha's composition (Pandit 1976: 4–5). Another manuscript (now in Limbdi) was copied less than a decade later, in 1363, again in Anahilla Pattana (Pandit 1976: 5). There are two other extant manuscripts: one (now in Patan) copied in Anahilla Pattana in 1452, and a second (now in Pune) copied at an unknown but fairly early date (Pandit 1976: 4–6). Paul Dundas (2020: 752) describes it as "a running explanation of the *Ṣaḍāvaśyaka Sūtra*, a commonly used version of the older *Āvaśyaka Sūtra* that describes the ritual involved in the performance of the six 'obligatory actions' essential to daily monastic practice and also supposedly incumbent on the lay community." His further description of the text shows how already we can see that a *bālāvabodh* was a multilingual text addressed simultaneously to mendicant and lay audiences, and which served a pedagogical function: "While it is not clear whether this work, which contains passages in Sanskrit, was intended for use by the monastic community or perusal by the laity, the presence in this commentary of 31 narratives in lively Gujarati [Bhasha] gives some sense of how public exposition in the vernacular by monks must have animated lay understanding of basic Jain values."

Many hundreds of *bālāvabodh*s were written during the half-millennium when Bhasha was a dominant literary language in western In-

---

dia. Mohanlal Dalīcand Deśāī and Jayant Koṭhārī present information
on 133 *bālāvabodh*s in the revised edition of *Jain Gūrjar Kavio* (1986–
1997).[41] Śitikaṇṭh Miśra includes over 300 *bālāvabodh*s in his *Hindī Jain
Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihās* (1989–99). Mahopādhyāya Vinayasāgar lists 137
*bālāvabodh*s in his *Khartargacch Sāhitya Koś* (2006). Muni Praśamar-
ativijay provides a list of 474 *bālāvabodh*s and *ṭabā*s in an appendix (pp.
311-27) to his edition of Somasundarasūri's *bālāvabodh* on Hemacandra's
Yogaśāstra. There is extensive overlap among these four compilations,
but even accounting for this overlap, the number of *bālāvabodh*s is
substantial. No doubt additional examples could be included were one
to scour more recently published manuscript catalogues such as the
thirty-seven volumes so far published (as of 2023) by the Mahavir Jain
Aradhana Kendra in Koba and available on the Jain eLibrary site.

*Bālāvabodh*s were composed on source texts in Prakrit, Sanskrit, Ap-
abhramsha and Bhasha. The source texts encompassed the full range of
Śvetāmbara textual production: scriptural *Āgama*s, devotional and ritual
*stotra*s (hymns), narratives, cosmological texts, texts on Jain doctrine
and metaphysics, ritual manuals, grammars and textbooks on aesthetics.
*Bālāvabodh*s were not restricted to Jain texts, but were written on some
of the non-Jain Sanskrit texts that are often found in Jain libraries,
and which were widely read by Jains. For example, in 1734 in Sojat
the Kharatara Gaccha Rāmavijayopādhyāya wrote a *bālāvabodh* on the
Amaruśataka, a classic of Sanskrit erotic poetry (Vinayasāgar 2006:
10; Deśāī and Koṭhārī 1986–97: Vol. 5, 340; Miśra 1989–99: Vol. 3,
411). Two Kharatara authors wrote *bālāvabodh*s on the *Śatakatraya* of
Bhartṛhari, his three centuries of verse on practical ethics (*nīti*), erotics
(*śṛṅgāra*) and renunciation (*vairāgya*): Abhayakuśalagaṇi in 1698 in Sin-
ali, and Rāmavijayopādhyāya in 1731, again in Sojat (Vinayasāgara 2006:
193; Deśāī and Koṭhārī 1986–97: Vol. 5, 339). In many cases multiple
*bālāvabodh*s were composed on the same source text. Six *bālāvabodh*s
were written on the thirteenth century Prakrit *Ṣaṣṭiśataka*, a text on
correct mendicant praxis by the Kharatara Gaccha layman Nemicandra
Bhaṇḍārī. These were by Somasundarasūri in 1439, Jinasāgarasūri in
1444, Dharmadevagaṇi in c. 1458, Merusundaropādhyāya in 1470, Dhar-
manandanagaṇi in the sixteenth century, and Vimalakīrttigaṇi sometime
between 1595 and 1633 (Cort forthcoming). The existence of so many
versions, many of them in multiple manuscript copies, indicates the
practical functions of *bālāvabodh*s: they were texts composed for use in

---

[41] I thank Steve Vose for providing me with this number.

preaching, for conducting seminars for mendicants and laity during the rainy-season retreat, and as textbooks for young mendicants.

The range of possible content in *bālāvabodh*s was vast. In their briefest form, as word-for-word paraphrases, the genre overlapped with that of the *ṭabo*, and a number of texts are titled by both terms in different manuscripts.[42] In more expanded form, they included doctrinal details and exemplary stories. This was in direct continuity with the Jain Prakrit and Sanskrit commentarial tradition, as Jain Prakrit and Sanskrit commentaries often included both discussions of doctrinal and ritual details and edifying stories, often explicitly labelled *dṛṣṭānta*, "illustrative story." In most cases the source text was in Sanskrit or Prakrit, but *bālāvabodh*s were also composed on Bhasha and a few Apabhramsha texts. Most of the source texts were in verse, either poetic verse or workmanlike verse. The function of Prakrit and Sanskrit commentaries on such source texts was to expand on the original in order to give the full meaning of the text; in the words of Mari Jyväsjärvi (2010: 133), "the task of the commentator" in a Jain context was "to retrieve and explain a text's true, hidden meaning." *Bālāvabodh*s served a very similar function, and some of the earliest usages of the term *bālāvabodh* for a commentary were applied to Sanskrit commentaries. As Upādhyāya Bhuvancandra (2007: unnumbered page 9) explains, "The author of a *bālāvabodh* strives to fully explain the meaning of the author of the text. In many places he makes the meaning clear by adding words that are not expressed in the verse. This results in an expansion. He takes note of places where the text is cryptic and gives an explanation."

