

**A**  
**Comprehensive**  
**History of**  
**Jainism**



**Asim Kumar Chatterjee**

In this book an attempt has been made to write a comprehensive and connected account about Jainism from 800 BC to the time of Mughal Emperor Akbar. Jainism is older than Buddhism and first to protest against Brahmanical Hinduism, though most of the authorities on Jainism were Brahmins by birth and a few Kṣatriyas also took part in the propagation.

Pārśvanātha, who was the real founder and penultimate Tīrthaṅkara of this religious system, lived 250 years before Gautama Buddha. Vardhamāna Mahāvīra, a contemporary of Buddha was the twenty-fourth and the last Tīrthaṅkara of this religious system whereas Ṛṣabhanātha was the first Tīrthaṅkara. Mahāvīra made Jainism vastly popular with the masses of northern India. Afterwards from first century BC, Jainism became popular in south India. In spite of systematic vilification by the Buddhist and the Brahmins, Jainism still continues to be a dominant religious system in India, although there is practically no trace of the doctrine of Buddhism, in the country of its birth. Even now in India, some twenty million people are Jains and they are quite prosperous.

Towards the end, this book also carries descriptive account of the well-known Jaina *tīrthas* (sacred places) and nearly three hundred places have been discussed.

**Rs 950**  
(for 2 vols.)

In this book an attempt has been made to write a comprehensive and connected account about Jainism from 800 BC to the time of Mughal Emperor Akbar. Jainism is older than Buddhism and first to protest against Brahmanical Hinduism, though most of the authorities on Jainism were Brahmins by birth and a few Kṣatriyas also took part in the propagation.

Pārśvanātha, who was the real founder and penultimate Tīrthaṅkara of this religious system, lived 250 years before Gautama Buddha. Vardhamāna Mahāvīra, a contemporary of Buddha was the twenty-fourth and the last Tīrthaṅkara of this religious system whereas Ṛṣabhanātha was the first Tīrthaṅkara. Mahāvīra made Jainism vastly popular with the masses of northern India. Afterwards from first century BC, Jainism became popular in south India. In spite of systematic vilification by the Buddhist and the Brahmins, Jainism still continues to be a dominant religious system in India, although there is practically no trace of the doctrine of Buddhism, in the country of its birth. Even now in India, some twenty million people are Jains and they are quite prosperous.

Towards the end, this book also carries descriptive account of the well-known Jaina *tīrthas* (sacred places) and nearly three hundred places have been discussed.

Asim Kumar Chatterjee was Senior Reader in the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture, Calcutta University. He also acted as Head of the Department from 1989–91. He has published several books and research articles which are published in learned journals. At present he is writing a book on "Gautama Buddha".



# A Comprehensive History of Jainism

Vol. I

From the Earliest Beginnings to AD 1000

By the same Author

*The Cult of Skanda-Kārttikeya in Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1970.

*Ravindranath*, Calcutta, 1970.

*Ancient Indian Literary and Cultural Tradition*, Calcutta, 1974.

*Political History of Pre-Buddhist India*, Calcutta, 1980.

# A Comprehensive History of Jainism

Vol. I

From the Earliest Beginnings to AD 1000

Asim Kumar Chatterjee



Munshiram Manoharlal  
Publishers Pvt Ltd

ISBN 81-215-0930-0 (for the set)

ISBN 81-215-0931-9 (for vol. I)

Second revised edition 2000

First published in 1978

© 2000, **Chatterjee**, Asim Kumar

All rights reserved, including those of translations into other languages. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form, or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the written permission of the publisher.

Typeset, printed and published by  
Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd.,  
Post Box 5715, 54 Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi 110 055.



*Dedicated to  
the sad memory of my elder brother  
Dr. Amiya Kumar Chatterjee  
(1936–74), M.R.C.P. (Edin.),  
a cancer specialist, who himself became  
a victim of that deadly disease.*



## Contents

<i>Preface to the Second Edition</i>	ix
<i>Preface to the First Edition</i>	xi
<i>Introduction</i>	xiii
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xxi
CHAPTER I	
Tīrthamkaras from Rṣabha to Ariṣṭanemi	1
CHAPTER II	
Pārśvanātha	11
CHAPTER III	
Life of Mahāvīra	17
CHAPTER IV	
Spread of Jainism (The Early Phase)	32
CHAPTER V	
Jainism in Mathurā	40
CHAPTER VI	
Jainism in Orissa	69
CHAPTER VII	
Jainism in North India (200 BC–AD 600)	79
CHAPTER VIII	
Jainism in South India (The Early Phase)	104

CONTENTS

CHAPTER IX	
Jainism in North India (AD 600–1000)	133
CHAPTER X	
Jainism in South India (AD 600–1000)	156
CHAPTER XI	
Śvetāmbara Canonical Literature	200
CHAPTER XII	
Non-Canonical Śvetāmbara Literature	241
CHAPTER XIII	
Digambara Literature	259
CHAPTER XIV	
Jaina Thinkers	282
APPENDIX A	
Ājīvikism and Gośāla	297
APPENDIX B	
Early Jainism and <i>Yakṣa</i> -Worship	307
<i>Bibliography</i>	315
<i>Index</i>	317

## Preface to the Second Edition

This new edition of my work on Jainism is being published after a gap of nearly twenty years. I am happy to note that this work has been generously received by the historians all over the world, although a few readers have criticised me for my boldness. Let me declare candidly that I have the highest respect for both Lords Pārśvanātha and Mahāvīra. In this work, I have tried to show that Lord Pārśvanātha was the first prophet of non-violence and the earliest genuine teacher, advocating the equality of men and women.

It is of great interest to note that even the great Buddhist Emperor Aśoka befriended the Jainas and the Ājīvikas, along with the Buddhists and the Brahmins. Unlike the Buddhist canonical authors, he, in his epigraphs, has mentioned the Brahmins before the Śramaṇas and the classical Greek and Roman authors have done the same.

Before the beginning of the Christian era, Jainism became a vastly popular religious system in this subcontinent and even reached Ceylon.

In course of time, this system touched Bengal and afterwards became popular in Orissa. From there it travelled towards the southern part of this country. Another group of the Jainas made their faith popular in western India. In the Gupta period, we find even Brahmins of Bengal, embracing this new religious system.

Thousands of Jaina icons are preserved in the museums of India and also in other museums, outside this country. Even now there are millions of Jainas, who are quite prosperous, and some of them are also great intellectuals. Buddhism, has vanished from India, but the followers of Mahāvīra are found in every city of this great subcontinent.

ASIM KUMAR CHATTERJEE

*Calcutta*  
*21 February 2000*



## Preface to the First Edition

Jainism, which is certainly older than Buddhism, originated some 800 years before the birth of Christ. Pārśvanātha, the twenty-third Tīrthāṅkara, but in reality the founder of this religion, belonged to Vārāṇasī, India's most sacred city. It is extremely significant that the first genuine protest against the Brahmanical religion came from a person who belonged to its strongest citadel. The religious system, established by Pārśva, gradually spread towards the east, and by the time Lord Mahāvīra was born, became one of the dominating forces in the religious life of eastern India. The *Ācārāṅgasūtra*, which is one of the oldest Jaina religious texts, informs us that even the parents of Mahāvīra, who lived near Vaiśālī in northern Bihar, were followers of Pārśva.

Lord Mahāvīra, who was a somewhat junior contemporary of the Buddha (as I have shown in this work), made Jainism one of the most popular religious systems of northern India. For thirty years after his enlightenment, he spared no effort to make the Nirgrantha religion an all-India religious system. If we are to believe the evidence of the *Bhagavatī*, he personally preached even in western India. His rival, the Buddha, never went farther than the Kuru country. However, both these great Masters, it appears, spent the major part of their lives in modern Bihar and Uttar Pradesh, Magadha and Kosala being the *janapadas*, that received their greatest attention.

After Mahāvīra, his devoted followers made every effort to carry the message of Pārśva and Mahāvīra to millions of Indians living in different parts of this subcontinent. The immediate disciples of Mahāvīra were all Brahmans but at a later stage some non-Brāhmaṇa disciple gradually made the Nirgrantha religion a thoroughly anti-Brahmanical religious system. Even the great Bhadrabāhu, a native of northern Bengal, was a Brahman and the first genuine Jaina philosopher, namely Umāsvāti, also belonged to that caste. From the first century BC, however, persons belonging to the business community started patronizing Jainism. I strongly believe that it was this

community, which was responsible for moulding it as an anti-Brahmanical religious system.

In vol. I, I have outlined the history of Jainism from the earliest time to AD 1000. In vol. II, I will endeavour to cover the period between AD 1000 and 1500, and which shall in addition shall also have chapters on Jaina Iconography and Philosophy.

My work is principally based on the original sources and the views expressed are entirely mine. This is the first systematic historical study of Jainism, and I hope it will be well received by the academic world. For any misprints and other errors, I can only crave the indulgence of my readers.

A.K. CHATTERJEE

*Calcutta*  
*14 March 1978*



## Introduction

Jainism is one of the world's major religious systems; older than both Buddhism and Christianity. Its contribution to the progress of our civilization is immense, and there is no aspect of Indian history which has not been directly enriched by the religion of the Jinas. For the purpose of discussion, let us divide the entire subject into five principal divisions, namely, religious, cultural, social, economic and political.

As I have already said, Jainism is older than Buddhism, and in this volume I have shown that the first historical prophet of Jainism was Pārśvanātha, who probably lived in the ninth to eighth centuries BC. A few earlier Tīrthamkaras like Ādinātha and Neminātha, were also probably actual historical figures, but unfortunately we do not have much historical evidences concerning their religious systems.

Both Jainism and Buddhism, and also the Lokāyatas, were against the Brahmanical religious system which was based on sacrifice or *yajña*, but these, the three religious systems, being anti-Vedic, were dubbed *nāstika* by the Brahmanical philosophers. The word *nāstika* does not necessarily mean an atheist, but that which is anti-Vedic or, in other words, anti-Brahmanical. The Jaina philosopher Pārśvanātha, who probably invented the word *nirgrantha* was, significantly born at Varanasi, the great citadel of Hinduism and had the courage to challenge the ancient Brahmanical philosophical system, and his teaching based on fourfold truth or vows (*cāturyāma*) was quite simple, practical and readily acceptable to the poor and common people. It should also be recalled that the Vedic form of sacrifice was very expensive, and the majority of the common people could not afford the expenses connected with such elaborate undertakings which became the preserve of only the kings and rich householders. Another factor that made this new religious system very popular was its emphasis on non-violence or *ahiṃsā*, which was also advocated by the Upaniṣadic *ṛṣis* whose emphasis was on *jñāna* (knowledge) and not *karman*.

Another factor that should be considered to be a definite contribution of the Jainas in the progress of civilization in this sub-continent was the significance it gave to the role of women in religious practices. It is however, true that even in the Vedic period women participated in religious ceremonies and in the *Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣad* we find Maitreyī accompanying her husband, the celebrated Yājñavalkya, to the forest, when the latter sought to renounce worldly life. Lord Pārśvanātha was the first non-Brāhmanical saint to permit women to renounce the worldly life and thus paved the way for the real emancipation of women. It is of some significance in this context that even Lord Buddha was himself against admitting women into his order; that it was only after he was requested by his favourite disciple Ānanda that he relented. We can therefore aver, without hesitation, that Lord Pārśvanātha was a truly rational philosopher of his time. Since he had to popularize his teachings in a town that was considered to be the principal seat of orthodox Brahmanism, we can gauge the degree of his success.

Lord Pārśvanātha gave India the doctrine of *ahimsā* and Lord Mahāvīra taught his countrymen the doctrine of chastity (*brahmacharya*). He never cared for royal patronage and lived in absolute penury, and it was his towering personality along that made Jainism an all-India religion even during the pre-Mauryan period.

I am of the opinion that the *yakṣapūjaks* of eastern India were first to accept the religious system propounded by Pārśva and Mahāvīra, and that these *yakṣa*-worshippers belonged to the lower strata of the society and the *deva-pūjaks* were the upper caste Brāhmaṇa and Kṣatriyas. It is however true that all the immediate disciples of *gaṇadhara*s of Lord Mahāvīra were Brahmins by caste, but most of his followers were common people which is further testified to by early Jaina epigraphs found from Mathura and elsewhere.

From the cultural point of view too, Jainism has left its mark on all aspects of Indian civilization. The Jaina Āgamic texts often refer to 72 *kalās* and 64 *gaṇiyāguṇas* and there is no doubt that all types of arts and crafts received generous patronage from devout Jainas. Indeed, Jaina narrative literature contains hundreds of stories about ladies, who were well-versed in all these arts, and that dramatic art was particularly popular amongst the Jainas from the earliest times.

Literature is an integral part of any culture and that of the Jainas is extremely rich and extensive. The Āgamic texts themselves have great literary value, and works like the *Bhagavatī*, *Jñātādharma-kathā*,

*Vipākaśruta*, *Uttarādhyayanāsūtra* and *Daśavaikālika* are great and original literary products, and the last cited, composed by Brāhmaṇa Sayyambhava at Campā around 400 BC, can be compared with the *Bhagavadgītā* and the *Dhammapada*.

The story literature of the Jainas can be compared with the literature of the Hindus. Even the Āgamic texts are extremely attractive story texts and the *Jñātādharma-kathā*, *Vipākaśruta*, *Antagaḍadasā*, etc., contain innumerable stories and even an abundance of love stories. The two epics and the missing *Br̥hatkathā* have deeply influenced Jaina narrative literature, and hundreds of Śvetāmbara and Digambara works were composed in imitation of the Brahmanical texts cited above.

The earliest non-Āgamic Jaina literary work is the *Paumacariyam* of Vimala, composed in all probability, in the first century AD. It is my belief that it is the earliest Prākṛta work in India, and probably somewhat earlier than the missing *Br̥hatkathā* of Guṇāḍhya. It is the Jaina version of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the poet has shown considerable originality in his treatment of the Rāma story. Although Vimala has not cared to mention Vālmiki by name, he has scrupulously followed the original work although throughout there is a Jaina bias. Later Jaina *Rāmāyaṇas*, such as those composed by Raviṣeṇa, Svayambhū, Hemacandra, etc., are all based on Vimala's admirable work.

The *Mahābhārata* saga also influenced the Jainas, and we have in the *Vasudevahiṇḍī*, the *Harivaṃśa* (by Jinasena II), and the later *Pāṇḍavapurāṇas*, stories from the *Mahābhārata*, and even Hemacandra, the great Kalikālasarvajña was influenced by the original *Mahābhārata* in his celebrated *Triṣaṣṭīśalākāpuruṣacaritra*. The *Br̥hatkathā* literature has left its imprint on works like the *Vasudevahiṇḍī*, the *Harivaṃśa*, *Br̥hatkathākośa*, etc. However, in all their literary works, the Jaina writers have shown great skill and maturity.

The most original among the Jaina writers of the medieval period was however Somadeva, the celebrated author of the *Yaśastīlakacampū*, written in the mid-tenth century AD. It is a great novel, composed by a writer who was probably a native of Bengal and could be termed the Bāṇabhaṭṭa of the Jaina literature. He has wit, a keen sense of humour, and his knowledge of human character is unsurpassed in Sanskrit literature. His *Nītivākyaṃṛta* demonstrates his knowledge of the science of polity, and is the third great work on political science after the *Arthaśāstra* and *Kāmandakīya Nītisāra*. We have also Jaina writers who have written on astronomy,

mathematics, and other branches of science, which they have undoubtedly enriched.

The Jaina writers have also greatly contributed to our knowledge of Indian society in different periods. One great advantage of Jaina works is that, by and large, they are dated, giving us a clear idea of the state of society in different periods. For example, the *Paumacariyam*, written 530 years after the *nirvāṇa* of Lord Mahāvīra provides invaluable details regarding Indian society, the caste system, family life, etc. of the first century AD. It, for instance, testifies that marriage between cousins was quite popular at the time, particularly marriage with the daughter of a maternal uncle. This particular type of marriage, though censured by the authors of Madhyadeśa, was unusually popular in the Deccan, the whole of Gujarat, Maharashtra, and the far south, and even the Hindu Vedāṅga writers have noted this. The *Vasudevahiṇḍī*, a unique Prākṛta work written in the Gupta period, as Alsdorf has shown, throws welcome light on the society of this enlightened and prosperous Indian history. Again, the *Padma Purāṇa* of Raviṣeṇa, a work dated to the seventh century AD also throws welcome light on the social life of the post-Gupta period. The *Varāṅgacarita* of almost the same period, the *Harivamśa* of Jinasena II written in AD 783, the *Kuvalayamālā* of Udyotana, written five years earlier in Rajasthan, the *Upamitibhavaprapaṅcakathā* of Siddharṣi written in AD 906, the *Dharmopadeśamālā* of Jayasimha, written in the third quarter of the ninth century, the tenth century texts like the *Tilakamañjarī* and the *Yaśastilakacampū* all provide invaluable information, regarding Indian society as it existed in the early medieval period. They recorded details regarding social customs, popular festivals, family life and, above all, information regarding the position of women and the high degree of personal liberty they enjoyed.

The Jaina authors have, at the same time, supplied us information on the economic life of ancient India. Various aspects of this is also provided in the *Aṅgavijjā*, a third century text, written in Mahārāṣṭrī Prākṛta, and it is impossible to overemphasize the great importance of this wonderful Jaina work. A number of ancient names of coins not found elsewhere are to be found in this text and two of particular interest are *ḷṣatrapaka* and *sateraka*. The first is the type of coin introduced by the Kṣatrapa kings of Ujjayinī and the second refers to the Indo-Greek stater type coins. There are very interesting references to the names of ships like *Koṭṭima*, *Ṭappaka*, and

Saṅghaḍa, which are first mentioned in the *Periplus*, a Greek work written by an unknown sailor, in the second half of the first century AD. The *Āṅgavijjā* also provides details regarding the economic activities of that period. Other Jaina works like the *Nisūthacūṛṇī*, written in the seventh century, the *Harivaṃśa*, of the eighth, and the *Yaśastilakacampū* of the tenth shed much light on the economic activities of the post-Gupta and early medieval periods. An extremely interesting text, the *Dravyaparīkṣā*, written during the time of Alaud-din Khilji by Ṭhakkura Pheru, is undoubtedly the only Indian work dealing not only with the coins of the Guptas, but also with the various early medieval dynasties like the Pratihāras, Candellas, virtually all the Cālukya kings of Gujarat, and also the coins of the Tomaras of Delhi. The coins of Tomara king like Anaṅgapāla, Madanpāla, etc., are particularly interesting because not much is known about these, apart from the information in Pheru's work and that in the *Kharataragacchabṛhadgurvāvalī*, another valuable Jaina work.

The most important contribution of the Jainas was however in the field of historical studies, and they produced a number of first-rate historicans like Hemacandra, Merutuṅga, Rājaśekhara, etc. and other writers of *prabandhas*. Hemacandra's (twelfth century) *Dvyāśrayakāvya* is one of the greatest works on Gujarat history, and the earliest. The first twenty chapters, in Sanskrit, are on Kumārapāla's predecessors and the last eight chapters, in Prakṛta, are on Kumārapāla's activities. Welcome light has also been shed on great kings ruling outside Gujarat, like the Mālava king Bhoja, the Cedi king Karṇa, etc. Being a contemporary and *guru* of Kumārapāla, the author has provided us with the minutest details relating to the religious and political activities of that great Jaina emperor. Much more comprehensive in scope is the history of Merutuṅga, called *Prabandhacintāmaṇī*, written in AD 1305. It is undoubtedly a great historical work, following Kalhaṇa's *Rājatarāṅginī*, although its worth has often been underestimated. The account of earlier kings like Vikramāditya of tradition, is somewhat fanciful, but from vs 802, the accession date of Vanarāja, his history is authentic and is confirmed by other literary and epigraphic sources. The name of Muñja's minister, Rudrāditya, given by him, is confirmed by contemporary epigraphs and the details of the struggle between the Mālavas and the Cālukyas of Kalyāṇa are also fully confirmed by epigraphs. He recorded the tragic end of the great

Muñja and provided interesting information regarding the Bengal king Lakṣmaṇasena and his poet-minister Umāpati, whose name is found in the famous Deopara *praśasti* of the Senas. He refers to the defeat of Paramardin by Pṛthvīrāja which is confirmed by epigraphy. The date of the destruction of Valabhī has however been incorrectly given by him as vs 375; the actual date vs 845, having been supplied by another Jaina work, the *Vividhatīrthakalpa* of Jinaprabha. His account of the Cālukya and Vāghela dynasties is flawless, as also that of the two great ministers Vastupāla and Tejaḥpāla. The *Prabandhakośa* of Rājaśekhara, written in AD 1347 is another interesting work of history, although its author does not stand comparison with either Hamacandra or Merutunga, and it contains some fanciful details. Interesting light has however been thrown on the political relationship between Jayacandra of Kānyakubja and Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal, although he incorrectly says that the great Bhadrabāhu was the son of a Brāhmaṇa of Pratiṣṭhāna, the correct information being provided in a much earlier work, the *Bṛhatkathākośa*, written in AD 931 which represents this savant as the son of a Brāhmaṇa of Devakoṭṭa in Bengal.

A very interesting work, which is actually a geographical treatise, is the *Vividhatīrthakalpa* of Jinaprabha, written between vs 1364 and 1389. Its great importance has been discussed by me in the second part of this volume. It is of great significance that Jinaprabha was even honoured by the Muslim emperor Muhammad bin Tughlaq. Some dates given by him are absolutely correct, namely the date of the destruction of Valabhī, of Somnāth, and of the date of Pṛthvīrāja's defeat and death, and through the information supplied by him, we have been able to correctly identify the ancient city of Mithilā.

Another medieval Jaina work, the *Kharataragacchabhīhadgurvāvalī*, is of overriding importance both to students of history and geography, and provides details regarding the activities of some little-known kings. It also tells us about the atrocities, committed by the Muslim rulers in northern India, and these details in this and other Jaina texts fully tally with those of the Muslim historians themselves. Those modern historians who have sought to whitewash these Muslim invaders should pursue these contemporary Jaina accounts for a true picture.

The Jaina epigraphs also contribute substantially to our knowledge of ancient and medieval India. We have Jaina inscriptions from the days of Khāravela (first century BC) to the days of Akbar, and

even later. Among the important Jaina inscriptions, I might mention the Hāthīgumphā inscription of Khāravēla, the Mathurā inscription, the Pahārpur Digambara inscription, from Rajshahi district, Bangladesh, the Aihole *praśasti* of Ravikīrti, etc. Over five thousand Jaina epigraphs have so far been discovered and published, and nearly 100,000 remain unpublished.

In the field of art too the Jainas have contributed a great deal. The earlier temples have virtually disappeared, but thousands of medieval Jaina temples still survive in all their splendour in Gujarat, Rajasthan, and in parts of other states of northern India. In south India, we still have many standing Jaina temples, especially in Karnataka, and Tamil Nadu. Jaina sculptures from the first century BC up to the present time survive and a few thousand examples of these are preserved in various Indian museums.

The present-day Jainas continue to maintain their separate identity and fortunately the two warring sects, the Digambaras and the Śvetāambaras, have come closer to each other, and their relationship with Hindus too is one of warmth and cordiality.





## Abbreviations

AB	<i>Aitareya Brāhmaṇa</i>
ABORI	<i>Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Institute, Pune</i>
ASIAR	<i>Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report</i>
CHI	<i>Cambridge History of India.</i>
CII	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum</i>
DHNI	<i>Dynastic History of Northern India, 2 vols.</i>
EC	<i>Epigraphia Carnatica</i>
EI	<i>Epigraphia Indica</i>
GOS	<i>Gaekwad's Oriental Series</i>
HIL	<i>History of Indian Literature</i> by M. Winternitz
IA	<i>Indian Antiquary</i>
IC	<i>Indian Culture</i>
JA	<i>Journal Asiatique</i>
JAHRS	<i>Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society</i>
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
JASB	<i>Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal</i>
JBBRAS	<i>Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society</i>
JBORS	<i>Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society</i>
JDL	<i>Journal of the Deptt. of Letters, University of Calcutta</i>
JIH	<i>Journal of Indian History</i>
JISOA	<i>Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art</i>
JOI	<i>Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda</i>
JRAS	<i>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, London</i>
JSBI	<i>Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa, 6 vols.</i>
JŚLS	<i>Jaina Śilālekha Saṁgraha</i>
MAR	<i>Mysore Archaeological Report</i>
Mbh.	<i>Mahābhārata</i>
MDJM	<i>Maṅikcandra Digambara Jaina Granthamālā</i>
NIA	<i>New Indian Antiquary</i>
PHAI	<i>Political History of Ancient India</i>
PHNI	<i>Political History of Northern India</i> by G.C. Chowdhury
PIHC	<i>Proceedings of the Indian History Congress</i>
QSMS	<i>Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society</i>

<i>RV</i>	<i>R̥gveda</i>
<i>ŚB</i>	<i>Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa</i>
<i>SBE</i>	<i>Sacred Books of the East</i>
<i>Sel. Ins.</i>	<i>Select Inscriptions</i> by D.C. Sircar
<i>SII</i>	<i>South Indian Inscriptions</i>
<i>SJGM</i>	<i>Singhi Jaina Granthamālā</i>
<i>ZDMG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift Deutschen Morganländischen Gesellschaft</i>

## CHAPTER I

### Tīrthamkaras from Ṛṣabha to Ariṣṭanemi

#### ṚṢABHANĀTHA

The canonical texts like the *Kalpasūtra*<sup>1</sup> and *Samavāyāṅga*<sup>2</sup> give us some idea about the life of the first Jaina Tīrthamkara. He is regarded as the first Tīrthamkara of the current *osappiṇī* and is uniformly described as belonging to Kosala (*Kosalie*). His father was Kulakara Nābhi of Vinītā (Ayodhyā) city and his mother was called Marudevī. He belonged, like Mahāvīra, to the Kāśyapa lineage. The canonical texts would have us believe that he was 500 *dhanuṣas*<sup>3</sup> (bow-lengths) in height. A few vague and indistinct details are given about him in the texts, and it is extremely difficult to reconstruct a coherent account of his life from the early Jaina works. The *Āvaśyakaniryukti*,<sup>4</sup> a work written after the first century AD, informs us that Ṛṣabha, in course of his wanderings, visited countries like Joṇaga and Suvanṇabhūmi, and<sup>5</sup> also mentions his two wives, Sumaṅgalā and Sunandā, and his hundred sons, including Bharata. He lived for 2 m *pūrvā* years as a prince and 6 m and 3 lakh *pūrvā* years as a king. During his reign, we are told, he taught for the benefit of his people, 72 *kalās*, 64 *mahilā-guṇas*, 100 arts, and 3 occupations of man. Ṛṣabha, after anointing his 100 sons as kings of various kingdoms, renounced the world and attained omniscience outside the town of Purimatāla, which was near his home town.<sup>6</sup> According to the *Samavāyāṅga*,<sup>7</sup> his first disciples were Ṛṣabhasena and Bāmbhī. The same text tells us the name of the tree associated with him, i.e., *nyagrodha*.<sup>8</sup> Ṛṣabha had under him 84 groups of *gaṇas*, 84 *gaṇaharas* (group-leaders), 84,000 monks with Ṛṣabhasena as their head, 3 lakh nuns with Bāmbhī and Sundarī as heads. His chief lay disciples were Sejjāmsa and Subhaddā<sup>9</sup> and his total lifespan, according to the texts, was 84 lakh years. He died on the summit of Aṭṭhavāya which has tentatively been identified with Kailash.<sup>10</sup> According to the seventh century text, the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi*, Ṛṣabha's son constructed a shrine on this mountain.

I have tried above to give readers some idea about Ṛṣabha's life

and activities as given in the early canonical texts. In the well-known Vaiṣṇava work, the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*,<sup>11</sup> there is a fairly detailed account given about the first Jaina path-finder. We should recall in this connection that this work was familiar to the author of the *Nandīsūtra*,<sup>12</sup> which was definitely in existence before the Valabhī council (c. AD 525). In that text this work is mentioned along with Bhārata, *Rāmāyaṇa*, Kauṭilya, and Patañjali. The *Bhāgavata* account also depicts Ṛṣabha as the son of Nābhi and Marudevī (spelt Merudevī). The most vital piece of information given in the *Bhāgavata* regarding Ṛṣabha is however that he was regarded as an incarnation (*avatāra*) of Viṣṇu.<sup>13</sup> Since this work was in existence before the compilation of the *Nandīsūtra*, its evidence is of some importance. It shows that the first Jaina Tīrthaṅkara was accepted as an incarnation of Viṣṇu by the Hindus in the early centuries of the Christian era, if not earlier, probably at the time when the founder of Buddhism was accepted as an *avatāra* of the same god.

The life and activities of Ṛṣabha, as given in the *Bhāgavata*, tally in all major details with those given in Jaina texts. According to this account too, Ṛṣabha had 100 sons, including Bharata. It has nothing but praise for Ṛṣabha's activities as an able monarch, and also records that after his abdication, he went about naked with dishevelled hair (*gaganaparidhānaḥ prakīrṃakeśaḥ*, V.5.28). As with Mahāvīra he too had to suffer a lot in the hands of ignorant people (V.5.30). We are further told that he visited places like Koṅka, Veṅka, Kuṭaka, and South Karnataka (V.6.7). The *Bhāgavata* further refers to his followers in those countries (V.6.9 ff.).

The *Bhāgavata*, however, has no word of praise for Ṛṣabha's followers who are emphatically called *pākhaṇḍas* (V.6.8), and criticizes them too for their 'habits'. Most of Ṛṣabha's followers, according to that text, disparaged the Veda, Brāhmaṇa, and *yajña* [*Brahma Brāhmaṇayajñāpuruṣaloka-vidūṣakāḥ prāyeṇa bhaviṣyanti* (V.6.10)]. One thing that strikes a scrupulous and careful student of Jaina history in this connection is that the author of the *Bhāgavata*, who has nothing but deference for Ṛṣabha, is extremely critical about his followers, i.e., the Jainas. There is nothing surprising in this. The Jainas, from very early times, were freely and blindly anti-Brahmanist. There is the oft-quoted passage in the *Kalpasūtra*,<sup>14</sup> according to which no Tīrthaṅkara, Cakravartin, or Baladeva (and Vāsudeva) can be born in a Brāhmaṇa family. This anti-Brahmanical attitude is found uniformly in the canonical and non-canonical texts

of both the Śvetāmbaras and Digambaras.<sup>15</sup>

The Vedic texts<sup>16</sup> know one king Ṛṣabha, who is described as a performer of the Aśvamedha sacrifices. Another Ṛṣabha appears in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* (7.17) as a son of Viśvāmitra. The *Mahābhārata* not only knows one ancient king, Ṛṣabha (VI.9.7) but also an ascetic of that name who is represented in one place<sup>17</sup> as asking king Sumitra of the Haihaya dynasty to give up desire or false hope which, in fact, is one of the fundamental teachings of Jainism. It is very interesting to note that a certain Ṛṣabha-*tīrtha* is mentioned in the *Mahābhārata* (III.85.10-11) as situated in the Ayodhyā region, the home country of the first Tīrthamkara. This *tīrtha* is apparently mentioned in the Gunji Rock inscription of Kumāraviradatta which has been assigned to the first century AD.<sup>18</sup>

Although neither of the two epics, nor the Vedic texts, connect Ṛṣabha with a heretical religion, there is little doubt that a king or ascetic called Ṛṣabha was known from very early times. He was, in all probability, a historical personage and the Jainas, a century or two after the demise of Mahāvīra, conceived the idea of making this ancient ṛṣi their earliest path-finder. There is little doubt that the account of Ṛṣabha, given in the *Bhāgavata*, was composed only after Jainism came to be regarded as one of the principal religions of India. I am of the opinion that the *Bhāgavata* account of Ṛṣabha was composed after 100 BC, but probably before the Kuṣāṇa period.

It is of some interesting that even a few mediaeval Jaina commentators were acquainted with the Hindu Purāṇic references to Ṛṣabha. Śāntisūri, in his *Uttarādhyayanavṛtti*,<sup>19</sup> tells us that according to the *Brahmaṇḍapurāṇa* Ṛṣabha belonged to the Ikṣvāku lineage, and was the son of Nābhi and Marudevī.

Inscriptions at Mathurā definitely show that Ṛṣabha was regularly worshipped as a Tīrthamkara in the Mathurā region from the first century AD. We have already observed he was made a Tīrthamkara, probably a century or two after Mahāvīra's demise. Since the *Kalpasūtra*, which was in all probability composed before 100 BC, refers to him and describes his life, we will not be far wrong in assuming that he was inducted into the Nirgrantha religion around 300 BC.

In the *Rāmāyaṇa* (VII.111.10) there is a reference to one king Ṛṣabha of Ayodhyā during whose reign the city once more rose to eminence. It is tempting to identify this Ṛṣabha with the first Jaina Tīrthamkara since both are connected with Ayodhyā, but in the

absence of more positive evidence we cannot afford to be dogmatic about this.

#### AJITANĀTHA

Like the first Tīrthamkara, the second also according to the Jainas, was a Kosalan. Ajita (Ajiya) was the son of Jitaśatru of Ayodhyā, and his mother's name was Vijayā. He was 50 *dhanuṣas* in height, less than Ṛṣabha who was 450 *dhanuṣas*. He lived for 72 lakh years and the sacred tree associated with him was *saptaparṇa*. He died on the summit of Pareshnath hill (Sammeya). Sīhasena and Phaggu were his first disciples.<sup>20</sup> There is nothing to indicate that he was a historical figure.

#### SAMBHAVANĀTHA

The third Tīrthamkara Sambhava (Sambhava), like the first two, was a Kosalan. He was the son of king Jitāri and Senā of Śrāvastī. Since he is the third Tīrthamkara, he should be of lesser height; and we are told that he was only 400 *dhanuṣas*. His lifespan too was limited to only 60 lakh years! His sacred tree was *sāla*. Like the second, he too attained liberation on the summit of Sammeya hill.<sup>21</sup> Prominent disciples of his were Cāru and Sāmā. He is mentioned in a Mathurā inscription of Huvīṣka<sup>22</sup> dated in the Kaniṣka year 48 corresponding to AD 126.

#### ABHINANDANA

The fourth Tīrthamkara was also a Kosalan, according to the Jainas, and was born at Vinītā. His parents were Samvara and Siddhārthā. His height, as expected, was 350 *dhanuṣas*, and he lived 10 lakh years less than the third Tīrthamkara. Vajranābha and Ajitā were his chief disciples. His sacred tree was *priyaka*.<sup>23</sup>

#### SUMATI

The fifth Tīrthamkara was also born at Vinītā in the Kosala country. His parents were king Megha and queen Maṅgalā, his height was 300 *dhanuṣas*, and lifespan 40 lakh years. His sacred tree was *priyaṅgu* and his chief disciples Camara and Kāsavi. He attained liberation on mount Sammeya.<sup>24</sup>

Like Ṛṣabha, this Tīrthamkara also finds a place in the *Bhāgavata-purāna* (V.15.1), which informs us that Sumati will be worshipped in the Kali Age by irreligious and non-Aryan peoples as their god. It further tells us that Sumati followed the path of Ṛṣabha. There can

be little doubt that the author of the *Bhāgavata* here has the fifth Jaina Tīrthamkara in mind, who however, according to him, was the grandson of Ṛṣabha.

#### PADMAPRABHA OR SUPRABHA

The sixth Tīrthamkara, unlike the first five, was not a Kosalan but was born in the adjoining Vatsa territory in the famous city of Kauśāmbī. His parents were king Dhara and queen Susīmā. His sacred tree was *chatrābha* and his disciples were Suvrata and Rati. He lived for 30 lakh years and had a height of 250 *dhanuṣas*. He had his *nirvāṇa* on Sammeya.<sup>25</sup>

#### SUPĀRŚVA

The seventh Tīrthamkara Supārśva was born at Vārāṇasī and his parents were king Pratiṣṭha and queen Pṛthvī. His height, 200 *dhanuṣas*, lifespan 20 lakh years, chief disciples, Vidarbha and Somā. *Śirīṣa* was his sacred tree. He died on the Sammeya mountain.<sup>26</sup>

#### CANDRAPRABHA

The eighth Tīrthamkara Candraprabha is also known as Śasī and was born at Candrapura. Scholars identify it with Candrāvātī, a modern village near Kāśī.<sup>27</sup> This Tīrthamkara had a height of 150 *dhanuṣas* and a lifespan of one million years. He was the son of Mahāsenā and Lakṣmaṇā of that town. His sacred tree was *nāgavṛkṣa*, and he died on Sammeya mountain. Diṇṇa and Sumanā were his chief disciples.<sup>28</sup>

#### PUṢPADANTA OR SUVIDHI

The ninth Tīrthamkara was the son of Sugrīva and Rāmā of Kākandī. It is identified with Kakan in the Monghyr district, Bihar.<sup>29</sup> Here are his statistics—height, 100 *dhanuṣas*; lifespan, 2 lakh years; sacred tree *mālī* or *mālī*; disciples, Varāha and Vāruṇī; *nirvāṇa*, Sammeya mountain.<sup>30</sup>

#### ŚĪTALANĀTHA

The tenth was the son of Dṛḍharatha and Nandā of Bhaddilapura. This place has tentatively been identified with Bhadia, a village in Hazaribagh district, Bihar.<sup>31</sup> His sacred tree was *pilaṅka* and chief disciples, Ānanda and Sulasā. He attained liberation on mount Sammeya at the age of one lakh years.<sup>32</sup>

## ŚREYĀMSA

The eleventh Tīrthaṅkara was the son of Viṣṇu and Viṣṇā of Simhapura (identified with Simhapurī near Benares).<sup>33</sup> His chief disciples were Gothubha and Dhāriṇī. He reached liberation on mount Sammeya,<sup>34</sup> having lived for 84 lakh years.

## VĀSUPŪJYA

The twelfth Tīrthaṅkara Vāsupūjya was the son of Vasupūjya and Jayā of Campā. He was 70 *dhanuṣas* in height and his sacred tree was *pātala*. He had a lifespan of 72 lakh years, and unlike most of his predecessors, did not die on mount Sammeya. According to the canonical texts, he breathed his last at Campā. Suhamma and Dharaṇī were his chief disciples.<sup>35</sup>

## VIMALA

The thirteenth Tīrthaṅkara, was the son of Kayavamma and Sāmā of Kaṁpilla-pura, he was 60 *dhanuṣas* in height and had a lifespan of six million years. His sacred tree was *jambu* and chief disciples Mandara and Dharaṇīdharā. He attained liberation on mount Sammeya.<sup>36</sup>

## ANANTA

The fourteenth Tīrthaṅkara, was the son of Simhasena and Sujasā of Ayodhyā, he was 50 *dhanuṣas* in height and had a lifespan of 3 million years. His sacred tree was *āsvattha*. His first disciples were Yaśa and Padmā. He too died on mount Sammeya.<sup>37</sup>

## DHARMANĀTHA

The fifteenth Tīrthaṅkara was the son of Bhānu and Suvratā of Rayaṇapura, he was 45 *dhanuṣas* in height and his sacred tree was *dadhīparṇa*. Ariṣṭa and Śivā were his chief disciples. He had a lifespan of one million years and he died on mount Sammeya.<sup>38</sup>

## ŚĀNTINĀTHA

The son of Viśvasena and Avirā of Gaḷapura (Hastināpura), his chief wife was Vijayā. His sacred tree *nandī*, and he was 40 *dhanuṣas* in height. He attained liberation on Sammeya mountain at the age of one lakh years. His chief disciples were Cakkāha and Suī.<sup>39</sup> He is mentioned in a Mathurā inscription.<sup>40</sup>



## KUNTHU

The son of Śūra and Śrī of Hastināpura, he was 35 *dhanuṣas* in height and his sacred tree was *tilaka*. His disciples were Svayambhū and Aṁjuyā. He attained liberation on mount Sammeya after living for 95,000 years.<sup>41</sup>

## ARANĀTHA

The son of Sudarśana and Devī of Hastināpura, he was 30 *dhanuṣas* in height and his sacred tree was mango. Kumbha and Rakkhiyā were his chief disciples. He attained liberation on mount Sammeya at the age of 84,000 years.<sup>42</sup> He is referred to in the well-known Mathurā inscription of the year 79 (= AD 157) which mentions the *devanirmita* Buddhist *stūpa*.<sup>43</sup>

## MALLI

This Tīrthaṅkara, unlike the others, was a woman.<sup>44</sup> She was the daughter of Kumbha and Prabhāvātī of Mithilā. A detailed account of her life and activities is preserved in the *Nāyādhanmakahāo*.<sup>45</sup> She was exceedingly beautiful and was 25 *dhanuṣas* in height. The kings of six leading cities of northern India, we are told, demanded her hand in marriage. When refused, they all simultaneously attacked Mithilā but before long, were all converted by her and became devout Jains. Her sacred tree was *āsoka* and she had a lifespan of 45,000 years. Indra and Bandhumatī were her chief disciples. This woman Tīrthaṅkara died on mount Sammeya.<sup>46</sup>

## SUVRATA

He was the son of Sumitra and Padmāvātī of Rājagrha. His sacred tree was *campaka* and he had a lifespan of 30,000 years. He was 20 *dhanuṣas* in height and Kumbha and Puṣpavatī were his chief disciples. He died on mount Sammeya.<sup>47</sup>

## NAMINĀTHA

Like Malli, this Tīrthaṅkara also belonged to Mithilā. We are told that he was the son of Vijaya and Vappā of that city. He was 15 *dhanuṣas* in height and had a lifespan of 10,000 years. Śubha and Amalā were his chief disciples; *bakula* was his sacred tree. He died on mount Sammeya.<sup>48</sup>

## ARIṢṬANEMI (NEMINĀTHA)

The immediate predecessor of Pārśva was Tīrthaṅkara Ariṣṭanemi,

also known as Neminātha. According to the Jainas, he was an exact contemporary of the great Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa; he too, we are told, belonged to the Yādava tribe. His parents were Samudravijaya and Śivā of Soriyapura. He was only 10 *dhanuṣas* in height and his sacred tree was *vetasa*.

According to the sacred texts of the Jainas, Ariṣṭanemi's marriage was settled with Rāimāī, a daughter of Uggasena. While on his way to marry, he saw a large number of animals in cages and enclosures, and when he learnt that they were kept there for slaughter at his impending marriage ceremony, he resolved to renounce the world.

The name 'Ariṣṭanemi' is known to the poet of the *Mahābhārata*,<sup>49</sup> but he cannot be identified with the Jaina Tirthaṅkara. In the Udyogaparvan of the *Mahābhārata* Kṛṣṇa is once called by this name.<sup>50</sup> The Vaiṣṇava works do not cite of an Ariṣṭanemi belonging to the Hari Vaṃśa. Although he is referred to in a Mathurā inscription,<sup>51</sup> we cannot, in the absence of more positive evidence, call him as historical figure. It is also interesting that both Kṛṣṇa and Neminātha are given a lifespan of 1,000 years in the Jaina canonical texts.

Ariṣṭanemi's chief disciples were Varadatta and Yakṣiṇi, and he died on the summit of mount Ujjaṃta (Girnar), one of the holiest *tirthas* of the Jainas.<sup>52</sup> The Buddhist texts cite a certain 'Aranemi',<sup>53</sup> but he cannot be identified with the twenty-second Jaina Tirthaṅkara.