The genre of *bālāvabodh* complicates any clearcut division between commentary and translation, which is why Hunter's discussion of the commentarial mode of translation is applicable to the genre. A *bālāvabodh* provides the Prakrit, Sanskrit, Apabhramsha or Bhasha source text, which is usually followed by a close parsing of the words into Bhasha. Thus we can call it a translation, as Balbir does. Then follows a lengthier Bhasha prose text, in which the author expands upon the original with quotations, discussions of doctrine and practice, and/or illustrative stories. Thus we can call it a commentary as well. Balbir (2020: 775) points out that the Bhasha commentarial tradition existed side-by-side with the Sanskrit commentarial tradition, and many

---

[42] The *Stabak* by Ācārya Jñānavimalasūri (1638–1726) on Ānandaghana's Bhasha *Covīsī* is a good example of a text called a *stabak* or *ṭabo* that in its form is quite similar to a *bālāvabodh*.

authors such as Somasundarasūri wrote both Sanskrit commentaries[43] and Bhasha *bālāvabodh*s.

One more continuity between Sanskrit commentaries on Prakrit texts and Śvetāmbara Bhasha *bālāvabodh*s on Prakrit and Sanskrit texts is the lack of any direct reference to the fact that the author has engaged in a transposition from one language to another.[44] While the colophons of some *bālāvabodh*s were in Bhasha, often they were in Sanskrit (even if the source text was not). As in Sanskrit commentaries, the colophon simply marked that the text was complete or concluded. The author did not call attention to the fact that he had just engaged in writing a two or three-language text in which the activity that we can call translation had been an integral element. For the authors, translation was simply part and parcel of what it meant to write a Jain commentary in Bhasha. For example, Pārśvacandrasūri concluded the ninth chapter (and therefore the entire first part of the text) of his *Bālāvabodh* on the canonical *Ācārāṅga Sūtra*, which he finished in 1525, with this Sanskrit prose:

> Thus is concluded the ninth chapter in the blessed *Ācārāṅga Sukhāvabodh*, done by Upādhyāya Pāśacanda, the disciple of blessed Sādhuratna, the crest-jewel of the learned, who strives in correct conduct, in the blessed Bṛhattapāgaccha. Thus is completed the first *Śrutaskandha* in the blessed *Ācārāṅga*.[45]

He made no mention of the fact that he wrote his text in Bhasha, nor that in addition to being a commentary (*avabodh*) it also involved the act of translation. In a similar manner, Ratnaśekharasūri concluded his 1450 *Śrāddhavidhi Kaumudī*, his Sanskrit commentary on the Prakrit *Śrāddhavidhi*, with similar words:

> By the grace of these good gurus [whom he had enumerated in the preceding verses], in the year 1506 [VS], Ratnaśekharasūri composed the commentary on the *Śrāddhavidhisūtra*. (12)
>
> . . .
>
> Counting every letter, there are 6,761 verses in the commentary called the *Vidhikaumudī*. (15)

May this commentary, along with the verses of the *Śrāddhavidhi* textbook, [which was] composed for the well-being of the faithful [laymen], give success for a long time. (16)[46]

As in Pārśvacandrasūri's colophon to his Bhasha text on a Prakrit source, we see that Ratnaśekharasūri gave no indication that his Sanskrit commentary also involved the act of translating the root Prakrit verses into Sanskrit. These texts involved both commentary and translation, but within the South Asian intellectual and literary world only "commentary" was a distinct, theorised genre that was worth mentioning. "Translation" as a literary genre or epistemic concept was absent. But the texts clearly involved the act of translation.

Jain Practice of "Translation" and "Commentary"

1. Prakrit to Bhasha (and Sanskrit)

In this section I give, in Roman script and partial English translation, examples of a Bhasha (with some Sanskrit mixed in) *bālāvabodh* on a Prakrit text, and a Sanskrit commentary (*vṛtti*, *ṭīkā*) on a Prakrit text, to show how similar the two genres are despite the language differences. The two examples were written within a half-century of each other, by mendicant authors who were heads of the Tapā Gaccha. They undoubtedly knew each other, and participated in the same multilingual literary circle; but the structural similarities between a Sanskrit commentary on a Prakrit text and a Bhasha *bālāvabodh* on a Sanskrit or Prakrit text extend far beyond this literary circle and inform the practice of the two genres throughout the medieval and early modern periods.

Somasundarasūri lived from 1374 to 1443, and was head of the Tapā Gaccha from 1401 until his death (Śāh 2001: 16–18; Parmār 1993). He helped oversee the extensive copying of older palm-leaf manuscripts onto paper, which were then deposited in a library (*bhaṇḍār*) in Patan. He wrote many texts in Sanskrit and Bhasha. He particularly favoured *bālāvabodh*s, and wrote at least eight of them. He was an important

---

[46] *eṣāṃ śrīgurūṇāṃ prasādataḥ ṣaṭkhatithimite varṣe /*
śrāddhavidhisūtravṛttiṃ vyadhatta śrīratnaśekharaḥ sūri // 12 //

. . .

vidhikaumudīti nāmnyāṃ vṛttāv asyāṃ vilokitair varṇaiḥ /
ślokāḥ sahasraṣaṭkaṃ saptaśati caikaṣaṣṭyadhikāḥ //15 //
śrāddhahitārthaṃ vihitā śrāddhavidhiprakaraṇasya sūtrayutā /
vṛttir iyaṃ cirasamayaṃ jayatāj jayadāyinī kṛtinām //16//
Śrāddhavidhi praśasti 12, 15, 16, 2005 edition, p. 496.

member of the several generations of leaders of the Tapā Gaccha who in the fourteenth through sixteenth centuries brought the lineage into a position of prominence among Jains in western India through their extensive composition and patronage of Bhasha literature. He wrote the *Upadeśamālā Bālāvabodh* in 1429. Among Somasundarasūri's five chief disciples was Munisundarasūri, who lived from 1380 until 1447, and succeeded Somasundarasūri as head of the Tapā Gaccha. Most of his many compositions were in Sanskrit and Prakrit, but he might have written a *bālāvabodh* on the fourth chapter of Hemacandra's *Yogaśāstra*.[47] Munisundarasūri was succeeded as head of the Tapā Gaccha by Ratnaśekharasūri, who lived from 1401 until 1461, and was initiated as *sūri* in 1446, one year before Munisundarasūri's death.[48] Ratnaśekharasūri was also a prolific author of Prakrit and Sanskrit texts who evidently did not compose in Bhasha.