I have given above the Jaina account of their first twenty-two Tirthaṅkaras. With the possible exception of Ṛṣabha, none of them has any claim to historicity. I have already expressed my view regarding Ṛṣabha's, but there is little doubt that he was accepted as a Tirthaṅkara of the Jainas, only after the demise of Mahāvīra.

#### REFERENCES

1. 205 ff.
2. 157.
3. *Kalp.*, 210; *Sam.*, 108; *Sthā*, 435; etc.
4. 336-7.
5. 191, 383, 398.
6. *Kalp.*, 212.
7. 157.
8. Loc. cit.
9. *Kalp.* 213,1; *Sam.*, 84.

10. N.L. Dey, *The Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Mediaeval India*, p. 83.
11. V, chs. 3 ff.
12. 42.
13. V.3.18, 20.
14. See Jacobi's translation in *Jaina Sutras*, vol. 1, *SBE*, 22, p. 225.
15. See my *Ancient Indian Literary and Cultural Tradition*, pp. 101, 185–6.
16. See *ŚB*, 13.5.4.15; *Śāṅkh. Śrau. Sū.*, 16.9.8.20.
17. XII, chs. 125 ff.; also XII.128. 24.
18. D.C. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, p. 223.
19. p. 525.
20. See *Samavāyāṅga*, 71, 90, 157.
21. *Ibid.*, 59, 106, 157.
22. See K.L. Janert, ed., *Mathurā Inscriptions*, p. 45.
23. See *Sam.*, 105, 157; *Sthā*, 730.
24. *Sam.*, 104, 157; *Sthā*, 664; *Kalp.*, 200.
25. *Sam.*, 103, 157; *Sthā*, 411.
26. *Kalp.*, 198; *Sam.*, 95, 101, 157.
27. See J.C. Jain, *Life in Ancient India*, p. 276.
28. See *Kalp.*, 197; *Sam.*, 93, 101, 157; *Sthā*, 520, 735.
29. J.C. Jain, *op. cit.*, p. 291.
30. *Sam.*, 75, 86, 100, 157; *Sthā*, 411; *Kalp.*, 196.
31. J.C. Jain, *op. cit.*, p. 272.
32. *Sam.*, 83, 157; *Kalp.*, 196.
33. J.C. Jain, *op. cit.*, p. 334.
34. *Sam.*, 66, 80, 157.
35. *Sam.*, 62, 157; *Kalp.*, 193; *Sthā*, 520.
36. *Sam.*, 56, 157; *Kalp.*, 192; *Sthā*, 411.
37. *Sam.*, 50, 54, 157; *Sthā*, 411.
38. *Sam.*, 45, 48, 157; *Kalp.*, 190; *Sthā*, 735.
39. *Sam.*, 40, 75, 90, 93, 157, 158; *Kalp.*, 157; *Sthā*, 228.
40. See *EI*, I, no. 43(3).
41. *Sam.*, 32, 35, 37, 81, 91, 95, 157–8; *Kalp.*, 188; *Sthā*, 411, 718.
42. *Kalp.*, 187; *Sam.*, 157.
43. *EI*, II, no. 14(20).
44. The Digambaras, however regard this Tīrthamkara as having been a male; according to them, the highest knowledge is beyond the reach of any woman.
45. See 70 ff.
46. *Sam.*, 25, 55, 39, 157; *Sthā*, 229, 777; *Nandīsūtra*, V.19; *Kalp.*, 186.
47. *Nandīsūtra*, V.19; *Sam.*, 20, 50, 157; *Kalp.*, 185; *Sthā*, 411; *Bhagavatī*, 576, 617.
48. *Nandī*, V.19; *Sthā*, 411, 735; *Sam.*, 39, 41, 157; *Kalp.*, 184.
49. See I.65.40; III.184.8, 17–22; XII.288.5–86.

50. 71.5.
51. See *EI*, II, no. 14(14).
52. See *Kalp.*, 174–83; *Sam.*, 10, 18, 40, 54, 104, 110, 157; *Nandī*, V.19; *Sthā*, 381, 626, 641, 735; *Uttarādhyayana*, ch. XXII; see also Jacobi, *Jaina Sutras*, pt. 2, *SBE*, 45, pp. 112 ff.; *Nirayavalikā*, 5.1; *Nāyā*, 53, 129; *Antagadasāo*, 8–9.
53. *Āṅguttara*, tr. by E.M. Hare, III, p. 264.

## CHAPTER II

### Pārśvanātha

The penultimate Jaina Tīrthaṅkara Pārśva was, in all probability, the real founder of Jainism. The *Kalpasūtra* (149–69)<sup>1</sup> provides a brief history of his life, but even this brief account, like all other Jaina writings, is full of stereotyped words and sentences. According to this account, he was the son of Aśvasena, king of Vārāṇasī, by his wife Vāmā. Charpentier writing in the *Cambridge History of India*<sup>2</sup> observes that ‘no such person as Aśvasena is known from Brāhmaṇa records to have existed’. We therefore need not accept the Jaina account that Aśvasena was really a king of Kāśī. He probably belonged to an aristocratic Kṣatriya family; let us not forget that the Jainas have uniformly depicted all their Tīrthaṅkaras as kings’ sons. The modern historian cannot help condemning this affected attitude of the early Jaina canonical authors. This form of vanity is also discernible in the writings of the Buddhists, who leave no stone unturned to prove that their founder really belonged to the most august and aristocratic family of those times.<sup>3</sup> It is, therefore, quite reasonable to infer that Pārśva, like the Buddha or Mahāvīra, was a scion of a well-to-do Kṣatriya family.

The most significant fact about Pārśva is however that he belonged to Vārāṇasī, the cultural and religious centre of India from time immemorial. As a citizen of this great city, he probably came into contact with some men of vision. That even the Kṣatriyas of this city were men of learning and intuition is testified to by the fact that king Ajātaśatru, lauded in the Upaniṣadic texts,<sup>4</sup> is described as belonging to this city. He (not to be confused with his Buddhist namesake) is delineated as expounding to Dṛpta Bālāki Gārgya, a Brahmin *ācārya*, the real nature of *ātman*. His son Bhadrāsena Ajātaśatrava too, was a man of wisdom and a rival of the great Uddālaka.<sup>5</sup> It is little wonder then that Pārśva, as a scion of an aristocratic family of this marvellous metropolis, should have received some serious training in religion and philosophy in early youth. We are told that he led the householder’s life up to the age of 30 and then renounced

the world. Nothing more is indicated in the canonical texts regarding his early life. Only from some late texts do we learn that he married a woman named Prabhāvātī.<sup>6</sup>

The *Kalpasūtra* then goes on to say that after practising penance for 83 days Pārśva obtained omniscience. Thereafter, we are told, he remained a *kevalin* for 70 years, dying at the age of 100 on the summit of Sammeya mountain. The round figure of 100 is also suspect. We should remember that the *Kalpasūtra*, which contains the earliest biography of this great prophet, was in all probability, written 500 years after his death. Even so one is prepared to believe that Pārśva had a fairly long life and died in the fulness of years.

The *Kalpasūtra* does not give us any idea of Pārśva's doctrine, but we have sufficient information in some other canonical texts about his teachings, and a number of these were composed before the *Kalpasūtra*.

The celebrated *Uttarādhyayanāsūtra* (ch. 23) records a very moving conversation between Keśin a follower of Pārśva's church and Indrabhūti, a disciple of Mahāvīra. In Keśin's words we learn that Pārśva enjoined only four vows and allowed an upper and undergarment. This conversation took place in the city of Śrāvastī where Keśin arrived, we are told, with a large number of his associates. We further learn from this conversation between the two monks that there was no fundamental difference between the two Teachers, Pārśva and Mahāvīra, the only difference being that the law of Mahāvīra recognized 5 vows, one more than Pārśva's. Also, while Pārśva allowed the use of clothing, Mahāvīra himself went about naked. That Pārśva's followers (called Samanas) were almost everywhere during Mahāvīra's lifetime is testified to by some other references to his followers in the older texts. The *Bhagavatī* more than once<sup>7</sup> refers to Pārśva's followers. In the ninth *uddesaka* of the first *śataka* of that work we are confronted with a follower of Pārśva called Kālasavesiyaputta who at first expressed grave doubts regarding Mahāvīra's teachings. The Master, however, soon succeeded in converting him to his religion of fivefold vows. In the fifth *uddesaka* of the second *śataka* of the same text we are told that the city of Tuṅgiyā was often visited by Pārśva's followers. In this connection we came across the names of four monks belonging to Pārśva's school. They are Kāliyaputta, Mehila, Kāsava, and Ānaṃdarakkhiya. The *Bhagavatī* records another interesting conversation (9.32) between a follower of Pārśva called Gaṅgeya (Gāṅgeya) and Mahāvīra at Vāṇiyagāma

(near Vaiśālī). This further testifies that even northern Bihar came under Pārśva's influence, and this is further corroborated by the fact that according to the celebrated *Ācārāṅgasūtra*<sup>8</sup> even Mahāvīra's parents, who lived near Vaiśālī, were themselves Pārśva's followers. The importance of this statement of the *Ācārāṅga* can hardly be overemphasized, for it shows that Mahāvīra himself grew up under the umbrella of Pārśva's religion.

The *Ṇāyādhammakahāo*<sup>9</sup> makes mention of one Puṁḍarīya, a prince of Puṣkalāvātī, who became a follower of Pārśva's religion of four vows, and refers<sup>10</sup> to a number of lay women who followed suit. The *Ṇāyādhammakahāo*<sup>11</sup> also tells us the story of one old maiden called Kālī who joined Pārśva's ascetic order. The *Nirayavalikā*,<sup>12</sup> an Upāṅga text, relates the story of the conversion of one Bhūyā, the daughter of a merchant of Rājagṛha called Sudarśana, to Pārśva's religion. She was converted by Pupphacūlā, Pārśva's principal lady-disciple. The combined testimony of the two texts, *Ṇāyādhammakahāo* and *Nirayavalikā*, therefore proves that women were freely admitted into Pārśva's order. Pārśva, who was a great rationalist, naturally bore no prejudice against the weaker sex and, unlike the Buddha, never hesitated in allowing women to embrace the ascetic life. In his boyhood Pārśva had probably seen nuns belonging to various Brahmanical schools at Kāśī and therefore no Ānanda was required to plead before him in favour of admitting women into the new order.

One of the earliest canonical texts, the *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*,<sup>13</sup> records a very interesting discussion between Indrabhūti and a follower of Pārśva called Udaya Peḍhālaputta. Like Keśin and Gāṅgeya, he too, later accepted Mahāvīra's doctrine.

The above discussion clearly shows that Pārśva, who preached his new religion around 800 BC (250 years before Mahāvīra),<sup>14</sup> succeeded to a large extent in popularizing his teachings in different parts of northern India. We have very strong reason to believe that the term 'Nirgrantha' was first invented by him and latter came to denote his followers. The evidence of the Buddhist texts too fully supports this contention. The *Sāmaññaphala Sutta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya* actually shows acquaintance with Pārśva's religion of four vows and not with Mahāvīra's doctrine of five restraints. Elsewhere in the Pāli *Tripiṭaka*<sup>15</sup> there are references to the Nirgrantha religion of four vows although, to my abiding regret, the Buddhists have not mentioned him by name. It however appears from their writings that Mahāvīra was an

ascetic belonging to the Nirgrantha order and nothing more.

Pārśva was the first historical prophet of ancient India to clearly understand the real significance of *ahimsā*. The concept of non-violence is, no doubt, to be found in the earlier Upaniṣadic works and also in the *Mahābhārata*, but to Pārśva *ahimsā* meant something more concrete. It was his whole existence. His other teachings (i.e., not to lie, not to steal, and not to own physical possessions) are of course to be found in all schools of thought.

I have already referred to Pārśva's attitude towards women. He also, unlike some later Jaina thinkers, had no prejudices against Brāhmaṇas. The *Nirayavalikā* (3.3) contains the story of Brāhmaṇa Soma's conversion to Pārśva's order. This Brāhmaṇa was, like Pārśva, a citizen of Vārāṇasī. That Pārśva's doctrine had great appeal even for kings is testified to by the elaborate story of the conversion of Paesi, king of Seyaviyā, by Keśin, the celebrated follower of Pārśva, related in the *Rāyapaseṇīya*,<sup>16</sup> an Upāṅga text. I have very little doubt that the *Pāyāsi Suttanta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya* was composed in imitation of this Upāṅga text. We must remember that Keśin was also known by the name 'Kumārasamaṇa', and in the above-mentioned Buddhist work a certain Kumārasamaṇa is delineated as engaged in conversation with king Pāyāsi of Setavyā, which is evidently the same as Seyaviyā. Indeed, there is reason to believe that Pārśva's followers were also generally known as Kumārasamaṇas. P.C. Bagchi<sup>17</sup> believes that in a particular *sūtra* of Pāṇini (II.1.69) these Kumārasamaṇas have been referred to. Although we cannot be dogmatic about this, there may be some truth in this.

According to the *Samavāyāṅga* (157), Diṇṇa was Pārśva's principal male disciple and Pupphacūlā the female disciple. Pupphacūlā, as I have already mentioned is also cited in the *Ñāyādhammakahāo*. His principal male lay votary was Suvvaya<sup>18</sup> and female lay votary Sunandā.<sup>19</sup>

Regarding Pārśva's date, it may here be pointed out, that it is only from two late texts that we learn that his liberation took place 250 years before Mahāvīra's emancipation. In the concluding lines of Mahāvīra's and Pārśva's biography in the *Kalpasūtra* which were obviously added during the council of Valabhī (c. AD 525), and in the *Āvaśyakabhāṣya* (17), another text of practically the same date, we are told about this figure of 250 years. It is quite possible that the time gap separating Mahāvīra from Pārśva was less than 250 years, but since we have not other evidence, we have to provisionally as-



sign to Pārśva a date around 800 BC.

### REFERENCES

1. See also Jacobi's translation, in *SBE*, 22, pp. 271 ff.
2. p. 154.
3. See specially in this connection, the *Ambaṭṭha Sutta* included in the *Dīgha Nikāya*.
4. The *Buddhavaṃśa* actually describes one of the previous Buddhas called Phussa, whom I propose to identify with Pārśva of the Jaina canonical texts. The Ardha-Māgadhī name for Pārśva is Pāsa, and Phussa is the Pāli form, apparently of the same name. It is significant that both the Jains and the Buddhists represent him as a resident of Vārāṇasī, while the Jains call him a Tirthaṅkara, the Buddhists regard him as one of 24 Buddhas. The Vaiṣṇava conception of *avatāra* has apparently influenced the followers of these two heretical sects, and they too have invented the idea of 24 Buddhas and Tirthaṅkaras in order to glorify their respective doctrines. We should also remember that the *avatāra* idea goes back to the period of the Brāhmaṇas, which were composed long, long before the rise of either Jainism and Buddhism. The earliest of the *avatāras* are associated with Prajāpati, the Supreme God of the Brahmanical period; and they are Kūrma, Varāha and Matsya (see J.N. Banerjea, *Development of Hindu Iconography*, third edn., New Delhi, 1986, p. 389). The theory of *avatāra* has been beautifully explained in those famous passages of the *Gītā*, which run as follows:

*yadā yadā hi dharmasya glānirbhavati bhārata/ abhyutthānamadharmasya tadātmānam sṛjāmyaham// paritrāṇāya sādḥūnām vināśāya ca duṣkṛtām/ dharmasamsthāpanārthāya sambhavāmi yuge yuge // [Mbh., critical edn., VI.26.78]*

The Jains and Buddhists, who have virtually copied everything from the Brāhmaṇas, have successfully utilised the *avatāra* theory, and have invented the 24 Tirthaṅkaras and 24 Buddhas theory. The name *Buddhavaṃśa* also appears quite suspect, as it reminds us instinctively of the name *Harivaṃśa* of the Vaiṣṇavas. The Jains have virtually two *Harivaṃśas*, one by Jinasena II, composed in AD 783, and the other by Dhavala, written in Apabhraṃśa.

The *Buddhavaṃśa* correctly represents Phussa or Pārśva simply as a Kṣatriya and not as the son of a *rājā*. The relevant passage runs thus (20.14):

*kāsikam nāma nagaram jayasene nāma khattiyo sirimā nāma janikā phussassā pi mahesino.*

In the Jaina account namely the *Kalpasūtra* (149–69) we have, respectively, the names Āsasena and Vāmā as the names of Pārśva's parents. The similarity of the names of Pārśva's parents in both the accounts are quite significant. For the father, we have *senā*-ending names, and for the mother *mā*-ending ones, and can therefore conclude without any hesitation that the Buddhists knew this twenty-third Tīrthāṅkara as a scion of an aristocratic family of the famous city of Vārāṇasī. The Buddhists have Phussa *lokanāyaka*, while the Jainas have the epithet *purisādaniya*, which is the Prakṛta form for *puruṣādaniya*, and both the epithets have something in common.

5. See *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Up.*, 2.1.1; also *Kauṣītaki Up.*, 4.1.
6. See *Satapatha*, 5.5.5.14.
7. See *Kalpasūtravṛtti* by Samayasundra, pp. 164–5.
8. I.9; II.5; IX.32 et seq.
9. See Jacobi's translation in *SBE*, 22, p. 194.
10. See 141 ff.
11. Tenth chapter of the second part.
12. Para 148 (II.1).
13. See Jacobi's translation, *SBE*, 45, pp. 420 ff.
14. For a discussion on Pārśva's date, see *infra*.
15. See under 'Nāthaputta' and 'Nirgrantha' in Malalasekera's *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*.
16. See 157 ff.
17. See *Sir Asutosh Mukherjee Silver Jubilee Volume*, III, p. 74.
18. See *Kalpasūtra*, 163.
19. *Ibid.*, 164.

## CHAPTER III

### Life of Mahāvīra

The last or the twenty-fourth Tīrthaṅkara Vardhamāna Mahāvīra was born, according to some late non-canonical texts, 250 years after Pārśva's emancipation. The earliest non-canonical text that mentions this figure, is the *Āvaśyakabhāṣya*,<sup>1</sup> a work probably written after AD 300. The same figure of 250 is obtained from concluding passages of the lives of Pārśva and Mahāvīra given in the *Kalpasūtra*,<sup>2</sup> which were obviously added to that work during the council of Valabhī held during the reign of Dhruvasena I (c. AD 525), who was a feudatory of an imperial Gupta ruler. From the Pāli texts we learn that he died a year or two before the demise of the Buddha, and since he had a total lifespan of 72 years, he was in all probability a somewhat junior contemporary<sup>3</sup> of the Śākya prophet, who definitely died at the age of 80.

Unlike his predecessors, Mahāvīra's life has received extensive treatment in the early Jain canonical texts. The earliest work that does so to a considerable degree is the celebrated *Ācārāṅgasūtra*, the first Aṅga and probably the earliest canonical work of the Śvetāmbara Jains. There is very little doubt that the *Ācārāṅga* account of the life of Mahāvīra was composed a century or two after the demise of the teacher and is therefore tolerably reliable. It should however also be remembered that the *Ācārāṅga* provides details of Mahāvīra's life up to his forty-second year (the date of enlightenment) and gives no information about his last thirty years.

Both the *Ācārāṅga*<sup>4</sup> and *Kalpasūtra*<sup>5</sup> inform us that when the moon was in conjunction with the Hatthuttarā constellation (Uttara-phālgunī), Mahāvīra descended from the Puṣpottara celestial abode on the expiry of his period of life as a God. He then took the form of an embryo in the womb of the Brāhmaṇa lady Devānandā of the Jālandhara lineage, wife of the Brāhmaṇa Rṣabhadatta of the Koḍāla lineage (*Koḍālasagottassa*) belonging to the Brahmanical part of Kuṇḍagrāma town (*Māhaṇakumḍaggāme nayare*). According to the *Kalpasūtra*<sup>6</sup> Devānandā saw the following fourteen objects in her

dream: an elephant, a bull, a lion, an anointment, a garland, the moon, the sun, a flag, a vase, a lotus lake, the ocean, a celestial abode, a heap of jewels and a flame.

The following idea then struck Śakra (Indra), the king of gods:

It never has happened, nor does it happen, the Arhats, Cakravartins, Baladevas or Vāsudevas, in the past, present or future, should be born in low families, mean families, degraded families, poor families, indigent families, beggars' families or Brahmanical families . . . [they] are born in high families, noble families, royal families, noblemen's families, in families belonging to the race of Ikṣvāku, or of Hari or in other such families of pure descent on both sides.<sup>7</sup>

Then he asked Hariṇegamesī, commander of the infantry (evidently another name of Skanda, who is also known as Naigameya or Naigameśa) to transfer the embryo from the womb of Devānandā to that of Triśalā of the Vāsiṣṭha *gotra*, wife of Kṣatriya Siddhārtha of the Kāśyapa *gotra*, belonging to the Kṣatriya part of the Kuṇḍapura town. This Siddhārtha, we are further told, was a scion of the clan of Jñātr̥ṣ (Prākṛta Nāya). The order was promptly carried out. This event, according to the above-mentioned texts, took place on the eighty-third day after Mahāvīra's descent from heaven into the womb of Devānandā, when the moon was once more in conjunction with Uttaraphālgunī.<sup>8</sup> It was the thirteenth day of the dark half of the month of Āśvina. The *Kalpasūtra*<sup>9</sup> further informs that in that night (eighty-third) Devānandā dreamt that the fourteen objects of her dream were taken from her by Triśalā. At the same time, the Kṣatriya lady Triśalā saw those fourteen objects entering her own dream.

No modern historian can accept the transfer of embryo story, whatever may be its antiquity.<sup>10</sup> It is more probable that Devānandā was Mahāvīra's real mother and he was subsequently accepted by Kṣatriya Siddhārtha as his adopted son. In this connection I should point to the story told in the *Bhagavati*<sup>11</sup> regarding Devānandā's meeting with Mahāvīra. This meeting took place at the Brahmanical part of Kuṇḍagrāma. We are told that at that time (i.e., when Devānandā saw Mahāvīra when the latter was already a *kevalin*) milk oozed from the breasts of that Brāhmaṇa lady. When Gautama enquired about this, his chief disciple, Mahāvīra, explained that she was his mother, and it was because of her motherly affection that this had occurred. I quote here Mahāvīra's original words:

*Devāṇamdā māhaṇī mamaṃ ammagā, ahaṃ ṇaṃ Devāṇamdāe māhaṇīe attae; taṇṇaṃ sā Devāṇamdā māhaṇī teṇaṃ puvvaṇaputtasīṇeharāgeṇaṃ agaya-*

*paṅḥayā, jāva samūsa-viyaromakūvā namam animisāe diṭṭhīe pehamāṇī pehamāṇī ciṭṭhai.*

We should particularly note the expression 'pūvvaṇḍa-siṅḥarā-geṇam'. This striking incident narrated in such an early text as the *Bhagavatī* abundantly explodes the popular Jaina belief that Mahāvīra was the son of the Kṣatriya lady Triśalā. The transfer of embryo story probably originated a century or two after the demise of Mahāvīra (c. 300 BC), when Jainism was firmly established in India and assumed a thoroughly anti-Brahmanical stance. It must be remembered that in ancient India an adopted son (*dattaka*) was simply looked upon as 'real son' as was the case with a *kṣetraja* son (cf. the case of the Pāṇḍavas). Jacobi's conjecture that Devānandā was another of Siddhārtha's wives should not be taken seriously.<sup>12</sup> I do not however wish to be dogmatic about this but do feel that the mystery surrounding Mahāvīra's births has not yet been properly investigated. The original Jaina inventor of the embryo story probably had in mind the story of Kṛṣṇa's birth as related in the Vaiṣṇava devotional literature.

Now, Siddhārtha's wife Triśalā, according to the seventh-century text, the *Āvaśyakacūṛṇī*<sup>13</sup> of Jinadāsagaṇi Mahattara, was a sister of the illustrious Ceṭaka, a Kṣatriya chief of Vaiśālī. In the original canon how even nothing has been said about her relationship with that prince. She, however, gets here the significant name Videhadiṅṇā.<sup>14</sup> It should be recalled that Kūṇika-Ajātaśatru, who according to the original canon was a son of Cellaṇā, a daughter of Ceṭaka,<sup>15</sup> receives the title Videhaputta in the *Bhagavatī*<sup>16</sup> and a similar epithet for him is also found in the Pāli canon. It is, therefore, permissible to conjecture that the author of the *Āvaśyakacūṛṇī*, so famous for his erudition, had definite access to some other source which is not lost. Another daughter of Ceṭaka, called Mṛgāvātī, according to the *Bhagavatī*,<sup>17</sup> was the mother of the great Udayana of Kauśāmbī. The Jaina works<sup>18</sup> unanimously bestow on Ceṭaka the title 'king' and, according to the *Nirayavalikā*<sup>19</sup> an Upāṅga text, he was as powerful a monarch as Kūṇiya, the king of Magadha. It is exceedingly strange that this famous personality is entirely ignored in the Pāli canonical texts.

According to both the *Ācārāṅga*<sup>20</sup> and *Kalpasūtra*,<sup>21</sup> Mahāvīra was born on the thirteenth day of the bright half of the month of Caitra when the moon was in conjunction with the Uttaraphālgunī. A scrupulous reader of the Jaina texts is not expected to take such astro-

nomical details seriously, which are scattered throughout Jaina literature and specially in connection with the description of the lives of the Tirthaṅkaras. He was christened Vardhamāna, 'the increasing one', because the family treasure went on increasing from the moment of his birth.<sup>22</sup> He was also known by two other names: Samaṇa and Mahāvīra. We are told that the people called him Samaṇa because he was always engaged in penances, and Mahāvīra because he nurtured no fear and was unafraid of danger.<sup>23</sup> The canonical texts also refer to him by such names as Nāṭaputta,<sup>24</sup> Vesālia<sup>25</sup> and Videhadiṇṇa.<sup>26</sup> The first name was evidently the more popular since it is constantly referred to in the Buddhist texts. Mahāvīra was called 'Vesālia' because he was born in a suburb of that city. As his birthplace lay within the territory of Videha, he was given the name 'Videhadiṇṇa'.

We have seen, in connection with our discussion of Pārśva, that Mahāvīra's parents themselves were followers of the former. Since this statement is found in the *Ācārāṅga*, one of the oldest texts of the Jains, its authenticity cannot be questioned. This implies that Mahāvīra himself grew up under the shadow of Pārśva's religion. There is little doubt that Siddhārtha and Trisālā scrupulously taught him in his boyhood the Nirgrantha doctrine of four principal restraints as preached by the great thinker from Kāśī. As his birthplace was near the great city of Vaiśālī, it is very probable that Mahāvīra came into contact not only with Pārśva's followers in his early youth, but also with other thinkers of that celebrated city. There is little doubt that this city was founded centuries before the birth of Mahāvīra and the Buddha. According to the *Rāmāyaṇa*,<sup>27</sup> the kings of this city were known for their large-heartedness and religious disposition. The combined testimony of the Jaina and Pāli texts indicate that the city had a number of shrines, mostly dedicated to *yakṣas*, in sixth century BC. In the famous<sup>28</sup> *Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya* a number of such shrines are mentioned, namely Sārandada, Cāpāla, Udena, Gotamaka, Bahuputta, and Sattamba. From the *Pāṭika Suttanta*<sup>29</sup> of the same work we further learn that Udena was to the east of Vaiśālī, Gotamaka to the south, Sattamba the west, and Bahuputta to the north. The shrine of Bahuputta, it is useful to note, was once visited by Mahāvīra, as is vouched for by the evidence of the *Bhagavati*.<sup>30</sup> Another shrine in this city mentioned in the *Bhagavati* was Koṃḍiyāyaṇa, where Gośāla performed his sixth *pauṭṭaparihāra* (entering into another's dead body). I will elsewhere

in this work discuss the nature of influence exercised by the *yakṣa*-worship on early Jainism, but it should be emphasized here that not all the *ceiya-ceiyas* were dedicated to them. The shrine of Bahuputta, as is evident from the Upāṅga text the *Nirayavalikā*,<sup>31</sup> was probably dedicated to the goddess Bahuputtīyā, who was connected with children's welfare. I am, however, aware that elsewhere<sup>32</sup> in the Jaina texts a certain Bahuputtīyā is described as a spouse of *yakṣa* Pūrṇabhadra. Regarding the Gotamaka shrine, we can say this much that Sabhāparvan<sup>33</sup> of the *Mahābhārata* speaks of the shrine of Gotamaka at Rājagṛha and connects it with ṛṣi Gautama. There is no reason why the shrine of the same name situated in Vaiśālī should not be connected with the same ṛṣi. Worship of ancient saints, like the worship of *devas* and *yakṣas*, was an integral part of ancient Indian religion. The worship of ṛṣi Agastya is a well-known instance. What I am trying to drive at is that both Mahāvīra and the Buddha were considerably influenced by the popular religious systems of their time. In this connection I would point to the words spoken by Mahāvīra in the eighteenth *śataka* of the *Bhagavatī*<sup>34</sup> where he says that he used to visit places like *sabhā*, *pavā*, *ārāma*, *ujjāna*, and *devakulas*. That both Mahāvīra and the Buddha used to frequent the popular *caityas* is clear from Jaina and Buddhist writings.

Turning once more to the life of Mahāvīra, we find him marrying a girl called Yaśodā (Jasoyā) of the Kauṇḍinya *gotra* and the couple had a daughter, who was christened Priyadarśanā. The Digambaras vehemently deny that Mahāvīra ever married, but we need not take their objection seriously. It should be recalled that the reference to Mahāvīra's marriage is found in a work like the *Ācārāṅga*<sup>35</sup> and is supported by the *Kalpasūtra*.<sup>36</sup> We therefore have to accept the fact of Mahāvīra's marriage, however distasteful it may appear to a Digambara Jaina. Both the above-mentioned works refer to Mahāvīra's granddaughter Yaśovatī, Priyadarśanā's daughter, but do not mention the name of Mahāvīra's son-in-law. We however learn from the *Ācārāṅga* that the son-in-law belonged to the Kauśika *gotra*.<sup>37</sup> From a few late works<sup>38</sup> we learn that Mahāvīra's son-in-law was Jamāli. It is curious that although this individual is prominently mentioned a number of times in the original canon, nothing has been said about his marriage to Priyadarśanā. On the other hand, the *Bhagavatī*,<sup>39</sup> which gives a detailed account of him and the story of his rebellion, refers to his eight wives. His parents are mentioned but not named. We however learn that he belonged to a highly

prosperous family of Kṣatriya Kuṇḍagrāma near Vaiśālī.

The next important event in Mahāvīra's life was his renunciation that took place on his attaining the age of thirty.<sup>40</sup> Siddhārtha and Trīśālā were no longer then in the land of the living. His elder brother Nandivardhana<sup>41</sup> and sister Sudarśanā<sup>42</sup> were there, but they apparently did not attempt to prevent Mahāvīra from embracing an entirely new life. It is probable that before his eventual departure, Mahāvīra gave his daughter in marriage to a person of the Kauśika *gotra*.

At the age of thirty, on the tenth day of the month of Mārgaśīrṣa, when the moon was once more in conjunction with Uttaraphālgunī, after taking the permission of the elders,<sup>43</sup> Mahāvīra left for the park of Nāyasamḍa,<sup>44</sup> which was situated near his home town. There, under an *aśoka* tree,<sup>45</sup> he divested himself of all his ornaments and finery, and then plucked out his hair in five handfuls.<sup>46</sup> The *Kalpa-sūtra*<sup>47</sup> then informs us that Mahāvīra retained his cloth covering for thirteen months, and thereafter wandered about naked.

The original canon gives us some idea about Mahāvīra's wanderings in his twelve-year pre-*kevalajñāna* period. The *Ācārāṅga* mentions a few places he visited after his departure from home,<sup>48</sup> and the *Bhagavatī*, which is also an original canonical text, gives us some important information about this period of Mahāvīra's life, and this is to be found in the fifteenth Śataka of this work.

According to this account, in the second year of his wanderings, Mahāvīra came into contact with Maṅkhaliputta Gośāla at Nālandā, a famous suburb of Rājagṛha.<sup>49</sup> The author of this portion of the *Bhagavatī* would have us believe that Gośāla became Mahāvīra's disciple and wandered with him to a number of places for six years. In this connection the *Bhagavatī* mentions three, Kollāga *sanniveśa* (a small town near Nālandā), Siddhārthagṛāma, and Kūrmagrāma. All these were in all probability situated near Rājagṛha. In the later texts they are represented as visiting a number of places together.<sup>50</sup>

A few of the places visited by Mahāvīra during his wanderings are mentioned in the *Ācārāṅga*. We are told that besides Kummāragāma,<sup>51</sup> a place he visited in the very beginning of his wanderings, he travelled in the country of the Lāḍhas,<sup>52</sup> and also went to Vajjabhūmi and Subbabhūmi. According to the commentaries,<sup>53</sup> Vajjabhūmi and Subbabhūmi were divisions of Lāḍha identifiable with West Bengal.

In the commentaries like the *niryuktis* and *cūrṇīs* a large number



of places are described as having been visited by Mahāvīra,<sup>54</sup> but it is extremely doubtful whether all of them were ever visited by the Jaina prophet. Reading between the lines of the relevant passages of the original canon would convince a discerning reader that he only toured in Bihar and Bengal in his twelve-year pre-enlightenment period.

Both the works, the *Ācārāṅga*<sup>55</sup> and the *Kalpasūtra*,<sup>56</sup> have described in identical words the story of his final enlightenment. We are told that in the thirteenth year, in the month of Vaiśākha, when the moon was in conjunction with Uttaraphālgunī, Mahāvīra attained *nirvāṇa* (enlightenment) outside the town of Jambhiyagāma. The exact place where this occurred was the bank of the river Ṛjupālikā, near the residence of a householder called Sāmāga and an old temple (*ceiya*).

Next comes the most important period of Mahāvīra's life, namely that as a teacher and path-finder. We are extremely fortunate to have a passage, included in the *Kalpasūtra*, which gives us a very good idea about his forty-two-year ascetic life, including his twelve-year pre-*nirvāṇa* period. The passage runs thus:

... the venerable ascetic stayed the first rainy season at Aṣṭhikagrāma, three rainy seasons in Campā and Pṛṣṭhicampā, 12 in Vaiśālī and Vāṇijyagrāma, 14 in Rājagṛha and its suburb called Nālandā, 6 in Mithilā, 2 at Bhadrīkā, 1 in Ālabhīkā, 1 in Paṇitabhūmi, 1 in Śrāvastī, and 1 at the town of Pāpā in king Hastipāla's office of writers (*rajjūsabhā*).<sup>57</sup>

We have already observed that in his twelve-year career as a learner Mahāvīra probably visited only a few places in Bihar and Bengal. The passage, quoted above, does not probably give any chronological sequence of Mahāvīra's wanderings as a learner and teacher. We must remember that it was probably composed 200 years after Mahāvīra's demise, and it was, therefore, virtually impossible for the writer of the *Kalpasūtra* to give a complete chronological account of Mahāvīra's entire career as an ascetic. There is however no doubt that the passage gives us a broad and general idea about his wanderings from the age of 30, up to his death at the age of 72.

A closer analysis of the above-quoted passage of the *Kalpasūtra* would show that barring a year in Śrāvastī, and a year probably in western Bengal, Mahāvīra spent his life only in what is now known as the state of Bihar. He, however, occasionally visited other places in India, as is evident from the combined testimony of the passages scattered in the original canon. We have also to consider, in this

connection, the extremely valuable information provided by the Pāli texts.

According to different original texts, the Master visited, during his career as a teacher, the following places. Kāmpilyura,<sup>58</sup> Sāketa,<sup>59</sup> Mathurā,<sup>60</sup> Hastināpura,<sup>61</sup> Vardhamānapura,<sup>62</sup> Āmalakappā,<sup>63</sup> Purimatāla,<sup>64</sup> Kākandī,<sup>65</sup> Polāsapura,<sup>66</sup> Vārāṇasī,<sup>67</sup> Kauśāmbī,<sup>68</sup> Seyaviyā,<sup>69</sup> Kajaṅgalā,<sup>70</sup> etc. The later texts and commentaries mention a large number of places Mahāvīra visited, but it is extremely doubtful whether their evidence is of any real value. The canonical account of Mahāvīra's visit to Hastināpura is probably based on imagination since this city, according to the Purāṇas,<sup>71</sup> was destroyed by the Ganges during the reign of Nicakṣus, a great-grandson of Janamejaya II. The Jaina and Buddhist writers had some real weakness for cities of epic fame, and that is why cities like Hastināpura and Indraprastha occur so frequently in their writings, although both these disappeared from the map of India long before the birth of the Buddha and Mahāvīra. Frequent references to the Kauravas and Ikṣvākus in the Jaina and Buddhist texts are also indirect evidence of the influence of the two epics on these works.

The Pāli texts also directly confirm the evidence of the Jaina canonical texts regarding the wanderings of Mahāvīra. The *Upālisutta* of the *Majjhima Nikāya*<sup>72</sup> refers to Nāthaputta's visit to Nālandā with a large company of Jaina monks. Another Pāli text the *Samyutta*,<sup>73</sup> connects this place with Mahāvīra. We have already seen that according to the *Kalpasūtra* the Teacher spent forty rainy seasons at Rājagṛha and Nālandā. It was at Nālandā, as we have already noticed, that Mahāvīra had met Gośāla for the first time. Mahāvīra's intimate association with Rājagṛha is proved by repeated references to this city everywhere in the Jaina canon. The *Majjhima Nikāya* (no. 14) also mentions that Rājagṛha was a popular centre for Jains, and that there were numerous Jains residing on mount Isigili (Rṣigiri). The Pāli works also confirm the Jaina account of Mahāvīra's close link with Vaiśālī, with which both the *Majjhima*<sup>74</sup> and *Anguttara*<sup>75</sup> connect Mahāvīra. It is extremely interesting to note that even among the Śākya of Kapilavastu, there was an individual called Vappa who was a disciple of Mahāvīra. This is testified to by the evidence of the *Anguttara*.<sup>76</sup> A place called Macchikāsaṇḍa, according to the *Samyutta*,<sup>77</sup> was visited by Mahāvīra with a great company of the Jains.

The combined evidence of the Jaina and Buddhist texts leaves

no room to doubt the great success of Mahāvīra's missionary activities. The Nirgrantha religion founded by Pārśva around 800 BC, slowly yet surely became a major religion of eastern India during Mahāvīra's lifetime. The Teacher, as we have already noticed, met with his greatest success in Bihar, although places outside this province like the Śrāvastī region and western Bengal came increasingly under the influence of the Jaina religion.

Let us not briefly turn to Mahāvīra's relation with contemporary political figures. The Magadhan king Śreṇika Bimbisāra, who was almost a personal friend of Gautama Buddha, figures in the Jaina texts as an admirer of Mahāvīra.<sup>78</sup> He is chiefly called by the name Seṇia or Seṇiya in the Jaina canonical texts, although the name Bimbisāra (Bhambhasāra) is not entirely unknown.<sup>79</sup> Although a few canonical texts depict him as a devotee of Mahāvīra, he is said to have gone to hell after his death,<sup>80</sup> evidence perhaps that he was not really a true Jaina at heart. There is however little doubt that his eldest son Abhaya was a real admirer, if not a devotee of Mahāvīra.<sup>81</sup> That he was essentially a kind-hearted and liberal person is demonstrated not only by the Jaina but also by the Buddhist texts. It was this prince who, through kindness and love, converted an abandoned child of a prostitute into a world-renowned physician. We are referring here to Jīvaka Komāravacca, the son of the courtesan Sālāvati, who was later brought up by Abhaya as his foster-son. The close connection of Abhaya with the Jains is also shown by the evidence in the Pāli *Majjhima Nikāya*.<sup>82</sup> Regarding Bimbisāra's better known son Ajātaśatru, who succeeded him, it may be pointed out that he was probably more inclined towards Jainism than any other religion. It is, however, also true that the Buddhist texts, sometimes claim him to be their follower. Indeed, the famous *Sāmaññaphala Sutta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya* was recited to him by the Buddha in the concluding parts of which he expresses repentance for his sin of parricide. There is however great reason to suspect that his passion for the Buddhist religion was never genuine. His earliest *guru* was probably Devadatta, but at a later period, through his mother's influence he became a friend and patron of Mahāvīra. He is favourably pictured virtually throughout the Jaina canon and especially in the *Aupapātikasūtra*.<sup>83</sup> The Jaina texts like the *Bhagavatī*<sup>84</sup> and *Nirayavalikā*<sup>85</sup> provide a detailed account of his war with his opponents, the eighteen confederate kings, in which he was eventually victorious.

Kūṇika Ajātaśatru's mother Cellaṇā, a cousin of Mahāvīra, and daughter of king Ceṭaka of Vaiśālī, was favourably inclined towards the religion of her cousin. Her father Ceṭaka, a brother of Kṣatriyāṇī Triśalā, is represented in later texts, as a devotee of Mahāvīra. But what about the illustrious Prasenajit (Pasenadi of the Pāli texts), king of Kosala? This great patron of Gautama Buddha has been almost totally ignored in the Jaina canonical works.<sup>86</sup> The other influential contemporary royal personalities like Udayana and Caṇḍa Pradyota had little to do with either of the two great heretical religions.<sup>87</sup>

There were two principal objectives before Mahāvīra when he started his missionary career. The first was to convert the existing Nirgrantha ascetics belonging to Pārśva's order to his religion of five vows; and the second was to recruit new monks who would be able to popularize his teachings. We have already referred to such conversion of monks belonging to Pārśva's order in ch. II. These instances show that almost all the monks belonging to Pārśva's order were slowly converted to the new and more vigorous Nirgrantha religion preached by Mahāvīra. Mahāvīra's second objective, namely to recruit new monks also met with success. Like Pārśva he too had his Gaṇadharas (the head of a group of monks), and the *Kalpasūtra*<sup>88</sup> refers to his principal disciple Indrabhūti (Indrabhūti), a Brāhmaṇa of the Gautama *gotra*. This highly learned individual figures in the celebrated twenty-third chapter of the *Uttarādhyayana*. His two brothers Agnibhūti and Vāyubhūti were also prominent Gaṇadharas.<sup>89</sup> Among other prominent disciples (Gaṇadharas) of Mahāvīra, mention be made of Sudharman and Moriyaputta, the fifth and seventh Gaṇadharas, respectively. The Jaina canon is said to have been preached to Jambusvāmin by Sudharman.<sup>90</sup> I identify Moriyaputta, the seventh Gaṇadhara with Tāmali Moriyaputta mentioned prominently in the *Bhagavati*,<sup>91</sup> although the *Āvaśyakaniryukti*<sup>92</sup> would have us believe that they were different persons.

Mahāvīra had a large number of nuns under him headed by Candanā.<sup>93</sup> There was also no dearth of lay votaries, many of whom were quite prosperous.<sup>94</sup> Details about them are given in the *Upāsakadaśā*, the seventh Aṅga of the Jaina canon. In this connection we should at least mention Ānanda of Vāṇiyaggāma (a suburb of Vaiśālī) who was not only a very rich lay votary but also a very pious man. His role is almost identical to that of Anāthapiṇḍika of the Buddhist texts. The *Upāsakadaśā*<sup>95</sup> contains a story, according to

which, even Indrabhūti was defeated in an argument with this lay votary of Mahāvīra.