By looking at the beginning of Somasundarasūri's *bālāvabodh* on Dharmadāsagaṇi's Prakrit *Upadeśamālā*, we can see how a *bālāvabodh* is a Bhasha text, with some Sanskrit mixed in, that simultaneously translates and comments on the Prakrit original.[49]

Somasundarasūri started with a benediction (*maṅgalācaraṇa*) in Jain Sanskrit.

ūṃ namaḥ śrī sarvvajñāya

[Translation: oṃ praise to blessed omniscience]

Next came a single Sanskrit verse in which he stated the intention of the text.

śrī varddhamāna jinavaram ānamya tanomi bālabodhāya
prākṛta-vārtārūpaṃ vivaraṇam upadeśamālāyāḥ

---

47 Reference to this *bālāvabodh* is found only in Miśra (1989–99: Vol. 1, 596), who says that a copy of the manuscript is in Patan. The Patan catalogue (Jambūvijaya 1991) makes no mention of such a text, nor is any reference to it found in Deśāī and Koṭhārī (1986–97). It may be that Miśra mistakenly referred to the *bālāvabodh* on the first four chapters of Hemacandra's *Yogaśāstra* by Munisundarasūri's guru Somasundarasūri.

48 Ratnaśekharasūri was not the direct disciple of Munisundarasūri; he was initiated by Sādhuratnasūri (a different Sādhuratna than Pārśvacandra's guru), and studied under Bhuvanasundarasūri, both of whom were also disciples of Somasundarasūri. Anon. 1927: 2.

49 Somasundarasūri, *Upadeśamālā Bālāvabodh*, Vol. 1, p. 1.
Sanskrit is indicated by green, Prakrit by blue, Bhasha by red, and Bhasha nouns that are *tatsam*s from Sanskrit by orange. For simplicity's sake I have avoided italicising Sanskrit, Prakrit and Bhasha terms in my translations.

[Translation: Having bowed to the blessed excellent Jina Vardhamāna, in order to educate the young I compose a commentary on the Upadeśamālā, consisting of explanation of the Prakrit.]

Somasundrasūri then gave the initial verse of the Prakrit source text, followed by a translation into Bhasha prose. In his Bhasha prose Somasundarasūri went beyond a word-for-word trot to provide an expanded explanation (*vārtā*) of the Prakrit words. The resultant Bhasha prose was not in proper grammatical form; it definitely was not what Hunter would call a translation in the artistic mode. This was very much a translation in the commentarial mode. I translate the Bhasha portions of this passage, and leave the Prakrit in their original form. To further underscore the multilingual nature of this text, many of the Bhasha terms are *tatsam*s, i.e., direct transpositions from Sanskrit into Bhasha.

namiūṇa jiṇavariṃde īṃdanariṃdaccie tiloaguru
uvaesamālamiṇamo vucchāmi guruvaesaṇaṃ //1//

jinavarendra śrī tīrthaṅkaradeva namiūṇa kahīī namaskarī iṇamo e upadeśamālā śreṇi vucchāmi bolisu gurūvaesaṇaṃ guru śrī tīrthaṅkara gaṇadharādika tehanaïṃ upadesiiṃ na tu āpaṇī buddhiiṃ śrī jinavarendra kisyā chaïṃ īṃdanariṃdaccie 64 narendra cakravarti vāsudeva pramukha nareśvara tehe arcita pūjita varttaïṃ valī kisyā tiloagurū svarga-martya-pātāla rūpa je trinni loka tehanā guru samyak mokṣamārga taṇā upadesaṇhāra chaïṃ /

jinavarendra is the blessed lord tīrthaṅkara. namiūṇa is to say obeisance. iṇamo in this line of upadeśamālās vucchāmi I speak gurūvaesaṇaṃ the teachings of the gurus, i.e. the blessed tīrthaṅkaras, gaṇadharas, etc., not according to my own thought but as explained by the blessed tīrthaṅkara. īṃdanariṃdaccie the indras are the 64 narendra emperors the vāsudevas and the chief lords of men, who honour and worship the one who is tiloaguru the guru of the three worlds, that is heaven, hell and earth, and who teaches the true path to liberation.

Finally, Somasundarasūri concluded his exposition on the first verse with a short passage in Bhasha prose in which he summarised the import of the opening Prakrit verse.

e pahilī gāthā pāchilāṃ ācāryanī kīdhī saṃbandha jāṇivā bhaṇī / atha śrī dharmmadāsagaṇi śāstranaï dhuri maṅgalika bhaṇī pahilā anaï caüvīsamā tīrthaṅkaradevanaü namaskāra kahaï chaïṃ //

[Translation: This first verse says that this [text] is in line with the knowledge told by previous *ācārya*s. Blessed Dharmmadāsagaṇi first speaks the benediction firmly rooted in the *śāstra*s, saying the obeisance to the 24 lord *tīrthaṅkara*s.]

2. Prakrit to Sanskrit Commentary and Translation

We can see how a Sanskrit commentary on a Prakrit text also involved elements of both exegesis and translation in the following example from Ratnaśekharasūri's Sanskrit autocommentary on his Prakrit *Śrāddhavidhi*. We also see just how similar a Bhasha *bālāvabodh* was to a Sanskrit commentary.

Ratnaśekharasūri began the commentary with three benedictory verses in Sanskrit (which I skip here), and introduced the first Prakrit verse. He then glossed the Prakrit in Sanskrit, with a suitable expansion to convey a fuller meaning of the contents of the verse.[50] The form of Ratnaśekharasūri's Sanskrit commentary on the Prakrit verse was no different from a Sanskrit commentary on a Sanskrit verse. His gloss was in fact already a translation: with one exception, in his prose exegesis he did not repeat the Prakrit term, but gave it in a Sanskrit form. Thus the Prakrit verse read *siri-vīrajiṇaṃ*, but rather than repeat this in his prose commentary, Ratnaśekharasūri gave it in Sanskrit translation as *śrī-vīrajinaṃ*. The one exception is the Prakrit verb *sāhemi* ("I will speak"); in his commentary he gave the exact Prakrit verb from the source text which he then glossed (translated) by the Sanskrit *kathayāmi*. The Sanskrit translations for the Prakrit originals that Ratnaśekhara gave in his commentary are the same as the Sanskrit *chāyā*, and so we see how a *chāyā* can be implicit in a commentary.[51]

After three benedictory Sanskrit verses, he presented the first verse of the Prakrit source text.[52]

sirivīrajiṇaṃ paṇamia suāo sāhemi kimavi saḍḍhavihiṃ /
rāyagihe jagaguruṇā jahabhaṇiyaṃ abhayapuṭṭheṇaṃ // 1 //

śrīvīrajinaṃ praṇamya śrutāt kathayāmi kimapi śrādhavidhim /
rājagṛhe jagadgurūṇā yathā bhaṇitaṃ abhayapṛṣṭenaṃ // 1 //

---

[50] As I discuss above, some modern editions of the text also include a Sanskrit *chāyā*.

[51] Given the extent to which the Sanskrit commentarial translation of the Prakrit *gāthā*s closely matches the Sanskrit *chāyā* found in modern editions, I am led to speculate that perhaps the *chāyā* might have been the first element in the text and commentary written by Ratnaśekharasūri, who then back-translated the Prakrit verses from the Sanskrit.

[52] I follow the 2005 edition of Muni Vairāgyarativijay and Muni Praśamarativijay, which was a re-editing of the 1952 edition by Muni Vikramvijay and Muni Bhāskarvijay, which in turn was based on the 1918 edition by Ācārya Vijay Dānsūri. The 2005 edition lacks the Sanskrit *chāyā*, which I therefore follow according to the 1995 edition by Paṇnyās Vajrasenvijaygaṇi and the anonymous 1980 edition.

Ratnaśekharasūri then glossed the Prakrit verse in the distinctive style of Sanskrit commentarial prose.[53]

> *śriyā   kevalālokāśokādiprātihāryapañcatriṃśadvacanaguṇādyatiśāyilakṣmyā yuktaṃ vīrajinaṃ caramatīrthaṅkaraṃ karmavidāraṇādyanvarthācca vīraḥ / uktaṃ ca [. . .] // evaṃ ca śrīvīrajinam ity etāvataivāpāyāpagamajñānapūjāvacanātiśayāś catvāropy asūcyanta praṇamya prakarṣeṇa bhāvapūrvakaṃ manovākkāryair natvā śruyāt siddhāntāt punar āvṛttivyākhyānena śrutād gurusampradāyāder ākarṇitāc ca śrāddhasya śrāvakasya vakṣyamāṇānvarthasya vidhiṃ sāmācārīṃ kenopadiṣṭāṃ rājagṛhe nagare samavasṛtena jagadgurūṇā arthād vīrajinenābhayakumārapṛṣṭenā yathā yena prakāreṇa bhaṇitam upadiṣṭaṃ tathābhūtaṃ kimapi saṃkṣepeṇa sāhemi kathayāmīti yoga iti prathamagāthāḥ //1//*

śriyā marked by omniscience, the aśoka tree and other [eight] **prātihāryas** {miraculous attending features}, the thirty-five virtues of speech, and other atiśayas {eminent features} **vīrajinaṃ** the supreme tīrthaṅkara who has overcome karma is the **vīra.** It is said: [here Ratnaśekharasūri gave two Sanskrit verses describing the Jinas]. thus **śrīvīrajinam** is known by four eminent features: all obstacles are removed, his [omniscient] knowledge, he is worshipped [by the indras], and his [divine] speech. **praṇamya** he is bowed to in a manner full of faith, with mind, speech and body. **śrutād** {heard} by the sermon on the doctrine and its commentary, **śruyāt** {heard} according to the succession of gurus. **śrāddhasya** {of the faithful} of the laymen **vidhiṃ** the correct conduct. by whom was it taught? **rājagṛhe** in the city **jagadgurūṇā** i.e. by mahāvīra jina **abhayakumārapṛṣṭena yathā** in the manner that the teaching was spoken **kimapi** concisely **sāhemi** I will speak it. this is the first verse.

Ratnaśekharasūri's commentary continued in this vein. He gave extended discussions of doctrinal matters. These discussions included frequent quotation of Prakrit and Sanskrit texts; Vajrasenvijaygaṇi in the table of contents to his edition lists fifty-seven texts, and Ratnaśekharasūri quoted other texts that Vajrasenvijaygaṇi and other editors have not been able to trace. Ratnaśekharasūri also regularly interwove elucidating stories (*dṛṣṭānta*) of varying length; Vajrasenvijaygaṇi lists eighty of them. In other words, Ratnaśekharasūri's expansive Sanskrit commentary (*vṛtti, ṭīkā*) on a short Prakrit text[54] was strikingly similar in its basic outlines to Somasundarasūri's expansive Bhasha translation-commentary (*bālāvabodh*) on another Prakrit text.

---

[53] The words of the source Prakrit verse, in all but one case translated into Sanskrit, are indicated by **bold**. Words in square brackets are my editorial additions; words in braces are English translations or explanations of the preceding Sanskrit word(s).

[54] There are only seventeen *gāthā*s in the Prakrit root text, which R. Williams (1963: 16) describes as "manifestly only a peg on which to hang a vast Sanskrit prose treatise."

Concluding Observations: Translation in South Asian Literary History

In an oft-cited article "In Our Own Time, On Our Own Terms: 'Translation' in India," in the 2006 volume *Translating Others*, Harish Trivedi engages in a strongly-argued postcolonial critique of the applicability of the concept of translation—or, as he phrases it, "'translation' in the Western sense" (Trivedi 2006: 102)—to India in the three thousand years before the advent of British colonialism and the hegemony of English. In part his essay involves a postcolonial stance that the field of translation studies is so permeated by Western presuppositions that it cannot do justice to "other/Other languages and cultures which [have] so far remained disregarded by Western discourse" (2006: 102). He says there is a "non-history" of translation in India. The evidence I have presented in this chapter—and I have presented just a few examples from the hundreds of Jain texts that we can call translations—shows just how wrong is his assessment. Much of his discussion deals with translations between India and other cultures (Greek, Latin, Chinese, Persian, Arabic—not all named in his essay, and he overlooks the evidence of extensive translation from Arabic and especially Persian into Indian languages), and downplays the extensive evidence of translation among South Asian languages. According to Trivedi, pre-colonial South Asia had no need for translation, because of the widespread bilingualism or multilingualism found throughout South Asian history. "Translation," he argues, "is the need of the monolingual speaker" (2006: 103), whereas South Asian multilingualism "is not in general conducive to translation" (2006: 104). Scholars in recent years have explored the relationships between translation and multilingualism in increasing depth, and shown that the two are not binary opposites, but rather intertwined practices.[55] In the words of Reine Meylaerts (2016: 519; quoted in Israel 2021: 125; emphasis in original), "At the heart of multilingualism, we find translation. Translation is not taking place *in between monolingual* realities but rather *within multilingual* realities." The Jain evidence clearly supports this conclusion.