The teacher's religious career was not however plain sailing. I have already briefly referred to Gośāla, who according to the Jaina texts, was originally a disciple of Mahāvīra. This controversial religious personality appears also in the Buddhist works as one of the six great heretical teachers of the Buddha's time. There is, nothing, however in the Pāli works to show that he was a disciple and subordinate of Nirgrantha Nāthaputta. There is however little doubt that Mañkhaliputta Gośāla was a veritable thrown in the flesh of both Mahāvīra and the Buddha. An analysis of the relevant passages of the *Bhagavati*<sup>96</sup> and *Upāsakadaśā*<sup>97</sup> show that he was an influential Ājīvika leader of Śrāvastī and had a large number of followers. He was not however, the founder of the Ājīvika school; this sect was probably founded at least a century before the birth of Gośāla. In this connection I would like to invite attention to the story recorded in such an early Pāli text as the *Mahāvagga*<sup>98</sup> according to which, immediately after his enlightenment (at the age of 35), the Buddha met one Upaka who was a naked Ājīvika monk. We have already seen that Mahāvīra was a somewhat junior contemporary of the Buddha and there is little doubt that he was at that time probably in his late twenties and hence a householder at Kṣatriya-Kuṇḍagrāma. There was thus no question of his meeting Gośāla at that time, and he had become an Ājīvika long before Gośāla started preaching his doctrine (according to the *Bhagavati*, Gośāla<sup>99</sup> had left Mahāvīra when the latter was 36 and founded his Ājīvika school in Śrāvastī). There are also other indications<sup>100</sup> in the Pāli texts to show that Ājīvikism was founded long before the Buddha and Mahāvīra.

A few scholars believe<sup>101</sup> that it was Gośāla who persuaded Mahāvīra to give up the habit of wearing clothes, but there is nothing in the Jaina canon to prove the veracity of this. The *Kalpasūtra*<sup>102</sup> simply states, as we have already noticed, that Mahāvīra wore clothes for a year and a month and then went about naked. It is also true that Mahāvīra had met Gośāla in his second year of renunciation. There is however no reason why should we link these two events. Indeed, the Ājīvikas were not the only naked ascetics of that time, even in the later Vedic period, monks from various sects wandered about naked.

From the relevant passages of the *Bhagavati* it becomes clear that

bitter rivalry continued between Gośāla and Mahāvīra up to the former's demise. Mañkhaliputta was probably a victim of epilepsy and his unnatural and premature death probably inspired the writer of the fifteenth Śataka of the *Bhagavatī* to write his account of the death of this bitter rival of Mahāvīra. Anyone who has taken the trouble of studying this Book of the *Bhagavatī* will, I believe, understand that the account was composed by a diehard Jaina wholly inimical to the Ājīvikas. There is little doubt that this religion continued to flourish for a long time after Gośāla's death which took place in Śrāvastī, sixteen years before Mahāvīra passed away.

A disciple of the Master, Jamāli, who was a scion of a rich Kṣatriya family of Mahāvīra's home town,<sup>103</sup> and who according to late commentaries,<sup>104</sup> was a son-in-law of Mahāvīra, publicly announced his difference with his teacher and founded his own school in Śrāvastī. From the very outset, as it appears from the *Bhagavatī*,<sup>105</sup> Jamāli began to behave as Mahāvīra's rival. The *Bhagavatī* also informs<sup>106</sup> us that immediately after embracing the ascetic-life, Jamāli started wandering alone with a few of his followers, much against Mahāvīra's wishes. Subsequently there were further doctrinal difference between the two, and Jamāli, like Gośāla, declared himself a Jina in Śrāvastī. Those who had expressed faith in him, remained with him in Śrāvastī and he, along with his disciples, stayed in the well-known Koṣṭhaka shrine of that town. Those refusing to acknowledge him as their teacher went to Mahāvīra, who was then staying in the Pūrṇabhadrā shrine of Campā and reported the whole matter to him. Afterwards, we are told, Mahāvīra publicly defeated Jamāli in a debate that took place at Campā,<sup>107</sup> but Jamāli even after this, continued to defy Mahāvīra's authority till his death. According to the Jaina texts<sup>108</sup> he was the first Niṇhava (propounder of wrong doctrines).

There is little doubt that Jamāli, like Devadatta, was a born rebel and had a distinct personality of his own. It is a pity that no works composed by their disciples are extant, leaving persons like Gośāla, Jamāli, or Devadatta in our eyes as mere 'rebels' in the religious history of India.

For thirty years Mahāvīra preached his doctrine and in spite of the opposition, he faced, made his religion the solace for thousands of people of eastern India. The end came quietly at the town of Pāvā in king Hastipāla's office for writers on the fifteenth day of the dark fortnight of Kārttika while the moon was in conjunction with Svāti.<sup>109</sup> That very night, we are told, his chief disciple Indrabhūti

obtained *kevala-jñāna*.<sup>110</sup> The *Kalpasūtra*<sup>111</sup> also informs us that during the night, when the venerable ascetic died, the 18 confederate kings of Kāśī and Kosala instituted an illumination saying 'since the light of intelligence is gone, let us make an illumination of material matter'. Several Pāli canonical texts confirm the Jaina account that Mahāvīra breathed his last at Pāvā<sup>112</sup> and also add that the Buddha died after the demise of the Jaina Tirthaṅkara. The writer in the *Cambridge History of India* (vol. I)<sup>113</sup> believes that the Buddha died before Mahāvīra, which obviously goes against available evidence. I believe that the Buddhist account of the death of their founder after the demise of Nāthaputta is basically accurate.

## REFERENCES

1. v. 17.
2. See *SBE*, 22, pp. 270, 275.
3. Let us remember that both Mahāvīra and the Buddha died after the accession of Kūṅika-Ajātaśatru. The Buddhists hold that the Buddha died in the eighth year of Ajātaśatru's reign (see Ray-chaudhuri in *Political History of Ancient India*, p. 214). Since the Buddha died at the age of 80 and Mahāvīra at 72, the latter was slightly younger. We should also remember that the rebellion of Devadatta, which coincided with the accession of Ajātaśatru, was known to Mahāvīra (see *Majjhima*, 58). There is therefore little doubt that Mahāvīra was the younger teacher.
4. See *SBE*, 22, p. 189.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 219.
6. *Loc. cit.*
7. *Kalpasūtra* (*SBE*, 22), p. 225.
8. *Ibid.*, pp. 189, 229.
9. p. 230.
10. Let us remember that the story is found in such early texts as the *Ācārāṅga*, and *Kalpasūtra*. An early sculpture from Mathurā also supports the tradition of the transfer of embryo.
11. (Sailana edn.), IV, pp. 1690–1704.
12. See *SBE*, 22, intro., p. xxxi, n. 2.
13. I, p. 245.
14. See *SBE*, 22, p. 193.
15. See *Nirayavalikā* (Rajkot, 1960), pp. 25ff.
16. III, p. 1199.
17. IV, p. 1986.
18. *Loc. cit.* See also *Nirayavalikā*, pp. 40 ff.
19. pp. 44 ff.
20. p. 191.
21. p. 251.

22. *Ācārāṅga*, p. 192.
23. *Kalpasūtra*, pp. 255–56.
24. See Mehta and Chandra, *Dictionary of Prakrit Proper Names*, pt. II, p. 576.
25. Loc. cit.
26. Ibid.
27. Gītā Press edn., I, 47.18.
28. See Nālandā edn., II, pp. 92 f.
29. Nālandā edn., III, p. 9.
30. VI, p. 2665.
31. See III, fourth *adhyayana*.
32. See Mehta and Chandra, op. cit., pt. II, p. 503.
33. Gītā Press edn., 21.5–8.
34. See VI, p. 2759.
35. p. 193.
36. This text, however, does not mention her name.
37. *Ācārāṅga*, p. 194.
38. See *Āvaśyakacūrṇī*, I, p. 416; *Kalpasūtravṛtti* (of Dharmasāgara), p. 92; *Uttarādhyayanavṛtti* (Śāntisūri), p. 154.
39. IV, p. 1723.
40. *Ācārāṅga*, p. 194; *Kalpasūtra*, p. 256.
41. See *Ācārāṅga*, p. 193.
42. Loc. cit.
43. *Kalpasūtra*, p. 256.
44. *Ācārāṅga*, p. 199; *Kalpasūtra*, p. 259.
45. *Kalpasūtra*, p. 259.
46. *Ācārāṅga*, p. 199; *Kalpasūtra*, p. 259.
47. pp. 259–60.
48. pp. 84 ff.
49. V, pp. 2376 ff.
50. See Mehta and Chandra, op. cit., pt. II, pp. 577 ff.
51. p. 200.
52. p. 85.
53. See p. 84, n. 1.
54. See Mehta and Chandra, op. cit., pt. II, p. 580.
55. pp. 201 ff.
56. p. 263.
57. p. 264.
58. See *Ṇāyā*, 157; *Upā*, 35.
59. *Ant.*, 14.
60. *Vipāka*, 26.
61. *Anut.*, 6.
62. *Vipāka*, 32.
63. *Rāj.*, 5 ff.
64. *Vipāka*, 16.
65. *Ant.*, 14; *Anut.*, 3
66. *Upā*, 39-45; *Ant.*, 15.
67. *Upā*, 27, 30; *Ant.*, 15.



68. *Bhagavatī*, IV, p. 1987.
69. See *Āvaśyakaniryukti*, v. 469.
70. See *Bhagavatī*, I, p. 391.
71. See *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, IV.21.8; see also *PHAI*, p. 43.
72. See Nālandā edn., II, p. 43.
73. Nālandā edn., III, p. 281.
74. Nālandā edn., I, p. 280.
75. Nālandā edn., III, pp. 293 ff.
76. Nālandā edn., II, pp. 210 f.
77. Nālandā edn., III, p. 265.
78. See *Daśa*, 10.1; also *Ṇāyā*, 148.
79. *Uvavāyīya*, 9; *Daśa*, 10.1; *Sthā*, 693.
80. *Sthā*, 693.
81. See Mehta and Chandra, op. cit., pt. I, pp. 49 ff.
82. See Nālandā edn., II, pp. 67 ff.
83. See Sailana edn., pp. 56 ff.
84. See III, pp. 1199 ff.
85. See pp. 45 ff.
86. For a somewhat late reference to him, see *Uttarādhyayananiiryukti*, p. 286.
87. The *Bhagavatī*, however, represents Udayana as honouring Mahāvīra, see IV, p. 1987.
88. pp. 267, 286.
89. Loc. cit.
90. See Mehta and Chandra, op. cit., pt. I, p. 270.
91. II, p. 572.
92. See vv. 595, 623, 645, 648.
93. *Kalpasūtra*, p. 267.
94. See especially the various stories about them in the *Upāsakadaśā*.
95. *Upā.*, 16 ff.
96. See Śataka 15.
97. See N.A. Gore edn., 1953, pp. 114 ff.
98. Nālandā edn., p. 11.
99. See V, p. 2386.
100. See Nālandā edn., of *Majjhima*, I, pp. 41 ff.
101. See B.M. Barua, *History of Pre-Buddhist Indian Philosophy*, p. 300.
102. pp. 259–60.
103. See *Bhagavatī*, IV, p. 1705.
104. See *Āvaśyakacūrmī*, I, p. 416; *Kalpasūtravṛtti* by Dharmasāgara, p. 92.
105. IV, pp. 1752 ff.
106. *Ibid.*, pp. 1753 ff.
107. *Ibid.*, pp. 1758 ff.
108. See *Sthā*, 587; *Āvaśyakaniryukti*, 780.
109. *Kalpasūtra*, p. 269.
110. *Ibid.*, p. 265.
111. *Ibid.*, p. 266.
112. See *Dīgha*, III, p. 91; *Majjhima*, III, p. 37.
113. p. 163.

## CHAPTER IV

### Spread of Jainism (The Early Phase)

It is extremely difficult to correctly gauge the progress of the Jaina religion during the centuries preceding the Christian era in different parts of India. The available inscriptions, it is true, do help us in this with regard to some parts of India. However, with the exception of the Mathurā region and Orissa, very few pre-Christian inscriptions relating to the Jaina religion have been discovered.<sup>1</sup> The early canonical texts are of some help in relation to various parts of northern India.

In our discussion on the career of Pārśva we noticed that he was successful in popularising the Nirgrantha religion in different parts of what is now known as U.P. This religion, as have already pointed out, originated in all probability, at Kāśī, and before the demise of that great prophet won a good number of converts in some prominent cities of U.P. He himself personally visited places like Kauśāmbī,<sup>2</sup> Sāketa,<sup>3</sup> Kāmpilyapura,<sup>4</sup> Āmalakappa,<sup>5</sup> Mathurā<sup>6</sup> and a few other cities. We are also told that he carried out missionary activities in Rājagṛha.<sup>7</sup>

After Pārśva's death, close disciples of his undoubtedly continued his task of popularizing the doctrine of fourfold restraints. In the canonical literature his disciples are frequently mentioned, and the city of Tuṅgiyā is specially mentioned in the *Bhagavatī*<sup>8</sup> as a centre of the disciples of Pārśva. We have already noticed that even northern Bihar after Pārśva's death fell under the influence of his religion. Not only were the parents of Mahāvīra followers of Pārśva, but a prominent disciple belonging to his school lived at Vāṇiyaggāma<sup>9</sup> near Vaiśālī. The *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*<sup>10</sup> refers to another prominent disciple, belonging to Pārśva's school, whom Mahāvīra met and converted at Nālandā. A few other places connected with the missionary activities of monks of Pārśva's order (*Pāsā-vaccijja*) have already been noticed. It is extremely probable that before the birth

of Mahāvīra the Nirgrantha religion founded by Pārśva was firmly established in U.P. and Bihar.

Under Mahāvīra the Jaina religion became one of the major religious sects of eastern India. We have already noted that Mahāvīra visited a number of places in eastern India during this missionary career and converted a large number of people of different prominent cities. He, however, achieved his greatest success in Bihar where the Nirgrantha religion became almost as popular as the religion founded by Gautama Buddha. This is indirectly confirmed by Pāli canonical texts. Another interesting thing which a zealous student of these two great religions will not fail to notice is that whereas the Buddhist canonical writers take so much trouble to repeatedly mention Nāthaputta and his followers, the Jaina counterparts take almost no notice of the Buddha and his monks. The only religious rival of Mahāvīra, who figure prominently in the Jaina canon, is Gośāla. In the commentaries, however, the later Jaina writers do pay some attention to the Buddha and his followers.

As a result of Mahāvīra's religious conquest, western Bengal came under the influence of Jainism. We have already noticed in connection with our discussion of the career of Mahāvīra that he undertook tours to that part of eastern India. It is also permissible to believe that Bengal accepted Jainism before Buddhism as only a few places of this province figure in Pāli canonical texts. Some parts of western U.P. were also visited by Mahāvīra, and we should particularly note Mahāvīra's visit to the great city of Mathurā<sup>11</sup> which, as we have already noted, was visited by Pārśva. We will later see how this city gradually became one of the largest centres of Jaina religion in northern India.

The *Bhagavatī*<sup>12</sup> gives us the somewhat intriguing information that Mahāvīra visited the city of Vītībhaya, the capital of Sindhu-Sauvīra. We are told in this connection that the Master travelled all the way from Campā to Vītībhaya in order to meet king Udayana of Sindhu-Sauvīra. We are further told that this king later became a Nirgrantha monk. The *Bhagavatī* account of Mahāvīra's visit to the country of Sindhu-Sauvīra cannot be dismissed as a product of imagination since the work itself was probably written a century or two after Mahāvīra's demise. Besides, once we accept the *Bhagavatī* account of Mahāvīra's visit to the country of Sindhu-Sauvīra, we have to admit that the message of the Nirgrantha religion reached India's western coast during the lifetime of the Teacher himself, and

this was indeed no mean achievement.

It is not easy to trace the history of the spread of Jainism after the death of Mahāvīra, but a careful study of the relevant portions of the *Therāvalī*, which is a part of the *Kalpasūtra* will give us some definite idea about the history of the gradual spread of Jainism in different parts of India.

Among the four *śākhās* originating from Godāsa, a disciple of Bhadrabāhu, who flourished in the fourth century BC, we have the following three significant names:<sup>13</sup> Tāmraliptikā *śākhā*, Koṭivarṣiyā *śākhā*, and Puṇḍravardhaniyā *śākhā*. All the three *śākhās* were evidently connected with the three well-known geographical units, all of which were situated in Bengal. The first name does not need any comment. The second, Koṭivarṣa, according to the *Paṇṇāpaṇṇā*,<sup>14</sup> a canonical text, was the capital of Lāḍha country and the third, present north Bengal. We have already noticed that Mahāvīra himself visited some places in Bengal during his missionary career, so it is natural that Jainism should flourish after his death in the places where he taught his doctrine. There was however another more important factor behind the popularity of Jainism in Bengal in pre-Christian times. We have already seen that according to the *Therāvalī* all these *śākhās* originated from Godāsa, who was a disciple of the great Bhadrabāhu. Now, this saint (i.e., Bhadrabāhu), according to the *Bṛhathkathakośa*<sup>15</sup> of Hariṣeṇa (AD 931), was born at the town of Devakoṭṭa situated in the Puṇḍravardhana country. There is no doubt that Hariṣeṇa was indebted to earlier works for this information about Bhadrabāhu's place of birth. It is natural therefore, that the *śākhās* founded by Godāsa, a disciple of Bhadrabāhu, should be connected with Bengal.

So far as Tāmralipta is concerned, it would not be unreasonable to note that at the famous port of Tāmralipta lived the merchant Tāmali Moriyaputta, who became a Jaina recluse, apparently during Mahāvīra's lifetime. The story of how he renounced everything is graphically related in the *Bhagavaṭī*.<sup>16</sup> Regarding northern Bengal, we will later see that this area produced true and devoted Jainas during the Gupta period.

From Balisaha, who was a disciple of Ārya Mahāgiri (c. 300 BC), who himself was a disciple of the well-known Sthūlabhadra, a number of *śākhās* originated, and among them the name Kauśāmbikā is conspicuous. This *śākhā* was evidently connected with the famous city of Kauśāmbī, the capital of the Vatsa country and which, according

to the Purāṇas, rose to prominence after the destruction of Hastināpura by the Gaṅgā in c. 1300 BC. During the lifetime of Mahāvīra and Śākyamuni, Kauśāmbī was a flourishing metropolis, and the capital of the celebrated Udayana, who did not hesitate to pay homage to Mahāvīra when he visited his city.<sup>17</sup> Jayantī, an aunt of Udayana, became a Jaina nun, according to the *Bhagavatī*.<sup>18</sup> Another Jaina Aṅga text, the *Vipākaśruta*,<sup>19</sup> tells the story of the love affair of Bṛhaspatidatta, the priest of Udayana, and Padmāvati, a queen of that famous king.

Among the *śākhās* originating from Ārya Rohaṇa<sup>20</sup> (c. 250 BC), a disciple of Suhastin, we have the very significant name, Udumbarikā. This *śākhā* was certainly connected with the Audambara tribe who lived in Punjab and whose coins, dating from pre-Christian times have been discovered in large numbers there.<sup>21</sup> There is no doubt that by the time this *śākhā* originated (c. 250 BC),<sup>22</sup> Jainism had been firmly established in Punjab. From another disciple of Suhastin, Bhadrayaśas, originated a number of *śākhās*, apparently in the middle of the third century BC. At least two *śākhās* originating from him were connected with geographical names, Bhadrīyikā and Kākandikā.<sup>23</sup> These two *śākhās* were apparently connected with the towns of Bhadrīkā and Kākandī, mentioned prominently in the Jaina texts. From another disciple of Suhastin, Kāmardhi, originated a number of *śākhās*, among which Śrāvastikā *śākhā*.<sup>24</sup> deserves special mention. As the name indicates, this *śākhā* was connected with the famous city of Śrāvastī which had been more than once visited by Mahāvīra. It was in this famous city that persons like Gośāla and Jamāli preached their doctrines, and it was there that the famous encounter between the two great teachers, Mahāvīra and Gośāla, took place. From yet another disciple of Suhastin, Rṣigupta, originated a number of *śākhās*, among which the most significant name is that of Saurāṣṭrika.<sup>25</sup> This shows that before the end of the third century BC, Jainism reached Gujarat, and as history testifies, it has maintained its existence there to the present time. Another interesting *śākhā* connected with a definite geographical name is Madhyamikā,<sup>26</sup> which originated from another disciple of Suhastin. The town of Madhyamikā, it is interesting to note, is mentioned in the canonical texts,<sup>27</sup> and the creation of this *śākhā* before the end of the third century BC, proves that the Jaina religion reached Rajasthan before that time.

This rapid analysis of the names of the *śākhās* of the *Therāvati*

gives us some idea about the history of the spread of Jainism in different parts of India. A particular passage<sup>28</sup> of the *Bṛhathkalpa*, a *Chedasūtra* text, attention to which has already been drawn by previous scholars, seems to indicate the extent of the spread of Jainism at the time of its composition (c. 350 BC). We are told in this passage that a Jaina monk must not go beyond Aṅga-Magadha in the east, Kauśāmbī in the south, Kuṇāla (N. Kosala) in the north and Thuṇā (Thaneswar) in the west. This passage was in all probability composed before the creation of the *sākhās* mentioned in the *Therāvalī*. The *Bṛhathkalpa* may not be a very old text, but the passage in question probably preserves a much older tradition.

In 1912 a stone inscription was discovered by Pandit G.H. Ojha from a place called Baḍalī in Ajmer district, Rajasthan,<sup>29</sup> which, according to that celebrated palaeographer, contains the words 'eighty-four' and 'Vīra'. Pandit Ojha argues that the palaeography of this inscription is older than those of Aśoka and that is why he feels that it relates to the year 84 of the Vīra Nirvāṇa era. In that case the inscription should be regarded to date 400 BC. Some orthodox Jaina scholars have therefore jumped to the conclusion that Jainism was introduced in Rajasthan before 400 BC. Ojha further remarks<sup>30</sup> that his view regarding the inscription has the support of MM. S.C. Vidyabhusana. D.C. Sircar, another noted epigraphist, however, assigns<sup>31</sup> the inscription to the close of the second century BC, although he does not offer any argument in favour of such a late date for this inscription. I have very carefully examined the letters of this inscription and strongly believe that its palaeography cannot be later than that of the inscriptions of Aśoka. Sircar's attempt at explaining *caturāsiti* as meaning '84 villages' is, to say the least, ludicrous. But even then we cannot wholly accept Ojha's view regarding the terms 'Vīra' and '84', the truth is that there is no pre-Christian record of the Vīra Nirvāṇa era. If therefore the tradition recorded in the *Therāvalī* is of any value, then we have to accept that Jainism was introduced in Rajasthan only after 250 BC, but this is a view open to revision until more positive evidences become available.

We do not know much about the religious leaning of the Nandas, but the Jainas claim that the first Mauryan emperor Chandragupta embraced their religion during the closing years of his life. Chandragupta's name is absent in all early Śvetāmbara canonical and non-canonical texts, and it is only in some *bhāṣya* and *cūṛṇī* texts,<sup>32</sup> written after the Gupta period that he is mentioned by name.

Even in those works, however, he is not termed a Jaina, but the Digambara traditions, both literary and epigraphic, delineate him as a Jaina devotee.<sup>33</sup> Some scholars believe that the earliest Digambara literary tradition regarding Candragupta's conversion is that recorded by Hariṣeṇa in the *Bṛhathkathākośa* (AD 931). However, a much earlier Digambara literary work, the *Tiloya-Paṇṇatī*, written around AD 600, represents Candragupta as a Jaina devotee,<sup>34</sup> but even this work was composed some 900 years after the death of that great emperor. We cannot therefore accept, in the absence of some earlier evidence, the argument of scholars like Smith<sup>35</sup> and Raychaudhuri<sup>36</sup> who hold that Candragupta became a Jaina *sādhu* before his death. The Greek and Roman historians, who definitely knew the Jainas,<sup>37</sup> have not said anything regarding Candragupta's conversion to that religion, and indeed there are indications in their writings that Candragupta was an orthodox Hindu believing in sacrificial religion. The famous play of Viśākhadatta, written before the *Tiloya-Paṇṇatī*, never connect Candragupta with Jainism. It also appears somewhat bizarre that a stern and ruthless military conqueror like Candragupta Maurya, should suddenly transform himself into a penniless Jaina *muni* and end his life in such a curious way.

We have another very significant passage<sup>38</sup> in the *Nisūthaviṣeṣacūrṇī* of Jinadāsagaṇi Mahattara (seventh century AD), which also seems to go against the Digambara tradition. The passage compares the Mauryan dynasty with a barley-corn, emphasizing that only its middle portion, represented by the rule of Samprati, was elevated. Had Candragupta been a Jaina, Jinadāsagaṇi would never have failed to notice it in this vital passage. This evidence probably goes far to destroy the contention of the Digambaras regarding Candragupta's conversion to Jainism.

Regarding Aśoka, the third Mauryan king, it can be said with certainty that he was a Buddhist. But as a liberal and magnanimous monarch his respect for non-Buddhists, and the Ājīvikas and Jainas have been mentioned in his records.<sup>39</sup> The Śvetāmbara commentaries mention him as a king of Pāṭaliputra.<sup>40</sup> His son Kuṇāla is also mentioned several times and a tragic story about the loss of his eyes has been related in the commentaries.<sup>41</sup> Kuṇāla's son Samprati (Sampai), according to the Jaina commentaries,<sup>42</sup> was a devout Jaina and did everything in his power to popularize this religion in various parts of India. That Samprati is not a shadowy figure, is proved

by the combined evidence of the Jaina, Buddhist, and Purāṇic texts.<sup>43</sup> Jinadāsagaṇi informs<sup>44</sup> us that Samprati constructed Jaina shrines in areas like Andhra, Daṃḷa, Marahaṭṭa, etc. We are further told that he was a votary of Suhastin. We have already noticed that it was during the time of Suhastin that different *kulas* and *sākhās* were established in various parts of India so there is little doubt that the uniform Jaina tradition regarding Samprati's leaning toward the Nirgrantha religion is essentially based on fact.

#### REFERENCES

1. The inscription from Baḍali (Rajasthan), which is definitely a pre-Christian record, is, however, a doubtful case.
2. *Nāyā*, 158.
3. *Ibid.*, 154, 157.
4. *Ibid.*, 157.
5. *Ibid.*, 148–9.
6. *Ibid.*, 156.
7. *Ibid.*, 158; *Nir.*, 4.1.
8. Sailana edn., p. 468.
9. *Bhag.*, p. 1614.
10. See *SBE*, 45, p. 420.
11. *Vip.* 26; see also the edn. from Kota (1936), pp. 204 ff.
12. p. 2234.
13. See *SBE*, 22, pp. 288.
14. Para. 37.
15. Ed. A.N. Upadhye, 131.1-4.
16. pp. 572 ff.
17. *Bhag.*, p. 1987.
18. *Ibid.*, pp. 1987 ff.
19. Kota, 1935, pp. 200 ff.
20. *SBE*, 22, p. 290.
21. See *The Age of Imperial Unity*, p. 162, n. 4.
22. Since Rohaṇa's preceptor Suhastin was a disciple of Sthūlabhadra (c. 300 BC), Rohaṇa flourished in the middle of the third century BC.
23. *SBE*, 22, p. 291.
24. *Loc. cit.*
25. *SBE*, 22, p. 292.
26. *Loc. cit.*
27. See *Vipākaśruta* (Kota, 1935), p. 369; see also *Sukhavipāka Sūtra* (Sailana), p. 26.
28. I, 51–2.



29. See G.H. Ojha, *Bhāratiya Prācīn Lipimālā* (in Hindi), pp. 2 ff.; for the original inscription see *JBORS*, XVI, pp. 67–8.
30. Ojha, op. cit., p. 3, fn 1.
31. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, p. 89.
32. See Mehta and Chandra, op. cit., pt. I, p. 245.
33. See Raychaudhuri, *PHAI*, pp. 294 ff.
34. See *Tiloya-Pannatī*, IV, 1481.
35. See *Oxford History of India*, p. 76.
36. *PHAI*, p. 295.
37. See Majumdar, *The Classical Accounts of India*, pp. 425 ff.
38. See IV, pp. 128–31.
39. See *Select Inscriptions*, p. 63.
40. See Mehta and Chandra, op. cit., pt. I, p. 72.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 188.
42. *Ibid.*, pt. II, p. 741.
43. See *PHAI*, pp. 350 ff.
44. *Nis. Cū.*, IV, pp. 128 ff.

## CHAPTER V

### Jainism in Mathurā

According to Jaina canonical accounts both Pārśva and Mahāvīra had visited Mathurā in course of their religious wanderings. The story of Pārśva's visit to this great city is recorded in the *Ṇāyādhammakahāo*<sup>1</sup> and that of Mahāvīra in the *Vipākāśruta*.<sup>2</sup> It is however extremely doubtful that these visits created any substantial enthusiasm among the sophisticated residents of this city.

The great city of Mathurā was under the occupation of the non-Aryan (Asura) chief Lavaṇa during the days of Rāma. At a later period of Rāma's reign at Ayodhyā, his younger brother Śatrughna had wrested this city from the above-mentioned barbarian chief.<sup>3</sup> The same text informs us that this city gradually became a celebrated centre of trade and commerce. The king of Mathurā, some fifty years before the Bhārata war, was Kāmsa<sup>4</sup> who was a friend of the great Jarāsandha of Magadha. As it well-known, his nephew Kṛṣṇa, son of Davakī and Vasudeva, with the assistance of his elder brother Baladeva, killed him in his own court. But the Vṛṣṇis, as we learn from the Sabhāparvan<sup>5</sup> of the *Mahābhārata*, were completely uprooted from Mathurā, by Jarāsandha. The Vṛṣṇis, who had fled to Dvārakā, once more returned to north India after the death of Vāsudeva and Baladeva. The *Mahābhārata* tells us that the Vṛṣṇis, under Kṛṣṇa's great-grandson Vajra, were rehabilitated by Arjuna in the town of Indraprastha.<sup>6</sup> They also got a foothold in the Punjab (Pañcanada country) as we learn from the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*.<sup>7</sup> At a later stage, Mathurā became a centre of the Bhakti cult, first propagated by Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa.<sup>8</sup> Both the Buddhist and Jaina canonical writers show their intimate acquaintance with this place. The story of the Buddha's visit to Mathurā is recorded in the *Anguttara Nikāya*,<sup>9</sup> but the Buddha himself looked upon this city with disfavour.<sup>10</sup> According to the Pāli texts, the city was infested with *yakṣas*.<sup>11</sup> Soon after the demise of the Buddha, however, one of his great disciples Mahākaccāna started preaching the doctrine of his guru there. We also learn that the king of Mathurā, after the death of the Buddha,

was Avantīputta,<sup>12</sup> who, judging by his name, was probably connected with the ruling house in Avantī. One of the finest *sūtras* of the Pāli literature, the *Madhurasūtra*, was recited by the above-mentioned disciple of the Buddha in this city. The meeting of the learned Brāhmaṇa Kaṇḍarāyaṇa with Mahākaccāna took place there at a place called Gundāvana near Mathurā.<sup>13</sup> This Gundāvana may or may not be identical with Vṛndāvana<sup>14</sup> of Sanskrit literature.

Regarding the actual introduction of Jainism in the Mathurā region, we have a story told in the *Paumacariyam* of Vimalasūri, a text composed 530 years after the Mahāvīra's death.<sup>15</sup> This date is supplied by the poet in the concluding verses of his poem, and there is nothing in the *Paumacariyam* itself that contradicts it. We have therefore to accept it as a work of the first century AD.<sup>16</sup> According to this poem, the Śvetāmbara Jaina religion was introduced in Mathurā by the following seven Jaina saints: Suramantra, Śrīmantra, Śrītilaka, Sarvasundara, Jayamantra, Anilalalita, and Jayamitra.<sup>17</sup> The *Paumacariyam* contains a verse,<sup>18</sup> the importance of which can hardly be overestimated for the early history of Jainism, which runs as follows:

*iha bhāraḥmivāse volīne nandanaravīkāle  
hohī pavīralagahano jinadhamme ceva dusamāe.*

According to this verse the Jaina religion had to encounter difficult days after the rule of the Nandas. The poet further informs us that the people of India during this period had become more interested in the religion of the Buddha and Śiva (*liṅga*).<sup>19</sup> However, as a result of the missionary activities of the above-mentioned Jaina monks, the religion of Pārśva and Mahāvīra once more gained popularity in some parts of India. There is little doubt that the author of the *Paumacariyam*, writing in the first century AD, faithfully portrays the religious condition of pre-Christian India when Buddhism was completely dominant. Śaivism also, if we are to believe the evidence of Patañjali,<sup>20</sup> was quite popular in the Maurya period. The seven Jaina saints cited above, we are told, were responsible for the introduction of Jainism not only in Mathurā but also Sāketa (Ayodhyā).<sup>21</sup> In this connection we are informed by Vimala that there was a temple dedicated to Muni Suvrata, the twentieth Tīrthamkara, at the town of Sāketa,<sup>22</sup> which apparently, was built a few centuries before Vimala. This was surely one of the earliest Jaina temples of northern India. The Jaina *ṛsis*, according to the account of the *Paumacariyam*,<sup>23</sup> went to Mathurā from Sāketa, and if this account be accepted we must

conclude that Jainism travelled to Mathurā from eastern India via Ayodhyā.

Since the earliest Jaina inscription from Mathurā is as old as 150 BC, it can easily be conjectured that Jainism got a foothold there by the beginning of the second century BC, if not earlier. The seven Jaina monks, who are mentioned in the *Paumacariyam* in connection with the introduction of Jainism in Mathurā, probably flourished during that period. It is also possible that some of them were the teachers of a few Jaina monks mentioned in the inscriptions. The account of the *Paumacariyam* induces us to believe that the monks responsible for the introduction of Jainism in Mathurā originally came from Kosala, the metropolis of which, as we have already noticed in a previous chapter, was intimately connected with the activities of Mahāvira, the last Tīrthamkara. Pārśva, the real founder of Jainism, according to the *Ṇāyādhammakahāo*,<sup>24</sup> had visited Sāketa in course of his religious tour. The Jaina canonical writers believe Kosala to be the homeland of most of their earlier Tīrthamkaras. It is also possible that cities like Śrāvastī received their first dose of Jainism even before the birth of Mahāvira. The Śrāvastikā *sākhā*, mentioned in the *Therāvalī*, originated in the third century BC, and its very name indicates that it originated in Śrāvastī, the capital of Kosala.

What I am trying to suggest is that the Jaina monks of Kosala had by 200 BC, begun popularising their religion in the celebrated city of Mathurā, which was surely a great centre of the Bhāgavata cult from a much earlier period. This city, according to both Jaina and Buddhist sources, was also intimately connected with *yakṣa* worship. We have already noted the evidence of the Pāli canon regarding *yakṣa* worship in Mathurā. According to the *Vipākaśruta*,<sup>25</sup> there existed a shrine dedicated to *yakṣa* Sudarśana in Mathurā. The Jaina monks had therefore to meet the challenge of both the Vaiṣṇavas and *yakṣa* worshippers, and it is attested to by scores of inscriptions that the Jaina religion received strong support from the ordinary people of Mathurā.

In this connection I would like to point out that not only Kosala, but the adjoining Vatsa territory too probably sent Jaina missionaries to Mathurā. The *Bhagavati*<sup>26</sup> records that Mahāvira was very cordially received along with his disciples by the great king Udayana in his capital Kauśāmbī. The Kauśāmbikā *sākhā*, mentioned in the *Therāvalī*, as we have already noticed in a previous chapter, origi-

nated by the beginning of the third century BC. Two inscriptions<sup>27</sup> from Pabhosa near Kauśāmbī of the second century BC, testify that Jaina monks enjoyed royal patronage during the Śuṅga period in the Kauśāmbī region. It is therefore possible that like the monks of Kosala, the Jaina *sādhus* of the Vatsa country took an active interest in the propagation of Jainism in Mathurā.

An interesting fact related by Vimala in his description of the introduction of Jainism in Mathurā is that the images of Tīrthamkaras along with the images of the above-mentioned Jaina *sādhus* gradually came to be installed in different residential buildings of Mathurā. Now, image-worship was an integral part of *yakṣa* worship. Every important *yakṣa* shrine in northern India had images of *yakṣa*, to which it was dedicated. In this connection we can refer to the story of *yakṣa* Moggarapāṇi of Rājagṛha told in the *Antagaḍadasāo*<sup>28</sup> where there is a definite and clear reference to the image of that *yakṣa*. We further learn from the *Vipākāśruta*<sup>29</sup> that the images of *yakṣas* were worshipped with leaves, flowers, etc., like the image of gods. The practice of worshipping Deva<sup>30</sup> and *yakṣa* icons in their respective shrines from later Vedic times, naturally influenced the early Jaina religion. We will later see that the worship of icons of Tīrthamkaras was practised even in the fourth century BC. It is also safe to conjecture that the temple of Muni Suvrata at Sāketa, built probably in the third century BC, held an image of that Tīrthamkara.

The earliest Jaina inscription from Mathurā has been assigned to the middle of the second century BC by Bühler.<sup>31</sup> I am referring to the stone inscription<sup>32</sup> which records the dedication of an arch for the temple (*pāsādotoraṇa*) by *sāvaka* Utaradāsaka (Uttaradāsaka), son of Vachī (Vātsī) and disciple (*aṃteṅvāsī*) of the ascetic (*samaṇa*) Māharakhita (Māgharakṣita). This monk, Māgharakṣita, undoubtedly lived during the first half of the second century BC, and was one of the successful early Jaina missionaries of Mathurā. This inscription further testifies that the earliest Jaina temple in Mathurā was already in existence in the present Kaṅkālī Ṭilā area before 150 BC, and was probably the *devanirmita stūpa* of a second-century Jaina inscription about which I will have something more to say later. It is also tempting to conjecture that our Māgharakṣita was a disciple of one of those seven monks mentioned in the *Paumacariyam*, but in the absence of more positive proof we cannot be positive about this.

Chronologically, the next Jaina inscription from Mathurā is that which mentions a person called Gotiputra and his wife Śimitrā who

belonged to Kauśika *gotra*.<sup>33</sup> This inscription records, after an invocation of Arhat Vardhamāna, the setting up of a tablet of homage (*āyāgapāṭa*) by the above-mentioned lady. The most important expression of this inscription is however the epithet *poṭhayaśakakālavāḷa* bestowed on her husband Gotipura. Bühler translates it as 'black serpent to the Poṭhayas and Śakas'.<sup>34</sup> The Poṭhayas of this inscription, according to Bühler should be identified with the Proṣṭhas mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*.<sup>35</sup> Now, that epic mentions this tribe along with a few others, including Trigarta, the well-known Punjab tribe. It therefore testifies that the Proṣṭhas were in all probability their neighbours, and is thus not surprising to find them mentioned in a pre-Christian inscription at Mathurā. It is also significant that Poṭhayas are mentioned along with the Śakas, who had started playing an important part in the politics of northern India from a much earlier period. The Śakas are mentioned immediately after the Gandhāras (Gadara) in the Behistun and Persepolis inscriptions<sup>36</sup> of Darius, the great Achaemenian emperor of Persia who flourished in the last quarter of the sixth century BC. They are also mentioned in other inscriptions of the same monarch and the Persepolis inscription of Xerxes.<sup>37</sup> It is extremely likely, therefore, that by the closing years of the sixth century BC, when Darius flourished, the Śakas were already in India, although politically they came into prominence only after 100 BC. Mathurā, as we will presently see, was under the Śakas from the closing years of the first century BC. Probably our Gotiputra was one of those Kṣatriyas of Mathurā who did all in his means to check the Śaka advance into the Mathurā region. Probably for a few years, as the inscription indicates, he successfully fought off the Śaka challenge, but eventually succumbed. Lüders<sup>38</sup> rejects Bühler's translation of the expression mentioning Poṭhayas and Śakas. According to him, Poṭhayaśaka is a proper name. He however obviously fails to interpret the term *kālavāḷa*. Now, such a proper name as Poṭhayaśaka is exceedingly rare in ancient India and there can be absolutely no basis for such an interpretation. Bühler's translation is eminently reasonable. Also if there is any truth in the later Jaina tradition, another valiant warrior of the Āryāvarta successfully fought with the Śakas in the mid-first century BC. I am referring to king Vikramāditya, who according to the Indian tradition, reigned in mid-first century BC.<sup>39</sup> In any case, our Gotiputra is one of those few Indians, who had sought to withstand the advance of foreign tribes into the heart of India, and deserves

to be remembered for this. His wife, 'Kośiki', also probably belonged to an aristocratic Kṣatriya family. Both, as this inscription indicates, were devoted worshippers of Tīrthamkara Vardhamāna. Another inscription, also written in Prākṛta, mentions this individual and gives his real name as Indrapāla.<sup>40</sup> This inscription contains the expression *arahatapūjāye*, which once more testifies to Gotiputra's leaning toward the Jaina religion. It is very significant that, unlike most of the early Jaina devotees, mentioned in the Mathurā inscriptions, this person was a Kṣatriya nobleman. Like Khāvela of Kaliṅga he was a valiant soldier, but his martial zeal did not prevent him from falling in love with a religious system which was basically based on the concept of non-violence. Non-violence is not cowardice, and the example of Gotiputra shows that a person believing in non-violence could, for the sake of his country, transform himself. Both the inscriptions mentioning Gotiputra are dated to the second half of the first century BC by Bühler and Fleet.<sup>41</sup>

We will now discuss some other pre-Kuṣāṇa Jaina inscriptions of Mathurā. A majority of such inscriptions are undated, though a few have dates. The most important of the latter, is the inscription which mentions the Śaka Mahākṣatrapa Śoḍāsa<sup>42</sup> and gives us the date 72 which should be referred to the era of 58 BC. It should therefore correspond to AD 14. This Mahākṣatrapa was the son of Mahākṣatrapa Rañjuvula who had apparently conquered Mathurā before the beginning of the Christian era. Gotiputra was probably one of his adversaries. Both Rañjuvula and Śoḍāsa are mentioned in the well-known Mathurā Lion Capital inscriptions<sup>43</sup> and also the Mora Well inscription<sup>44</sup> which refers to the Vṛṣṇi heroes. Both father and son probably nurtured equal deference for Brahmanical Hinduism, Buddhism, and Jainism. The inscription under discussion records, after an invocation to the Arhat Vardhamāna, the setting up of an Āryavatī<sup>45</sup> by Amohinī, the Kochī (= Kautsī), a female lay disciple of the ascetics (*samanasāvīkā*), together with her sons Pālaghoṣa, Poṭhaghoṣa, and Dhanaghoṣa for the worship of Arhats.