Trivedi admits (2006: 117) that his essay is "no more than a preliminary and haphazard ramble over some of the vast ground," but he is misled in this ramble by the extant scholarship on Hindi and South Asian literature. Translation practice is barely if at all discussed in most of the standard histories and overviews of literature; for example, the

---

[55]   For one example, see the recent volume edited by Rita Kothari (2018).

massive 2003 *Literary Cultures in History: Reconstructions from South Asia*, edited by Sheldon Pollock (and in which Trivedi has a chapter on Hindi), does not even include "translation," or any of its South Asian equivalents, in the index. A similar omission marks the standard histories of Hindi. The problem is exacerbated by the ideological omission of Jain literature from histories of Hindi[56]; including Jain literature would have made it more difficult for Hindi scholars to avoid discussing translation.

I am not the only person to take Trivedi to task for his argument that there is no history of translation in South Asia. Peter Gerard Friedlander in his 2011 article "Before Translation?" explores Hindi/Bhasha medical literature (much of it Jain) from the late-sixteenth century to 1800—i.e., before the advent of British colonial practices of translation and the eventual coining of terms such as *anuvād*. He gives examples of Hindi/Bhasha texts that are explicitly retellings of medical texts from both Sanskrit and Persian. He concludes (2011: 53), "taken together this sample of works provides evidence for a tradition of retelling medical texts in contemporary forms of speech, a tradition active from at least as early as the sixteenth century in what was to become the Hindi speaking region. Furthermore, it included not only retellings of works from earlier Sanskrit traditions, but also retellings of works in Persian."

Examples of scholarship that discusses and analyzes early modern translations into South Asian languages could be multiplied. In this chapter I have shown that Jains have been translating for a thousand years.[57] The extensive Jain practice of translation from Prakrit, Sanskrit and Apabhramsha into Bhasha significantly enhances our understanding of the extent of early modern South Asian translation practice. The

---

[56] Kastūrcand Kāslīvāl (1965: 112) makes this point forcefully:
It has not been possible as of yet to research fully the old literature of the Hindi language. It remains to research fully the Jain and non-Jain manuscript collections and the private collections in Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Delhi. There are unknown and important texts in these collections that after they were composed were deposited in these collections, and then never again came to the attention of the general people. In these manuscript collections there are hundreds of old texts gathered into *guṭkā*s, and found as independent texts. It has not been possible to publish them. This author has found many important Hindi texts from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. . . . Therefore it is not possible to write the proper history of the *ādikāl* [foundational period] and the *madhyakāl* [middle period] of Hindi literature as long as the texts gathered in these collections have not been properly researched.

[57] If one includes as a mode of translation the Maharashtri Prakrit commentaries on the Ardhamagadhi Prakrit *Āgama*s (Balbir 2020: 774)—an intellectual move I find completely reasonable, and even necessary—then the history of Jain translation practice extends even earlier, to the early centuries of the first millennium CE.

Jain evidence also allows us to see that translations into Bhasha were in direct continuity with, and even contemporary with, much older patterns of translation in Jain literary traditions, in which commentaries in Sanskrit on Prakrit source texts involved a practice that we can identify as translation. Finally, this chapter has shown that our understanding of translation history is enhanced when we expand our definition of what constitutes a translation to include the many ways that translation and commentary are inextricably interwoven.

Bibliography

Primary Texts

Bhadreśvarasūri. *Kahāvalī*. 3 Vols. Edited by Muni Kalyāṇkīrtivijay. Ahmedabad: Kalikalasarvajña ŚrīHemacandrācārya Navam Janmaśtābdī Smṛti Saṃskār Śikṣaṇnidhi, 2012–16.

Bhūdhardās. *Pārśva Purāṇ*. Calcutta: Jain Pustak Bhavan, 1999.

Devendrasūri. *Devavandana-Guruvandana-Pratyākhyāna-Bhāṣyatraya*, with *Avacūri* of Somasundarasūri. Edited by Ācārya Vijayjinendrasūri. Lakhabaval—Shantipuri: Harṣapuṣpāmṛt Jain Granthmālā, 1993.

Jinaprabhasūri. *Vividhatīrthakalpa*. Edited by Jinvijay. Shantiniketan: Siṅghī Jain Jñānpīṭh, 1934.

Jñānvimalsūri. *Ānandghan Covīsī Stabak*. Edited by Kumārpāḷ Desāī. Ahmedabad: Kauśal Prakāśan, 1980.

Kāslīvāl, Daulatrām. *Padmapurāṇ Bhāṣā*. ShriMahavirji: Śāntisāgar Jain Siddhānt Prakāśinī Saṅsthā, 1959.

Nemicandrasūri. *Ākhyānakamaṇikośa*, with *Vṛtti* of Āmradevasūri. Edited by Muni Puṇyavijay. Varanasi: Prākṛt Granth Parisad, 1962.

Pārśvacandrasūri. *Ācārāṅga Sūtra Bālāvabodh*. Edited by Upādhyāya Bhuvancandra and Amṛt Paṭel. Nani Khakhar: Pārśvacandra Sūri Sāhitya Prakāśan Samiti, 2005.

Prabhācandrācārya. *Prabhāvakacarita*. Edited by Muni Jinavijay. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1940.

Rājaśekharasūri. *Prabandhakośa*. Edited by Muni Jinavijay. Santiniketan: Siṅghī Jain Pīṭh, 1935.

Ratnaśekharasūri. *Śrāddhavidhi*, with *Śrāddhavidhi Kaumudi Ṭīkā* of Ratnaśekharasūri. Edited by Ācārya Vijay Dānsūri. Bhavnagar: Jain Ātmānand Sabhā, 1918.

Ratnaśekharasūri. *Śrāddhavidhi,* with *Śrāddhavidhi Kaumudī Ṭīkā* of Ratnaśekharasūri. Edited by Muni Vikramvijay and Muni Bhāskarvijay. Surat: Śeṭh Devcand Lālbhāī Jain Pustakoddhār Phaṇḍ, 1952. Second printing 1960.

Ratnaśekharasūri. *Śrāddhavidhi*, with Sanskrit *Chāyā* and anonymous Gujarati tr. of *Śrāddhavidhi Kaumudī Ṭīkā* of Ratnaśekharasūri. Ahmedabad: Harīphārm Korporeśan, 1980.

Ratnaśekharasūri. *Śrāddhavidhi*, with *Śrāddhavidhi Kaumudī Ṭīkā* of Ratnaśekharasūri and Gujarati translation of Paṇḍit Dāmodar Govindācārya. Edited by Paṅnyās Vajrasenvijaygaṇi. Ahmedabad: Bhadraṅkar Prakāśan, 1995.

Ratnaśekharasūri. *Śrāddhavidhi*, with *Śrāddhavidhi Kaumudī Ṭīkā* of Ratnaśekharasūri. Re-edited by Muni Vairāgyarativijay and Muni Praśamarativijay. Third printing Pune: Pravacan Prakāśan, 2005.

Ratnaśekharasūri. *Śrāddhavidhi*, with *Śrāddhavidhi Kaumudī Ṭīkā* of Ratnaśekharasūri. Ahmedabad, L. D. Institute of Indology, ms. 423. http://www.ldindology.org/manuscripts/listing-page-of-manuscripts/22478.

Somasundarasūri. *Upadeśamālā Bālāvabodh*. 2 Vols. Edited by Kāntībhāī B. Śāh. Mumbai: Saurāṣṭra Kesarī Prāṅguru Jain Filosofical eṇḍ Liṭararī Rīsarc Seṇṭar, 2001.

Somasundarasūri. *Yogaśāstra Bālāvabodh*. Edited by Muni Praśamarativijay. Pune: Pravacan Prakāśan, 2003.

Secondary Texts

Acharya, Diwakar. "A Brief Note on Harṣapāla's Commentary on the Prakrit Kāvya Setubandha." *Newsletter of the NGMCP* 2 (2006), 2–4.

Allen, Michael S. *The Ocean of Inquiry: Niścaldās and the Premodern Origins of Modern Hinduism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2022.

Anon. "ŚrīĀcārapradīpasyopodghātaḥ." *Ācārapradīpa* of Ratnaśekharasūri. No ed., unnumbered 5 pages. Bombay: Śreṣṭi Devcandra Lālbhāī Jain Pustakoddhār, 1927.

Balbir, Nalini. "Functions of Multiple-Text Manuscripts in India: The Jain Case." *The Emergence of Multiple-Text Manuscripts*. Eds. Alessandro Bausi, Michael Friedrich and Marilena Maniaci, 3–35. Berlin: de Gruyter. 2019.

Balbir, Nalini. "Scripture, Canonicity, and Commentary." *Brill's Encyclopedia of Jainism*. Eds. John E. Cort, Paul Dundas, Knut Jacobsen and Kristi L. Wiley, 756–82. Leiden: Brill, 2020.

Balbir, Nalini. "Translating Sacred Scriptures: The Śvetāmbara Jain Tradition." *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Religion*. Ed. Hephzibah Israel, 398–414. London: Routledge, 2023.

Bangha, Imre. "The Emergence of Hindi Literature: From Transregional Maru Gurjar to Madhyadeśī Narratives." *Text and Tradition in Early Modern North India*. Eds. Tyler Williams, Anshu Malhotra, and John Stratton Hawley, 3–39. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Bangha, Imre. *Where Does Hindi Come From? The Emergence of a Literary Tradition c 1350–1450*, forthcoming.

Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal. "Periodization of the Historical Development of Gujarati." *Tessitori and Rajasthan*. Eds. Donatella Dolcini and Fausto Freschi, 131–36. Udine: Società Indologica "Luigi Pio Tessitori", 1999.

Bhāyāṇī, Harivallabh Cunnīlāl. *Gujarātī Bhāṣānuṃ Aitihāsik Vyākaraṇ*. Gandhinagar: Gujarāt Sāhitya Ekeḍamī, 1988.

Bhāyāṇī, Harivallabh. "Prastāvnā." *Prācīna Gūrjara Kāvya Sañcaya*. Eds. H. C. Bhayani and Agachand Nahta, 1–16. Ahmedabad: L. D. Institute of Indology, 1975.

Bhāyāṇī, Harivallabh. "Gadyasāhitya." *Gujarātī Sāhityano Itihās, Vol. 2 (Ī. 1450–1850)*. Eds. Umāśaṅkar Jośī, et al., 667–79. Ahmedabad: Gujarātī Sāhitya Parīṣad, 1976.

Bhāyāṇī, Harivallabh. "Bhūmikā." Merusundaragaṇi, *Śīlopadeśamālā Bālāvabodha*. Eds. H. C. Bhayani, R. M. Shah and Gitabahen, 1–30. Ahmedabad: L. D. Institute of Indology, 1980.

Bhāyāṇī, Harivallabh. "Gujarātī Bhāṣāno Kuḷkram." *Gujarātī Sāhityano Itihās, Vol. 1 (Ī. 1150–1450)*. Eds. Umāśaṅkar Jośī, Anantrāy Rāvaḷ, Yaśvant Śukla (1st ed.), Ramaṇ Sonī (2nd ed.), 25–44. Ahmedabad: Gujarātī Sāhitya Pariṣad, 2001 (1st ed. 1973).

Bhuvancandra, Upādhyāya. "Gūrjarbhāṣāmāṃ Śāstra ane tenuṃ Gujarātī Bhāṣya." *U. Yaśovijayjīkṛt 350 Gāthānā Stavanno Pt. Padmavijayjīkṛt Bālāvabodh*. Ed. Ācārya Pradyumnasūri, unpaginated (11 pp). Ahmedabad: Śrutajñān Prasārak Sabhā, 2007.

Clines, Gregory M. *Jain Rāmāyaṇa Narratives: Moral Vision and Literary Innovation*. London: Routledge, 2022.

Cort, John E. "Making it Vernacular in Agra: The Practice of Translation by Seventeenth-century Jains." *Tellings and Texts: Music, Literature and Performance in North India*. Eds. Francesca Orsini and Katherine Butler Schofield, 61–105. Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, 2015.