Another interesting early inscription from Mathurā<sup>46</sup> records the setting up of a shrine (*devikula*) of the Arhat, an *āyāgasabhā*, a reservoir (*prapā*), and stone slabs (*śilapaṭa*) in the Arhat temple (*arahatāyatana*) of the Nigathas (Nirgranthas) by a few courtesans (*gaṇīkā*). Regarding the names of the latter there is some confusion. According to Bhagwanlal Indraji, at least four of them, namely Nādā, Vāsā, Dandā and Leṇaśobhikā are mentioned in this inscrip-

tion, but Lüders<sup>47</sup> reduces the number to two. The former interpretation seems more reasonable, but what is of much greater interest is that even women leading an immoral life could be converted to the doctrine of dedication and love by a few zealous ascetics. The setting up of so many things is indicative that the courtesans mentioned in this inscription, were quite rich, and it is no surprise to find prostitutes taking an active part in religious affairs. Even a superficial acquaintance with the Buddhist canon would show how prominent courtesans actively helped the Buddha and the Saṃgha. One of the best lay-disciples of the Buddha was the son of a courtesan. This was Jivaka Komāravaccha, the physician who was a son of a prostitute called Sālāvati, whose fee per night at Rājagṛha was 100 *kahāpaṇas*.<sup>48</sup> The fee of the courtesan Ambapālī was 50 *kahāpaṇas* per night.<sup>49</sup> The great Vasantasenā of Bhāsa's *Cārudatta* and Śūdraka's *Mṛcchakaṭīka* was not only an exceedingly rich lady but also one of the most accomplished persons of Ujjayinī. It seems that the *ganikās*, mentioned in the inscription under discussion, were prominent citizens of Mathurā. The reference to *devikula* (*devakula*) is indicative that this term was used freely to describe any type of shrine. Apparently the *devikula* built by these courtesans was somewhat smaller because it was built within the enclosure of the Arhat temple (*āyatana*).

Another pre-Kuṣāṇa inscription<sup>50</sup> found from Kaṅkālī Tīlā records the setting up of a tablet of homage by Śivayaśā, who has been described as the wife of a dancer (*nartaka*) called Phaguyaśa. This inscription once more shows that persons engaged in curious professions took an active interest in the welfare of the Jaina church. Another inscription, which has been assigned to the pre-Kuṣāṇa period by Bühler, is that which refers<sup>51</sup> to Sihanādika, son of the *vānika* Sihaka and Kośikī. This Sihanādika, according to this inscription, set up tablet of homage (*āyāgapaṭa*) for the worship of Arhats. Bühler observes that the epithet *vāruka* given to the father of Sihanādika proves that he was a representative of the merchant community. His mother, however, belonged to a superior caste which is indicated by the word *kośikī*. In that case, this should be regarded as an instance of *pratiloma* marriage which is generally condemned in the Smṛti texts. But the epithet *vānika* given to Sihanādika's father Sihaka does not clearly prove that he belonged to the Vaiśya caste. There are many cases of persons of superior caste adopting the profession of lower classes. We have the classic example of Cārudatta,



who was a *sārthavāha* but was at the same time a Brāhmaṇa. In the Buddhist canon we have at least fifty cases of a Brāhmaṇa adopting the profession of much lower classes. In the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*<sup>52</sup> there is reference to a Brāhmaṇa called Saṅgāvāra who was a celebrated mason and built many houses at Vaiśālī.<sup>53</sup>

The fragmentary inscription<sup>54</sup> recording the dedication by Pūsā, the wife of Puphaka Mogaliputta, is also a pre-Kuṣāṇa record according to Lüders,<sup>55</sup> but a more important pre-Kuṣāṇa inscription is that which mentions a Jaina monk called Jayasena<sup>56</sup> and his female disciple (*āṃtevāsini*) Dharmaghoṣā. It further records the gift of a temple (*pāsāda*) by that lady. An inscription<sup>57</sup> found from Kaṅkāli Tīlā mentions, according to Bühler, a Śrāvikā called Lahastinī. It records the dedication of an arch (*toraṇa*). Lüders,<sup>58</sup> is, however, of the opinion that *lahastinī* here is not a proper name. Another inscription, which appears to be a pre-Kuṣāṇa record, is that which refers<sup>59</sup> to the setting up of a tablet of homage (*āyāgaṇa*) by one Acalā, the daughter-in-law of Bhadrayaśas and wife of Bhadrānadi. The gift of another *āyāgaṇa* is recorded in an inscription<sup>60</sup> by a woman who is described as the wife of one Māthuraka (inhabitant of Mathurā).

Before turning our attention to the Jaina inscriptions of the Kuṣāṇa period, we must take note of the last important pre-Kuṣāṇa record that mentions Bhagavat Nemesa.<sup>61</sup> There is little doubt, and this is pointed out by Bühler, that the god Nemesa who is sculptured as a goat-headed deity here is Hariṇegameśī of the Jaina canonical texts. This god, as we learn from the *Kalpasūtra*, transferred the embryo of Mahāvīra from the womb of Devānandā to that of Trisālā. The story of the transfer of embryo virtually replicated by the Jaina artist of Mathurā.<sup>62</sup> The god Hariṇegameśī is not only mentioned in the *Kalpasūtra* but also in such works as the *Antagaḍadasāo*,<sup>63</sup> *Bhagavatī*,<sup>64</sup> etc. This god is surely identical to Kārttikeya who is also known by the name Naigameya.<sup>65</sup> Bühler points out that four mutilated statues or statuettes of the Mathurā museum refer to the same legend as told in the *Kalpasūtra*.<sup>66</sup> Two of these figures are goat-headed males and two are females, each holding an infant in a dish.<sup>67</sup> This infant is no other than the Lord Mahāvīra himself.

A large number of Jaina inscriptions of the Kuṣāṇa period found in Mathurā are dated. The earliest of these is that dated to the year 4 corresponding to AD 82 which falls within the reign of the great Kuṣāṇa king Kaniṣka. It mentions a monk called Puṣyamitra,<sup>68</sup> and

for the first time in the Jaina records of Mathurā, the *gaṇa*, *kula*, and *śākhā* of a particular monk are mentioned. We have already noticed that these *gaṇa*, *kula*, and *śākhās* originated after Bhadrabāhu, who was in all probability, a contemporary of Candragupta Maurya. Not a single one among the pre-Kuṣāṇa inscriptions which we have so far noticed contains any reference to them. According to the inscription under discussion, the monk Puṣyamitra belonged to the Vāraṇa *gaṇa*, the Arya (Ārya)—Hāḷakiya *kula* and the Vajanagarī *śākhā*. It was formerly read as Arya-Haṭṭakiya *kula* by Bühler, but Lüders<sup>69</sup> in 1911 suggested that all the letters read as 'ṭṭa' should be read as 'la'. Now, according to the *Therāvalī*, there is no *gaṇa* of the name of Vāraṇa, but the *śākhā* Vajanagarī mentioned here is included in the *gaṇa* called Cāraṇa. There is therefore, little doubt, and as was suggested long ago by Bühler, 'Cāraṇa' has evidently been erroneously inscribed instead of 'Vāraṇa'. Now, this particular *gaṇa*, according to the same text, originated from Sirigutta (Śrīgupta) of the Hāriya (Hārīta) *gotra*, who was one of the disciples of Suhastin who flourished around 250 BC, since he himself was a disciple of Sthūlabhadra, a junior contemporary of Bhadrabāhu. This particular *gaṇa*, therefore, originated in the latter half of the third century BC, and judging by its occurrence in the Mathurā inscriptions, it was surely one of the most popular *gaṇas* of the Mathurā region. The *kula* Ārya-Hāḷakiya should be the correct reading for 'Hālijja' which according to the *Therāvalī* is a *kula* under Cāraṇa. The name of the *śākhā*, namely Vajanagarī is exactly the same here as in the *Therāvalī*. According to Bühler,<sup>70</sup> this particular *śākhā* should be connected with the Vṛjji country, but in the absence of more definite evidence we cannot accept this. It is, however, true that most of the *śākhās* and *kulas* of the early Śvetāmbara Jains had something to do with geographical units. This we have already noticed in the previous chapter.

Now, this particular inscription not only mentions the monk Puṣyamitra but also his female pupil (*śiṣinī*) Sathisihā and also her pupil whose name cannot be deciphered. There is however a reference to a monk called Sihamitra whose *saḍhacarī* (female companion) was this unnamed female disciple of Sathisihā, at whose request an unnamed lady along with two of her male relatives Grahaceta and Grahadāsa made a gift of an image.

A number of Jaina inscriptions<sup>71</sup> bearing the date of the year 5 of the reign of Kaṇiṣka have been found from the Kaṅkālī Ṭilā mound,

the earliest of which is a fragmentary inscription.<sup>72</sup> There is however a reference in it to the *gaṇa* called Koliya (which Bühler read as *Koṭṭiya*). It also mentions a preacher (*vācaka*) whose name cannot be deciphered. The reference to *vācaka* undoubtedly proves that the Jaina canon was already in existence before this date. It further indirectly testifies that the canon was reduced to writing before the first century AD. We will later see in connection with our discussion of the Jaina canonical literature that the complete canon came into existence at least before 100 BC. The Koliya *gaṇa*, mentioned in this inscription, was the most popular *gaṇa* of Mathurā. A majority of the inscriptions found from this region mention this particular *gaṇa*. Now, according to the *Therāvalī* this particular *gaṇa* originated from two monks called Suttḥiya (Susthita) and Suppaḍibuddha (Supratibuddha), who were like Śrīgupta, disciples of Suhastin. There is therefore little doubt that this particular *gaṇa* also originated like Vāraṇa in the latter half of the third century BC.

The second inscription<sup>73</sup> bearing the date of the year 5 pointedly mentions Devaputra Kaniṣka. It further records the gift of an image of Vardhamāna by a woman whose name cannot be deciphered. Her father's name was Pāla, and we are told that she made this gift at the request of Khudā, the female companion (*saḍhacārī*) of Sena, the female pupil (*śiṣnī*) of Sethiniha. This particular monk belonged to Koliya *gaṇa* Bahmadāsika *kula* and Ucenāgarī *sākhā*. Bahmadāsika is evidently the same as Bambhalijja of the *Therāvalī*, mentioned as one of the four *kulas* under Koliya *gaṇa*. There is no doubt that 'Bahmadāsika' is the correct term. The name of the *sākhā*, Ucenāgarī, is preserved in the *Therāvalī* in exactly the same form. This is one of the four *sākhās* under Koliya *gaṇa*; the other *sākhās* too, as we will see later in this chapter, are mentioned in the epigraphs of Mathurā. Bühler<sup>74</sup> thinks that Ucenāgarī *sākhā* was named after the fort of Ūcanagar, today known as Bulandshahr. This suggestion may be correct, but it remains only a suggestion. The two other inscriptions<sup>75</sup> of the same date refer to the same *gaṇa*, *kula*, and *sākhā*. One of them<sup>76</sup> however discloses the names of two monks, Mihila and his pupil Kṣeraka. These two monks, we will see later, are also mentioned in a few other Mathurā inscriptions. The next inscription<sup>77</sup> is dated in the year 7 and mentions *mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra śāhi* Kaniṣka. This interesting image inscription mentions the nun Jayā (Āryā Jayā), sister of the *vācaka* Sandhika, the *śiṣya* of the *gaṇin* Buddhaśrī who belonged to the Ārya Odehikiya (= Ārya Uddehikiya)

*gaṇa*, the Nāgabdhūtikiya *kula*. Now *this* particular *gaṇa* appears in the *Therāvalī* in an unchanged form. The name of the *kula* also appears as Nāgabdhūya in the *Therāvalī*, where it is cited as one of six *kulas* under Uddeha *gaṇa*. The same text further informs us that this *gaṇa* originated from Ārya Rohaṇa, one of the disciples of Suhastin. This *gaṇa* therefore, like Koliya and Vāraṇa, originated in the second half of the third century BC.

One inscription,<sup>78</sup> of the year 9 mentions 'Mahārāja Kaniṣka'. It records the dedication of an image by Vikatā, wife of Bhaṭṭimita at the request of *vācaka* Nāganandi from the Koliya *gaṇa*, Sthāniya *kula*, the Vairī *śākhā*. Now, *sthāniya* is apparently a Sanskrit term. In Prakṛta it should be *thāniya*, which actually appears as *vāniya* in the *Therāvalī* under Koliya *gaṇa*. The name of the *kula*, Vairī, appears unchanged in the *Therāvalī*. There is another inscription of the same date (i.e., the year 9) which was first decoded by R.D. Banerji,<sup>79</sup> and later corrected by Lüders.<sup>80</sup> This inscription yields the name of the same *gaṇa*, *kula*, and *śākhā* that we find in the previous inscription of the same date. It records the gift of Grahapalā, daughter of Grahmitra, daughter-in-law of Avaṣiri, wife of Kaḷala, at the request of Ārya Taraka who belonged to the *gaṇa*, etc., mentioned above. Another short inscription between the feet of the Jina mentions the female pupil (*śiṣimā*) of Ārya Aghama. R.D. Banerji also refers to another image inscription<sup>81</sup> of the year 12 which was supposed by him to be an image discovered from Ramnagar, the ancient Ahicchatra. He evidently relied on Führer<sup>82</sup> for this report, the person who probably discovered this image. Lüders<sup>83</sup> is however of the opinion that not a single Jina image was ever discovered from the site mentioned in Führer's 'Reports'. The inscription under discussion mentions the Koliya *gaṇa*, Bambhadāsiya *kula* and Ucenāgarī *śākhā*.<sup>84</sup> According to R.D. Banerji, a number of carpenters<sup>85</sup> jointly made the gift of an image. The person who inspired them to do so, according to Lüders, is Deva,<sup>86</sup> the sister of Nāndi, the female pupil of Ārya Puṣila. Chronologically the next Jaina inscription<sup>87</sup> is dated in the year 15 and records the dedication of a fourfold (*sarvato-bhadrikā*) image of Bhagavat by Kumāramitā, wife of *śreṣṭhin* Veṇi, mother of Bhaṭṭisena, at the request of Āryā Vasulā, the female pupil of Āryā Saṅgamikā, who was the female pupil of Ārya Jayabhūti of the Mehika *kula*. It is of very great interest to note that the same nun, Āryā Vasulā, is mentioned in a Mathurā inscription<sup>88</sup> dated in the year 86 in which the monk Jayabhūti and the nun Saṅgamikā

are also mentioned. This lady Vasulā had therefore an unusually long life. The *kula* of the monk Jayabhūti, Mahika, appears as Mehiya in the *Therāvālī* as a *kula* belonging to Vesavāḍiḡa *gaṇa*, which according to it, was founded by Kāmiddhī, who also was a disciple of Suhastin. Bühler<sup>89</sup> translates the term *śreṣṭhin* as 'alderman', which suggests that Verī, the husband of Kumāramitā, was a very respectable resident of Mathurā. Lüders,<sup>90</sup> however takes it to mean a 'banker'. In any case, in ancient India a *śreṣṭhin*<sup>91</sup> was regarded as an important person and his position was definitely superior to that of an ordinary merchant or *sārthavāha*. The inscription<sup>92</sup> of year 18 refers to a *sarvatobhadrikā* image and also mentions the Koḷiya *gaṇa* and Vacchaliya *kula*. This particular *kula* is mentioned in the *Therāvālī* under Koḷiya *gaṇa* as Vacchalijja. Another inscription<sup>93</sup> of the same date is more interesting since it yields the name of Ariṣṭanemi, the twenty-second Tīrthamkara. We have already observed, in connection with our discussion of Tīrthamkaras, that the cult of Tīrthamkaras originated a century or two after the demise of Mahāvīra. We will presently see that quite a few other Tīrthamkaras appear in the inscriptions of Mathurā. The image inscription<sup>94</sup> of year 19 is also important since another Tīrthamkara, Śāntinātha, is mentioned here. The Koḷiya *gaṇa*, Thāniya *kula* and Verī *sākhā* are also mentioned. The 'Verī' here is the same as 'Vairī'. The dedication of this image was made at the request of *vācaka* Mātṛdina, who was a pupil (*śiṣya*) of *vācaka* Baladina. The *vācaka* Mātṛdina also appears in an inscription<sup>95</sup> of year 22 as we will soon see.

We have two inscriptions<sup>96</sup> of year 20, the first of which records the dedication of an image of Vardhamāna by the *śrāvikā* Dinā, daughter of Dātīla, wife of Mātīla, mother of Jagavāla, Devadāsa, Nāgadina, and Nāgadinā at the request of the *vācaka* Ārya Saṅghasiha who belonged to Koḷiya *gaṇa*, Sthāniya *kula*, Verī (Vairī) *sākhā*. The second inscription<sup>97</sup> of the same date records the dedication by Mitrā, the first wife of Haggudeva, daughter-in-law of the ironmonger (*lohavāṇiya*) Vādhara, daughter of the jeweller (*māṇikara*) Khalamitta at the request of the *vācaka* Ārya Sīha, the pupil of the *vācaka* Ārya Datta, who was the companion (*śraddhacara*) of the *gaṇin* Ārya Pāla, who was the *śiṣya* (pupil) of Ārya Oggha, who was the pupil of the great preacher (*bṛhamtavācaka*) whose name begins with *ja* and ends with *mitra* out of the Koḷiya *gaṇa* Brahmādāsiya *kula*, and Ucenāgarī *sākhā*. An undated inscription<sup>98</sup> contains the names of the monks Sīha and the *guru* Datta mentioned in this inscription.

There are two inscriptions bearing the date 22, the first of which records<sup>99</sup> the dedication by Dharmasomā, the wife of a caravan leader (*sarttavāhinī*) at the request of the *vācaka* Ārya Māṛḍina. As we have already noted, this monk is mentioned in an inscription of year 19. A second inscription<sup>100</sup> of the same date records the dedication of an image of Vardhamāna. Its primary interest however lies in its reference to the Petavāmika *kula* of the Vāraṇa *gaṇa*. In the list of *kulas* under Cāraṇa (i.e., Vāraṇa) in the *Therāvalī* we have the *kula* called Pīdhammiya. There is little doubt that this is a corrupt form of 'Petavāmika'. The inscription<sup>101</sup> of year 25 records the dedication by Vusu(?), the wife of a dyer (*rayaginī*), daughter of Nādi, daughter-in-law of Jabhaka, wife of Jayabhāṭa. Two monks are also mentioned, namely Sadhi and his preceptor Ārya Balatrata who belonged to the Koliya *gaṇa*, Brahmadāsika *kula* and Ucenāgarī *śākhā*. The monks Ārya Balatrata and his pupil Sadhi are also mentioned in an undated inscription of Mathurā.<sup>102</sup>

The inscription<sup>103</sup> of year 28 is interesting, for it mentions, according to Fleet,<sup>104</sup> Lüders,<sup>105</sup> and Vogel,<sup>106</sup> the king Vāsiṣka,<sup>107</sup> the successor of Kaṇiṣka. There are two inscriptions of year 29. In the first inscription<sup>108</sup> the name of the reigning king is given but it cannot be properly deciphered, but he was surely Huviṣka,<sup>109</sup> the successor of Vāsiṣka. It records the dedication of an image of Vardhamāna by a married lady (*kuṭumbinī*) Bodhinādī, daughter of Grahahathi at the request of Gahapravika(?), pupil of Ārya Datta, a *gaṇin* belonging to the Vāraṇa *gaṇa* and Puṣyamitriya *kula*. The *kula* mentioned is Pūsamitti under Cāraṇa (i.e., Vāraṇa) in the *Therāvalī*. Another inscription of the same date<sup>110</sup> refers to *mahārāja devaputra* Hukṣa, i.e., Huviṣka. It also yields the name of a monk called Nagadata (Nāgadatta).

V.S. Agrawala in 1937 drew our attention to a Jaina inscription bearing the date of year 30,<sup>111</sup> but beyond the date there is nothing more in it. The inscription<sup>112</sup> of year 31 refers to the dedication by Grahaśrī, daughter of Buddhi and wife of Devila. It refers to a monk called Godāsa who belonged to the Koliya *gaṇa*, Sthāniya *kula*, and Verī *śākhā*. The interest of the inscription<sup>113</sup> of year 32 lies in its reference to an unnamed perfumer (*gandhika*) and monk Nandika of to the Koliya *gaṇa*, Sthāniya *kula*, and Verī *śākhā*. More interesting is the inscription<sup>114</sup> of year 35 that records the dedication of an image of Vardhamāna by the perfumer (*gandhika*) Kumārabhaṭi, son of Kumāramitā, the *śiṣinī* (female pupil) of Ārya Baladina who

belonged to Koliya *gaṇa*, Sthāniya *kula*, and Vairā *sākhā*. The name of the nun at whose request the gift was made is given as Kumāramitā. It seems that on this day she became a nun after leading married life for several years. The donor mentioned in this inscription was her son who naturally was anxious to help his mother, who became a nun in her old age. It is also tempting to identify this Kumāramitā with her namesake of the inscription of year 24, described as the wife of *śreṣṭhin* Veṇi and mother of Bhaṭṭisena. If we accept this identification, we must regard the donor of the year 35 as another son of this lady. A few may suggest that the donor of the inscription was a natural son of the nun Kumāramitā. In that case, we are led to believe that Jaina monks and nuns of Mathurā led an immoral life, but cannot accept this without further evidence.

The Jaina elephant inscription<sup>115</sup> of year 38 is of great interest. It mentions *mahārāja devaputra* Huviṣka and also records the setting up of elephant Nandiviśāla by *śreṣṭhin* Rudradāsa, son of the *śreṣṭhin* Śivadāsa for the worship of Arhats. The reference to Nandiviśāla certainly proves that the donor Rudradāsa, notwithstanding his deference for Jaina monks, was really a Śaiva devotee. His name and the name of his father also suggest this inference. In the Pāli canonical texts<sup>116</sup> we find references to 'Nandiviśāla' which certainly must be Śiva's Nandī. Lüders<sup>117</sup> does not succeed in his attempt to explain the relation of Nandiviśāla with Jainism. There is really no need for such an attempt. It is enough that the Jaina monks of Mathurā allowed Śaiva devotees to build a typically Śaiva object of worship within the compound of their own shrine. Some elements of orthodox Hinduism found their way into both Jainism and Buddhism. Every dedicated student of Pāli and Jaina literature knows how deeply orthodox Hinduism influenced both these religious systems. It is quite likely that a number of donors, mentioned in the Jaina inscriptions of Mathurā had equal respect and love for orthodox Hindu deities. Indeed, most of such donors never felt that they were doing something for a different religious system. They only wanted to perform some pious act and to them there was really not much difference between a Jaina *sādhu* and a Śaiva or Vaiṣṇava ascetic. This question is however beyond the scope of this work.

The next Jaina inscription<sup>118</sup> is dated year 40 although Lüders<sup>119</sup> feels that year 40 is not clearly decipherable. This inscription records the dedication of an image by a lady, the wife of *grāmika* (village headman or simply a villager) Jayanāga, mother of Sihadata. Two

monks are mentioned, Mahānandin and Dantin (Dati) belonging to the Vāraṇa *gaṇa*, Ārya-Hāḷakiya *kula* and Vajanagarī *śākhā*. The inscription<sup>120</sup> of year 44 mentions Mahārāja Huiṣka. It records the dedication at the request of Nāgasena, the pupil (*śiṣya*) of Haginandi, *vācaka* belonging to Vāraṇa *gaṇa*, Āryacetiya *kula*, and Hāritamāla-kaḍhi *śākhā*. Both these *kulas* and *śākhās* are mentioned in the *Therāvalī* under the Cāraṇa (i.e., Vāraṇa) *gaṇa*. The Jaina inscription<sup>121</sup> of year 45 mentions two persons called Buddhi and Dharmavṛddhi. Probably the second person was a monk. The inscription of year 47 (Lüders, no. 45) mentions the monk Ohanadi (Oghanandin) and his disciple Sena belonging to the Petivāmika *kula* of the Vāraṇa *gaṇa*. Another undated inscription<sup>122</sup> that mentions a certain *mahārāja rājātirāja* also refers to these two monks. R.D. Banerji edited an important inscription<sup>123</sup> of year 48 of the time of Mahārāja Huiṣka. It records the gift an image of Sambhava, the third Tīrthaṅkara by Yaśā, the daughter-in-law of Budhika, granddaughter of Savatrata, at the request of Dhañāsiri (Dhanyāśrī), the female pupil (*śiṣinī*) of Dhañavala (Dhanyavala) in the Koliya *gaṇa* Brahmadāsika *kula*, Ucenāgarī *śākhā*. We have already noticed that a few other Tīrthaṅkaras are also mentioned in the Mathurā inscriptions. Another inscription<sup>124</sup> of the same year of Mahārāja Huiṣka mentions the Brahmadāsika *kula* and Ucenāgarī *śākhā*.

Probably the most important Jaina inscription<sup>125</sup> of Mathurā is that of year 49. The figure '49' was formerly read as 79 by Bühler,<sup>126</sup> but later as 49 by Lüders.<sup>127</sup> It records the dedication of an image of the Arhat Nāndivarta (Nandyāvarta) at the 'Vodva' *stūpa* which was built by gods (*devanirmute*) by *śrāvikā* Dinā at the request of the monk Vṛddhahasti who belonged to the Koliya *gaṇa* and Vairā *śākhā*. This monk, as we shall see later, is mentioned in an inscription of year 60. Now, the Jaina Tīrthaṅkara who has this symbol (Nandyāvarta) is Arhanātha, the eighteenth, but the most important expression of this inscription is the epithet *devanirmita* applied to the 'Vodva' *stūpa* here. According to Bühler the expression means 'the *stūpa* built by gods'. He further takes 'Voḍva' to mean 'Buddhist'. That there was a *devanirmita stūpa* in Mathurā is attested to by the evidence of Jaina literature. Both the *Bṛhalkalṭhapabhāṣya* and *Vyavahārabhāṣya*, Saṅghadāsagaṇi Kṣamāśramaṇa (eighth century) refer to the *devanirmita stūpa* of Mathurā.<sup>128</sup> The great Jaina saint Jinabhadragaṇi (sixth century) lived in this *stūpa* and had rescued here a mutilated manuscript of *Mahānīṣīthasūtra*.<sup>129</sup> Bühler argues



on the basis of the testimony of Tibetan historian Tāranātha that pre-Mauryan shrines were known by the term *devanirmita*. The Jaina texts mentioned above record that there was a persistent dispute regarding this particular *stūpa*. The Buddhists, Jainas, and also the Vaiṣṇavas claimed this *stūpa* as their own. It is probable that originally it was either a Brahmanical or a Buddhist shrine, but from the days of the Kuṣāṇas it passed into the hands of the Jainas. This particular *stūpa* is probably represented by the extensive ruins at Kaṅkāli Ṭīlā and it is also probable that it included Buddhist and Brahmanical objects of worship.

There are a few Jaina inscriptions<sup>130</sup> of year 50, but only one of them is important. I refer to the inscription that records the dedication of an image of Vardhamāna by Vijayaśrī, daughter of Bubu, wife of Rājyvasu, mother of Devila, grandmother of Viṣṇubhava. It also mentions a nun called Jinadāsī and a monk named Samadi (?) who belonged to the Vāraṇa *gaṇa*, Kaniyasata *kula*, and Saṁkasiyā *śākhā*. Among the *kulas* mentioned in the *Therāvatī*, this particular one is cited as Kanahasaha. The Saṁkasiyā *śākhā* is also mentioned in this text under the same *gaṇa*. The two other Jaina inscriptions of year 50 are not so important, although one of them mentions *Mahārāja devaputra* Huviṣka.<sup>131</sup>

The inscription<sup>132</sup> of year 52 records the dedication of an image by the worker in metal (*lohikākāraka*) called Śūra, the son of Śramaṇaka, at the request of Ārya Deva, the companion (*saḍhacara*) of the *ganin* Ārya Maṅghasthi, the pupil of Ārya Ghastuhasti of the Koliya *gaṇa*, Verā *śākhā*, and Sṭānikiya *kula*. The great importance of this inscription lies in the fact that it mentions the monk Maṅghasthi who is prominently mentioned in early Jaina literature. In the *Nandīsūtra* (v. 30), a late cononical text of the Jainas, probably composed around AD 350 the name of this monk is conspicuous. In the *Āvaśyakaniryukti*,<sup>133</sup> another early Jaina text, this monk is mentioned as a resident of Mathurā which is a clinching evidence that the Ārya Maṅghasthi of this inscription is really the monk mentioned as Ārya Maṅgha in these two texts. Incidentally, Maṅgha is the only monk in early Jaina literature to be mentioned in an inscription of Mathurā.

The image inscription<sup>134</sup> of year 54 is also very interesting. It records the dedication of an image of Sarasvatī by the worker in metal (*lohikakāraka*) Gova (Gopa), the son of Siha. The monks mentioned in the inscription of year 52 are also mentioned here with the exception of Maṅghasthi, who is replaced by Māghasthi.

But it is probable that Māghahasti is another name of Maṅgu. The importance of this inscription however lies in the fact that it once more evidences the close connection of Hindu deities with Jainism. In the chapter on Jaina Iconography I will discuss the importance of this particular icon of Sarasvatī. This inscription also has the word *raṅga*, which means an auditorium, is evidence the popularity of drama in Mathurā. A much earlier reference to an auditorium will be found in the *Bhagavati*<sup>135</sup> where there is the word *peccāghara*, and also *raṅgasthāna*.<sup>136</sup> We will later see that in another inscription in Mathurā there is a very clear reference to actors.

The next Jaina inscription<sup>137</sup> is dated year 60. This inscription mentions *mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra* Huviṣka. It records the dedication of an image of Ṛṣabha at the request of Ārya Kharanṇa(?), pupil of Ārya Vrddhahasti, who is mentioned in that well-known inscription of year 49. There are two inscriptions<sup>138</sup> of year 62 and a monk called Karkuhastha and his disciple Grahabala are mentioned in both of them. One of these<sup>139</sup> contains the significant words *catuvani saṃgha* (community of four classes). The next Jaina inscription<sup>140</sup> is dated year 74 and it was decoded by R.D. Banerji. It records the gift of Dharavalā at the request of Arhadāsī, the female pupil of Grahavi'ā. A monk whose name cannot be read but who belonged to the Vāraṇa *gaṇa* and Vajanakāri *śākhā* is also mentioned.

We have an interesting inscription<sup>141</sup> of year 77 which records the dedication by one Devila at the temple of Dadhikarṇa (*Dadhikarṇadevakulika*). This Dadhikarṇa is also mentioned in an inscription<sup>142</sup> where he is called *bhagavat nāgendra* i.e., the divine lord or serpents. This inscription records the dedication of a stone slab (*śilāpaṭṭa*) in the temple (*stāna*) of that god by the sons of actors (*śailālakas*), the Māthuras, who are praised as the Chādaka brothers, chief of whom was Nandibala. This inscription, according to Führer, was found near the brick *stūpa* adjoining Jaina temples.<sup>143</sup> As pointed out by Bühler,<sup>144</sup> Dadhikarṇa is mentioned as a prominent snake in the *Harivaṃśa*<sup>145</sup> and in the list of *nāgas* in the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi*<sup>146</sup> his name figures. We should remember that the real founder of Jainism, Pārśvanātha, had a snake as his emblem. The temple of Dadhikarṇa, mentioned here, was probably situated within the Jaina temple-complex of Mathurā. There is however no necessity to regard these two inscriptions as Jaina records. The reference to actors (*śailālakas*) proves that drama was quite popular in Mathurā in the Kuṣāṇa period, if not earlier. Pāṇini's

*sūtra* 'Pārāśarya-śilālibhyām bhikṣunaṭasūtrayoḥ' (4.3.110) is clearly proves that drama in India dates back at least to 500 BC.<sup>147</sup> This problem cannot however be discussed here in details. It is sufficient to note that even before Aśvaghōṣa the art of drama was already in a sophisticated stage in Mathurā.

The next inscription<sup>148</sup> is dated to year 80 and mentions Mahārāja Vāsudeva, beyond which there is nothing of much importance in the inscription. The inscription<sup>149</sup> of year 81 is slightly more interesting since it mentions a woman called Datā, the female pupil (*āṃteṅvāsikinī*) of Āryā Jivā. The image inscription<sup>150</sup> of year 83 mentions Mahārāja Vāsudeva and also a woman called Jinadāsī, who is represented as the wife of a perfumer (*gandhika*). We have two important Jaina inscriptions of year 84, the first decoded by R.D. Banerji and second by D.R. Sahni. The first inscription<sup>151</sup> mentions *mahārāja rājātīrāja devaputra śāhi vāsudeva*. It records the setting up of an image of Rṣabha by several women at the request Kumāraka, pupil (*śiṣya*) of Gamikagutta. We have already noticed that the earliest Tirthamkara Rṣabha appears in an inscription of year 60. The second inscription<sup>152</sup> of year 84, decoded by D.R. Sahni, records the gift an image of Vardhamāna by Okhārikā, the daughter of Damitra and Datā. Two monks, Satyasena and Dharavṛddhi of the Kōḷiya *gaṇa*, are also mentioned, as is woman called Okharikā in an inscription of year 299, as we will see later. For year 86 we have an inscription<sup>153</sup> which records the dedication by some woman, the daughter of Dasa, the wife of Priya, at the request of Āryā Vasulā, the *śiṣinī* of Saṅgamikā of the Mehika *kula*. As we have already noticed nuns Vasulā and Saṅgamikā are mentioned in a much earlier inscription dated to the year 15. Of the two inscriptions<sup>154</sup> of year 87, the earlier one refers to Mitra, the pupil of Ārya Kumāranandin of the Ucenāgara *śākhā*. The second inscription only mentions king Vāsudeva with his full titles. The inscription<sup>155</sup> of year 90 is interesting since it refers to the Praśnavāhanaka *kula* and Majhamā *śākhā* of the Kōḷiya *gaṇa*. In the *Therāvalī* both these *kulas* and *śākhās* are mentioned. However, instead of Majhamā we get Majhimillā. The epigraph of year 93 records<sup>156</sup> the setting up of an image of Vardhamāna by the daughter of *hairanyaka* ('treasurer' according to Bühler) Deva at the request of the *gaṇin* Nandi.

The inscription of year 98 refers to *rājña vāsudevasya*<sup>157</sup> and two monks Kṣema and Devadatta who belonged to Odehikiya *gaṇa*, the Paridhāsika *kula*, and Petaputrikā *śākhā*. A certain perfume

(*gandhika*) called Varuṇa is also mentioned. The Paridhāsika *kula* is mentioned as Parihāsaya in the *Therāvalī*. For the *sākhā* called Petaputrikā we have a slightly different form in that text which was undoubtedly due to the copyists' error. Another inscription<sup>158</sup> of the same date refers to the Ucenāgarī *sākhā* of the Koliya *gaṇa*.

The inscription<sup>159</sup> of year 299 is certainly puzzling; for it is difficult to think of a *mahārāja rājātirāja* ruling in AD 377 in Mathurā other than a Gupta monarch. V.S. Agrawala,<sup>160</sup> in order to solve this riddle, has suggested that the year 299 should be referred to an earlier era. Now even if we refer to this inscription to 58 BC, we have to find out who this great king ruling in the Mathurā region in the mid-third century AD was. This particular inscription records the setting up of an image of Mahāvīra in the temple of Arhats, and a *devakula* is also mentioned. As we have already noticed, a woman, called Okhārikā figures, and a woman of this name is mentioned, as already noted, in an inscription of year 84.

We have several important undated Kuṣāṇa inscriptions bearing on the Jaina religion. A few of them mention the ruling king but a majority of them do not. One undated inscription,<sup>161</sup> mentions Kaṇiṣka, was first decoded by R.L. Mitra, but it does not contain any information. An undated inscription<sup>162</sup> of the time of *devaputra* Huviṣka also does not help us much. However the two inscriptions mentioning the monk Jeṣṭhasti of the Koliya *gaṇa*, Brahma-dāsika *kula* and Ucenāgarī *sākhā* are of some value. One of them<sup>163</sup> records the dedication on an image of Ṛsabha by Gulhā, the daughter of Varmā and wife of Jayadāsa, at the request of Āryā Śāmā, the *śiṣinī* of Ārya Gāḍhaka, who was a pupil of Ārya Jeṣṭhasti. The second inscription<sup>164</sup> records the dedication a fourfold image (*savadobhadrikā*) by Sthirā, daughter of Varaṇahasti and of Devī, daughter-in-law of Jayadeva and Moṣiṇī, wife of Kuṭha Kasutha, at the request of Ārya Kṣeraka, pupil of Ārya Mihila who was a pupil of Jeṣṭhasti. Let us not forget that monks Kṣeraka and Mihila are mentioned in an inscription of year 5, so there is little doubt that the monk Jeṣṭhasti, who was the teacher of Kṣeraka's teacher, lived in early first century AD, if not earlier.

An undated Jaina image inscription<sup>165</sup> of the Kuṣāṇa period mentions an image of Pārśva. It also refers to the *vācaka* Ghoṣaka, pupil of Uggahini of the Sthānikiya *kula*. No other inscription of Mathurā refers to this great Tīrthamkara and the real founder of Jainism. According to Bühler,<sup>166</sup> Uggahini was probably a female. In that

case, we will have to accept the fact that in Mathurā in those days, males accepted even females as their gurus, but Lüders,<sup>167</sup> it appears, takes Uggahini to have been a male. Another undated inscription<sup>168</sup> is of some importance since it mentions Kaniyasika *kula* of the Vāraṇa *gaṇa*. This particular *kula*, as we have already noted, is mentioned in an inscription of year 50, although the reading there is not so clear. Another interesting inscription<sup>169</sup> records the dedication of an image of Vardhamāna by Jayā, daughter of Navahasti, daughter-in-law of Grahasena, mother of the brothers Śivasena, Devasena, and Śivadeva. The monk Ārya Balatrata and his pupil Ārya Sandhi, belonging to the Ucenāgarī *śākhā* are also mentioned. These two monks, as we have already seen, are mentioned in an inscription of year 25.

R.D. Banerji decoded an interesting image inscription<sup>170</sup> which mentions a monk of Adhicchatra (i.e., Ahicchatra) belonging to Petavāmika *kula* and Vajanagarī *śākhā*. It was taken by him to be an inscription from Ramnagar, ancient Ahicchatra, but Lüders<sup>171</sup> is not prepared to believe this. In any case, this inscription certainly shows that Ahicchatra was not immune from Jaina influence in the Kuṣāṇa period.

We have a few inscriptions of the post-Kuṣāṇa period found from the Mathurā region, and these are dealt with in a subsequent chapter. Indeed, as V.S. Agrawala has pointed out,<sup>172</sup> hundreds of Jaina sculptures belonging to Gupta and early mediaeval period have been discovered from Mathurā, and a number of those will be considered in the chapter on Jaina Iconography.

The above analysis of the contents of most of the Mathurā inscriptions of the early period provides abundant proof of the tremendous popularity of Jainism from the second century BC onwards. We have already observed, on the basis of the evidence of Vimalasūri's first-century work the *Paumacariyam*, that Jainism which had suffered a setback after the Nandas, was revived by some Jaina saints, who preached both at Sāketa and Mathurā. These inscriptions of Mathurā show that very few among Jaina devotees came from the so-called aristocratic families. No inscription from Mathurā yields the name of any Brāhmaṇa patron of Jainism. It is extremely likely that members of this particular caste were much more interested in the sacrificial cult and diverse theistic religions than in either Buddhism or Jainism. Mathurā, we must remember, was a stronghold of the Bhāgavata cult and even in the second century AD, when Jainism

had reached a very high level of popularity, this city was known to a foreigner like Ptolemy as a 'city of gods'.<sup>173</sup> There is nothing to show that the Śāka or Kuṣāṇa kings themselves, had any particular weakness for this religion, rather, they manifestly show their bias for Hinduism and Buddhism. A few Kṣatriyas did however show some regard for Jainism as did a few ladies of aristocratic families. However, as we have seen in our analysis of the inscriptions, ninety-five per cent of the admirers were common people. Even persons of questionable professions contributed liberally to the welfare of the religion of Pārśva and Mahāvīra. We should also particularly note the interest shown by the business community for Jainism in Mathurā, and this is underscored by canonical and non-canonical texts.

What now about the monks and nuns mentioned in the Mathurā inscriptions? Quite a number of monks belonging to different *gaṇas* and *kulas* are mentioned in these inscriptions. The following *gaṇas* are directly mentioned in these inscriptions: Koḷiya, Vāraṇa and Uddehikīya. All the *kulas* under Koḷiya, mentioned in the *Therāvalī*, appear in these inscriptions. They are: Brahmadāsika, Vacchaliya, Thāṇiya, and Pavahaka; and is also the case with all the *śākhās* mentioned under this *gaṇa* in that text. The only *śākhā* under Koḷiya, not noted by me, namely Vijjāhari actually appears in a Gupta inscription<sup>174</sup> of Mathurā which we will discuss elsewhere. Among the *kulas* under Vāraṇa, the following are mentioned in the Mathurā inscriptions Petivāmika, Puṣyamitra, Kaniyasika, and possibly Ayyabhista; and with the exception of Gavedhūyā all the *śākhās* under this *gaṇa* are referred to, as are a few of the *śākhās* and *kulas* under Uddehikīya. This last named *gaṇa* was not however as popular as Koḷiya or Vāraṇa. Another *kula*, namely Mehika, which is a *kula* under Vesavāḍiya in the *Therāvalī*, as we have already noticed, is mentioned twice.

In a previous chapter I had observed that *gaṇas*, *kulas*, etc., appeared only a century or two after Mahāvīra's demise. In the earlier canonical texts they are very rarely referred to. The three words *gaṇa*, *kula*, and *saṃgha* (and not *śākhā*) are mentioned together in the *Bhagavati*.<sup>175</sup> In one place the *Ācārāṅga*<sup>176</sup> they are mentioned. If we are to believe in the evidence of the *Therāvalī*, *gaṇa*, *kula*, etc. originated after Bhadrabāhu, so we would not be incorrect in saying that they became a regular feature of the Jaina religion from the beginning of the third century BC. Again, if we are to believe in the evidence of the *Therāvalī*, most of the *śākhās* had originated

during the third century BC. For the benefit of students of the Jaina religion we give the list below of Jaina monks and nuns mentioned in the inscriptions of Mathurā.