Cort, John E. "Jain Multiple Language Use and Cosmopolitanism." *Early Modern Literatures in North India: Current Research*. Eds. Monika Horstmann, Kiyokazu Okita and Hiroko Nagasaki. Heidelberg: Heidelberg Asian Studies Publishing, forthcoming.

Dave, Trimbaklal N. *A Study of the Gujarāti Language in the 16th Century (V.S.) with Special Reference to the Ms. Bālāvabodha to Upadeśamālā*. London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1935.

Desāī, Kumārpāḷ. "Upodghāt." *Vācak Merusundarkṛt Bālāvabodh* [on *Ajitaśānti Stava* of Nandiṣeṇa]. Ed. Kumārpāḷ Desāī, 5–8. Ahmedabad: Jaybhikkhu Sāhitya Ṭrasṭ, 1990.

Deśāī, Mohanlal Dalīcand (ed.), and Jayant Koṭhārī (2nd ed.). *Jain Gūrjar Kavio*. 10 Vols. Second ed. Mumbai: Mahāvīr Jain Vidyālay, 1986–1997.

Dundas, Paul. "Jain Attitudes towards the Sanskrit Language." *Ideology and Status of Sanskrit: Contributions to the History of the Sanskrit Language*. Ed. Jan E. M. Houben, 137–56. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Dundas, Paul. 1998. "Becoming Gautama: Mantra and History in Śvetāmbara Jainism." *Open Boundaries: Jain Communities and Cultures in Indian History*. Ed. John E. Cort, 31–52. Albany: SUNY Press.

Dundas, Paul. 2020. "Jainism and Language Usage." *Brill's Encyclopedia of Jainism*. Eds. John E. Cort, Paul Dundas, Knut Jacobsen and Kristi L. Wiley, 739–55. Leiden: Brill.

Friedlander, Peter Gerard. "Before Translation?" *Translation in Asia: Theories, Practices, Histories*. Eds. Ronit Ricci and Jan van der Putten, 45–56. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing, 2011.

Gopinathan, G. "Ancient Indian Theories of Translation: A Reconstruction." *Beyond the Western Tradition: Essays on Translation Outside Standard European Languages*. Ed. Marilyn Gaddis Rose, 165–73. Binghamton: Center for Research in Translation, State University of New York at Binghamton, 2000.

Gopinathan, G. "Translation, Transcreation and Culture: Theories of Translation in Indian Languages." *Translating Others*. 2 Vols. Ed. Theo Hermans, Vol. 1, 236–46. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing, 2006.

Granoff, Phyllis. "The Biographies of Siddhasena: A Study in the Texture of Allusion and the Weaving of a Group-Image." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* (1989–90) 17: 329–84 and 18: 261–304.

Granoff, Phyllis. "Buddhaghosa's Penance and Siddhasena's Crime: Remarks on Some Buddhist and Jain Attitudes Towards the Language of Religious Texts." *From Benares to Beijing: Essays on Buddhism and Chinese Religion*. Eds. Koichi Shinohara and Gregory Schopen, 17–33. Oakville, Ont.: Mosaic Press, 1991.

Hatcher, Brian A. "Translation in the Zone of the Dubash: Colonial Mediations of *Anuvāda*." *Journal of Asian Studies* 76 (2017), 107–34.

Hunter, Thomas M. "Translation in a World of Diglossia," *Translation in Asia: Theories, Practices, Histories*. Eds. Ronit Ricci and Jan van der Putten, 9–26. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing, 2011.

Israel, Hephzibah. "Translation in India: Multilingual Practices and Cultural Histories of Texts." *Translation Studies* 14 (2021), 125–32.

Jain, Munnī. *Hindī Gadya ke Vikās meṃ Jain Manīṣī Pt. Sadāsukhdās kā Yogdān*. Varanasi: Pārśvanāth Vidyāpīṭh; and Ajmer: Digambar Jain Siddhkūṭ Caityālay Ṭempal Ṭrasṭ, 2002.

Jambūvijaya, Muni. *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Pāṭaṇa Jain Bhaṇḍāra*. 3 vols. Ahmedabad: Sharadaben Chimanbhai Educational Research Centre, 1991.

Jinvijay, Muni (ed.). *Ṭhakkur Saṅgrāmsiṃh viracit Bālśikṣā*. Jodhpur: Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, 1968.

Jyväsjärvi, Mari. "Retrieving the Hidden Meaning: Jain Commentarial Techniques and the Art of Memory." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 38 (2010), 133–62.

Kāslīvāl, Kastūrcand. "Hindī kī Prācīn Ajñāt Kṛtiyāṃ." *Sammelan Patrikā* 50: 2–3 (1965), 112–24.

Ketkar, Sachin C. "Dnyaneshwar's 'Duji Shrushti': Poetics and Cultural Politics of Pre-Colonial Translation in the Dnyaneshwari." *India in Translation, Translation in India*. Ed. G. J. V. Prasad, 1–27. New Delhi: Bloomsbury India, 2019.

Kothari, Rita (ed.). *A Multilingual Nation: Translation and Language Dynamic in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Lal, P. *Transcreation*. Calcutta: Writers Workshop, 1996.

Leclère, Basile. "Missing Shadows, Moving Shadows: The Process of Translating Prakrit in an Indian Drama Manuscript." *Riviste degli Studi Orientale* (ns) 95 (2022), 109–20.

Lutgendorf, Philip (tr.). *Tulsidas, The Epic of Ram*, Vol. 1. Cambridge, MA: Murty Classical Library of India, Harvard University Press, 2016.

Mālvaṇiyā, Dalsukh. "Prāstāvik." *Śrī Jñānvimalsūri kṛt Stabak* [on *Covīsī* of Ānandghan]. Ed. Kumārpāḷ Desāī, 3–5. Ahmedabad: Kauśal Prakāśan, 1980.

Meylaerts, Reine. "Multilingualism as a Challenge for Translation Studies." *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies*. Eds. Carmen Millan and Francesca Bartrina, 519–33. London: Routledge, 2016.

Miśra, Śitikaṇṭh. *Hindī Jain Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihās*. 4 Vols. Varanasi: Pārśvanāth Vidyāśram Śodh Saṅsthān, 1989–99.

Mukherjee, Sujit. "Transcreating Translation." *Indian Literature* 40 (1997), 158–67.

Nāhṭā, Agarcand. *Rājasthānī Sāhitya kā Gauravpūrṇ Paramparā*. Calcutta: Rādhākṛṣṇa Prakāśan, 1967.

Nāhṭā, Agarcand. *Jain Maru-Gūrjar Kavi aur unkī Racnāeṃ,* Vol. 1. Bikaner: Abhay Jain Granthālay, 1974.

Nāhṭā, Agarcand, et al., eds. *Rājasthān kā Jain Sāhitya*. Jaipur: Kalā evaṃ Saṅskṛti Vibhāg, Rājasthān Sarkār, 2003. Reprint of 1977 first edition.

Novetzke, Christian Lee. *The Quotidian Revolution: Vernacularization, Religion, and the Premodern Public Sphere in India*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2016.

Orsini, Francesca, and Samira Sheikh. "Introduction." *After Timur Left: Culture and Circulation in Fifteenth-Century North India*. Eds. Francesca Orsini and Samira Sheikh, 1–44. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Pandit, Prabodh Bechardas. *A Study of the Gujarati Language in the 14th Century with Special Reference to a Critical Edition of Ṣaḍāvaśyaka Bālāvabodhavṛtti of Taruṇaprabha*. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1976.

Parmār, Jorāvarsiṃh. "Ācāryaśrī Somsundarracit 'Upadeśamālā Bālāvabodh'." *Madhyakālīn Gujarātī Jain Sāhitya*. Eds. Jayant Koṭhārī and Kāntibhāī Bī. Śāh, 256–59. Bombay: Mahāvīr Jain Vidyālay, 1993.

Plau, Adrian. "The Deeds of Sītā: A Critical Edition and Literary Contextual Analysis of the *Sītācarit* by Rāmcand Bālak." Ph. D. dissertation, SOAS, 2018.

Pollock, Sheldon (ed.). *Literary Cultures in History: Reconstructions from South Asia*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.

Pollock, Sheldon. *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.

Ravishankar, Akshara. "Commentary and Canonization: The *Bhagavad Gītā* in Sanskrit and Hindi, 1400–1800 CE." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 2024.

Ravishankar, Akshara. "These are all Hidden Matters: Omission as Interpretive Strategy in Theghnāth's *Gītā Bhāṣā*." *Early Modern Literatures in North India: Current Research*. Eds. Monika Horstmann, Kiyokazu Okita and Hiroko Nagasaki. Heidelberg: Heidelberg Asian Studies Publishing, forthcoming.

Restifo, Aleksandra. "Publishing in the Early Twentieth Century: Nāthūrām Premī (1881–1960) and His Translation of Vādicandra's Jñānasūryodaya-nāṭaka (1591 CE)." Conference "Opening the Archive: Scholars and Monks in a Moment of Change." Neubauer Collegium, University of Chicago, March 23–24, 2023.

Śāh, Kāntibhāī Bī. "Śrī Somsundarsūrikṛt Upadeśamālā Bālāvabodh: Abhyās." *Śrī Somsundarsūrikṛt Upadeśamālā Bālāvabodh*, 2 Vols. Ed. Kāntibhāī Bī. Śāh, Vol. 1, 12–29. Mumbai: Saurāṣṭra Kesarī Prāṇguru Jain Filosofical eṇḍ Liṭararī Rīsarc Senṭar, 2001.

Sāṇḍesarā, Bhogīlāl J. *Literary Circle of Mahāmātya Vastupāla and its Contribution to Sanskrit Literature*. Bombay: Singhi Jain Shastra Siksapitha, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1953a.

Sāṇḍesarā, Bhogīlāl J. "Prastāvnā." Nemicandra Bhaṇḍārī, *Ṣaṣṭiśataka Prakaraṇ, Traṇ Bālāvabodh Sahit*. Ed. Bhogīlāl J. Sāṇḍesarā, 4–29. Vadodara: Mahārāj Sayājīrāv Viśvavidyālay, Prācīn Gurjar Granthmālā, 1953b.

Sāṇḍesarā, Bhogīlāl. "Gadya." *Gujarātī Sāhityano Itihās, Vol. 1 (Ī. 1150–1450)*. Eds. Umāśaṅkar Jośī, et al., revised ed. Ramaṇ Sonī, 275–86. Ahmedabad: Gujarātī Sāhitya Parīṣad, 2001.

Śāstrī, Keśavrām K. "Madhyakālīn Gujarātī Jain Gadyasāhitya." *Madhyakālīn Gujarātī Jain Sāhitya*. Eds. Jayant Koṭhārī and Kāntibhāī Bī. Śāh, 60–68. Bombay: Mahāvīr Jain Vidyālay, 1993.

Smith, J. D. "An Introduction to the Language of the Historical Documents from Rajasthan." *Modern Asian Studies* 9 (1975), 433–64.

Trivedi, Harish. "In Our Own Time, On Our Own Terms: 'Translation' in India." *Translating Others*. 2 Vols. Ed. Theo Hermans, Vol. 1, 102–19. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing, 2006.

Tschacher, Torsten. "Commenting Translation: Concepts and Practices of Translation in Islamic Tamil Literature." *Translation in Asia: Theories, Practices, Histories*. Eds. Ronit Ricci and Jan van der Putten, 27–44. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing, 2011.

Vinayasāgar, Mahopādhyāya (ed.). *Khartargacch Sāhitya Koś*. Jaipur: Prākṛt Bhāratī Akādamī, 2006.

Williams, R. *Jaina Yoga: A Survey of the Mediaeval Śrāvakācāras.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Williams, Tyler. "Commentary as Translation: The *Vairāgya Vṛnd* of Bhagvandas Niranjani." *Text and Tradition in Early Modern North India.* Eds. Tyler Williams, Anshu Malhotra and John Stratton Hawley, 99–125. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Williams, Tyler. "Why Comment? Translational Strategies on Paper." Paper at conference "Beyond Boundaries: A Celebration of the Work of John E. Cort." University of California Davis, August 11–14, 2022.

Williams, Tyler. "Opening the Archive: Scholars and Monks in a Moment of Change." Conference "Opening the Archive: Scholars and Monks in a Moment of Change." Neubauer Collegium, University of Chicago, March 23–24, 2023.

Yashaschandra, Sitamshu. "From Hemacandra to *Hind Svarāj*: Region and Power in Gujarati Literary Culture," *Literary Cultures in History: Reconstructions from South Asia.* Ed. Sheldon Pollock, 567–611. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.