<i>Name</i>	<i>Gaṇa, Kula and Śākhā</i>	<i>Date (approx.)</i>
1	2	3
A. MONKS		
Māharakhita	—	150 BC
Jayasena	—	25 BC
Puṣyamitra	Vāraṇa, Ārya-Hāḷkiya, Vajanagarī	AD 25
Sihamitra	—	75
Sena	Koḷiya, Brahmādāsika, Ucenāgarī	75
Sethiniha	—	50
Buddhaśrī	Odehikiya, Nāgabhūtikiya	50
Sandhika	—	75
Nāganandi	Koḷiya, Sthāniya, Vairī	75
Taraka	—	75
Puśila	Koḷiya, Bambhadāsīya, Ucenāgarī	75
Jeṣṭhasti	—	25
Mihila	—	50
Kṣeraka	—	75
Jayabhūti	Mehika <i>kula</i>	25
Baladina	Koḷiya, Ṭhāṇiya, Vairī	75
Māṭṛdina	—	100
Saṅghasiha	—	100
Ārya Ogha	Koḷiya, Brahmādāsīya, Ucenāgarī	25
Ārya Pāla	—	50
Ārya Datta	Koḷiya, Brahmādāsīya, Ucenāgarī	75
Ārya Sīha	—	100
Balatrata	—	75
Sadhi	—	100
Ārya Datta	Vāraṇa, Puṣyamitriya	75
Gahaparakika	—	100
Nāgadatta	—	100

1	2	3
Godāsa	Koḷiya, Sthāniya, Vairī	AD 100
Nandika	Vāraṇa Sthāniya, Vairī	100
Baladina	Koḷiya, Sthāniya, Vairī	100
Dati	Vāraṇa, Ārya-Hāḷakiya,	75
Mahānandin	—	100
Haginandi	Vāraṇa, Āryacetiya, Haritamālakaḍhi	75
Nāgasena	—	100
Dharmavṛddhi	—	120
Ohanadi	Vāraṇa, Petavāmika	100
Sena	—	125
Dhanavala	Koḷiya, Brahmadāsika, Ucenāgarī	125
Vṛddhahasti	Koḷiya, Vairī, Sthānikīya	125
Samadi	Vāraṇa, Ayyabhista, Samkasiyā	100
Hastahasti	Koḷiya, Sthāniya, Vairī	75
Maṅguhasti	—	100
Māghahasti	—	100
Deva	—	125
Ārya Kharanṇ:	Koḷiya, Sthānikīya, Vairī	140
Grahabala	—	140
Karkuhastha	—	125
Gamikagutta	—	140
Kumāraka	—	160
Satyasena	Koḷiya	160
Dharavṛddhi	—	160
Kumāranandin	Koḷiya, Ucenāgarī	140
Mitra	—	160
Nandin	—	170
Devadata	Odehikīya, Pāridhāsika, Petaputrika	170
Kṣema	—	170
Śivadiṇa	—	375 (?)
Datilācārya	Koḷiya, Vidyādhari	433
Nāganandin	—	sec. cent.
Gāḍhaka	Koḷiya, Brahmadāsīya, Ucenāgarī	AD 75



1	2	3
Uggahini	Koḷiya, Sthānikīya	sec. cent.
Ghoṣaka	—	sec. cent.
Goṣṭha	Odehikīya, Nāgabhūtikīya	AD 75
B. NUNS		
Dharmaghoṣā	—	25 BC
Sathisihā	Vāraṇa, Ārya-Hāḷakīya, Vajanagarī	AD 75
Khuḍā	Koḷiya, Brahmādāsika, Ucenāgarī	75
Jayā	Odehikīya, Nāgabhūtikīya	75
Devā	Koḷiya, Brahmādāsika, Ucenāgarī	75
Saṅgamikā	Mehika	75
Vasulā	—	100
Kumāramitrā	Koḷiya, Sthāniya, Vairī	100
Dhānaśrī	Koḷiya, Brahmādāsika, Ucenāgarī	120
Jinadāsī	Vāraṇa, Ayyabhista Saṃkasiyā	125
Akakā	Vāraṇa, Ārya-Hāḷakīya, Vajanagarī	120
Nandā	—	120
Āryā Jīvā	—	150
Āryā Sāmā	Koḷiya, Brahmādāsika, Ucenāgarī	75

We have been able to identify at least one monk mentioned in the Jaina inscriptions of Mathurā. It is possible that a few other monks and nuns mentioned in the inscriptions appear also in the literary texts. In this connection we should remember that Jaina literary texts also refer to the glorious state of Jainism in Mathurā. We have already discussed the evidence of the *Paumacariyam* of Vimalasūri. According to the *Āvaśyakaniryukti*<sup>177</sup> (c. AD 350), the Jaina monks had no trouble collecting alms in this city. The eighth-century Śvetāmbara commentator Saṅghadāsagaṇi, at least twice in his works, refers to the great influence the Jainas exercised in Mathurā. As we have already noted, he refers to the great *devanirmita stūpa* of

Mathurā, and also describes the *stūpamaha*<sup>178</sup> festival of this place in his *Vyavahārabhāṣya*. It was in Mathurā that a council to collect and edit the Jaina canon under the presidentship of Skandila<sup>179</sup> was held 827 years after the death of Mahāvīra. This corresponds roughly to the first half of the fourth century AD. The fourteenth-century Jaina savant Jinaprabha in his monumental work the *Vividhatīrthakalpa*, gives us a vivid idea about the glorious condition of the Jaina religion in Mathurā. According to his testimony, the sixth-century Jaina saint Jinabhadragaṇi lived and wrote his commentaries in Mathurā. I have already referred to the fact that this great saint had saved the manuscript of the *Mahānīśīthasūtra* from destruction at the *devanirmita stūpa* of Mathurā. I will later examine the evidence of the Digambara literary texts regarding the condition of Jainism in Mathurā. Quite a number of Śvetāmbara and Digambara Jaina saints lived and worked in Mathurā. Let us remember that even in the days of Hariṣeṇa (AD 931), the author of the *Bṛhatkathākośa*,<sup>180</sup> the city of Mathurā was known as a great centre of Jainism. The most popular *gaṇa* of Mathurā, namely Koliya, survived, as Bühler observes, even up to the fourteenth century AD.<sup>181</sup> Even in the days of Jinaprabha (fourteenth century) Mathurā was known as a great Jaina *tīrtha*.

#### REFERENCES

1. Para 156.
2. Para 26.
3. *Rām.*, VII.60 ff.
4. *Mbh.*, XII.339.89–90.
5. 14.48 ff.
6. XVII.1.9.
7. V.38.12.
8. See *Mbh.*, XII.339.89–90.
9. II.57; III.256.
10. II.256.
11. See Malalasekera, *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*, vol. II, pp. 438–99.
12. Loc. cit.
13. *Aṅguttara*, I.67 ff.
14. A very early reference to Vṛndāvana will be found in Bhāsa's *Bālacaritam*, Act III.
15. See Prākṛta Text Society edn., II.118.103.
16. See my *Ancient Indian Literary and Cultural Tradition*, pp. 177 ff.

17. 89.2 ff.
18. 89.42.
19. 89.43 ff.
20. *Mahābhāṣya* on Pāṇini, V.3.99.
21. See 89.20 ff.
22. 89.20.
23. See ch. 89.
24. 154, 157.
25. p. 204. (Kota, 1935).
26. p. 1987 (Sailana edn.).
27. Lüders, *List of Brāhmī Inscriptions*, nos. 904–5.
28. Tr. L.D. Barnett, pp. 86 ff.
29. p. 248.
30. The earliest reference to *devagr̥ha* will be found in the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, and to *devakula* in the *Sāṅkhāyana Gr̥hyasūtra*; see M. Monier-Williams, *SED*, pp. 492–3.
31. *EI*, II, p. 195.
32. *Ibid.*, XIV (1); see also Lüders, *op. cit.*, no. 93.
33. *EI*, I, p. 396, no. 33; Lüders, no. 94.
34. *EI*, I, p. 396.
35. VI.9.61.
36. See D.C. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, pp. 3 ff., 6 ff.; see also S. Sen, *Old Persian Inscriptions*, pp. 2–6.
37. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 11 ff.; Sen, *op. cit.*, pp. 148 ff.
38. *EI*, XXIV, pp. 202 ff.; see also his *List*, p. 169.
39. See the summary of my paper entitled 'Was there a pre-Gupta Vikramāditya?' in *Summaries of Papers*, 27th All-India Oriental Conference, pp. 199–200.
40. See *EI*, II, no. 9, p. xiv; see also Lüders, no. 96.
41. *JRAS*, 1905, pp. 635–55.
42. *EI*, II, no. 2, p. 199; see also Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 120–1 and Lüders, no. 59.
43. See Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 114 ff.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 122; see also *EI*, no. 24, p. 194.
45. *EI*, II, no. 2, p. 199.
46. See *Actes du sixième Congrès International des Orientalistes à Leide*, pt. III, pp. 142 ff.
47. *IA*, 33, no. 30, pp. 152 ff.; see also his *List*, no. 102.
48. *Mahāvagga* (Horner), p. 380.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 379.
50. *EI*, II, no. 5, p. 200; Lüders, no. 100.
51. *EI*, II, p. 207, no. 30; Lüders, no. 105.
52. *Anguttara*, tr., E.M. Hare, III, p. 171.
53. *Loc. cit.*
54. *IA*, 33, no. 28, p. 151.

55. Loc. cit.
56. *Bühler, EI*, II, no. 4, p. 199; Lüders, no. 99.
57. *EI*, I, no. 17, p. 390; Lüders, no. 108.
58. *IA*, 33, pp. 153 ff.
59. *EI*, II, no. 32, p. 207; Lüders, no. 107.
60. *EI*, II, no. 8, p. 200; Lüders, no. 103.
61. *EI*, II, no. 6, p. 200; Lüders, no. 101.
62. See Smith, *Muttra Antiquities*, pp. 25 ff.; see also Bühler in *EI*, II, pp. 314 ff.
63. p. 67.
64. p. 803.
65. See my *The Cult of Skanda-Kārtikeya*, pp. 103 ff.
66. *EI*, II, pp. 314 ff.
67. See Cunningham, *Reports*, 20, p. 36, pl. IV.
68. *EI*, II, no. 11, p. 201; Lüders, no. 16.
69. *JRAS*, 1911, p. 1085.
70. See *EI*, I, pp. 373 ff.
71. See Lüders, nos. 17–20.
72. *EI*, II, no. 12, p. 201; Lüders, no. 17.
73. *EI*, I, no. 1, pp. 381ff.; Lüders, no. 18.
74. See *EI*, I, pp. 378 ff.
75. Lüders, nos. 19–20.
76. Cunningham, *ASI Report*, III, p. 31; see Lüders, no. 20.
77. *EI*, I, no. 19, p. 391; Lüders, no. 21.
78. See Bühler, *Vienna Oriental Journal*, I, no. 2, pp. 1734. Lüders, no. 22.
79. *EI*, X, no. 3, pp. 109 ff.; Lüders no. 22a.
80. *JRAS*, 1912, pp. 157 ff.
81. *EI*, X, no. 4, pp. 110 ff.; see Lüders, no. 23a.
82. See *NWP and Oudh Provincial Museum Minutes*, V, p. 6. App. 6A; see *EI*, X, p. 111.
83. See *JRAS*, 1912, pp. 153 ff.
84. See *EI*, X, pp. 110 ff.
85. Loc. cit.
86. See no. 23a.
87. *EI*, I, no. 2, p. 382; Lüders, no. 24.
88. *EI*, I, no. 12, p. 388; Lüders, no. 70.
89. *EI*, I, p. 382.
90. See no. 24.
91. In the *Mycchakaṭika* the *śreṣṭhin* is evidently an important person, in the Pāli canon too he holds a very high position.
92. *EI*, II, no. 13, p. 202; Lüders, no. 25.
93. *EI*, II, no. 14, p. 202; Lüders, no. 26.
94. *EI*, I, no. 3, pp. 382 ff., Lüders, no. 27.
95. *EI*, I, no. 20, p. 391; Lüders, no. 31.
96. Lüders, nos. 28–9.

97. *EI*, no. 4, pp. 383 ff.
98. Lüders, no. 123.
99. *EI*, I, no. 29, p. 395; Lüders, no. 30.
100. *EI*, I, no. 20, p. 391; Lüders, no. 31.
101. *EI*, I, no. 5, p. 384; Lüders, no. 32.
102. Lüders, no. 119.
103. Lüders, no. 33.
104. *JRAS*, 1905, p. 358.
105. Lüders, p. 164 (no. 33).
106. *JRAS*, 1910, p. 1314.
107. See Raychaudhuri, *PHAI*, p. 476.
108. *EI*, I, no. 6, p. 385; Lüders, no. 34.
109. See Raychaudhuri, op. cit. pp. 476 ff.
110. *EI*, II, no. 26, p. 206; Lüders, no. 35.
111. *JUPHS*, vol. 10, pt. 1, pp. 1 ff., no. 2.
112. *EI*, II, no. 15, pp. 202 ff.; Lüders, no. 36.
113. *EI*, II, no. 6, p. 203; Lüders, no. 37.
114. *EI*, I, no. 7, p. 385; Lüders, no. 39.
115. See *IA*, 33, no. 10, pp. 40 ff.; Lüders, no. 41.
116. See *Samyutta*, I, p. 87.
117. *IA*, 33, pp. 40 ff.
118. *EI*, I, no. 11, pp. 387 ff.; Lüders, no. 48.
119. *IA*, 33, pp. 103 ff.; See, *EI*, IX, pp. 244 ff.
120. *EI*, I, no. 9, p. 387; Lüders, no. 42.
121. *EI*, I, no. 10, p. 387; Lüders, no. 44.
122. Lüders, no. 81.
123. *EI*, X, no. 5, p. 112; Lüders, no. 45a.
124. *IA*, 33, no. 14, p. 103; Lüders, no. 46.
125. *EI*, II, no. 20, p. 204; Lüders, no. 47.
126. *EI*, II, p. 204.
127. *EI*, IV, pp. 244 ff.
128. See *Dictionary of Prakrit Proper Names*, pt. II, p. 589.
129. See *Vividhatīrthakalpa*, p. 19.
130. Lüders, nos. 49–51.
131. See *IA*, 6, no. 11, p. 219; Lüders, no. 51.
132. *EI*, 2, no. 18, pp. 203 ff.; Lüders, no. 53.
133. See J.C. Jain, *Prākṛta Sāhitya kā Itihāsa*, p. 207.
134. *EI*, I, no. 21, p. 391; Lüders no. 54.
135. p. 1948.
136. p. 1912.
137. *EI*, I, no. 8, p. 386; Lüders, no. 56.
138. Lüders, nos. 57–8.
139. See Bühler, *Vienna Oriental Journal*, I, pp. 172 f.; correction by Lüders, *IA*, 33, no. 19, pp. 105 ff.; see his *List*, p. 166 (correction under no. 57).
140. *EI*, X, no. 9, pp. 115 ff.; Lüders, no. 59a.

141. *IA*, 33, no. 13, p. 102; Lüders, no. 63.
142. *EI*, I, no. 18, p. 390; Lüders no. 85.
143. See *EI*, I, p. 381.
144. Loc. cit.
145. II.109.29 (Gītā Press edn.)
146. v. 1311.
147. Pāṇini cannot be later than the fifth cent. bc.
148. *EI*, I, no. 24, p. 392; see Lüders, no. 66.
149. *EI*, II, no. 21, pp. 204 ff.; Lüders, no. 67.
150. *IA*, 3337, no. 21, p. 107; Lüders, no. 68.
151. *Proc. JASB*, N.S., V, pp. 276 ff.; Lüders, no. 69a.
152. *EI*, XIX, no. 4, p. 67.
153. *EI*, I, no. 12, p. 388; Lüders, no. 70.
154. Lüders, nos. 71–2.
155. *EI*, II, no. 22, p. 205; Lüders, no. 73.
156. *EI*, II, no. 23, p. 205; Lüders, no. 74.
157. *Vienna Oriental Journal*, I, no. 8, pp. 177 ff. See also *IA*, 33, no. 23, p. 108; Lüders, no. 76.
158. *EI*, II, no. 24, p. 205; Lüders, no. 77.
159. See *Vienna Oriental Journal*, vol. 10, pp. 171 ff.; see also *IA*, 37, pp. 33 ff.; Lüders, no. 78.
160. *JUPHS*, 1950, 10, p. 38.
161. *JASB*, 39, pt. I, no. 16, p. 129; Lüders, no. 79.
162. *EI*, II, no. 25, p. 206; Lüders, no. 80.
163. *EI*, I, no. 14, p. 389; Lüders, no. 121.
164. *EI*, II, no. 37, pp. 209 ff.; Lüders, no. 122.
165. *EI*, II, no. 29, p. 207; Lüders, no. 110.
166. *EI*, II, p. 207.
167. See his *List*, no. 110.
168. *EI*, I, no. 23, p. 392; Lüders, no. 113.
169. *EI*, II, no. 34, p. 208; Lüders, no. 119.
170. *EI*, X, no. 16, p. 120; Lüders, no. 107d.
171. See *JRAS*, 1912, pp. 106 ff.
172. See *JUPHS*, 1950, 23, pp. 36–71.
173. See McCrindle's *Ancient India as Described by Ptolemy*, ed., S.N. Majumdar, p. 124.
174. *EI*, II, no. XIV (39).
175. p. 1766.
176. p. 62, Jacobi's translation.
177. See *Prākṛta Sāhitya kā Itihāsa*, p. 207.
178. See *ibid.*, p. 219.
179. See *Nandīcūṛṇī*, p. 8; see also Haribhadra's com. on *Nandī*, pp. 17 ff.
180. See 2.1.
181. We will later see that this *gana* survived up to the end of the eighteenth century.

## CHAPTER VI

### Jainism in Orissa

Mahāvīra, originally a native of northern Bihar visited, as we have noticed in a previous chapter, a few areas of western Bengal during his missionary career. According to the *Kalpasūtra*,<sup>1</sup> the Master had spent a year of his missionary career in Paṇiyabhūmi, which was actually included in Lāḍha or West Bengal. The *Ācārāṅga*,<sup>2</sup> which is certainly a very ancient text, informs us that Mahāvīra had visited areas of both western and southern Bengal. It is, therefore, likely that Mahāvīra visited places which were not far from the borders of Orissa. A somewhat late text, the *Āvaśyakaniryukti*,<sup>3</sup> records that Mahāvīra more than once visited Tosali, a well-known city of Orissa. The same text informs us the king of that area bound Mahāvīra with rope seven times. This particular text was however probably composed after AD 300, and its evidence is thus of little value. It is however likely that within a few years of Mahāvīra's demise some of his followers, probably from southern Bengal, carried the message of the Nirgrantha religion to Orissa and succeeded in converting some people there. In both the canonical texts of the Jainas<sup>4</sup> and Buddhists<sup>5</sup> we come across a certain king Karaṇḍu (also called Karakaṇḍa, Karakaṇḍaka) of Dantapura<sup>6</sup> (which was situated in the Kaliṅga country) who was a very pious man. According to both the Buddhists and Jainas this king later became a Pacceka Buddha. The Jainas<sup>7</sup> too have nothing but deference for this ancient royal sage of Orissa. Since he is mentioned in both the Buddhist and Jaina texts he was probably a historical figure. According to the Jaina commentaries,<sup>8</sup> Karaṇḍu was a son of king Dadhivāhana of Campā. This Dadhivāhana, according to the same commentaries,<sup>9</sup> was a contemporary of Śātānīka, the father of the celebrated Udayana. It, therefore, follows that king Karaṇḍu-Karakaṇḍu was contemporaneous to the Buddha and Mahāvīra, and was universally admired for his pious nature. It is very significant that this particular king of Orissa, who lived in the sixth century BC, is called a Pacceka Buddha (Ardha-Māgadhī: *Patteyabuddha*) in the texts of both Buddhists and Jainas.

It is probable that Khāravēla was inspired by the deeds of this great monarch of Orissa and sought to follow in his footsteps.

We have already observed that Jainism was probably introduced in Orissa by some zealous monks of Bengal during the closing years of the fifth century BC. According to the Jaina commentaries,<sup>10</sup> king Kākavarṇa of Pāṭaliputra was arrested in the Isitalāga lake of Tosālī by the king of that area. The son of Kākavarṇa, however, avenged his father's humiliation by occupying Tosālī and releasing him. It is therefore a historical fact that hostility between Kaliṅga and Magadha started from about 400 BC,<sup>11</sup> the date of Kākavarṇa, who is also known as Kālāśoka. During the days of the Nandas, if we are to believe the evidence of the famous inscription of Khāravēla, there was no love lost between Magadha and Kaliṅga. It is quite likely that Kaliṅga was under the Nandas and early Mauryan rulers for a quite long time and probably during the closing years of Bindusāra, the son of Candragupta Maurya, Orissa declared independence, and Aśoka eight years after his accession, successfully crushed the rebellion in Kaliṅga and once more annexed the kingdom. The testimony of Aśoka's thirteenth Rock Edict shows that only after a fierce and bloody battle, which cost thousands of lives that Kaliṅga submitted. There is however little doubt that soon after Aśoka's death, Orissa declared its independence.

The Meghavāhana dynasty, to which the great Khāravēla belonged, according to the first line of the Hāthigumphā inscription, was a branch of the great Cedi family. In this connection we should remember that, according to the *Mahābhārata*,<sup>12</sup> the five sons of the great Cedi monarch Uparicara Vasu became kings of five different countries. The name of one of the sons was Maṇivāhana which may be an error for 'Meghavāhana'. We have already noticed that one Dadhivāhana, was the father of Karakaṇḍu, the celebrated king of Orissa, who reigned in the sixth century BC. That kings belonging to the Cedi family reigned in the eastern parts of India is also proved by a *śloka* of the *Mahābhārata*,<sup>13</sup> according to which Pauṇḍra Vāsudeva, the well-known rival of Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa and the king of Vaṅga, Puṇḍra and Kirāta belonged to that celebrated family. It is, therefore, not at all surprising to find a branch of that great family ruling in another kingdom of eastern India.

The Hāthigumphā Inscription<sup>14</sup> opens with an adoration to the Arhats and *siddhas*, as in any Jaina canonical text. According to this inscription Khāravēla was the third king of the Mahāmeghavāhana



dynasty (*tatiye kaliṅgarājavase*). Unfortunately, we do not know the names of the first two kings of this dynasty. We are first told that up to his fifteenth year Khāravela played a variety of games, apparently under the loving care of his parents. Later, for nine years as a *yuvarāja* he received extensive training in the following branches of learning: *lekha*, *rūpa*, *gaṇanā*, *vyavahāra*, and *vidhi*. He became *mahārāja* at the age of 24. In the first year of his reign Khāravela was engaged in repairing the buildings and defensive walls of his capital, which had been damaged by a storm (*vātavihīta*) and made arrangements for the erection of the embankments of a *śītala tadāga* (lake) which was probably the principal source of water-supply to the city of Kaliṅganagara. He also restored all the gardens of the city and incurred a total expenditure of 35,00,000 (apparently *kārṣāpaṇa*) for the entertainment of his subjects. In the second year of his reign, without paying heed to Śātakarṇi (*acitayatā sātakamnim*), he sent a huge army in the western direction consisting of *haya*, *gaja*, *nara*, and *ratha* (apparently a *caturāṅga* army) which reached the bank of the river Kaṅhaveṅṇā (i.e. Kṛṣṇā) and plundered the city of Asikanagara, which was apparently situated on the river Kṛṣṇā. The Śātakarṇi of this inscription has been satisfactorily identified with Śātakarṇi I of the Śātavāhana dynasty. There is, however, no reason to believe that there was an all out war between the two monarchs. It is probable that Asikanagara was not included in the empire of Śātakarṇi I but was a town belonging to one of his vassal kingdoms. The relevant words also suggest that Khāravela did not himself lead his army in its march towards the western direction. We are also not in a position to know whether he was able to annex any new territory to his empire. In the third year the king engaged himself in cultural activities. We are told that he gladdened his subjects by holding popular festivals (*samājas* and *utsavas*). It should be noted here that Khāravela, although a Jaina, was shrewd enough to understand the real feeling of his subjects and did nothing to dampen their enthusiasm regarding festivals. It is apparent from the relevant words of the inscription (in the fifth line) that the king himself was a great lover of music and was probably acquainted with the literature on *Kāmasāstra* which specifically speaks of the Arts mentioned in the fifth line of the inscription. It should be noted here that unlike Aśoka, he had no affected attitude towards *samājas*.<sup>15</sup> Jainism, like the religion of the Buddha, did not approve of holding *samājas*,<sup>16</sup> but this ruler never sought to forcibly impose his faith on his people.

In the fourth year, once more, Khāravela was engaged in martial activities; but the real significance of the first few words of the fifth line is not clear, as majority of those words are virtually indecipherable, but it is apparent from the concluding words of this line that Khāravela forced the Raṭhikas and Bhojakas to pay him some form of tribute.<sup>17</sup> The Raṭhikas and Bhojas are respectively mentioned in fifth and thirteenth Rock Edicts of Aśoka. According to the *Mahābhārata*,<sup>18</sup> Bhojakaṭa was the capital of Vidarbha. This city derived its name from the Bhoja tribe who are even mentioned in the Vedic texts.<sup>19</sup> The kingdom of Bhojakaṭa is mentioned in a Vākāṭaka inscription<sup>20</sup> of AD 500. The inscription of Khāravela does not suggest that the Bhojakas and Raṭhikas submitted to him after any particular military engagement. It is more likely that Khāravela's military stature was sufficient to extract from such tribes some sort of allegiance. The early Śātavāhana inscriptions<sup>21</sup> suggest that the Raṭhikas had friendly relations of some kind with the Andhra monarchs. In connection with the achievements of Khāravela's fourth year we encounter the expression *viḷādharādhivāsam*, and Sircar believes<sup>22</sup> that Viḷādharā or Vidyādharā may be the name of a local ruler. Anyone who is familiar with the early Jaina literature knows however, that the term *vidyādharā* is generally used to mean *rākṣasas* or non-Aryans. In the *Paumacariyam* of Vimala, a work of AD 100, the *rākṣasas* of Laṅkā are constantly referred to as *vidyādharas*.<sup>23</sup> It is therefore, more probable that Khāravela in his fourth year conducted out some successful raids against a few non-Aryan tribes living in the hilly regions of Orissa. In the fifth year, once more, the king was engaged in constructive activities. We are told that he brought into the capital the canal (*paṇāḍi*) excavated 300 years earlier by a Nanda king. The reading Namdarāja is absolutely clear and there is little doubt that the Kaliṅga country was under the Nandas in 400 bc. This is also suggested by the Purāṇic evidence according to which Mahāpadma Nanda became a *samrāj* after his conquest of the entire subcontinent. We have already observed that attempts were made by the Magadhan rulers to conquer Orissa even before the rule of the Nandas. This passage of this inscription further testifies that this Cedi king of Orissa was not only a great conqueror but also a magnanimous and able monarch who did everything for the uplift of economic conditions in his empire. We have already noticed that in the first year of his reign he made arrangements for an adequate supply of drinking water to his capital. In the sixth year too he did

not undertake any fresh military expedition, but we are told that he performed the Rājasūya<sup>24</sup> sacrifice and spent a lot of money on this particular occasion. D.C. Sircar<sup>25</sup> believes that as a Jaina, Khāravēla could not have performed this sacrifice and therefore he suggests a slightly different reading for that word. We should not however forget that the demarcation line between the Hindu and Jaina religions was rather thin in those days and, as suggested by a passage of the *Bhagavatī*,<sup>26</sup> even Mahāvira did not hesitate to accept non-vegetarian food. The king Khāravēla, as we will see elsewhere, is described as having repaired *deva* temples. There is thus not at all surprising to find an able military conqueror like him performing the Rājasūya sacrifice.<sup>27</sup> It is not possible to say anything regarding his achievements in the seventh year in view of a quite a number of missing or damaged words, but from those that remain it appears that he did not undertake any military expedition that year. In the eighth year however the Orissan monarch resolved to carry out some ambitious military expeditions into the heart of northern and eastern India. Here too a few words are missing but, fortunately for us, a number of proper nouns are preserved. They are Goradhagiri (probably the Barabar hills), Rājagaha, Mathurā, and Yavana (king). It has rightly been conjectured that with a large army (*mahatā senā*) Khāravēla himself first attacked Magadha and plundered Rajgir and the Barabar hills. Subsequently, emboldened by his success, he proceeded towards Mathurā which was under an Indo-Greek ruler at that time and succeeded in defeating him. The name of this particular Indo-Greek king has been read as 'Dimita' by Jayaswal, but he cannot be the king Demetrios who ruled in the first half of the second century BC, at least one hundred years before Khāravēla. The passage of this inscription, however, strongly suggests that in mid-first century BC, Mathurā was under a later Indo-Greek ruler. The Jaina commentaries,<sup>28</sup> tell us about a certain Yavana king of Mathurā who assassinated the Jaina monk Daṇḍa in Jaunāvamka park in the city. It is tempting to suggest that Khāravēla wanted to punish this particular Greek king of Mathurā for his persecution of the Jaina monks. In any case, the expedition of the eighth year was a complete success and evidently enhanced the prestige of this valiant Orissan monarch. We are further told that after this expedition he satisfied the Brāhmaṇas by showering lavish presents on them. In the ninth year this victorious monarch celebrated his military success by building a *pāsāda* (palace) called Mahāvijaya which

involved an expenditure of 38,00,000 *kārsāpanas*. The significance of the expression *mahāvijayapāsāda* has been missed by scholars who have written on this inscription. The word *mahāvijaya* is used in the *Ācārāṅga*<sup>29</sup> and *Kalpasūtra*<sup>30</sup> in connection with Mahāvīra's descent to earth, signifying divine abode in those texts.<sup>31</sup> We are told that Mahāvīra descended to earth from the Mahāvijaya mansion of heaven. I have little doubt that Khāravēla, who was a Jaina, was acquainted with the story regarding Mahāvīra's birth as related in the *Ācārāṅga* and *Kalpasūtra*. The expression *mahāvijaya* occurs twice in Khāravēla's inscription, the first time, as we have noticed, as the name of the palace built by him at a great cost, and the second time in the concluding line of this inscription as an epithet of this king, which has been translated as 'great conqueror' by Jayaswal and Banerji,<sup>32</sup> but which Sircar takes as Khāravēla's *virūda*.<sup>33</sup> It was considered a sacred word by the early Jainas since it was connected with the story of Mahāvīra's birth.

In the tenth year the king undertook some military expeditions towards the north and it in this connection that the word 'Bharadvāsa' (i.e., Bhāratavarṣa) is used. But because a few other words here are damaged and indecipherable they do not give us a proper idea about his actual military achievements that year. In the eleventh year the king was also in a warlike mood. The proper name Pithumḍa is used in this connection which according to Barua<sup>34</sup> stands for the famous *tirtha* of Pṛthūdaka near Kurukṣetra and which, according to Rājaśekhara, was the northernmost boundary of Madhyadeśa. But Jayaswal and Banerji<sup>35</sup> believe it to be the Pihunda of Ptolemy. We are further told in connection with Khāravēla's military exploits of the eleventh year that he clashed with the Tamil states but the reading even in this case is not perfectly clear. In the twelfth year the monarch was engaged in wars against a few north and east Indian kings. The two words *uttarāpadharājāno* are testimony that the rulers of north India came into open conflict with Khāravēla. We are also told that king Bahasatimita was obliged to acknowledge Khāravēla's military superiority. Formerly, scholars used to identify Bahasatimita with Puṣyamitra Śuṅga; but there is little doubt that the king should be identified with the monarch of the same name mentioned in the Pabhosa cave inscription of the time of Udāka.<sup>36</sup> King Khāravēla too, we are told, set up in his capital the Jina of Kālīṅga (Kālīṅga-jina) which was taken away from Kālīṅga by king Nanda. The importance of this line of the inscription can hardly

be overemphasized. It not only shows that the worship of Jaina images was precised in the fourth century BC, but also demonstrates the weakness of the Nanda kings for this religion. In the last chapter I discussed a particular verse of the *Paumacariyam* which indirectly testifies to the popularity of the Jaina religion during Nanda rule. We are not in a position to know the exact name of the Nanda king who carried away the Jina of Kaliṅga, but it is just possible that the celebrated Mahāpadma Nanda himself was the culprit. After defeating the contemporary Magadhan king, who was in all probability. Bahasatimita, our king Khāravēla returned in triumph to his capital along with the Kaliṅga-jina. It has been conjectured by Jayaswal and Banerji<sup>37</sup> that this particular Jina was Śīṭalanātha, but in the absence of any evidence we cannot accept this. We are further told that Khāravēla brought treasures from the Paṁḍarāja (i.e., the Pandyan king). Some other constructive activities were also undertaken that year.

It appears that thereafter Khāravēla did not undertake any further military expeditions, directing his energy to religious affairs and as a lay devotee (*uvāsaga*) he sought to serve the Jaina monks. The concluding portion of the inscription provides magnificent tribute to this wonderful royal personality who, we are told, was not only a devoted Jaina, but also the worshipper of other religious sects (*sava-pāsāṁdapūjaka*) and one who also did his utmost to rebuild dilapidated *deva* temples. The writer of this inscription knows that as a Cedi king, Khāravēla is a descendant of the great Uparicara Vasu,<sup>38</sup> who in the inscription is called *rājasi* (*rājarsi*). In the *Mahābhārata*<sup>39</sup> too Uparicara Vasu is called a *rājarsi*. There is reason to believe that the writer of the Hāthigumphā inscription was acquainted with the story of Uparicara Vasu as related in the *Mahābhārata* and the character of Khāravēla, described here, is strikingly similar to that of Uparicara. We should also note that elsewhere in the *Mahābhārata*<sup>40</sup> Uparicara is called a Vaiṣṇava and a devoted worshipper of Nārāyaṇa, and it is significant that in this inscription<sup>41</sup> Khāravēla is given the epithet 'Cakadhara' (i.e., Cakradhara), a typical Vaiṣṇava expression. The Jainas, from the earliest times, had great deference for Kṛṣṇa and Nārāyaṇa; one of their Tīrthaṅkaras, Ariṣṭanēmi, is represented as a kinsman of Vāsudeva. It is significant that Khāravēla openly encouraged the holding of *utsavas* and *samājas*: in the *Mahābhārata*<sup>42</sup> Vasu Uparicara is described as the king who founded the *utsava* of the god Indra.

Probably the *utsava* referred to in the Hāthigumphā inscription was the well-known Indrotsava first started by Khāravela's celebrated predecessor.

The inscription of Khāravela is the first complete historical record of the achievements of a king of ancient India. We do not get much of an idea about Aśoka's real career (beyond his missionary activities) from his inscriptions. Other pre-Christian inscriptions are either too brief or too concerned with some particular religious purpose. This inscription however gives us a very lucid and accurate account of this exceedingly interesting monarch. The most significant thing about him is that in spite of being a Jaina and apparently a believer in the doctrine of *ahimsā*, he was a very successful military conqueror. There is however no reference to the killing of any opponent. Most of his adversaries were only forced to submit (cf. the words *pādaṃ vandāpayati*). We may recall here Aśoka's killing of thousands of soldiers of Kaliṅga on the battlefield; the war between Magadha and Kaliṅga was resumed in Khāravela's time, but this time the other side was victorious. Though apparently the *bhikṣurājā* Khāravela did not indulge in any senseless killing. He could have paid Magadha back in her own coin, but as a *dharma*rājā and a worthy descendant of Rājarṣi Vasu, he treated his opponents with tolerance and justice.

It is a matter of great regret that so far we have not been able to trace any reference to this celebrated Jaina king in any literary text of the Jainas. Not all the Jaina manuscripts have however been preserved in the Bhāṇḍāras that have been published. With the discovery of more texts, probably some new light will be thrown on this problem. Another reason why Khāravela was later forgotten is that Jainism steadily lost popularity in Orissa in the post-Christian period.

A few other inscriptions in the Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri caves disclose the names of a few Jaina devotees.<sup>43</sup> No. 1346 of Lüders' *List* belonging to the Mañcapurīgumphā records the establishment of a cave (*leṇa*) in honour of Arahanta by Khāravela's chief queen (*agamahisī*) who was a daughter of Rājan Lālaka, the great grandson (*popota*)<sup>44</sup> of Hathisiha. There is little doubt that Lālaka, though the father-in-law of Khāravela, was a subordinate ally of his son-in-law. It is not clear why instead of mentioning either the father or grandfather of Lālaka, the inscription refers only to his great-grandfather. It is probable that Hastisiṃha, who probably flourished in

the mid-second century BC was a petty chieftain of Orissa. He has not been given any royal title in this inscription, but it goes far to prove that Khāravela's chief queen, like her husband, was a devoted worshipper of the Tirthamkaras. The reference to the Jaina monks also testify to the developed stage of the Jaina church in Kāliṅga. Another inscription discloses<sup>45</sup> the name of either a predecessor or successor of Khāravela, Vakadeva, and like the former he is called the king of Kāliṅga and is represented as belonging to the Meghavāhana family. The inscription shows that he too was a Jaina.

A few other inscriptions (Lüders' *List*, nos. 1348–53) disclose the existence of a few Jaina devotees. No. 1348 yields the name of a prince called Vadhuka who too was a Jaina votary. Nos. 1349 and 1350 probably represent the gifts of common people, but no. 1351, according to Lüders is the gift to the town judge. Nos. 1352 and 1353 are also probably the gifts of important persons. Another inscription<sup>46</sup> records the donation of a servant (*pādamūlika*) called Kusuma.

These inscriptions abundantly demonstrate the immense popularity of Jainism in Orissa. The Mathurā inscriptions do not disclose the names of any royal devotee of this religion, but in Orissa the kings themselves probably inspired their subjects to befriend Nirgrantha monks. It is also interesting to note that although the Mahāmeghavāhana kings of Orissa claim descent from the celebrated Cedi family, they bear names that are typically non-Sanskritic.<sup>47</sup>

We have already observed that the message of the Nirgrantha religion was probably carried to Orissa by the Jaina monks of southern Bengal. These monks probably belonged either to Tāmraliptikā or Koṭivarṣiyā *śākhās* mentioned in the *Therāvāli*, but the popularity of Jainism in Kāliṅga during the days of the Nandas shows that even before the birth of the *śākhās* and *gaṇas* the Jaina religion won some converts in Orissa, and during the rule of the Mahāmeghavāhana kings, Jainism became the principal religion of Orissa.

Some later sculptures of Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri caves and few inscriptions<sup>48</sup> of the tenth or eleventh century are proof that even long after the time of Khāravela the Kumārīparvata (i.e., Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri hills) remained a favourite place of pilgrimage for the Jaina monks. In a later chapter I shall discuss the sculptures of the caves of Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri hills.

## REFERENCES

1. p. 264.
2. p. 85.
3. vv. 501 ff.
4. See *Uttarādhyayana* (*SBE*, 45), pp. 85 ff.
5. See *Kumbhakāra Jātaka*.
6. Loc. cit.
7. See *Uttarādhyayana*, pp. 85 ff.
8. *Āvacū*, II, pp. 204–7; *Uttaracū*, p. 178.
9. *Āvacū*, I, p. 318; *Āva*, no. 521.
10. *Bṛhalkalpabhāṣya*, vv. 3149–50.
11. See *PHAI*, pp. 221 ff.
12. I.63.29 ff.
13. II.14.18.
14. See *EI*, XX, pp. 71 ff.
15. See 1st Rock Edict, l. 4.
16. See my *Ancient Indian Literary and Cultural Tradition*, p. 166.
17. For these two tribes see *EI*, XX, p. 84.
18. II.31.11.12.
19. See *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, VIII.12; 14; 17.
20. See *Sel. Ins.*, p. 445.
21. *Ibid.*, pp. 191, 193.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 215, n. 4.
23. See my 'Vimalasūri's *Paumacariyam*', in *JAIH* 6, pp. 105 ff.
24. See *EI*, XX, p. 84.
25. See *Sel. Ins.*, p. 215, n. 8.
26. See p. 2468.
27. The reading *rājasūya* in the original inscription is perfectly clear.
28. *Āvacū*, II, p. 155.
29. p. 174 (Sailana).
30. p. 4.
31. See *Pāiasaddamahāṇṇavo*, PTS, p. 680.
32. *EI*, XX, p. 89.
33. *Sel. Ins.*, p. 221, n. 2.
34. See *IHQ*, pp. 261 ff.; see also *Sel. Ins.*, p. 217, n. 1.
35. See XX, 20, pp. 72 ff.
36. *Sel. Ins.*, p. 96.
37. *EI*, XX, p. 85.
38. The spelling here is *Vasū*.
39. I.63.32, 38.
40. XII, ch. 335 ff.
41. See l. 17.
42. I.63.17 ff.
43. See Lüders' *List*, nos. 1342–53.
44. See for a different interpretation, *ASIAR*, 1922–3, pp. 129–30.
45. No. 1347 of Lüders' *List*, p. 222.
46. No. 1344 of Lüders' *List*.
47. For etymological explanation of the name Khāravēla, see *Sel. Ins.*, p. 214n.
48. See *ASIAR*, 1922–3, p. 130.



## CHAPTER VII

### Jainism in North India (200 BC—AD 600)

It is difficult to give an accurate account of the state of the Jaina religion in different parts of north India after the Mauryan period. Epigraphic references are few and far between, and we have to depend primarily on the evidence supplied by literary texts, both Jaina and non-Jaina. Archaeology also helps us a great deal and the discoveries of early Jaina images gives us some idea about the popularity of this religion in particular localities.

We have already seen that long before the Kuṣāṇa period, Jainism became popular in Mathurā and Orissa. I have also indicated the route taken by the Jaina monks of earlier days. As I have already said, the Jaina monks of Bengal were largely responsible for the early popularity of Jainism in Orissa. Beyond a few references to *kulas* and *śākhās* however we know practically nothing regarding Jainism in Bengal after the demise of Mahāvira. We will have to refer later to the Chinese evidence regarding the popularity of Jainism in Bengal. But regarding a few other ancient places of north India we are slightly more fortunate. Archaeological and epigraphic sources give us some idea about the state of Jainism in places like Kauśāmbī, Śrāvastī, Rājagṛha, Ahicchatra, Takṣaśilā, Simhapura, and a few places in western India. Thanks to the iconoclastic zeal of the Muslim invaders, very few among the pre-Gupta or even post-Gupta Hindu temples have survived, and the early Jaina temples have fared no better. The Jaina literary evidences suggest the existence of Jaina temples in almost all the principal cities of north India, but these have simply vanished in the thin air leaving no trace. A recently discovered bowl from Rajasthan (Bharatpur district) contains the word *nogata* in early Brāhmī which may stand for *nigatha* (Jaina).<sup>1</sup>

Kauśāmbī like Sāketa was one of the early centres of Jainism. I have already referred, on the basis of the evidence supplied by the *Paumacariyam* to the temple of Suvratasvāmin at Sāketa. That Sāketa was connected with Muni Suvrata is also testified to by the evidence

of the *Vividhatīrthakalpa*<sup>2</sup> of Jinaprabha. I also opine that the temple of Suvrata at Sāketa was, in all probability, built before 300 BC. It is quite natural that the Jainas should be eager to build shrines in famous cities connected with Brahmanical culture and religion, I have already said that Jainism itself originated by 800 BC at Vārāṇasī, one of the greatest cities of ancient India, and during the time of Mahāvīra, became popular at Vaiśālī, Rājagṛha, Śrāvastī, Kauśāmbī, and a few other towns.

An inscription<sup>3</sup> assignable on the palaeographic grounds to the first century BC, found at Pabhosa near Kauśāmbī, is indicative that the Jaina monks living at that famous town enjoyed royal patronage. The two short inscriptions found at Pabhosa refer to the cave (*leṇa*) excavated by Āṣādhasena, the king of Adhicchatra (Ahicchatra), who was the maternal uncle of Bahasatimitra or Bṛhaspatimitra. This Āṣādhasena<sup>4</sup> seems to be a local ruler of the north Pañcāla region and is generally dated to in the first century BC. According to Führer,<sup>5</sup> the inscriptions refer to the Kāśyāpiya monks, which may mean monks belonging to the school of Vardhamāna Mahāvīra, who was a Kāśyapa Kṣatriya. But D.C. Sircar<sup>6</sup> rejects this reading and opines that the inscriptions refer to the monks of Ahicchatra. That Pabhosa cave was sacred to the Jainas from the pre-Christian times is testified to by the discovery of Jaina images and carvings from there,<sup>7</sup> where three standing Jaina images, cut in rocks are also to be found.<sup>8</sup> The Pabhosa cave was visited by Yuan Chwang in the seventh century AD.<sup>9</sup> There is little doubt that a number of Jaina monks lived in this cave in the pre-Christian period and naturally most of them were residents of Kauśāmbī, which is only two miles from there, and has yielded a number of Jaina antiquities of the Kuṣāṇa period.<sup>10</sup> Kauśāmbī, is still looked upon as a holy place by the devout Jainas. It was the birthplace of Padmaprabha, the sixth Tīrthamkara. Major R.D. Basu in 1908 discovered an inscription<sup>11</sup> of the year 12 of king Śivamitra which mentions three monks, Baladāsa, Śivamitra, and Śivapālita. R.D. Banerji believes that this inscription is dated in the Kaṇiṣka era of AD 78, and therefore its date corresponds to AD 90. As late as 1834, a small Digambara temple was built at Kauśāmbī.<sup>12</sup>

We have already seen that Lord Mahāvīra himself was probably responsible for the introduction of the new Nirgrantha religion at Kauśāmbī during the rule of the celebrated king Udayana, probably in early fifth century BC. The reference to the Kauśāmbikā *śākhā*,

which originated in the first half of the third century BC in the *Therāvālī* also directly testifies to the early popularity of Jainism in that region.

Like Kauśāmbī, the great city of Śrāvastī was associated with Jainism from very early times. It was believed to be the birthplace of the third Tīrthamkara, Sambhavanātha.<sup>13</sup> This city was very intimately associated with the life and activities of both Mahāvīra and the Buddha. It was in this town that the first Niṅhava Jamālī declared himself a Jina and the city was also a great centre of the Ājīvika religion. The *Bhagavati*<sup>14</sup> gives us the information that it was at this town that Gośāla declared himself a *kevalin*. The death of that famous Ājīvika philosopher took place at this town sixteen years before the demise of Mahāvīra. Lord Buddha spent the major part of his ascetic-life here at the Jetavana *vihāra* which was built by prince Jeta for the Buddhist community at a very high cost. Śrāvastī was the capital of Pasenadi (Prasenajit) of Kosala, a prominent figure in the Pāli texts. The Jainas, however, almost completely ignore this royal personality.

The *Therāvālī* refers to the Śrāvastikā *śākhā* which originated in the third century BC, and this particular Śvetāmbara branch was obviously associated with the city of Śrāvastī. We have already seen that this city was looked upon as the birthplace of Sambhava. It is interesting to note that one of the mounds of the ruined city is still known as the mound of Sobhnath, which is a vernacular corruption of the original Sambhavanātha. A detailed description of the ruined temple has been provided by Vogel in his Report.<sup>15</sup> The description leaves little scope to doubt that the original temple of Sambhavanātha was built a few centuries before the birth of Christ. We must remember that Śrāvastī was in utter ruins when Fa-hien visited this city in about AD 400. The original temple of Sambhavanātha was probably still there when the Chinese pilgrims came to India. The ruined temple has yielded a substantial number of Jaina images including those of Ṛṣabhanātha and Mahāvīra.<sup>16</sup> The icons belong to the Śvetāmbara sect and have stylish affiliation with those found from Mathurā.<sup>17</sup> The temple of Sambhava at Śrāvastī was rebuilt several times and finally it was destroyed during the reign of Ala-ud-din as we learn from Jinaprabha.<sup>18</sup> That Śrāvastī afterwards became a famous centre of the Digambara religion is evident from the *Bṛhatkathākośa*<sup>19</sup> of Hariṣeṇa, a text composed in AD 931.

Adicchatra or Ahicchatra, the ancient capital of North Pañcāla,

was certainly an important seat of early Jainism. The site, represented by modern Ramnagar in Bareilly district, U.P., was excavated first by Führer, who unearthed a number of Jaina images and other antiquities. According to the Śvetāmbara Jaina tradition, Ahicchatra was sacred to Pārśvanātha and there was actually a shrine dedicated to this Tirthaṅkara in this town. Śīlāṅka, who flourished in the second half of the ninth century AD, in his *Ācārāṅgavṛtti*<sup>20</sup> distinctly refers to it. Jinaprabha in his *Vividhatīrthakalpa*<sup>21</sup> gives a graphic and colourful description of the shrine, dedicated to Pārśva. Śīlāṅka informs us that Pārśva was worshipped here as Dharaṇīnda but, according to Jinaprabha<sup>22</sup> the shrine of Dharaṇīnda was near the original shrine (*mūlaceiya*) of Pārśva. Epigraphic evidence at our disposal fully supports the Jaina tradition regarding the existence of a shrine, dedicated to Pārśva at Ahicchatra. A Kuṣāṇa inscription,<sup>23</sup> found engraved in the pedestal of an image of Neminātha bearing the date 50 (i.e., AD 128), refers to the shrine of 'divine Pārśvanātha'. Cunningham also discovered an inscribed pillar of the Gupta period which refers to Ācārya Indranandin and also to the temple of Pārśva. A number of Jaina inscriptions of the Kuṣāṇa period have also been discovered here and at least one of them refers to the city of Ahicchatra.<sup>24</sup> The Kuṣāṇa inscriptions in this city contain the following dates: 9, 18, 31, 44 and 74. Most of the Jaina and Buddhist sculptures from Ahicchatra belong to the Mathurā school of art. The names of *gaṇa*, *kula*, and *śākhā* are usually like those of Mathurā, the most common *gaṇa* being Koliya. The images discovered here are generally nude, and this led Führer to suppose that they belonged to the Digambara temple of Ahicchatra. It must however be remembered that even before the emergence of the Digambara sect, some of the Jinas were shown naked. Even on the pedestals of nude Jina figures we have the names of well-known Śvetāmbara *śākhās* and *kulas*<sup>25</sup> which testifies to their being fashioned before the formal separation of the Digambaras from the original Nirgrantha religion. Several nude Mathurā images of Jina refer to some well-known *śākhās* and *kulas* mentioned in the Śvetāmbara *Therāvalī*. For reasons, best known to him, Lüders doubts the discovery of Jaina images from Ahicchatra,<sup>26</sup> but Führer's faithful account of the discovery<sup>27</sup> leaves no room to doubt the authenticity of the 'Reports'. Also, from the list of drawings in the same report by draftsmen Ghulam Rasul Beg and Sohan Lal, we learn that among the discoveries made, were a four-faced lion pillar

from the Jaina temple, an *āyāgapāṭa*, a fragment of frieze, illustrating the transfer of embryo and some railing pillars.<sup>28</sup>

The Jaina Kuṣāṇa inscriptions from Ahicchatra disclose the names of the following lay devotees: Gahapalā, the wife of Ekraḍala, the daughter-in-law of Śivaśiri, and the daughter of Grahamitra; all these persons are mentioned in the inscription of year 9, corresponding to AD 87;<sup>29</sup> in the inscription of the year 12 we have Jinadāsī, Rudradeva, Dāttāgālā, Rudra, Grahamitra, Kumāraśirī, Vāmadāsī, Hastisenā, Grahaśirī, Rudradatā, Jayadāsī, and Mitraśirī, all of whom were carpenters by caste;<sup>30</sup> in the inscription of year 74 we have<sup>31</sup> Dharavalā and Āryadāsī. The names of the following Jaina monks also occur in the inscriptions discovered of Ahicchatra: Tarika<sup>32</sup> in the inscription of year 9, who belonged to the Koliya *gaṇa*, Sthāniya *kula*, and Vairā *śākhā*; Puśila<sup>33</sup> (Koliya, Bambhadāsiya and Ucenagarī) and another unnamed monk<sup>34</sup> belonging to the Vāraṇa *gaṇa* and Vajanagarī *śākhā*. The most definite proof of the existence of Jaina monks at Ahicchatra is supplied by a Lucknow Museum Jaina image inscription<sup>35</sup> that refers to a monk (whose name is indecipherable) belonging to Petivāmika *kula* and Vajanagarī *śākhā*, who is called a native of Ahicchatra (Adhicchatrakā). All these pieces of evidence go far in testifying to the popularity of Jainism at Ahicchatra in early times.

Another old city, Kāmpilya, was intimately connected with Jainism in pre-Gupta days. This town was correctly identified by Cunningham with Kampil in Farrukhabad district, U.P.<sup>36</sup> It was, according to the *Mahābhārata*,<sup>37</sup> the capital of southern Pañcāla. The city, as we learn from the canonical texts,<sup>38</sup> was visited by both Pārśva and Mahāvira. It was believed to be the birthplace of the thirteenth Tīrthaṅkara, Vimala, and is also mentioned in the *Bhagavatī*<sup>39</sup> and *Aupaṅgātika-sūtra*.<sup>40</sup> The fourth Niṅhava Āsamitta, who flourished 220 years after Mahāvira's death, i.e., third century BC, was associated with this town. The *Uttarādhyayana*,<sup>41</sup> a very old Jaina canonical text, refers to a certain king Sañjaya, who was a Jaina devotee. This place has yielded a few Jaina inscriptions.<sup>42</sup>

Sāṅkāśya, mentioned prominently in the *Rāmāyaṇa*,<sup>43</sup> as the capital of Kuśadhvaja Janaka, Sītā's paternal uncle, was one of the important towns of pre-Buddhist India. It was, according to that epic, situated on the bank of the river Ikṣumatī. It is identified by Cunningham<sup>44</sup> with Saṅkissa in Farrukhabad district of U.P. This town, it is interesting to note, is mentioned by Pāṇini,<sup>45</sup> and Patañjali

also refers to it.<sup>46</sup> This city was visited by both Fa-hien and Yuan Chwang. The *Therāvalī* refers to the Saṅkāśiyā *śākhā* under Cāraṇa *gaṇa*, i.e., Vāraṇa *gaṇa*, established in the third century BC. This is definite evidence of Saṅkāśya's early association with the Nirgrantha religion.

It appears that the religion of Pārśva and Mahāvīra succeeded in penetrating north-western and western India at a quite early date. I had occasion to refer to the visit of Mahāvīra in Sindhu-Sauvīra, as described in the *Bhagavatī*, in a previous chapter. We now have definite evidence to show that even in pre-Christian times, Jainism became quite popular with the people of western India. A recently discovered inscription<sup>47</sup> from Pala, Pune district, Maharashtra, discloses the existence of a cave which was excavated by a monk (*bhadanta*) called Indrarakṣita. This inscription has been assigned, on palaeographical grounds, to the second century BC. It begins with the typical Jaina expression *namo aramhātānam*. We further learn from it that Indrarakṣita also constructed a reservoir (*poḍhi*) of water. Let us not forget that, according to the Jainas, the twenty-second Tīrthaṅkara, Neminātha or Ariṣṭanemi was born in western India. The earliest source that gives a glimpse of his life is the *Nāyādhammakahāo*, which was not improbably composed by 300 BC. I have already said that with the exception of Pārśva, no other Tīrthaṅkara before Mahāvīra, can be called historical figures. But the idea of Tīrthaṅkara was, as with the idea of previous Buddhas, developed within a century of the demise of Vardhamāna.<sup>48</sup> In making Neminātha their twenty-second Tīrthaṅkara, the Jainas have very ingeniously used the contemporary Vaiṣṇava tradition current in western India, regarding the Yādavas and Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa.

It is extremely significant that the *Therāvalī* refers to a *śākhā* called Saurāṣṭriyā (Prākṛta Soraṭṭhiyā) which originated from Rṣigupta, a disciple of Suhastin, who flourished in the third century BC. This definitely proves that Saurāṣṭra had received its first dose of Jainism in the Mauryan period. The inscription from Pāla, referred to above, shows that Jainism became popular in other centres of western India before the second century BC. It is interesting to note that the inscription, in question, does not give us any idea regarding the *gaṇa*, *kula* or *śākhā* of Indrarakṣita, and in this his position is similar to that of the monk Māgharakṣita of the Mathurā inscription of c. 150 BC. But unlike the latter, the monk Indrarakṣita himself takes the initiative for construction of a cave, for which he apparently did

not receive any financial support from his lay disciples.

Another small inscription<sup>49</sup> from Girnar, Gujarat, bearing the date 58 refers to *Pañcānacandamūrti*. The date has been ascribed to the Vikrama era 58. I have not however been able to examine the palaeography of this inscription, and therefore no conclusion is desirable on the basis of it alone. However, since the *Nāyādhammakahāo* and other canonical texts associate Girnar (Ujjiṃta or Ujjamta) with Ariṣṭanemi, we need not be surprised to find a first century inscription on this hill. The *Kalpasūtra*<sup>50</sup> also associates Neminātha or Ariṣṭanemi with the hill, and these literary references also constitute evidence of the early association of Gujarat with Jainism.

No early Jaina inscription has so far been discovered from north-west India, but we have strong reasons to believe that there were quite a few Jaina pockets in that part of India. The ancient city of Kāpiśī, which was visited by Yuan Chwang in the first half of the seventh century AD, and which has been identified with Opian in Afghanistan by Cunningham,<sup>51</sup> had a sizeable Jaina population. It is clear therefore that Jainism penetrated this part of north-west India (the original Indian subcontinent which undoubtedly included the whole of Afghanistan) in the early centuries of the Christian era.

Another old city, Takṣaśilā, was associated with Jainism from early days. Sir John Marshall, who first carried out systematic excavations at Taxila, observes: 'Taxila must have been adorned by a vast number of Jaina edifices, some of which were no doubt, of considerable magnificence.'<sup>52</sup> According to Marshall, the shrines in blocks F and G in the excavated area of Sirkap were probably Jaina. The Jaina literary tradition<sup>53</sup> associates Takṣaśilā with Bāhubali, a son of Rṣabha, who was believed to be a Jaina *sādhu*. We further learn from the *Āvaśyakaniryuktī*<sup>54</sup> and the *Āvaśyakacūṃṭī*<sup>55</sup> that Bāhubali had installed a jewelled *dharmacakra* at Takṣaśilā. The association of Bāhubali with Takṣaśilā is also mentioned in the *Vividhatīrthakalpa*<sup>56</sup> of Jinaprabha. Since Takṣaśilā was one of the greatest cities of ancient India, it is very natural that the Jainas should endeavour to extend the sphere of their influence in that city.

Siṃhapura, was another Jaina centre from early times. This place has been identified by Stein<sup>57</sup> and Cunningham<sup>58</sup> with modern Ketas in the Salt Range (Punjab, Pakistan). It was visited by Yuan Chwang<sup>59</sup> who saw Śvetāmbara Jainas there. That Chinese pilgrim, however, gives a very distorted account of the religious practices of the Śvetāmbaras. Now, according to the canonical texts, Sihapura (i.e.,

Simhapura) was the birthplace of Śreyāmsa, the eleventh Tirthamkara. A few Jaina scholars identify Sīhapura of the Jaina canon with Simhapurī near Banāras. But it is more likely that Simhapura of Punjab is identical with the Sīhapura of the Jaina texts. Let us not forget that the Jainas deliberately selected cities of hoary antiquity as the birthplaces of those Tirthamkaras who never existed in reality. Simhapura was a town of great antiquity, for we find it mentioned in connection with Arjuna's *digvijaya* in the *Mahābhārata*<sup>60</sup> where it appears after the Trigartas, a well-known Punjab tribe. That Jainism reached Punjab by the third century BC, is also indirectly testified to by the fact that the *Therāvāli* refers to the Audambarikā *śākhā* which originated from Rohaṇa in the third century BC. This *śākhā* was evidently linked with the Audambaras, a well-known Punjab tribe. It is therefore, permissible to identify Simhapura of Yuan Chwang and the *Mahābhārata* with Sīhapura of the Jaina texts.

Stein was successful in discovering a great number of Jaina antiquities from Simhapura. He is of the opinion that the Jaina sculptures of Simhapura are better executed than those of Ellora and Ankaī. He further informs us that even at the time of his visit, this place was regarded as a sacred site by the Jainas.<sup>61</sup> The *Varāṅgacarita*,<sup>62</sup> a work of the seventh century AD, refers to Simhapura as sacred to Śreyāmsa.

Let us once more turn our attention to western India. We have already observed that by the third century BC, Jainism became more or less popular in Gujarat. A stone inscription<sup>63</sup> of the second century AD of one of the grandsons of Jayadāman, the Śaka satrap, is definitely a Jaina record for it contains the significant word *kevalajñāna*. This inscription was discovered at Junagarh and also refers to the town of Girinagara, i.e., Girnar, which according to the *Nāyādharmakahāo* and *Kalpasūtra* was associated with Neminātha. I have already noted that Girnar was regarded as a sacred hill by the Jainas from a much earlier period. It has been suggested<sup>64</sup> that the inscription actually refers to the Samādhimaraṇa of the Digambara Jaina saint Dharasena, the original author of the Digambara canon, who according to the tradition resided at Candragumphā of Girnar whence the inscription was discovered. This is however pure conjecture and can be dismissed outright. In any case, the inscription indicates that Jainism was introduced in this area in the early centuries of the Christian era, if not earlier.

The Jaina antiquities discovered from Dhank and Bawa Pyara



caves in Gujarat indicate that these places were under the influence of Jainism in the early centuries of the Christian era,<sup>65</sup> and the image of Rṣabha, Śānti, and Pārśva from Dhank are easily distinguishable. The typical Jaina symbols from Bawa Pyara caves (Junagarh) are generally assigned to the early centuries of the Christian era.<sup>66</sup>

Bhrgukaccha, one of the oldest ports of India, which is identified with modern Broach in Gujarat, was a popular Jaina centre in the early centuries of the Christian era. The *Āvaśyakaniryukti*,<sup>67</sup> which was probably composed around AD 200, refers to the defeat inflicted by a Śvetāmbara Jaina monk Jinadeva on two Buddhist monks Bhadanta Mitra and Kuṇāla at Bhrgukaccha. This is also repeated in the *Āvaśyakacūrṇī*.<sup>68</sup> It appears that this famous port was a favourite haunt of monks of different schools. At least two Jaina *vihāras* existed at Bhrgukaccha, Śakunikāvihāra and Mūlavasati, about which we will have something more to say later.

#### EMERGENCE OF THE DIGAMBARA SECT

Although the Digambaras claim a hoary antiquity for their religion, no Digambara record earlier than AD 300, has so far been discovered. The earliest Śvetāmbara work that refers to the formal separation of the Digambaras from the original *saṃgha* is the *Āvaśyakaniryukti*<sup>69</sup> (c. AD 200). According to this work a monk called Śivabhūti, who was a disciple of the Śvetāmbara preceptor Kaṇha, founded the Boḍiya (i.e., Digambara) sect at a place called Rahavīrapura 609 years after Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa*. The *Uttarādhyayananiiryukti* also refers to this schism. According to these texts Śivabhūti was the last *niṅhava*. It is interesting to note that in the original Śvetāmbara canon<sup>70</sup> only seven Niṅhavas are mentioned, the last one being Goṣṭhamāhila, who founded his doctrine called Avaddhiya at the town of Daśapura 584 years after Mahāvīra's death. The *Sthānāṅga* which refers to the seven rebels has no knowledge of the Digambaras and only in the Niryukti texts do we find references to them. I am not aware of any Digambara sacred work that could have been composed before the date suggested in the Niryukti texts regarding the formal separation of the two sects. The town of Rahavīrapura, where Śivabhūti lived, cannot be properly identified, although it has been suggested that it was near Mathurā.<sup>71</sup> The evidence of the Śvetāmbara canon therefore suggests that the Digambaras formally separated only in the second century AD. It appears that the Digambaras also indirectly support the tradition recorded in the Śvetāmbara com-

mentaries.<sup>72</sup> According to them the original canon was forgotten after Lohācārya, who according to them died 565 years after Mahāvīra. It is interesting to note that Vimala's *Paumacariyam* shows no acquaintance with the Digambaras; and this work was written according to its own testimony 530 years after Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa*.

However, the detailed and biased account regarding Śīvabhūti given in the Śvetāmbara *cūṃṃ* texts can be dismissed offhand.

Now, the name Śīvabhūti is not absent in early Digambara works. The *Bhāvapāhuda*,<sup>73</sup> ascribed to Kundakunda, a work probably written around AD 300, refers to the monk Śīvabhūti who is probably no other than the Śīvabhūti of the Śvetāmbara commentaries. He is also mentioned in Devasena's *Ārādhanāsāra*,<sup>74</sup> written in the tenth century AD.

There is a Digambara tradition according to which Āryan Maṅkhu was one of the original authors of the Digambara canon. He is placed 683 years after Mahāvīra's death. I have already said that Maṅguhasti is mentioned in the Mathurā inscription of the year 52 corresponding to AD 130, and that this Maṅguhasti is to be identified with Maṅgu of the *Nandīsūtra*. The Śvetāmbara commentaries,<sup>75</sup> it is very significant to note, paint an unfavourable picture of this saint. We are told that he was born as Yakkha after his death at Mathurā. The date given in the inscription, mentioned above, and the date given to Ārya Maṅkhu in the Digambara tradition, support one another. It is therefore, permissible to believe that the second-century Jaina saint Maṅgu was one of the founders of the Digambara sect. This also indirectly confirms the Śvetāmbara evidence regarding the actual time when the Digambara formally separated, which should therefore be placed around AD 150.

It should be remembered that Pārśva allowed an under and an upper garment, while Mahāvīra forbade clothing altogether. This information is provided by as early a text as the *Uttarādhyayana*,<sup>76</sup> which was in all probability composed in the fourth century BC. It appears that from early times the Jaina monks, according to their individual whims, indulged in both kinds of practices, namely wearing cloth or going about naked. These two modes of conduct were known as *jinakalpa* and *sthavirakalpa*, respectively. Mahāvīra himself, as we have already noticed, discarded clothing altogether 13 months after he became an ascetic, but Pārśvanātha, whom I consider to be the real founder of Jainism, never went about naked. The *Bṛhalkalpapbhāṣya*<sup>77</sup> further informs us that the doctrine of the

first and last Tīrtham̐karas was based on nudity (*ācelakka*), while that of the intervening 22 Tīrtham̐karas permitted both nudity and wearing garments. Most of Mahāvīra's close followers naturally went about naked; but it seems that Mahāvīra himself never insisted on the strict observance of nudity. The *Āvaśyakacūṛṇī*<sup>78</sup> refers to one Muncanda who practised *jinakalpa* and was considered a rebel by Mahāvīra. Regarding nudity, the *Ācārāṅga*<sup>79</sup> says that if a naked monk thought that he could bear the pricking of grass, cold and heat, stinging of flies and mosquitoes or any other painful things, he could leave his private parts uncovered; but when the number of articles in a monk's equipment increased and when the monks began living more and more among the people, then he could cover his private parts with *kaṭibandha*. Later the *kaṭibandha* was replaced by *colapaṭṭa*.<sup>80</sup>

The evidence of some Mathurā sculptures suggests that even the Śvetāmbaras sometimes represented their Tīrtham̐karas as nude, so we need not be unduly perturbed if we come across nude Jina figures of pre-Christian times. Indeed, one of the early celebrated Jaina teachers, Mahāgiri, according to the *Āvaśyakacūṛṇī*, was an exponent of *jinakalpa*, i.e., the doctrine of nudity. Suhastin, another great Śvetāmbara monk practised *sthavirakalpa*. The evidence of that work also suggests that *jinakalpa* continued up to Āryarakṣita.<sup>81</sup> It also appears that the Digambaras, who insisted on absolute nudity, continued the tradition of *jinakalpa* monks and probably a rebel group under Śivabhūti finally raised the standard of rebellion and formed a new sect in the mid-second century AD. I must however confess that the mystery surrounding the birth of the Digambara sect has yet to be solved. I will have something more to say on this point in connection with the discussion of the canonical literature of the Jainas. I have also no comment to offer on the suggestion that Rathavīrapura (Rahavīrapura) was near Mathurā.

#### JAINISM IN THE GUPTA PERIOD

All the available sources indicate that by the beginning of the fourth century AD, Jainism became an all-India religion. Generally, however, in north India the Śvetāmbaras were predominant and in the south the Digambaras. I shall, in this section, endeavour to give readers an idea of the condition of the Jaina religion in north India in the Gupta period, and in doing so will have to turn to available epigraphic and literary sources, for assistance.

Probably the earliest Jaina inscriptions of this period come from

the celebrated city of Vidiśā. We have two Jaina image inscriptions both of which are now preserved in the local museum at Vidiśā.<sup>82</sup> These are not only important for the history of Jainism but also in the political history of the Gupta period. Both these inscriptions refer to 'Mahārājādhirāja Rāmagupta'. As the title indicates, this Rāmagupta was a paramount sovereign and not merely a local ruler. Coins of Rāmagupta are already known.<sup>83</sup> In the official Gupta records the name of Rāmagupta is understandably absent. The play *Devicandragupta* of Viśākhadatta, which is preserved only in fragments, delineates Rāmagupta as the successor of Samudragupta, and a weak monarch who did not hesitate to offer his wife to the Śaka king of Ujjayinī. His younger brother Candragupta, by a clever stratagem, succeeded in killing the Śaka king.<sup>84</sup> Later, we are told, he also killed his brother and married his wife Dhruvadevī. The discovery of the Jaina inscriptions testify that Rāmagupta is not a product of the imagination but Samudragupta's actual successor. We have already referred to his coins, and now these inscriptions engraved on the pedestals of Puṣpadanta and Candraprabha show that he was responsible for the construction of those images of the Jaina Tīrthaṅkaras. This he did on the advice of Celuṣamaṇa, the son of Golakyāntā and pupil of Ācārya Sarppasena Kṣamaṇa, the grand-pupil of Candra Kṣamācārya-kṣamaṇa-śramaṇa, who was a *pāṇipātrika*, i. e., one who used the hollows of his palms as an alms and drinking bowl. The celebrated Śivārya, the author of the *Bhagavati-ārādhana*, as we will see later, calls himself *pāṇidalabhoi*, which probably indicates that like him Candra was a Digambara monk.<sup>85</sup> This inscription, therefore, indicates that Rāmagupta had some genuine respect for the Jainas. The characters of the inscriptions agree closely with that of the Allahabad *prasasti* and I am not aware of the existence of any other Mahārājādhirāja Rāmagupta of the fourth century AD.

Another inscription<sup>86</sup> found from Udaygiri near Vidiśā and dated in the year 106 of the Gupta era corresponding to AD 426 of the reign of Kumāragupta refers to the erection of an image of Pārśva by Śaṅkara, a disciple of Gośarman, who was a disciple of Bhadrācārya of Āryakula. The inscriptions of the time of Rāmagupta, Kumāragupta's uncle, as we have already seen testifies to the popularity of Jainism in the Vidiśā region. Śaṅkara, we further learn from the same inscription, was formerly a warrior but later accepted the Jaina religion. These inscriptions go far to prove that Vidiśā was a

stronghold of Jainism and received royal patronage.

Literary evidence also testifies to the popularity of Jainism in the western part of modern Madhya Pradesh. The *Vasudevahinḍī*,<sup>87</sup> a Jaina text based on the missing *Bṛhathkathā*, and probably composed in the fifth century AD, distinctly refers to the temple of Jīvantasvāmin Mahāvīra at Ujjayinī. The discovery of a substantial number of Jaina sculptures, belonging to the Gupta period, from different places of Madhya Pradesh also show that Jainism enjoyed some popularity there, and also provide indirect evidence of the existence of Jaina temples in the Gupta period in Madhya Pradesh. We have icons from Sira Pahari (near Nachna, Panna district), and also from Panna proper.<sup>88</sup> I will discuss these icons in greater detail in a separate chapter in vol. II. A temple of Jīvantasvāmin is also referred to in the Jaina commentaries.<sup>89</sup> In another Jaina text of the seventh century we have a reference to an image of Jīvantasvāmin at Vidiśā. Daśapura (modern Mandsor, M.P.) too was a stronghold of Jainism. This is testified to by the fact that Niṅhava Goṣṭhāmahila<sup>90</sup> established in this town an independent doctrine known as Abaddhiya 584 years after Mahāvīra's death, i.e., in the first century AD. Quite a number of Śvetāmbara monks of the early first century AD, we are told, were connected with Daśapura.<sup>91</sup> Tosaliputta, who is mentioned in the *Āvaśyakaniryukti*, we are told, stayed at a park called Uccughara at Daśapura, and was well-versed with the Diṭṭhivāya, the twelfth Aṅga text. Rakkhiya, his famous disciple, spent his entire life at Daśapura, and also converted his younger brother Phaggurakkhiya. Both Mahāgiri and Suhatthi visited Vidiśā in the early third century BC in order to pay homage to the image of Jīvantasvāmin there.<sup>92</sup> This shows that from early times various places in Madhya Pradesh were connected with Jainism. It appears that the Śvetāmbara monks belonging to Kauśāmbika *śākhā* were responsible for the propagation of Jainism in M.P. We will later see that in the post-Gupta period too, Jainism was quite popular in that state.

An inscription<sup>93</sup> from Mathurā dated to the Gupta year 113 corresponding to AD 433 of the reign of *Paramabhātāraka*, *Mahārājādhirāja* Kumāragupta refers to an apparently prominent Jaina monk called Datilācārya, who belonged to the Vidyādhari *śākhā* and Koliya *gaṇa*. A disciple of this monk, called Sāmādhyā, built an image (*pratimā*) under the command of this guru. The Vidyādhari *śākhā* referred to here is mentioned in the *Therāvalī* as Vijjāharī, which was apparently founded in the third century BC. This is the only

epigraphic reference to this *sākhā*, I am aware of.

Another inscription<sup>94</sup> from Mathurā and dated 299 of an unknown era refers to the erection of an image of Mahāvīra and a temple (*devakula*) by Okhā, Sarika, and Śivadinā. The inscription is in Sanskrit and bears a date in the Kaniṣka era, corresponding in to AD 377, in Bühler's view. But the peculiar Kuṣāṇa title *rājātirāja* given to the reigning king, whose name is missing, probably indicates that it should be referred to an earlier era.

We should take here brief notice of the two Jaina councils held in the fourth century AD at Mathurā and Valabhī. The council at Mathurā was held under the presidentship of Khaṇḍila (Skandila) 827 years (or according to some 840 years) after Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa*. The earliest work that refers to this council is the *Nandīcūṛṇī*<sup>95</sup> composed in the seventh century AD. Another council was held almost simultaneously at Valabhī under the presidentship of Nāgārjuna. According to commentators, the canon compiled in the council of Mathurā was somewhat different from that compiled at Valabhī. The earliest Jaina council, held at Pāṭaliputra in the last quarter of the fourth century BC, will be discussed later in this volume.

The next important Jaina inscription belongs to the reign of Skandagupta. This inscription<sup>96</sup> has been found from Kahaum in Gorakhpur district, U.P. It bears the year 141 of the Gupta era corresponding to AD 461 of the tranquil (*śānte*) reign of Skandagupta. From this inscription we learn that this place was formerly called Kakubha (l. 5). We are told of the setting up of five images (*pañcendra*) of Tīrthaṃkaras (probably Ādinātha, Śānti, Nemi, Pārśva and Mahāvīra) by a person called Madra, who traced his descent from one Somila, and who had equal respect for *dvija*, *guru*, and *yati*. This inscription appears to be a Digambara record, and there are traces of Jaina shrines near the pillar bearing it.<sup>97</sup>

A copperplate inscription<sup>98</sup> of the Gupta year 159 from Paharpur, Bangladesh is one of the most interesting Jaina records of the Gupta period. The inscription is incidentally the earliest Jaina record from Bengal. It records an endowment for the worship of Arhats to a *vihāra* in Vaṭagoāli<sup>99</sup> near Paharpur, presided over by the disciples descended from the Nirgrantha Ācārya Guhanandin of Kāśī. This Guhanandin is further described as belonging to Pañcastūpanikāya. The persons who were responsible for the endowment were a Brāhmaṇa named Nāthaśarman and his wife Rāmī. The language of the inscription indicates that this Brāhmaṇa pair were zealous

devotees of Guhanandin. It is apparent also from the same inscription that this Guhanandin lived at least a century before the date of this inscription. We learn that it was originally founded by *śiṣyas* and *praśiṣyas* of Guhanandin. Probably this *vihāra* was built some 50 years before the date of this copperplate. Guhanandin himself probably lived in the last quarter of the fourth century AD at Kāśī. In no Jaina inscription before this date do we come across a Brāhmaṇa Jaina devotee, although the canonical texts, as we have already noticed, mention quite a number of Brāhmaṇa converts. The Jaina *vihāra* referred to above, according to the inscription, was situated in the Nāgiraṭṭa *maṇḍala* of Puṇḍravardhana *bhukti*.

The expression *Pañcastūpanikāya* is to be found in the non-canonical literature of the Digambaras. The great Virasena, the famous author of the *Dhavalā*, and Jinasena, the author of the *Ādīpurāna*, belonged to the Pañcastūpanikāya sect. In Hariṣeṇa's *Bṛhatkathakośa*<sup>100</sup> we have an account of the founding of five *stūpas* (*pañcastūpa*) at Mathurā. It is probable that the Digambara monks belonging to the Pañcastūpa sect of Mathurā later sent a few of the members of their sect to different parts of India. It is also not unlikely that Vārāṇasī was the earliest seat of this particular sect. In any case, we have to regard the Pañcastūpanikāya sect as one of the earliest branches of the Digambara school. In south Indian inscriptions too we come across Pañcastūpanikāya monks. The Paharpur inscription is therefore, indicative of the early popularity of the Digambara religion in Bengal. We have already noted that Bengal accepted Jainism long before any other state of India, and it appears that in the Gupta period the Digambaras succeeded in extending their sphere of influence in Bengal at the expense of the Śvetāmbaras.

The inscription<sup>101</sup> of early Gupta character near Śon Bhāṇḍāra cave at the ancient town of Rājagṛha refers to a Jaina *muni* called Vairadeva who is given the epithet *ācāryaratna*. The lower half of a small naked Jina image can still be seen cut out of a rock close to the inscription. It has been suggested<sup>102</sup> that this Vairadeva is the same as Ārya Vajra of the *Āvaśyakaniryukti*.<sup>103</sup> Sten Konow suggested<sup>104</sup> that the cave referred to in the inscription was sculpted between the second and third centuries AD. The expressions *ācārya* and *muni* probably show that it is a Digambara record, and in that case, the suggested identification of Vairadeva with *vajra* cannot be accepted. Besides, the Digambara invariably preferred Sanskrit to Prākṛta in all their early records, and this is the case with both the Paharpur

and Rajgir inscriptions.

Another small mutilated inscription<sup>105</sup> on a Neminātha figure in early Gupta script has been found from Rajgir. The image is fixed on a small ruined Jaina temple at Vaibhāra hill and refers to Mahārājādhirāja Candra, who may be either Candragupta I or Candragupta II. This image of Neminātha in black basalt is one of the earliest Jina images of the Gupta period.

We have already referred to the Gupta inscription,<sup>106</sup> noticed by Cunningham in the ruins of Ahicchatra, which mentions Ācārya Indranandin. This place, as we have already seen, was sacred to the Jainas from a much earlier period.

The evidence<sup>107</sup> of the *Kuvalayamālā*, composed by Udyotanasūri in 700 Śaka (AD 778) shows that king Toramāṇa, who ruled at the town of Pavvaiyā situated on the bank of the Candrabhāgā (Chenab) in the Uttarāpatha, was a disciple of Harigupta Ācārya, born in the Gupta family. We are further told that the city could boast of a great number of scholars, apparently Jaina *sādhus*. This city cannot be properly identified, but it was certainly in Punjab. Harigupta, it is interesting to note, is described as a scion of the Gupta family. Toramāṇa is known from inscriptions<sup>108</sup> and coins, and definitely ruled around AD 500. His *guru* Harigupta should be placed, therefore in the second half of the fifth century AD. This Harigupta is further described as the *guru* of Mahākavi Devagupta who is apparently mentioned also in the *Mahāniśītha*.<sup>109</sup> It is interesting to note that quite a number of Śvetāmbara *ācāryas* had names with Gupta endings. The *Mahāniśītha*<sup>110</sup> refers to one Ravigupta, who should be placed in the fifth century. The *guru* of Agastyasimha, the author of the *Daśavaikālikacūṛṇī*, was Rṣigupta<sup>111</sup> who belonged to the Koliya *gaṇa* and Verasāmi *śākhā*, and who could not have lived later than AD 400.<sup>112</sup>

The evidence of the *Kuvalayamālā*, therefore, shows that a stern military conqueror like Toramāṇa had a soft corner for Jainism, and probably like Khāavela embraced the religion in old age. We have already seen that there were a few Jaina pockets in Punjab from early times. The capital of Toramāṇa, Pavvaiya, which was situated on the Candrabhāgā, was certainly a Jaina centre like Simhapura in the Gupta period. The inscription of Toramāṇa<sup>113</sup> from Kurā, Salt Range (Punjab, Pakistan) shows that Punjab was part of Toramāṇa's empire.

Jainism, as we have already noticed, was firmly established in



Gujarat even before the Christian era. In the Gupta period, Gujarat was undoubtedly the chief centre of Jainism in India. This is indirectly shown by the fact that the Śvetāmbara canon was finally edited at Valabhī 980 or 993 years after Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa*. Two commentaries<sup>114</sup> of the *Kalpasūtra* refer to the council at Valabhī, and the Digambara work the *Bṛhathkathākośa*<sup>115</sup> (AD 931) also allude to the Valabhī council. The council was held, according to the Jaina commentators,<sup>116</sup> during the rule of Dhruvasena of Ānandanagara, which has been identified with Vadanagara in northern Gujarat. We have already seen that an earlier council under Nāgārjuna was held at Valabhī in the fourth century AD, which coincided with the Mathurā council.

Now Dhruvasena of the Jaina commentators should be identified with the first king of that name who, according to the inscriptions,<sup>117</sup> ruled from at least the year 206 to 226 of the Gupta era. The Jaina commentators further inform us that the *Kalpasūtra* was recited in the court of this king, on the sad occasion of the demise of his son. The Jaina account is confirmed by inscriptions according to which the Maitraka-Valabhī ruler Dhruvasena I, like his elder brothers, was succeeded by his younger brother Dharapaṭṭa. This was evidently because Dhruvasena had no son to succeed him. The date given by the Jaina commentators show that this Dhruvasena (AD 526–46) should be placed either 980 or 993 years after Mahāvīra's death which also directly shows that Lord Mahāvīra died only in the second quarter of the fifth century BC, and not earlier as was supposed by many Jaina writers. I, would, however, like to discuss this in a separate Appendix.

There is, however, nothing to show that Dhruvasena himself was inclined towards Jainism. Inscriptions<sup>118</sup> show that he was a devout Vaiṣṇava and not a single king of this illustrious family is known to have befriended the Jainas. A few royal members of this family are known to have patronized the Buddhists,<sup>119</sup> the bitter rivals of the Śvetāmbara Jainas. But Jainism continued to prosper in Gujarat despite the absence of royal patronage. An old manuscript of the *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya*<sup>120</sup> of Jinabhadragaṇi discovered in the Jaisalmer *bhāṇḍāra* informs us that this work was composed at Valabhī in Śaka 531 (i.e., AD 609) during the reign of Śīlāditya. Now, the inscriptions of this king range between CE 286 and 290 (AD 606–10) and therefore, there is no doubt that the date given in the manuscript is quite genuine. It further shows that Valabhī at that time was a strong-

hold of Jainism and probably the hometown of this famous Jaina scholar. King Śīlāditya is mentioned by Yuan Chwang<sup>121</sup> as having ruled 60 years before his time. Now, the latest known date of Śīlāditya's father and predecessor Dharasena II is GE 270 (AD 590) which shows that Yuan Chwang's '60' should be corrected as '50'.

There are other pieces of evidence to show that Jainism was in a flourishing state during the rule of the Maitraka-Valabhī kings. The *Kuvalayamālā*<sup>122</sup> (Śaka 700 = AD 778) distinctly refers to the fact that the grand-disciple of Devagupta, Yajñadatta, who evidently flourished around AD 600, adorned the Gurjaradeśa with Jaina temples. The language of the colophon of this text directly shows the tremendous popularity Jainism enjoyed in both Gujarat and Rajasthan in the sixth and seventh centuries AD. A number of Śvetāmbara images<sup>123</sup> have recently been discovered from the ruins of Valabhī which have been assigned to the sixth century AD. It has also been suggested<sup>124</sup> that Jinabhadra Vācanācārya mentioned in a sixth-century image-inscription from Akota (Gujarat) is to be identified with Jinabhadragaṇi, the famous Jaina scholar, who was probably a native of Valabhī. The *Vividhatīrthakalpa*<sup>125</sup> refers to the fact that there was a shrine dedicated to Candraprabha at Valabhī before its destruction by the Muslims in vs 845 (AD 787).<sup>126</sup>

The Digambara text, the Jaina *Harivaṃśa*, which was completed in AD 783 at Vardhamāna (Vaḍavan, Gujarat) gives us the very interesting piece of information<sup>127</sup> that the work was commenced in the temple of Pārśva which was built by king Nanna. There is no doubt that this Nanna is identifiable with the king of the same name mentioned as *kaṭaccuri-kulaveśma-pradīpa* in the Mankani Inscription,<sup>128</sup> who definitely ruled in the last quarter of the sixth century AD in this part of Gujarat. The Kaṭaccuris and the Kalacuris were basically Śaivas, but the evidence of 'Digambara Jinasena' shows, that at least one of its earlier members, had a catholic outlook, so far as religion was concerned. It is probable that the temple of Pārśva built by Nanna was a Digambara shrine and in that case it should be looked upon as the earliest known Digambara temple in Gujarat. It should, however be remembered that, according to the Digambara tradition, the earliest canonical authors of this sect were connected with Girinagara.<sup>129</sup> It should also be pointed out that Digambara Divākara of Karṇāṭa country, according to the Śvetāmbaras,<sup>130</sup> was defeated and converted by Vṛddhavādī at Bhṛgukaccha.

Jinasena also refers to another Digambara temple dedicated to

Śāntinātha at Doṣṭaṭikā (near Gīrnar) where he completed his text in Śaka 705. This temple, too, was probably built a century or two before this date.

Rajasthan, as we have already noticed, was connected with Jainism from a much earlier period. However we have practically no Jaina inscription or any other evidence to prove the connection of this state with the Jaina religion in the Gupta period. However, the evidence of the *Kuvalayamālā*<sup>131</sup> shows that Bhinnamāla (Bhīnmāl) was looked upon as a Jaina place of pilgrimage in the sixth century AD. It refers to the five temples of Agāsavaṇā which were also in Rajasthan. The Jaina monks of Mathurā, who used to visit Gujarat in the early centuries of the Christian era, had to pass through Rajasthan. In the post-Gupta period, however, as we will see later, Rajasthan was very intimately connected with Jainism.

Discovery of Jaina images<sup>132</sup> of the Gupta period from a few pockets of U.P. and Bihar testify its popularity there. I shall discuss these sculptures in a separate chapter in vol. II of this work. However, I must refer to the beautiful Jaina metal images of the Gupta period discovered from Chausa,<sup>133</sup> Bhojpur district, Bihar, now preserved in the Patna Museum.<sup>134</sup>

A number of places in modern Maharashtra state were connected with Jainism from early times. Literary<sup>135</sup> and archaeological<sup>136</sup> evidences show that Tagara, mentioned in the *Periplus*<sup>137</sup> was a popular Jaina centre in the early centuries of the Christian era.<sup>138</sup> That ancient city is now represented by Ter. A few scholars identify Tagara with Terāpura, mentioned in the *Bṛhathkathākośa*,<sup>139</sup> and assert that even in pre-Christian times the place was connected with Jainism. The *Vyavahārabhāṣya*,<sup>140</sup> a text of the eighth century, informs us that the Vyavahāra Dharma was established at Tagara by eight monks.

Discovery of Jaina images from Ellora, Patur<sup>141</sup> of the Gupta period show that Jainism was slowly emerging as an important religious sect in Maharashtra during the Gupta period. Śūrāpāraka,<sup>142</sup> according to the Jaina literary tradition, was connected with Jainism. Monks like Vajrasena, Samudra, and Maṅgu visited Śūrāpāraka.

I should refer, in this connection, to the unique bronze Pārśvanātha,<sup>143</sup> assigned to the first century BC and now preserved in the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay. This image reminds us of the celebrated Maurya image of Lohanipur (Bihar)<sup>144</sup> which has been accepted as the earliest Indian Jina image. According to U.P. Shah, this image of Bombay Museum bears close affinity in style with a

terracotta figurine from Mohenjo-daro.<sup>145</sup> Where this image was found is not known; but it was certainly from some site in western India, where Jainism was introduced around 300 BC.

In a number of pre-Christian and post-Christian non-Jaina texts there are frequent references to the Jainas. Bhāsa,<sup>146</sup> Subandhu,<sup>147</sup> and Bāṇa<sup>148</sup> frequently refer to the Jainas. It appears from Subandhu's *Vāsavadattā*<sup>149</sup> that the Digambara Jainas were looked upon as the bitterest rivals of Hindu philosophers. This work was in existence in the early Gupta period and is mentioned by Bāṇa. The poet Bāṇa, had some regard for the Jainas as one Jaina Vīradeva was a childhood friend of this great writer.<sup>150</sup> We can therefore assign Vīradeva to the last quarter of the sixth century AD. In the *Kādambarī*<sup>151</sup> Bāṇa openly praises the Jainas for their magnanimity. References to the Jainas in the *Bhāgavata*,<sup>152</sup> *Brahmāṇḍa*,<sup>153</sup> etc. also provide indirect evidence of its popularity in the early Christian period.

Varāhamihira (early sixth century) refers to the mode of fashioning a Jina image in his *Bṛhatsamhitā*.<sup>154</sup> The later Pāli works of Sri Lanka also refer to the Jainas.

Quite a good number of Jaina writers flourished during this period. Pādalipta, the author of the missing *Taraṅgavatī*, a Prākṛta poem, probably composed in the Śātavāhana period,<sup>155</sup> was one of the earliest Jaina poets. I have already referred to Vimala, who also lived in the first century AD. The *Vasudevahiṇḍī*<sup>156</sup> is definitely a product of the Gupta period. Among Jaina philosophers of north India of this period I may mention Vṛddhavādī, Mallavādī, Jinabhadraṅgi, and will have something more to say about them in a separate chapter.

It should here be pointed out that, unlike Buddhism, the Jaina religion did not receive any large scale princely patronage in its early stages. The only exception was Khāravela, who also patronized Brahmanical Hinduism. The Buddhists, on the other hand, did all they could to befriend princes and potentates. Jainism however appealed directly to the masses and gradually became popular in almost every part of India by the beginning of the Christian period.

## REFERENCES

1. See *Indian Archaeology*, 1965-6, p. 67.
2. Ed., Muni Jinavijaya, p. 86.
3. *EI*, II, pp. 242 ff.; Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, pp. 95 ff.
4. See Raychaudhuri, *PHAI*, p. 393 ff.
5. *EI*, II, pp. 242 ff.
6. *Sel. Ins.*, p. 96, n. 6.
7. See *Allahabad Gazetteer*, ed., H.R. Neville, p. 263; see also *JRAS*, 1898, pp. 516 ff.
8. See Cunningham, *ASI*, 21, pp. 1-3.
9. See Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, I, pp. 371 ff.
10. *ASIAR*, 1913-14, pp. 262 ff.; also pls. LXX, a, d, e.
11. Loc. cit.
12. See Neville, *Allahabad Gazetteer*, p. 153.
13. From Kauśāmbī an icon of Padmaprabha from the early Gupta period has been recently unearthed. See *Indian Archaeology*, 1953-4, p. 9. This must assuredly testify the association of that Tirthankara with this ancient city.
14. Sailana edn., p. 2402.
15. *ASIAR*, 1907-8, pp. 113 ff.
16. See *JRAS*, 1908, p. 1102, pl. V.
17. See Vogel in *ASIAR*, 1907-8, pp. 115-16; and also Sir John Marshall in *JRAS*, 1908, pp. 1085-1120; see in this connection *Annual Progress Report of the Superintendent of Archaeological Survey (N. Circle) for the year ending 1908*, p. 34.
18. p. 70.
19. Ed., A.N. Upadhye, pp. 8, 348 ff.
20. p. 418 (Āgamodaya Samiti).
21. p. 14.
22. Loc. cit.
23. See Führer, *Prog. Rep. of the Epigraphical and Archaeological Branch N.W.P. and Oudh for 1891-2*, p. 3.
24. See R.D. Banerji, *EI*, X, p. 120; see also Lüders' *List*, 107d.
25. See *EI*, X, pp. 109 ff.
26. See *JRAS*, 1912, pp. 153 ff.
27. See 1891-2 report, pp. 3, 5 ff.
28. *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14; see also Smith in *JRAS*, 1903, pp. 7-11.
29. *EI*, X, p. 110.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 111.
31. *Ibid.*, pp. 115 ff.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 110.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 111.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 116.
35. See Lüders' *List*, no. 107d.

36. *AGI*, p. 413.
37. I, 137.73.
38. *Nāyā*, 157; *Upā*, 35.
39. p. 2348.
40. Sailana edn., pp. 278 ff.
41. *SBE*, 22, p. 80.
42. *Annual Report of the Superintendent of Hindu and Buddhist Monuments* (N. Circle), 1918–19, p. 4; see also *Jaina Siddhānta Bhāskara*, 5, pp. 84 ff.
43. I, 70.3.
44. *AGI*, pp. 424 ff.
45. IV, 2.80.
46. Com. on I.3.11.
47. See *Jaina Śilālekha Saṃgraha*, V, p. 3. Bhāratiya Jñānapīṭha edn.
48. Quite a number of the previous Buddhas are mentioned in the earlier part of the original Pāli canon; they were also known during the days of Aśoka.
49. See *ASI*, 16, p. 357.
50. p. 164.
51. *AGI*, pp. 21 ff.; see also S.N. Majumdar's note in p. 671 of the same work.
52. *ASIAR*, 1914–15, p. 2.
53. See Sukthankar's note in *ASIAR*, 1914–15, pp. 39 ff.
54. v. 322.
55. I, p. 180.
56. p. 27.
57. See *Vienna Oriental Journal*, 1890, IV, pp. 80 ff., 260 f.
58. *AGI*, pp. 142 ff. for criticism of Waters, see *YC*, I, pp. 249 ff.
59. *YC*, I, pp. 248 ff.
60. II, 27.20.
61. *Vienna Oriental Journal*, pp. 80 ff.
62. Ed., A.N. Upadhye, 27, 82.
63. *El*, 16, p. 241; Lüders' *List*, no. 966.
64. See J.P. Jain, *The Jaina Sources of the History of Ancient India*, pp. 112–13.
65. See H.D. Sankalia, *Archaeology of Gujarat*, pp. 53, 166 ff.; also *JRAS*, 1938, pp. 427 ff.; and pls. III and IV; see also *NIA*, 1939, p. 563.
66. Sankalia, op. cit., pp. 166 ff.
67. v. 1299.
68. II, p. 201.
69. v. 782.
70. *Sthānāṅga*, 587.
71. See Muni Kalyāṇavijaya, *Śramaṇa Bhagawān Mahāvira* (Hindi), pp. 292 ff.

72. See *Bṛhatkathākośa*, 131, 69; see also Devasena, *Darśanasāra*.
73. v. 53.
74. v. 49.
75. See *Niś. Cū.*, II, pp. 125-6; *Āva Cū.*, II, p. 80; also *Niś., Bhā.*, 3200.
76. Sailana edn., 23.13.
77. Ed., Puṇyavijaya, VI, 6369 (p. 1681).
78. I, pp. 285-6, 291.
79. See *SBE*, 22, pp. 69-73.
80. See *Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya*, III, v. 6964.
81. pp. 406 ff.
82. See *JOI*, XVIII, 1969, pp. 247-51; also *EI*, 38, pp. 46-9.
83. See *PHAI*, p. 553; also *The Classical Age*, pp. 17 ff.
84. See also *Harṣacarita* (Chowkhambha edn.), pp. 354-5.
85. See *Jaina Art and Architecture*, ed., A. Ghosh, I, pp. 127 ff.
86. See *IA*, XI, p. 310; Kielhorn, *List*, no. 441.
87. A. Ghosh, op. cit., pp. 129 ff; see also *Anekānta* (in Hindi), 15, pp. 222-3.
88. Pt. I, p. 61.
89. See *Āva. Cū.*, II, pp. 156-7.
90. *Sthā.*, 587.
91. See *Prakṛit Proper Names*, pt. I, pp. 361-2.
92. *Ibid.*, II, p. 660.
93. See *EI*, II, no. XIV (39).
94. Lüders' *List*, 78; also *JRAS*, 1896, pp. 578 ff.
95. p. 8.
96. *CII*, III, p. 67; *Sel. Ins.*, pp. 316 ff.; Bhandarkar, *List*, no. 1278.
97. See in this connection *IHQ*, 28, pp. 298-300.
98. *EI*, 20, pp. 61ff.; *Sel. Ins.*, pp. 359ff.; Bhandarkar, *List*, no. 2037.
99. See N.R. Premi, *Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihāsa* (in Hindi), pp. 127 ff.
100. 12.132 ff.
101. See Guérinot, *List*, no. 87; and also *ASIAR*, 1905-6, p. 98, fn. 1. See in this connection T. Block, *ASIAR* (Bengal circle), 1902, p. 16.
102. *JBORS*, 39, 1953, pp. 410-12.
103. v. 769.
104. *ASIAR*, 1905-6, p. 166.
105. *Ibid.*, 1925-26, pp. 125 ff.
106. *ASI*, I, pp. 263 ff.
107. See colophon of that text edited by A.N. Upadhye.
108. See *Sel. Ins.*, pp. 420 ff.; see also *EI*, I, pp. 239 ff.
109. See J.C. Jain, *Prākṛta Sāhitya kā Itihāsa*, p. 147.
110. Loc. cit.
111. Colophon, v. 2.
112. See Puṇyavijaya's Introd., *Bṛhatkalpasūtra*, 6.
113. *Sel. Ins.*, pp. 422 ff.

114. Vinayavijaya, *Kalpasūtravṛtti*, p. 206; also the *vṛtti* on the same text by Dharmasāgara, pp. 129–30.
115. 131.69.
116. See Vinayavijaya, op. cit., pp. 1, 9, 201 and Dharmasāgara, op. cit., 9, 130.
117. See Bhandarkar, *List*, nos. 1293, 1308.
118. *Ibid.*, no. 1293.
119. Lady Duddā, who was Dhruvasena I's sister's daughter was the foundress of a Buddhist convent at Valabhī (see Kielhorn, *List of Inscriptions of Northern India*, no. 460). She is mentioned in a large number of Valabhī inscriptions.
120. See *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 3, pp. 130 ff.; see also *Purātana Jaina Vākya-sūcī*, Introd., p. 145.
121. Watters, op. cit., II, p. 242.
122. Colophon, v. 7–10.
123. See *Bulletin of the Prince of Wales Museum*, no. 1, p. 36; see also U.P. Shah, *Studies in Jaina Art*, pl. XII, and *Jaina Art and Architecture*, I, p. 135.
124. See *Lalit Kalā*, nos. 1–2, p. 59; see also *Jaina Art and Architecture*, I, p. 138.
125. p. 29.
126. This is probably the exact date of the destruction of Valabhī by the Muslims. The last known date of Śilāditya VII, in whose reign the city was destroyed, is the Gupta year 447 (see Bhandarkar, *List*, no. 1375), corresponding to AD 767. He probably reigned for a few years longer and was eventually overthrown by the Muslims. See also *Al-Biruni's India*, I, p. 192. The story told by Al-Biruni is similar to that by Jinaprabha. For some other views, see *The Classical Age*, pp. 150 ff.
127. 66.53.
128. *Imp. Ins. Bar.*, st. I, pp. 4 ff.; see also *The Classical Age*, p. 197.
129. See *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, IV, p. 28; see also Introd. to *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, I, by H.L. Jain.
130. *Vividhatīrthakalpa*, p. 88.
131. Colophon, v. 6.
132. See *Jaina Art and Architecture*, I, pp. 131 ff; see also p. 121.
133. *Ibid.*, pp. 124 ff.
134. See *Patna Museum Catalogue of Antiquities*, ed., P.L. Gupta, pp. 116–17.
135. See *Prakrit Proper Names*, pt. I, p. 332.
136. *ASIAR*, 1902–3, pp. 188, 195, 199, 204.
137. Edited Schoff, para 51.
138. See, in this connection, *ASWI*, 3, p. 11, and *ABORI*, 16, p. 7.
139. Story no. 56. Terāpura, here, is however described as situated in the Ābhira country, see v. 52.



140. p. 3. 350.
141. *Prog. Rep. of ASI* (W. India), 1901-2, p. 3; 1902-3, pp. 4-5.
142. See *Prakrit Proper Names*, pt. 2, pp. 863-73.
143. *Jaina Art and Architecture*, I, pp. 87 ff.
144. *Ibid.*, p. 71.
145. See *Bulletin of the Prince of Wales Museum*, 3, pp. 63-5.
146. See *Avimārakam*, Act 5.
147. See *Vāsavadattā*, L.H. Gray, ed., pp. 157, 174 et seq.
148. *Kādambarī* (Chowkhambha, edn.), p. 160.
149. pp. 157, 174 et seq.
150. See *Harṣacarita* (Chowkhambha, edn.), p. 75.
151. p. 160.
152. V, chs. 4 f.
153. Delhi, 1973, p. 87; see also *Bhaviṣya*, I.43.36.
154. 57.45.
155. See J.C. Jain, *op. cit.*, p. 377.
156. *Ibid.*, p. 381.

## CHAPTER VIII

### Jainism in South India (The Early Phase)

Before discussing the state of Jainism in different parts of South India we must, at the very outset, refer to an interesting passage<sup>1</sup> in the Buddhist *Mahāvamśa*, according to which the king Pāṇḍukābhaya constructed houses and temples for the Nigaṇṭha ascetics at Anurādhapura. We are told that this king built, at first, a house for Nigaṇṭha Jotiya, which was to the east of the cemetery. In that house there lived another Jaina ascetic whose name is given as Giri. We are further told that the same king built a temple for another Nigaṇṭha *sādhu* called Kumbhaṇḍa. From the same chapter<sup>2</sup> of the *Mahāvamśa* we learn that Pāṇḍukābhaya also built dwellings for the Ājīvikas and other sects.

Now, Pāṇḍukābhaya is generally placed in the fourth century BC by competent authorities including Geiger,<sup>3</sup> and the evidence of this Pāli text testifies to the presence of Jaina ascetics in Sri Lanka as early as the fourth century BC. The *Mahāvamśa* is a work of the fifth century AD,<sup>4</sup> and its evidence cannot be easily brushed aside. We should also note that in the *Dīpavamśa*, which was composed a century earlier,<sup>5</sup> and which Buddhaghōṣa frequently quotes in his commentary on the *Kathāvatthu*, there is a reference to the same Nigaṇṭha Giri.<sup>6</sup> Thus the combined evidence of these two Pāli texts testifies to the presence of the Jainas in Sri Lanka in the pre-Mauryan times. It is natural, therefore, to suppose that these Jainas migrated to Sri Lanka from Tamil-speaking areas of south India. Once we accept this, we have to take it for granted that Jainism was more or less firmly established in the southernmost corners of the peninsula by the fourth century BC.

In a previous chapter I endeavoured to show that Jainism spread to Orissa within a few years of Mahāvīra's death. It appears that wandering Nirgrantha monks carried the message of Mahāvīra to southern India, especially to the lands adjoining Bay of Bengal within a few decades of the demise of Lord Mahāvīra. Let us not forget

that an ordinary Nirgrantha monk, who seldom cared for personal comfort, and who practically wandered about penniless, was not expected to be daunted by the hazards of a foreign land. The evidence of the Pāli texts, referred to above, indirectly shows that Jainism reached the land of the Tamils before the end of the fourth century BC. In the earliest extant literature of the Tamils we have enough indications to show that Jainism was popular in quite early times in the regions south of the Kāverī. It should here be emphasized that the Jaina monks of Bengal and Orissa were responsible for the early propagation of Jainism in Tamil Nadu and not those of Karnataka, as is usually believed. The evidence of the Sri Lankan texts and those of the Tamil Sangam poetry indicate that Jainism definitely reached the southern Dravidian areas in the pre-Mauryan period and certainly before its introduction in what is now the state of modern Karnataka, I have already observed that there is nothing to prove that the first Mauryan emperor became a Jaina *sādhu* before his death and consequently the tradition regarding the migration of the Jainas under Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta, recorded in the Digambara works, cannot be accepted in the present state of our knowledge. Even if we accept the veracity of the Digambara tradition, we cannot say that the first group of the Jaina *sādhus* of Tamil Nadu and Kerala came from Karnataka. It appears exceedingly probable, and as will be shown later, that the Digambara Jainas of second century AD from north India popularized Jainism in Karnataka. The Jaina religion that we find portrayed in Sangam poetry, was the undivided Nirgrantha religion, propounded by Pārśva and Mahāvīra.

Regarding the chronology of the works of the Sangam period there is a great deal of controversy. According to a few scholars<sup>7</sup> these texts were composed after AD 400. It should however be remembered that the original Sangam texts do not apparently show any acquaintance with the Pallavas who dominated the political scene of southern India from the third century AD. The absence of the word *dināra* in the original Sangam texts is also significant. The historical geography, as gleaned from these texts, show that they refer to a period when southern India had brisk and lively commercial intercourse with the outside world, particularly Rome and Alexandria. Lastly, we should refer to the well-known Gajabāhu (Tamil Kayavāgu) synchronism. In the *Śiḷappadikāram*,<sup>8</sup> the Sangam epic, we are told that king of Laṅkā Gajabāhu was a contemporary of its

author, who was Ceral Ilango, the younger brother of the Cera king Senguṭṭuvan. Now, in the Sri Lankan chronicles we have two Gajabāhus, the first of whom reigned in the second century AD.<sup>9</sup> The second Gajabāhu ruled only in the twelfth century and there is absolutely no doubt that the Tamil epic refers to the first Gajabāhu as a contemporary of the author of the *Śilappadikāram*. Further, we are told that the Pattani worship was introduced in Sri Lanka from Tamil country during that king's time, and we have traces of its worship even now in Sri Lanka. It follows therefore that the two epics, *Śilappadikāram* and *Maṇimekalai*, written by two friends who were contemporaries of Gajabāhu I of Sri Lanka, are the products of the second half of the second century AD, and, therefore, the information contained regarding Jainism in these two works can be referred to that time.

But before we discuss the evidence supplied regarding Jainism in these two epics, we must discuss the information contained in the two earlier Sangam texts, the *Tolkāppiyam* and *Kural*.

The *Tolkāppiyam*,<sup>10</sup> a grammatical work of 1612 *sūtras*, according to the Jainism, was written by some Nirgrantha ascetics during the second Sangam. A number of scholars have upheld the Jaina contention that it was written by a member of that sect in the pre-Christian period.<sup>11</sup> It has been pointed out that in the prefatory verse of the text the author calls himself *padimayion*, i.e. one who observes, according to the commentator, the Jaina vow known as *padinai*.<sup>12</sup> In the section entitled Marabiyal, the *Tolkāppiyam* speaks of *jīvas* with one sense, such as grass and trees, *jīvas* with two senses, such as snails, *jīvas* with three senses, such as ants, with four senses, such as crabs, with five senses, such as higher animals, and with six, such as human beings. This classification of *jīvas* abundantly illustrates<sup>13</sup> that the author was perfectly at home with their traditional Jaina classification. Such classification is also to be found in other Tamil Jaina works like the *Nilakeśi* and *Merumandiram*.<sup>14</sup> This grammatical text was written before the epics and should be placed between 100 BC and AD 50.<sup>15</sup> Thus, if we accept this date, we have to assume that Jainism was not only in vogue in the Tamil-speaking areas of south India in the first century BC, but was firmly rooted in that country. We have already observed, on the evidence supplied by the *Dīpavamśa* and *Mahāvamśa* that Jainism reached the southern Dravidian states and Sri Lanka by the fourth century BC. We should also refer in this connection to another piece of information supplied by the

*Mahāvamsā*,<sup>16</sup> according to which, during the reign of the Sri Lankan king Vaṭṭagāmaṇi (29–17 BC), the Nirgrantha monastery of Anurādhapura was completely destroyed. It shows that Jainism, which was introduced into Sri Lanka in pre-Mauryan times, continued its existence there for roughly 300 years before yielding its ground to Buddhism.

The celebrated *Kural*,<sup>17</sup> another Sangam work, is strongly claimed by the Jainas to be a collection of the verses composed by ancient Jaina sages of the Tamil country. That this work was in existence before the Tamil epics is evident from the fact that the *Maṇimekalai*, a poem written just before the *Śilappadikāram*, quotes a verse from it. It is a work principally based on the concept of *ahimsā*.<sup>18</sup> We must remember that the Jaina commentator of the *Nilakeśi*, freely quotes from the *Kural* and whenever he quotes, he introduces his quotation with the words 'as is mentioned in our scripture'. From this, it is clear, that the commentator considered this work to be an important Jaina scripture in Tamil.<sup>19</sup> Besides, we have the evidence of the Tamil *Prabodhacandrodaya* where the Jaina ascetic recites a verse from the *Kural* which praises *ahimsā*.<sup>20</sup> This shows that even to the non-Jaina author of the Tamil *Prabodhacandrodaya*, the *Kural* was a Jaina poem. Competent scholars like Kanakasabhai<sup>21</sup> and Chakravarti<sup>22</sup> also believe this poem to be a product of the Jaina imagination. It should however be remembered that the teaching of the *Kural* appealed to all sects, as it was based on some fundamental ethical principles. Since the *Maṇimekalai* quotes a verse from it, we can tentatively place the *Kural* in the first century AD, if not earlier.

The most important Sangam work from the Jaina point of view is undoubtedly the *Śilappadikāram*, one of the twin Tamil epics. This work, according to its internal testimony,<sup>23</sup> was composed by Ceral Ilango, the younger brother of the king Śenguṭṭuvan, who as we have already noticed, was a contemporary of the Sri Lankan Gajabāhu, who flourished in the second half of the second century AD.

From the poet's preface (*padikam*) of that text we learn that this work was composed at Vañji,<sup>24</sup> the capital of the Cera king. We are further told that the poet was then residing in the hermitage of Kaṇavāyil, which the commentator<sup>25</sup> explains is a Jaina temple (*paḷli*). From the same work we learn<sup>26</sup> that an astrologer had predicted that Ilango would succeed his father to the Cera throne. Naturally, this prediction was not taken kindly to by his elder brother

Śenguṭṭuvan and the younger prince, in order to allay his elder brother's suspicions, went to the temple of Kuṇavāyil, which was situated near the eastern gate of Vañji and, 'standing before eminent saints (*pāṭiyor*) he renounced all thoughts of the burden of the earth in order to secure the kingship of the vast realms, a far off and eternal bliss, incapable of approach by even the faculty of reason.' It appears, therefore, that the author embraced Jainism in advanced youth and was residing in a Jaina temple near Vañji when he wrote this epic. We further learn that he decided to write a poem based on the life of Kovalan, the father of the heroine of the *Maṇimekalai*, the Buddhist epic composed by his friend Sittalai Sāttanār.

Dikshitar, the English translator of the *Śilappadikāram*, refuses to believe<sup>27</sup> that Ilango was a Jaina. It is true that the poem refers to a number of gods and goddesses like Śiva, Viṣṇu, Murugan, Durgā, etc.,<sup>28</sup> but quite a number of crucial passages of the text harp on the doctrine of *ahimsā*; and there are lines of the text which could only be written by devout Jaina and none else. The concluding passage of the text abundantly shows that the poet was a dedicated Nirgrantha *muni* and a believer in the doctrine of *karman*.

The *Śilappadikāram* gives a very beautiful and useful account of the state of Jainism in the three Dravidian states, Cola, Pāṇḍya, and Cera. Since this account was written by a poet of the second century AD, its evidence is of tremendous value to students of Tamil Jainism. We learn from this work that there were Jaina shrines in the capitals of all these three kingdoms. At Kāveripattinam, which was the ancient capital of the Colas,<sup>29</sup> there was a temple of the Nirgrantha<sup>30</sup> (*niggantakoṭṭam*). It is most likely that this Kāveripattinam corresponds to the Khaberis Emporium mentioned by Ptolemy.<sup>31</sup> Apparently the same temple of the Nirgranthas is referred to elsewhere in this work<sup>32</sup> as having been built of stone. We are further told that the lay disciples of the city (*śrāvakas*) were responsible for the construction of this temple, which was apparently built at a very high cost. The high, shining *śilātala* made of *candrakānta* (moonstone) of this temple has also been mentioned in this text.<sup>33</sup> In this connection the poet tells us that a class of Jaina ascetics, who were known by the name Cāraṇārs, used to visit this temple on certain occasions, which included the car festival.<sup>34</sup> Now, we learn from other Jaina texts that the car festival was exceedingly popular among the devout Jainas of north India. The earliest non-canonical north Indian Jaina text refers to this festival is Vimala's *Paumacariyam*, which

describes the *jina-ratha* festival. Decorated Jina images were placed on the chariots, which the devotees used to take out on certain occasions. The car festival was also popular among the Buddhists<sup>35</sup> and the Hindus.<sup>36</sup> Among the Jainas, the car festival was associated with the observance of the elaborate Aṣṭāhnikā festival which was celebrated thrice a year (Āṣāḍha, Kārttika, and Phālguna).<sup>37</sup> The reference to the car festival in the *Śilappadikāram* shows the general popularity of Jainism among the masses, and that by the second century AD, Jainism had become quite deep-rooted in the Cola country.

Regarding the Cāraṇārs, who used to visit the Nirgrantha temple of Kāveripattinam, I would like to make a few observations. So far it appears, nobody has been able to explain clearly identity of the Cāraṇārs referred to in this Tamil epic. According to the Aṅga text the *Sthānāṅga*,<sup>38</sup> the Cāraṇas were one of the nine *gaṇas* directly under Mahāvīra. The *Vyavahārasūtra*<sup>39</sup> refers to them as monks with fifteen years' standing. The *Prakrit Dictionary*<sup>40</sup> compiled by Pandit Hargovind Das explains *cāraṇa* as a group of Jaina monks. It is tempting to connect these Cāraṇas with the Cāraṇa *gaṇa*, mentioned in the *Therāvalī*, which originated in the third century BC. It has however been shown that, *cāraṇa* there, is an error for *vāraṇa*, mentioned in the Mathurā inscriptions. The *Sthānāṅga* reference shows that the Cāraṇa monks were in existence even during Mahāvīra's time. It would not be wrong to suppose that the Cāraṇas were the Jaina counterparts of the Brahmanical *parivrajakas*, wandering all over the country, carrying with them the message of Pārśva and Mahāvīra. The *Vyavahārasūtra*<sup>41</sup> refers to a particular power possessed by such monks, which it calls by the name of *cāraṇa-labdhi*. It further appears from another Jaina text<sup>42</sup> that there was a work called *Cāraṇa-bhāvanā*, which was probably the sacred book of these monks, which is now lost. Elsewhere in the Jaina Āgamic literature the Cāraṇas are also mentioned.

The *Śilappadikāram*<sup>43</sup> delineates the Cāraṇārs as monks possessing the highest knowledge of the past, present, and future, who had put aside attachment and anger. There is little doubt that these monks were responsible for the popularity of Jainism in south India, and it was because of their activities that even non-Jainas became great admirers of the Jaina religion.

Our epic also describes the temples of the Nirgranthas at Uraiyur called by the name Kandarapaḷli.<sup>44</sup> The temple was situated in an

extensive grove adjoining Arangam (Śrīrangam) and the image of Arivan (probably Adinātha), described as the first god, under the three umbrellas. The connection of the *aśoka* tree with the Jaina temple of this place is also significant, for it was sacred to the Jaina Tirthamkara Mallinātha and there is a graphic description of a grove of *aśoka* trees in the *Aupapātikasūtra*.<sup>45</sup>

We should also refer to the residence (*palli*) of the Jaina nun Kavundi, which was not far from Kāveripattinam<sup>46</sup> on the northern bank of the Kāverī. This lady, we are told, was anxious to visit Madura in order to worship 'Arivan by listening to Dharma, preached by the sinless, saints, who have by their purity got rid of all their Adharma.' This temple of Madura was also built of stone.<sup>47</sup> Another Sangam text of great antiquity, the *Maduraikkanchi*,<sup>48</sup> gives a graphic description of the large Nirgranthas temple of Madura. It runs thus: 'Nirgrantha crowd the cloisters of the monks of their saints, the walls of which are exceedingly high, and painted red, and are surrounded by pretty, little flower-gardens.' This shows that this particular Jaina temple of the great city of Madura was built at very high cost and was obviously a remarkable shrine of that ancient city.

We have already referred to the Nirgrantha shrine of Vañji, which was near the eastern gate of that city. This shows that Jainism was not only popular in the Cola and Pāṇḍya kingdoms, but also Kerala. Vañji has been identified with a place not far from the present Cochin, and like Madura and Kāveripattinam it was a very ancient city.

The *Śilappadikāram* also throws welcome light on the Jaina nuns of south India of those days. Among the equipment of Kavundi,<sup>49</sup> mention is made of begging bowl and peacock-feathers, which are still used by the Jaina nuns everywhere. This shows that the life led by the nuns was not very different from that of the present day. Kavundi's hunger for knowledge and respect for the Cāraṇārs mark her as a remarkably august personality. Her affection for the heroine (Kannaki) makes her a character of flesh and blood.

This epic refers to the five types of Jaina monks,<sup>50</sup> Arhat, *siddha*, *ācārya*, *upādhyāya*, and *sādhu*. Arivan is described as the 'bestower of Aṅga',<sup>51</sup> which implies that the Jaina literature was perfectly well known at that time in south India.

I have attempted to give readers some idea of the condition of the Jaina religion in southern India as revealed in this celebrated Tamil epic. It should not however be supposed that the poet being



a Jaina, has given only a picture of his religion in this work. He has equal respect for all religious sects, and his descriptions of gods and goddesses, including Viṣṇu,<sup>52</sup> and Durgā<sup>53</sup> are equally attractive. His acquaintance with theistic Hinduism<sup>54</sup> and Vedic Brahmanism are also deep and intimate. Let us not forget that he, being a prince, was taught almost every branch of learning in his youth, before he became a Nirgrantha ascetic. That is why he has been able to display such amazing knowledge regarding other sects in this immensely readable epic. He also knows the Ājīvikas,<sup>55</sup> but, time and again he returns to his favourite theme, namely the glorification of the philosophy of *karman*<sup>56</sup> and non-injury.<sup>57</sup> The hero Kovalan,<sup>58</sup> it appears, led the life of a pious Jaina *śrāvaka*, avoiding meat-eating and partaking of food in the day-time.

From the Buddhist epic *Maṇimekalā*<sup>59</sup> written by Sāttanār in the second century AD, we also get some information about the Jainas in south India. Since it is a poem written by an opponent of Jainism, it is but natural that the Jainas will not be favourably painted here. In the first canto we find a drunkard ridiculing a Nirgrantha ascetic with these words

welcome, thou reverend sir, I worship thy feet. Pray listen to me. The soul which dwells in thy unclean body pines like a prisoner confined in a close cell. Drink, therefore, of this today, which is drawn by the spathe of the cocoanut palm, and which will give pleasure both in this world and see if my words are true.<sup>60</sup>

We will later see that in the *Mattavilāsaprahasana* too the Jainas are ridiculed for their uncleanliness. However, elsewhere in the *Maṇimekalai*,<sup>61</sup> it appears that the poet has sought to give a correct account of the Jaina philosophy. Since the passage is extremely interesting, we quote it in full:

He [Nigeṇṭa] said that his god is worshipped by Indras: and that the Book revealed by him describes the following: the wheel of Law, the axle of Law, Time, Ether, Eternal atom, good deeds, bad deeds, the bonds created by these deeds and the way to obtain release from these bonds. Things by their own nature or by the nature of other objects to which are they are attached are temporary or ever-lasting. Within the short period of *kṣaṇa* [second] they may pass through the three unavoidable stages, appearance, existence and dissolution. That a margosa tree sprouts and grows is eternal: that it does not possess that property is temporary. Green gram when made into a sweetmeat with other ingredients does not lose its nature, but loses its form. The wheel of Law

[*dharmā*] pervades everywhere and moves all things in order and for ever. In the same way the axle of law retains everything [and prevents dissolution]. Time may be divided into seconds or extend to Eons. Ether expands and gives room for everything. The soul entering a body will through the five senses, taste, smell, touch, hear and see. An atom may become a body or assume other forms. To stop the origin of good or evil deeds, and to enjoy the effect of past deeds, and to cut off all bonds of release [is salvation].

This summary of Jaina philosophy given in this second century Buddhist Tamil poem reminds me of similar accounts in the *Digha Nikāya*<sup>62</sup> and regarding the philosophy of the Ājīvikas.<sup>63</sup> However, a far more intimate and affectionate picture of the Arhat or Tīrthāṅkara is given in the *Śīlappadikāram*,<sup>64</sup> which is reproduced here in full:

The All-knowing, the incarnation of Dharma. He who has transcended all limit of understanding, All-Merciful, victor among victors, the accomplisher, the adorable one, the origin of dharma, the overlord, absolute righteousness, the essence, the holy one, the ancient one, the all-wise, the vanquisher of wrath, the master, the Śīva-gati, supreme leader, the exalted one, the possessor of all virtues, the transcendental light, the great truth, the all-god, the supernatural sage [*Cāraṇar*], the root cause of all, the master of mysterious powers [*siddhan*], the paramount one, the infinitely radiant illumination, the dweller in everything, the *guru*, the embodiment of nature, our great god, the abode of never-diminishing eminence, the emperor of virtues, the Śāṅkaran, the Caturmukha, the Īśāna, the Svayambhū, the bestower of Aṅgas, the Arhat, the ascetic of grace, the one-god, the master of eight attributes, the indivisible eternal substance, the dweller in the heaven, the foremost of the Vedas, and the shining light that dispels ignorance. None can escape the prison of this body unless he obtains the illumination of the revealed Veda, proclaimed by him, who has the various above-mentioned names.

I have already pointed out that the poet of the *Śīlappadikāram* was a man of wide vision and extensive learning. This is why in the above description of the Tīrthāṅkara he has used epithets that are found in the description of Brahman or Śīva in Hindu mythology.

Let us turn our attention to some of the places of Tamil Nadu and Kerala connected with Jainism from the earliest time. The above discussion has abundantly shown the popularity of the Jaina religion in the three southern kingdoms of Cola, Pāṇḍya, and Cera. A large number of places associated with the Jaina religion and culture from different parts of these states have been discovered.

Although the inscriptions discovered from these Jaina holy places are of somewhat later date (mostly post-seventh century AD), there is little doubt that most of these places were associated with Jainism from a much earlier period. We have early Brāhmī inscriptions datable from the third century BC and first century AD, discovered from the hills connected with Jainism in Tamil Nadu and Kerala. These Brāhmī inscriptions have not yet been properly deciphered and therefore their contents continue to baffle researchers. Quite a few of them possibly contain the earliest specimens of the Tamil language, but most of them are a curious mixture of regional Prākṛta and Tamil. Besides, all these epigraphs contain only a few words, which is why we have not been able to do full justice to them.

Let us first turn our attention to the Jaina sites of Tamil Nadu. The present Madura district, it appears, was the most important stronghold of the Jaina religion in this state. We have already seen that, according to the Sangam literary texts, Madura was noted for its Jaina temples and large number of lay devotees. We must not forget that as a result of religious persecution virtually all the Jaina shrines of Madura city disappeared in the course of time. The exceedingly high red walls of Jaina monasteries, referred to in the *Maduraikkanchi*, are now things of the past. But elsewhere in the district, an unusually large number of sites (particularly in the hills) are known to contain Jaina relics. Among these, the following may be mentioned here in alphabetical order, Aivarmalai: Alagarmalai Anaimalai, Karungālakkuḍi, Kiolavu, Kongr-Puliyangulam, Mut-tupatti, Poygaimalai, Seṭṭipoḍavu, and Utamapalai. This list is by no means, exhaustive, and it also be noted that a majority of these sites are situated on hills.

Aivarmalai is nine miles from Palni and is 1402 feet above the sea-level.<sup>65</sup> The hill here, according to tradition, was associated with the Pāṇḍavas. Such traditions are common everywhere in India. On the north-east side of a natural shelter of the hill, which is 160 feet long and 13 feet high, we have 16 images of Tīrthaṅkaras. A number of inscriptions have been discovered from here and they will be discussed in the chapter X.

The range of hills known as Alagarmalai<sup>66</sup> is some 12 miles north-west of Madura. Brāhmī inscriptions, assignable to the second century BC have been discovered from the pillow side of the stone beds in a cavern of the hill, which were obviously used by the ascetics who lived there. Since the later inscriptions, found in the same cav-

ern, associate the place with Jainism, it is permissible to conjecture that the Nirgrantha *sādhus* used the stone beds in pre-Christian times and the Brāhmī inscriptions were caused to be inscribed by them. It has further been surmised<sup>67</sup> that the natural caves formed by the overhanging rocks with plain walls and vaulted roofs were provided with wooden facades in the pre-Christian period. We have already observed that the Jaina ascetics of pre-Christian times led a very simple, almost arduous life, and usually avoided populous towns and villages. It is also reasonable to conjecture that the Cāraṇārs, referred to in the Sangam texts, were the monks who inhabited such caverns.

Anaimalai or the elephant hill, which is six miles east of Madura, is 'the most striking mass of perfectly naked solid rock'.<sup>68</sup> It is about two miles long, a quarter of a mile wide, and 250 feet high. It bears a fair resemblance to an elephant lying down. On a large boulder of this hill we have a series of sculptures representing the Tirthaṅkaras. The overhanging portions of the boulder form a sort of natural cave which was probably used by the Jaina monks. There are signs of rude walls. In front of the cave there is a rock platform which commands the most beautiful view across the green fields. The Jaina ascetics, it appears, had an eye for the picturesque.<sup>69</sup> It is reasonable to surmise that the lay devotees of the city of Madura supplied the wherewithal for living to the venerable monks living there. This cavern is still known as Śamanar Kovil or temple of the Jaina *munis*. I shall discuss the inscriptions of this cavern, in a later chapter.

Karungālakkudi, another Pañcapāṇḍava hill is known for its ancient cavern and Brāhmī inscriptions.<sup>70</sup> In a later period too this hill was inhabited by Jaina ascetics. Kilalavu<sup>71</sup> is also a hill site situated in the Melur *tāluk* of Madura district. This hill has a very large number of stony beds, carefully sheltered, indicating a large settlement of ascetics in the earlier period. Other details regarding this site will be discussed later.

Kongar-Puliyaṅguḷam<sup>72</sup> is another hill site with rock-cut beds in the Tirumangalam *tāluk* of Madura. There is an interesting image here of the great Jaina saint Ajjanandi about whom I will have something more to say later.

Muttupatti<sup>73</sup> is the name of a village in the Nilakkottai *tāluk* where we have a huge overhanging boulder that has a few ancient stone beds and Brāhmī inscriptions. A number of later inscriptions, found from this site, will be discussed elsewhere.

Poyagaimalai<sup>74</sup> is eleven miles to the west of Tirumangalam in Madura district. In a natural cave of this hill a series of Jina sculptures are carved in relief. The hill is popularly known as Samanar Kovil or Jaina temple.

Seṭṭipoḍavu<sup>75</sup> (meaning 'the hollow of the eminent merchant') is an extremely interesting cavern near Kilakkudi, a village in Madura *tāluk*. It was undoubtedly a very popular Jaina resort from early times. A large number of interesting inscriptions have been found here. These inscriptions supply us with important information regarding the Jaina religion of later times; all these matters will be discussed in a later chapter. Uttampalai<sup>76</sup> is a Jaina site in Periyakulan *tāluk* and has several interesting inscriptions.

In the district of Tinnevely there was an extremely important stronghold of the Jaina faith in a place now called Kalugumalai.<sup>77</sup> This hill has treasured natural caverns with beds and inscriptions in Brāhmī characters. A very large number of later Jaina inscriptions and sculptures have also been found from this hill.

Among other celebrated Jaina sites of Tamil Nadu, the following may be mentioned: Pāṭalipura<sup>78</sup> (South Arcot), Colavañḍipuram<sup>79</sup> (South Arcot), Pañcapāṇḍavamalai<sup>80</sup> (North Arcot). In the former Pudukkottai state, now part of Tamil Nadu, we have the following interesting Jaina sites: Śittannavaśal,<sup>81</sup> Nārttāmala,<sup>82</sup> Āluruttimalai,<sup>83</sup> Bommamalai,<sup>84</sup> Melamalai,<sup>85</sup> Tenimalai,<sup>86</sup> Chetṭipaṭṭi,<sup>87</sup> and others.

A number of sites in modern Kerala connected with Jainism have been discovered. We have already noted that according to the *Śilappadikāram* there was a well-known Jaina monastery near the Cera capital Vañji Tiruccāntumalai,<sup>88</sup> also known as the hill of the Cāraṇārs near Chitalal in this state was a famous Jaina centre of pilgrimage in ancient times. The temple is now known as the shrine of Bhagavatī, but the icons here abundantly testify that it was a Jaina centre. In the natural cave at the top of the hill there are beautiful Jaina sculptures and inscriptions from the eighth to the tenth centuries AD, which will be discussed later. Jaina sculptures and inscriptions have also been discovered from Nagarkoyil.<sup>89</sup>

Let us turn our attention to the state of Jainism during the days of the Pallavas. The Pallavas, as is well-known, were Brahmanical Hindus. There are however indications that during the reign of the Pallavas, Jainism remained one of the dominant religious systems and more than one royal member of the dynasty favoured the monks belonging to this sect.

The first notable event in the history of Jainism in the post-Sangam period was the establishment of Drāviḍa Saṁgha by Vajranandin at Dakṣiṇa Mathurā, 526 years after king Vikrama. This information is supplied by Digambara Devasena in his *Darśanasāra*<sup>90</sup> composed in 990 vs or AD 933. Therefore, according to Devasena, the Drāviḍa Saṁgha was founded in AD 464 at Madura, which, as we have already seen, was intimately connected with the Jaina religion. A few years before this date, in the town of Pāṭalikā in Pāṇarāṣṭra<sup>91</sup> in Śaka 380 i.e., AD 458, the Digambara *Lokavibhāga* was composed by Sarvanandin in the twenty-second year of Siṁhavarman, the king of Kāñcī. We have already referred to the place called Pāṭalipura in South Arcot which is generally identified with Pāṭalikā of Sarvanandin. These two important pieces of evidence directly testify that Jainism was flourishing in the fifth century during the Pallava rule in south India. It should be mentioned here that the chronological evidence regarding the beginning of Siṁhavarman's rule, supplied by the *Lokavibhāga*, has greatly helped scholars in reconstructing early Pallava history.

Turning now to inscriptions before AD 600 we find there are at least two where a royal member of the dynasty of the Pallavas is associated with the Jaina religion. The first inscription<sup>92</sup> dated in sixth year of Siṁhavarman II, father of Siṁhaviṣṇu and grandfather of Mahendravarman, was discovered a few years ago. The great importance of this inscription can hardly be overemphasized. It records the grant of a village to the Jaina sage Vajranandin of Nandi Saṁgha at Vardhamāneśvara *tīrtha* for conducting the worship of Lord Jina. Since this Siṁhavarman was the grandfather of Mahendravarman, this inscription should be placed around c. AD 550.<sup>93</sup> It also refers to his son Siṁhaviṣṇu, who is described as the conqueror of the Cola country and at whose request the grant was made. The grant is partly in Sanskrit and partly in Tamil. Incidentally, this record contains one of the earliest specimens of epigraphic Tamil.<sup>94</sup> From the Tamil portion we learn that the land grant was at a place called Paruttikkanru which is a locality near Kāñcī. Narabhaya, the minister, figures as the *ājñāpati* of the grant. Narabhaya, the minister, figures as the *ājñāpati* of the grant. The same Siṁhaviṣṇu, who is here depicted as a patron of Jainism, appears elsewhere<sup>95</sup> as a devotee of Viṣṇu.

The reference to Vardhamāneśvara *tīrtha* is of great significance, providing evidence of the existence of a sacred Jaina site near Kāñcī,

named after the last Jaina Tīrthamkara. It is tempting to identify this *tīrtha* with the celebrated Jina-Kāñcī, but this must for the time being, remain a hypothesis.

Another member of the early Pallava royal family appears in a western Gaṅga inscription of the twelfth year of the reign of Avinīta,<sup>96</sup> discovered from Hoskote (Bangalore district, Karnataka) as a patroness of the Jaina religion. We are told in this inscription that a *devāyatana*, dedicated to *arhats*, was constructed by the mother (*jananī*) of the Pallava overlord (*adhirāja*) Simhaviṣṇu at the village of Pulligere in Korikunda division (*bhāge*). We further learn that this temple was meant for the use of of the monks of Yāvanīka Saṁgha (i.e., Yāpanīya Saṁgha). The most crucial passage of the inscription is however that which refers to the fact that the lady (i.e., the mother of Simhaviṣṇu) constructed the Jina temple with a view to enhancing the glory of her husband's family (*bhartṛkula-kīrtijanyārtham*), namely the Pallavas. Her husband was evidently Simhavarman II of the Pallava inscription, referred to above. It further shows that, not only the royal lady herself (cf. *ātmanaśca dharmapravardhanārtham*), but also members of husband's family nurtured soft corner for the Jaina religion. This inscription is to be placed in c. AD 560 according to my calculation.

The above discussion shows that the Pallavas, in spite of their weakness for traditional Hinduism, had great deference for the Jains. Let us not forget that, long before the emergence of the Pallavas as a political power, the Jains had carved for themselves a permanent place in the religious life of south India.

#### JAINISM IN KARNATAKA AND ANDHRA

Let us now turn our attention to Karnataka which from a fairly early period produced some remarkable Jaina saints. We have already opined that the tradition regarding the migration of the Jains under Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta cannot be accepted at the present state of our knowledge. Besides, the earliest author that refers to Candragupta's conversion to Jainism is Yativṛṣabha, the author of the *Tiloyapaññati* (early seventh century), who lived nearly 1000 years after Candragupta Maurya, Śravaṇa Belgoḷa, which according to the tradition was the place of Candragupta's death, has not produced any inscription which can be dated before AD 600.

The Western Gaṅgas, who ruled in southern Karnataka from the mid-fourth century AD, were great patrons of the Jaina religion and

culture from the very beginning of their history. The earlier speculations<sup>97</sup> regarding the beginning of the Western Gaṅga rule have now been proved wrong. The Penukoṇḍa plates<sup>98</sup> of Mādhava II (sometimes called Mādhava III), which were accepted as genuine even by Fleet, and which had been assigned to *c.* AD 475 by him, refers to a number of his predecessors. The founder Koṅkaṇivarman (Mādhava I) should be placed in the mid-fourth century AD. This is also confirmed by the fact that the third king Āryavarman or Harivarman was installed in his throne by his Pallava overlord Siṃhavarman I, who according to the *Lokavibhāga* ascended the throne in AD 436.

According to later records the earliest king Koṅkaṇivarman Mādhava, who came from the north, was helped by a great Jain saint called Siṃhanandi Ācārya in his attempt to carve out an independent kingdom in the south. The earliest record that refers to the help rendered by a Jain to Koṅkaṇivarman is a damaged copperplate of the reign of Śivamāra I (*c.* AD 670–713) which clearly states that at a suggestion of a Jain teacher Koṅkaṇivarman had cut down a stone pillar.<sup>99</sup> However, in the earlier copperplates of the dynasty no Jain teacher is connected with this valiant feat of the founder of the dynasty. Another inscription, the Udayendiran grant of Hastimalla dated *c.* AD 920, tells us that the Gaṅga family prospered because of Siṃhanandi's assistance.<sup>100</sup> A third inscription dated Śaka 884 of the reign of Mārasimha<sup>101</sup> also refers to this fact and the valiant feat of cutting asunder a great stone pillar Koṅkaṇivarman. A fourth inscription<sup>102</sup> of the eleventh century (dated AD 1077) gives the same information regarding Siṃhanandi's act and his contribution to the establishment of the Gaṅga empire. However, the most evocative and detailed account regarding Siṃhanandi's achievement is given in a long lithic record<sup>103</sup> found from Shimoga district of Karnataka, dated Śaka 1043 (AD 1121). From this account we learn that the two sons of one king Padmanābha called Daḍiga and Mādhava, who came from the north in search of fortune, found a beautiful spot in an extensive place (now located in Cuddapah district, Andhra Pradesh) and there they saw a Jain temple (*caityālaya*) and in that shrine they met Siṃhanandi Ācārya, the sun of the Krāṇura *gaṇa*, who is directly called in the inscription 'the promoter of the Gaṅga kingdom' (*gaṅga-rājya-samuddharaṇam*), who accepted them as his disciples. We are further told that the Jain saint gave the brothers a sword (*khaḍga*) and a whole king-



dom. Mādhava, one of the brothers, being so honoured, cut down a stone-pillar<sup>104</sup> with his sword, which promoted Simhanandi to make a crown from the petals of the *karnikāra* blossom and place it on the heads of the brothers. He in addition gave them his peacock fan as their banner and in due course provided them with an army. This inscription also records the advice which that *muniṣati* gave those two brothers:

If you fail in what you promise, if you dissent from the *Jaina śāsana*,<sup>105</sup> if you take the wives of others, if you are addicted to spirits or flesh (*madhumāmsa*), if you associate with the base, if you give not to the needy, if you flee in battle, your race will go to ruin.

Thus with Nandagiri as their fort (*koṭa*), Kuvalāla (Kolar) as their city, Gaṅgavāḍi as their kingdom, and *jinamata* as their faith, the two brothers Daḍiga and Mādhava ruled their kingdom.

The account related in the above-mentioned stone is more or less legendary, but as we have already noted, the connection of *Jaina* Simhanandi with the foundation of the Gaṅga kingdom is known from other sources. Its account regarding the earlier history of the Gaṅga dynasty can be dismissed offhand. Its attempt to make Padmanābha the father of the two brothers (Daḍiga and Mādhava) is, to say the least, ridiculous. We know from the early and genuine Gaṅga copperplates, in including the Penukoṇḍa, that Padmanābha is the deity addressed in the first line of those records. Padmanābha is a popular name for Viṣṇu, although according to the *Jainas*,<sup>106</sup> Padmanābha is the first Arhat of the future age. It is, however, most likely that the term 'Padmanābha' Gaṅga inscriptions refers to Lord Viṣṇu.

Simhanandi's connection with the founder of the Gaṅga dynasty is also confirmed by an old commentary of the *Gommaṭasāra*.<sup>107</sup> It thus appears to be a historical fact that Mādhava I Koṅkaṇivarman, who founded the Western Gaṅga kingdom in the mid-fourth century AD, owes his success to the activities of a *Jaina* saint. There is however no direct evidence to prove that Mādhava I himself became a *Jaina* convert. Besides, an overwhelming majority of early western Gaṅga inscriptions are grants made to Brāhmaṇas and other non-*Jainas*. It appears, however, that the Western Gaṅga monarchs, beginning from the founder of the dynasty, nurtured a special love for *Jainism*, although no *Jaina* record from the reign of first few Gaṅga kings has yet been discovered.

The first king of this dynasty of whose reign we have definite Jaina records is Mādhava III (sometimes called Mādhava II). One inscription<sup>108</sup> of his reign has been discovered from Nonamaṅgala (Kolar district). This is dated in the thirteenth year of his reign. As is well-known, his undated Penukoṇḍa plate inscription<sup>109</sup> is assigned to c. AD 475 by Fleet. That inscription further informs us that he was installed on the throne by his Pallava overlord Skandavarman, the son of Siṃhavarman I, so we have to assign Mādhava III to the last quarter of the fifth century AD. This inscription discloses the name of Ācārya Viradeva and refers to a Jaina temple erected by the monks of the Mūlasaṅgha at Pebbolala *grāma* of Mudukottūra *viṣaya*. The temple was apparently situated in Kolar district of Karnataka. The king Mādhava, we are told, granted to this temple the village of Kumārapura along with some other land which was apparently situated near the village. It is apparent that the temple mentioned here was built before the fifth century AD, the date of this inscription; but how long before, we cannot guess. The epithets bestowed on the Jaina *guru* Viradeva reveal that he was held in highest esteem by Mādhava III. It is also interesting to note that the grant was made in the bright fortnight of Phālguna, the time for the great Aṣṭāhnikā festival. Mādhava III, however, in spite of his fondness for the Jaina religion, was a tolerant king, as is evident from his grants made to other religious sects, including Buddhists.<sup>110</sup>

The next king, Avinīta Koṅkaṇivarman, had a long rule and may be assigned to the first half of the sixth century AD. Three inscriptions of his reign are Jaina grants, although the genuineness of one has been questioned. The earliest is a Nonamaṅgala (Kolar district) grant,<sup>111</sup> dated in the first year of his reign. We are told that the king, on the advice of his preceptor, *parama arhat*, Vijayakīrti whose fame had pervaded all regions granted land to the Uranur Arhat temple which was established by Candranandin and others. The same inscription refers to another Jaina temple called Perur Evāṇi Adigal Arhat temple. Both these temples were apparently situated in the Kolar district. It is interesting to note that the Jaina saint, Vijayakīrti in this inscription is represented as the preceptor (*upādhyāya*) of the king. Ācārya Candranandin of Mūlasaṅgha apparently flourished before Ācārya Vijayakīrti.

The second Jaina grant of king Avinīta is dated in the twelfth year of his reign,<sup>112</sup> an inscription discovered from Hoskote (Bangalore district, Karnataka). It records the grant of land to a

Jaina temple at Pulliura village of Korikunda-bhāga. We have already noticed this inscription in connection with Pallava Simhaviṣṇu. The reference to the well-known Yāpanīya Saṁgha is quite interesting. This inscription and that referred to above, show Avinīta's close and intimate relationship with the Digambara Jainas of various groups. This inscription, as we have already noticed, testifies to the contemporaneity of Pallava Simhaviṣṇu and Gaṅga Avinīta, and is therefore of great historical importance. However, there are reasons to believe, and as will be shown elsewhere, that Avinīta was a senior contemporary of Simhaviṣṇu.

The third Jaina inscription<sup>113</sup> of the reign of Avinīta is now the property of the Lutheral Museum, Basel (Switzerland). It refers to Koṅṅumamahādhiraṅga Avinīta and also gives the date Śaka 388. It was found in the Mercara treasury (Coorg district, Karnataka) but the inscription is clearly a later forgery as is evident from the details given regarding the date and *nakṣatra*, and also the script which is clearly of the eighth or ninth century AD. However, the details regarding Avinīta's predecessors in this inscription, are the same as those found in genuine Gaṅga records. It appears therefore that the inscription was forged at a later date by some intelligent Jaina monks, who had access to official Gaṅga records. They have even cleverly given some of the names of witnesses found in genuine early records.

This forged grant further refers to a minister of 'Akālavaraṣa Pṛthivīvallabha' who was probably a Rāṣṭrakūṭa king. But what a minister of a Rāṣṭrakūṭa king had to do with a grant of a Gaṅga ruler is not clear. Probably the forgery was made during the days of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Besides, the reference to the *anvaya* (lineage) of Kundakunda appears highly suspect.

This forged inscription gives the following list of the Jaina *ācāryas* of the *anvaya* of Kundakunda:

Guṇacandra-bhaṭāra  
 ↓  
 Abhayanandi-bhaṭāra  
 ↓  
 Śīlabhadra-bhaṭāra  
 ↓  
 Jayanandi-bhaṭāra  
 ↓  
 Guṇanandi-bhaṭāra  
 ↓  
 Candranandi-bhaṭāra

Since this inscription is a forged document of eighth or ninth century, we cannot rely on its evidence and accept the list of monks as persons belonging to the days of early Gaṅga rulers. Other details given in this grant should also be ignored.

Avinīta's son and successor Durvinīta ruled, in all probability, in the second half of the sixth century AD. Like his father, he too had a long reign.<sup>114</sup> We must remember that the great-grandson of Durvinīta, Bhūvikrama, started ruling from AD 625.<sup>115</sup> Durvinīta must therefore be placed before AD 600. This is confirmed partly by the discovery of a mutilated manuscript of the *Avantisundarīkathā*<sup>116</sup> which makes Durvinīta a contemporary of Simhaviṣṇu. We have already seen that Durvinīta's father, Avinīta, was a contemporary of Simhaviṣṇu. It would therefore appear that Avinīta's son was a junior contemporary of that Pallava monarch.<sup>117</sup>

No Jaina inscription of the reign of Durvinīta has yet been discovered but a later record, dated Śaka 977 (AD 1055) of the time of Someśvara I, the Kalyāṇa-Cālukya monarch, refers to a temple dedicated to Pārśva, which according to it, was built by Durvinīta.<sup>118</sup> This definitely proves that Durvinīta, like many of his predecessors, patronized the Jainas.

A few scholars are of the firm opinion that Durvinīta was a disciple of the great Jaina savant Pūjyapāda. The basis of their surmise is one of his records, dated in his fortieth regnal year.<sup>119</sup> According to this inscription he composed a work called the *Śabdāvatāra*.<sup>120</sup> Prof. Saletore argues<sup>121</sup> that Durvinīta merely put into Kannada the original *Śabdāvatāra*, a grammatical treatise written by Pūjyapāda, but this is mere conjecture. We must remember that according to Devasena (AD 933), Vajranandi, the founder of Drāviḍa Saṅgha, who flourished about AD 468, at Madura was a disciple of Pūjyapāda. We have however already seen that Durvinīta could not have flourished before the second half of the sixth century AD; and Pūjyapāda must have died at least 50 years before Durvinīta's probable date of birth. There is therefore no basis for the view that Durvinīta was a disciple of Pūjyapāda. It is however just possible that sometime after Pūjyapāda's death, Durvinīta, on his own initiative, translated the grammatical treatise of that Jaina savant.

In a later chapter I shall continue this discussion on the state of Jainism during the rule of the later western Gaṅga rulers. Let us now turn our attention to the condition of the Jaina religion in the Kadamba kingdom from the earliest times.

The Kadambas like the western Gaṅgas came into the limelight from the middle of the fourth century AD. Like the latter, they too were great patrons of the Jaina religion and culture. The earliest inscription<sup>122</sup> of the dynasty of the founder Mayūraśarman is assigned to the middle of the fourth century AD. The first king of this dynasty, who definitely showed special favour to the Jainas, was Kākutsthavarman whose Halsi grant (Belgaum district, Karnataka) is dated in the eightieth year of the *paṭṭabandha* of his ancestor Mayūraśarman.<sup>123</sup> It has been suggested<sup>124</sup> that the year 80 may also be referred to the Gupta era; in that case the inscription should be assigned to c. AD 400, which is also supported by the palaeography of the record.

The inscription begins with an adoration of the holy Jinendra who is represented almost as a theistic deity. Some of the grants of Mṛgeśavarman and Ravivarman begin with the same verse. It was issued from Palāśikā (Halsi, Belgaum district) by Kākutsthavarman, who is represented as the '*yuvarāja* of the Kadambas'. By this grant a field in the village called Khetagrāma, which belonged to the holy *arhats*, was given to the general Śrutakīrti as a reward for saving the prince. It is said that the confiscators of the field, belonging to the king's own family or any other family, would be guilty of *pañcamaḥāpātaka*. According to the Jainas the five sins are destruction of life, lying, unchastity, and immoderate desire. The inscription ends with the words *Ṛṣabhāya namaḥ*.

It is apparent from the inscription that the Jinendra temple of the ancient city of Palāśikā was built before the date of this inscription and probably sometime in the fourth century AD.

Several grants of Mṛgeśavarman, the grandson of Kākutsthavarman, who ruled in the last quarter of the fifth century AD,<sup>125</sup> are connected with the Jaina religion. The first inscription<sup>126</sup> found at Banavāsī is dated in the third regnal year. It records a grant of black-soil land (*kṛṣṇabhūmikṣetra*) in the village called Bṛhat-Parālūra to the divine, supreme *arhat* 'whose feet are rubbed by the tiara of the lord of gods' for the purpose of the glory of sweeping out the temple, anointing the idol with ghee, performing worship and repairing anything that may be broken. Another piece of land was also granted for decorating the idol with flowers, for which the term *devakula* is also used. The *paṭṭikā* is said to have been written by Dāmakīrti Bhojaka. We have another Banavāsī grant<sup>127</sup> dated in the fourth year of Mṛgeśa's reign which was issued on the eighth of the

bright fortnight of *varṣā* when the king was residing at Vaijyantī. The dating of the inscription was certainly due to the Jaina influence,<sup>128</sup> as it was the time of the Navdīśvara or Aṣṭāhnikā festival. By this grant the *dharmamahārāja* Śrī Vijayaśiva Mrgeśavarman made a gift of a village of the name of Kālavaṅga. It was divided in three equal portions: the first was meant for the temple of Jinendra which was situated at a place called Paramapuškala, the second for the *saṅgha* of the Śvetapaṭa-mahāśramaṇa who scrupulously followed the original teaching of the Arhat, and the third for the use of the Nirgrantha-mahāśramaṇas.

The reference to the Śvetapaṭa *sādhus* is of great significance. It clearly shows that the Śvetāmbaras were equally popular in Karnataka in the fifth century AD. The statement that they followed the good teaching of the Arhat implies that they were held in special esteem in those days. It is also evident from the inscription that the Jinendra temple mentioned here, was the joint property of the monks of both the sects. Needless to say, these monks belonging to the principal branches of Jainism, lived in perfect harmony in the fifth century AD. The seal of the grant, according to Fleet, bears the device of a Jinendra.

The third inscription of Mrgeśavarman bearing on Jainism is the Halsi grant<sup>129</sup> dated in the eighth year of that king. It begins like the inscription of Kākutsthavarman with an adoration to Jinendra in exactly the same words. The king Mrgeśa is further described as *Tuṅga-Gaṅgakulotsādī* and *Pallavapralayānala*, which suggest his success over the western Gaṅgas and Pallavas. Then we are told that, while residing at Vaijyantī, through the devotion of his father (Śāntivarman), he caused to be built a *jinālaya* at the town of Palāśikā (Halsi) and gave to the holy *arhats* thirty-three *nivartanas* of land between the river Mātṛsarit and Inṅiṅi-saṅgama for the Yāpanīyas, Nirgranthas, and Kūrcakas. The executor of the grant was *bhojaka* Dāmakīrti. Fleet takes the *bhojakas* to be the official priests in Jaina temples, but who were the *kūrcakas* mentioned in this inscription? It appears that they were bearded ascetics<sup>130</sup> and were distinguished from other Nirgrantha monks who were unbearded. Some other grants of Mrgeśavarman are meant for the Brāhmaṇas and other non-Jainas which shows that he was not a converted Jaina.<sup>131</sup>

The next king, Ravivarman, was not only a very able ruler and a great conqueror but also a sincere patron of the Jaina religion. We must first refer to his Halsi grant<sup>132</sup> dated in the eleventh year of his

reign which refers to his brother Bhānuvarman, who was probably the governor of Palāśikā<sup>133</sup> under Ravivarman. We are told that Bhānuvarman and one Paṇḍara Bhojaka granted land to the Jina at Palāśikā which was situated in a village called Kardamapaṭī. We are further told that the land was given for the purpose of worshipping the Lord Jina on every full moon day. We must then refer to two undated Halsi grants of the time of Ravivarman both of which are of great importance.

The first undated Halsi grant<sup>134</sup> of Ravivarman records the interesting history of a family that received favour from the days of king Kākutsthavarman. According to it, in former days a Bhoja named Śrutakīrti, who became a great favourite of Kākutsthavarman, enjoyed the village of Kheṭa. We have already noted that king Kākutsthavarman granted a field in that village to *senāpati* Śrutakīrti for serving him. After Śrutakīrti's death, at the time of Śāntivarman, his eldest son Mṛgeśa, after taking his father's permission, granted the village to the Dāmakīrti's mother. It appears that Dāmakīrti was the son of Śrutakīrti. The eldest son of Dāmakīrti was *pratīhāra* Jayakīrti, whose family is said have been established in the world by an *ācārya* named Bandhuṣeṇa. In order to increase his fortune, fame, and to acquire religious merit, Jayakīrti, through the favour of king Ravi gave the village of Parukheṭaka (probably larger Kheṭa) to his father's mother. This interesting grant further refers to the eight-day festival of Lord Jina at Palāśikā in which king Ravivarman himself participated. We are further told that the expenses for this Aṣṭāhnikā festival in the month of Kārttika was to be met from the revenue of the village. The grant further refers to the Yāpanīya monks and their chief Kumāradatta. The last few lines of the inscription conclusively show that king Ravivarman did everything to promote the worship of Jina at Palāśikā. It also appears that Sūri Kumāradatta, mentioned in this inscription, was a celebrated Jaina savant, belonging to the Yāpanīya sect and was universally admired for his learning and holiness. We must note carefully the following lines of this inscription 'wheresoever the worship of Jinendra is kept up, there is increase for the country, and the lords of these countries acquire strength [*urjas*].'

The second undated Halsi grant of Ravivarman<sup>135</sup> is historically more important since it refers to the killing of Viṣṇuvarman, his Kadamba kinsman, and his triumph over Caṇḍadaṇḍa, the lord of Kāñcī. The actual donor was Śrīkīrti, the younger brother of

Dāmakīrti, and the object was to enhance their mother's merit. A copperplate inscription,<sup>136</sup> dated in the thirty-fourth year of this king, found from Chitradurga district (Karnataka), records a grant of land to a Jaina temple.

It should here be remembered that Ravivarman did not favour the Jainas alone; other religious sects were also well-treated by him. This is testified to by his inscriptions found in various different places.<sup>137</sup> Ravivarman ruled in the closing years of the fifth and the first quarter of the sixth century AD.<sup>138</sup>

The Jainas also enjoyed patronage during the rule of Harivarman who, unlike his father Ravivarman, was not a very strong king. We have two dated Halsi grants of his reign. The first is dated in the fourth year of his reign.<sup>139</sup> It records that at Uccaśṛṅgī, the king on the advice of his uncle (*pitṛvya*) Śivaratha, gave the grant of a village to an *arhat* temple of Palāśīkā, which was built by one Mṛgeśa, the son of *senāpati* Simha. On behalf of the temple, the grant was received by Candrakṣānta, who is described as the head of a Kūrcaka Saṃgha named after Vāriṣeṇācārya. It thus appears that a particular member of Kūrcaka sect called Vāriṣeṇācārya established, before this date, a particular *saṃgha*, which was named after him. We have already taken note of these Kūrcakas, who are mentioned in an inscription of the time of Mṛgeśavarman. The village Vasuntavāṭaka, which was given as grant, was situated at Kanduraviṣaya. The inscription ends with a verse addressed to Vardhamāna.

The second Halsi grant<sup>140</sup> of Harivarman's reign is dated in his fifth regnal year. It is interesting that Palāśīkā is described here as the capital (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of this king. We are told that the king, being requested by Sendraka chief Bhānuśakti, gave the grant of a village called Marade for a Jaina *caityālaya* of Palāśīkā which was the property of Śramaṇa Saṃgha called Ahariṣṭi under Ācārya Dharmānandin. The Sendrakas were obviously the feudatories of the Kadambas. Harivarman however, before the end of his reign, became a Śaiva.<sup>141</sup>

Another branch of the Kadamba dynasty, who ruled in the southern part of the original Kadamba dominion, also patronized the Jainas. We have a grant,<sup>142</sup> of the time of Kṛṣṇavarman I (475–85), the brother of Śāntivarman, issued from Triparvata (probably Halebiḍ). By this grant a piece of land at a place called Siddhakedāra, which was in Triparvata division, was granted to Yāpanīya Saṃgha by Yuvarāja Devavarman for the maintenance, worship, and repair



of a *caityālaya*, which was probably near Siddhakedāra.

The above discussion shows the flourishing condition of Jainism in different parts of the Kadamba dominion. It appears that there were a number of Jaina temples at Palāśikā, which was a flourishing town in those days. These inscriptions, as noted above, has disclosed the names of a great number of Jaina savants, some of whom had even won the respect of the reigning monarchs. The reference to different Jaina sects like the Nirgranthas, Śvetapaṭas, and Kūrcakas prove that all these schools had their followers in the Kadamba dominion. The lay followers used to celebrate, with great pomp, the various Jaina festivals and, needless to say, such festivals made the Jaina religion extremely popular among the masses. The Kadamba kings, it appears, in spite of their religious catholicity, had special affection for the Jaina religion. It was largely as a result of their patronage that Jainism became a dominant religious force in Karnataka.

Turning to the western Cālukyas, some of whom ruled before AD 600, we find at least one king directly patronizing the Jains. We must however first refer to a spurious grant of the time of Pulakeśin I, known as the Altem grant.<sup>143</sup> This inscription gives the date Śaka 411 (i.e., AD 489) for Pulakeśin I, which is an impossible date for that king, for whom we now have an authentic date, Śaka 465,<sup>144</sup> supplied by an inscription inscribed on Bādāmī fort. As pointed out by Fleet, the script of the Altem grant belongs to a much later age, and, therefore it is desirable that the details of the inscription be discussed in a later chapter.

An undated stone inscription<sup>145</sup> of the time of Kīrtivarman I, who ruled in the second half of the sixth century AD, from Ādūr (Dharwar district, Karnataka) is an important Jaina record. Now we know that Kīrtivarman I's rule<sup>146</sup> terminated in AD 597, and therefore this inscription should be placed between AD 543 (Śaka 465) and AD 597. It begins with an adoration of Vardhamāna. Then it records the grant of a field for the *dānaśālā* of the *jinālaya* which had been built by one of the Gāmuṇḍas or village headmen. The inscription refers to Vaijayantī, but because it is damaged nothing definite can be learnt about its connection either with Kīrtivarman or Jainism. We are then told that while Kīrtivarman was reigning as supreme sovereign, and a certain Sinda king governing the city of Pāṇḍīpura (the ancient name of Ādūr),<sup>147</sup> a number of Gāmuṇḍas gave to the temple of Jinendra some rice-land to the west of the village of Karmagālur.

The inscription refers to a line of Jaina monks, the earliest of whom was Vinayanandin, who is here compared with Indrabhūti (the great disciple of Mahāvīra), and who obviously lived around the last quarter of the fifth century AD. The disciple of this Vinayanandin was Vāsudeva, whose disciple's disciple was Śrīpāla, who was responsible for the setting up the stone tablet. The grant was received on behalf of the Jina temple (which was at Ādūr) by Prabhācandra. It is interesting that this stone inscription has been discovered from a region that was formerly under the Kadambas. It also shows that Jainism received equal patronage even during the days of the Cālukyas, and in a later chapter we will see how favourably the Cālukyas regarded the Jainas.

Practically nothing is known regarding the condition of Jainism in Andhra Pradesh<sup>148</sup> before AD 600. However from a somewhat later eastern Cālukya inscription,<sup>149</sup> which will be discussed elsewhere, we learn that a number of Jaina saints flourished in the Dezwada region between AD 450 and 600. The names are as follows: Candraprabhācārya, his pupil's pupil Ravicandrācārya and his disciple's Ravinandin. These Jaina teachers, who are mentioned in the Musinikonda grant of Viṣṇuvardhana III, were the spiritual predecessors of Kālibhadrācārya, who was a contemporary of Ayyaṇa Mahādevī, the wife of Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana (early seventh century).

In a grant of Pallava Simhavarman found from Nellore district of A.P. (fifth century) there is a reference to the Ājīvikas,<sup>150</sup> but as far as Jainism is concerned, for a variety of reasons, the early monuments connected with it have simply disappeared.

A fair number of Jaina teachers of south India like Kundakunda, Samantabhadra, Divākara, Pūjyapāda, etc., certainly lived before AD 600. I shall discuss details of their lives and activities in a separate chapter.

#### REFERENCES

1. Geiger, p. 75.
2. X.102.
3. See Geiger, *Intro.*, p. xxxvi.
4. See Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature*, II, p. 211; see also *The Classical Age*, p. 407.
5. See Winternitz, *op. cit.*, p. 210; *The Classical Age*, pp. 405-7.
6. Ed., H. Oldenberg, 19.14.
7. See the entry on the 'Tamil Literature' in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*;

see also Vaiyapuri, *Tamil Language and Literature*, p. 151.

8. See Dikshitar, trans., p. 343.
9. *The Age of Imperial Unity*, pp. 239–40.
10. For a list of different Tamil editions of this text see Chakravarti, *Jaina Literature in Tamil*, p. 19, n. 2.
11. See, for different views on its date, Chakravarti, op. cit., p. 24n.
12. Chakravarti, op. cit., p. 21.
13. See Vaiyapuri, op. cit., pp. 65 ff.; Chakravarti, op. cit., p. 22.
14. Chakravarti, op. cit., p. 22.
15. See T.P. Meenakshisundaram, *A History of Tamil Literature*, p. 17.
16. 33.78.
17. Trans., G.U. Pope, London, 1886. For the list of Tamil editions of *Kural* see Chakravarti, op. cit., p. 28n.
18. See Chakravarti, op. cit., pp. 33 ff.
19. Loc. cit.
20. Chakravarti, op. cit., p. 38.
21. *The Tamils Eighteen Hundred Years Ago*, p. 139.
22. pp. 33 ff.
23. See Dikshitar, trans., pp. 343–4.
24. See Padikam, p. 77.
25. See Dikshitar, p. 77, n. 2.
26. Ibid., pp. 343–4.
27. Ibid., pp. 68 ff.
28. Ibid., pp. 181 ff., 231 et seq.
29. The name of this town was known to the Jātaka writers.
30. See Dikshitar, p. 152.
31. See McCrindle, *Ancient India*, p. 63.
32. Dikshitar, op. cit., p. 216.
33. Ibid., p. 157.
34. See my *Ancient Indian Literary and Cultural Tradition*, p. 188.
35. See Legge, *Record of the Buddhistic Kingdoms*, pp. 18 ff.; see also *Bṛhatkathākośa*, 12.116.
36. Even today Hindus observe the car festival.
37. See A.K. Chatterjee, op. cit., p. 188.
38. Para 680.
39. 10.29.
40. p. 322.
41. 10.29.
42. See Mehta and Chandra, *Prakrit Proper Names*, pt. I, p. 258.
43. See Dikshitar, op. cit., p. 163.
44. Ibid., p. 171.
45. Sailana edn., pp. 22 ff.
46. Dikshitar, p. 158.
47. Ibid., p. 216.

48. ll. 453 ff.; quoted in Kanakasabhai's *The Tamils Eighteen Hundred Years Ago*, p. 136.
49. Dikshitar, op. cit., p. 158.
50. Ibid., p. 157.
51. Ibid., p. 164.
52. Ibid., pp. 231 ff.
53. Ibid., pp. 181 ff.
54. Ibid., pp. 231 ff.
55. Ibid., p. 308.
56. See Chakravarti, op. cit., p. 52; also Diskhitar, op. cit., p. 227.
57. See Dikshitar, op. cit., p. 220; see also p. 344.
58. Ibid., p. 220.
59. For a summary see Kanakasabhai, op. cit., pp. 162–89; also Vaiyapuri, op. cit., pp. 169–90.
60. See Kanakasabhai, op. cit., p. 165.
61. Ibid., p. 215.
62. See *Sāmaññaphalasutta*.
63. Kanakasabhai, op. cit., p. 214.
64. Dikshitar, op. cit., p. 164.
65. See *Madura District Gazetteer*, ed., W. Francis, pp. 300–301; see also P.B. Desai, *Jainism in South India*, pp. 60–1.
66. See Desai, op. cit., p. 57; see also *ARE*, 1910, p. 69.
67. See *JOR*, XIII, p. 3.
68. *Madura District Gazetteer*, p. 254.
69. Ibid., p. 256.
70. See Desai, op. cit., p. 60; see also *ARE*, 1912, p. 50.
71. Ibid., p. 60; *ibid.*, 1910, pp. 68–9.
72. Ibid., p. 58; *ibid.*, 1910, p. 66.
73. Ibid., p. 58; *ibid.*, 1910, p. 6.
74. Ibid., p. 60; *ibid.*, 1909, p. 70.
75. See Desai, op. cit., p. 58.
76. *Madura District Gazetteer*, pp. 321 ff.; see also Desai, op. cit., p. 57.
77. Desai, op. cit., p. 64; *ARE*, 1907, p. 47.
78. Desai, op. cit., pp. 48–9; see also *EI*, XIV, p. 334.  
According to the *Periya Purānam* this place was a seat of a large Jaina monastery in the seventh century AD. See also Chakravarti, op. cit., p. 9.
79. See Desai, op. cit., pp. 49–50.
80. Ibid., pp. 39–41.
81. Ibid., pp. 51 ff.; see also *Manual of Pudukkottai State*, 1944, II, p. 1092.
82. Desai, op. cit., p. 53; *Manual of Pudukkottai State*, p. 1968.
83. Desai, op. cit., p. 53.
84. Ibid., pp. 53 ff.
85. Ibid., p. 54.

86. Loc. cit.
87. Desai, op. cit., p. 55.
88. Ibid., pp. 68 ff.; see also *Travancore Archaeological Series*, I, p. 194.
89. See *Travancore Archaeological Series*, II, pp. 127-9.
90. p. 24 (quoted in J.P. Jain's *The Jaina Sources of the History of Ancient India*, p. 160, n. 1).
91. See *EI*, 14, p. 334.
92. See *ARE*, 1958-9, A 10, also pp. 3-4; for the text see *Transactions of the Archaeological Society of South India*, 1958-9, pp. 41 ff.
93. See *ARE*, 1958-9, pp. 3 ff.
94. See Kamil Zvelebil, *Tamil in 550 AD*, Prague, 1964.
95. See *SII*, II, pp. 391 ff.
96. See *MAR*, 1938, pp. 80 ff.; see also *Jaina Śilālekha Saṅgraha*, IV, no. 20.
97. For a summary of various such speculations, see Saletore, *Mediaeval Jainism*, pp. 7 ff.
98. See *EI*, 14, pp. 334 ff.
99. *MAR*, 1925, p. 91.
100. *SII*, II, p. 387.
101. *MAR*, 1921, p. 19.
102. *EC*, VII, no. 46, p. 139.
103. See *Jaina Śilālekha Saṅgraha*, II, no. 277.
104. It has been suggested that Mādhava I Koṅkaṇivarman probably destroyed an Aśokan pillar with his sword; see Rice, *Mysore Inscriptions*, Introd., p. xlii; see also Saletore, op. cit., pp. 15 ff.
105. Emphasis mine.
106. See *Pāia-Sadda-Mahaṇṇavo*, p. 496.
107. See *MAR*, 1921, p. 26.
108. *EC*, X, Malur, no. 73.
109. *EI*, 14, pp. 334 ff.
110. See *Mysore Gazetteer*, II, pt. II (1930), p. 621.
111. *EC*, X, Malur, no. 72.
112. *MAR*, 1938, pp. 80 ff.
113. *EC*, I, no. 1.
114. See *MAR*, 1912, para 67. The Gummareddipura plates show that he ruled at least for 40 years.
115. *MAR*, 1925, no. 105.
116. See *Mysore Gazetteer*, II, pt. II, 1930, pp. 626 ff.; see also *MAR*, 1938, pp. 87 ff.
117. It appears that Viṣṇuwardhana mentioned in the *Avantisundarīkathā*, as a contemporary of Durvinita and Simhaviṣṇu, is a different king and not to be identified with Kubja Viṣṇuwardhana, the founder of the Veṅgī house.
118. See *Jaina Śilālekha Saṅgraha*, IV, no. 141, see also *IA*, 55, p. 74; and

- Saletore, op. cit., pp. 53 ff.
119. See Saletore, op. cit., pp. 19 ff.
120. *MAR*, 1912, pp. 31-2.
121. *Mediaeval Jainism*, pp. 21 ff.
122. *MAR*, 1929, p. 50; also Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, pp. 473 ff.
123. See Sircar, *The Successors of the Śātavāhanas in the Lower Deccan*, p. 255; see also *IA*, VI, p. 23.
124. *Ibid.*, p. 234n.
125. See *The Classical Age*, p. 272.
126. *IA*, VII, pp. 35-6.
127. *Ibid.*, pp. 37-8.
128. See Sircar, op. cit., p. 262.
129. *IA*, VI, pp. 24-5.
130. See M. Monier-Williams, *SED*, p. 300.
131. See *EC*, IV, p. 130; VIII, p. 12.
132. *IA*, VI, p. 28.
133. Sircar, op. cit., p. 269.
134. *IA*, VI, pp. 25-6.
135. *Ibid.*, pp. 29-30.
136. *MAR*, 1933, pp. 109 ff.
137. See *EI*, VIII, pp. 146 ff.; XVI, p. 264.
138. See *The Classical Age*, p. 273.
139. *IA*, VI, pp. 30-1.
140. *Ibid.*, pp. 31-2.
141. See *EI*, 14, p. 165.
142. *IA*, VII, p. 33.
143. See A.V. Naik, *A List of Inscriptions of the Deccan*, no. 3.
144. *Ibid.*, no. 1.
145. *IA*, XI, pp. 68-71.
146. *The Classical Age*, p. 233.
147. *IA*, XI, p. 69.
148. See, in this connection, *Journal of Andhra Research Society*, XIII, pp. 185-96.
149. See *Report on South Indian Epigraphy*, 1916-17, no. A-9.
150. *EI*, 24, pp. 296ff.

## CHAPTER IX

### Jainism in North India (AD 600–1000)

Despite the paucity of Jaina records in north India in the post-Gupta period, it is possible to write a more or less accurate account of the state of the Jaina religion, not only with the aid of inscriptions, but also literary works. We have already noticed that the religion of the Tīrthamkaras was firmly established in virtually every part of India by AD 600. We should remember in this connection that a large number of Jaina commentaries came to be written in the post-Gupta period, which also indirectly testifies to the popularity of this religion. However, Gujarat, Rajasthan, Bengal, and parts of Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh were especially closely connected with Jainism. In other parts of northern India, it merely continued its existence in the post-Gupta period. I shall endeavour in this chapter to give a historical account of the Jaina religion in different parts of northern India.

I should, at the very outset, refer to the extremely valuable account of the Chinese pilgrim Yuan Chwang, who came to India in the second quarter of the seventh century AD. It is apparent from his account that Jainism was quite popular in different parts of India when he visited. He especially refers to the Jainas who lived in his time at Kāpiśī,<sup>1</sup> Siṃhapura,<sup>2</sup> Rājagrha,<sup>3</sup> Puṇḍravardhana,<sup>4</sup> and Samataṭa.<sup>5</sup> It, however, appears from the account that the Digambara Jainas were more popular in India in his time than the Śvetāmbaras. The only reference to the Śvetāmbaras that we get in his narrative is in connection with the description of Siṃhapura. I have already referred to the discoveries made by Stein from there. From Murti (ancient Siṃhapura) in Salt Range and old Jaina temple has been discovered.<sup>6</sup> It appears that during the time of Yuan Chwang's visit a large Jaina temple complex existed there.

Rājagrha, which was intimately associated with the activities of Mahāvīra, was a flourishing Jaina centre during Yuan Chwang's visit. We are told that he saw many Digambaras on the Vipula mountain

incessantly practising austerities. 'They turn round with the Sun, watching it from its rising to its setting.'<sup>7</sup> We have already referred to the fact that during the Gupta period too, Jainism was quite popular at Rājagṛha.

Undivided Bengal was one of the greatest centres of Jainism almost from the days of Lord Mahāvīra. Unfortunately, beyond a few references to various *śākhās* connected with Bengal, nothing tangible is known regarding the state of Jainism there in pre-Gupta times. The Paharpur inscription, which has already been discussed, certainly testifies to the popularity of the Digambara religion in north Bengal in the Gupta period, and Yuan Chwang's account conclusively shows the tremendous popularity of Jainism in Puṇḍravardhana and Samatāṭa, the two provinces of ancient Bengal. In both these states the pilgrim noticed 'numerous Digambaras'. In spite of such popularity, neither the literary texts nor the available inscriptions throw any light on Jainism in Bengal in the post-Gupta period. Archaeology too, has not so far provided any clues. However, the discovery of a large number of Jaina temples and icons, particularly from Bankura<sup>8</sup> and Purulia<sup>9</sup> is evidence of the popularity of Jainism in West Bengal during the Pāla period. It also appears that a few Jina images of Bankura and Purulia, which are generally assigned to the Pāla period, are actually the products of an earlier age. A detailed and systematic study is necessary to ascertain the actual position.

There are only a few known Jaina inscriptions of northern India belonging to the seventh century AD. From Pindwara (Sirohi district, Rajasthan) a brass image of Rṣabhanātha was discovered with an inscription of Śaṃvat 744 corresponding to AD 687.<sup>10</sup> The image was first noticed by D.R. Bhandarkar<sup>11</sup> in the fort of Vasantgaḍh and is now preserved in the Mahāvīra temple there. Vasantagaḍh was formerly known as Vasantapura, but its earliest name was Vaṭapura.<sup>12</sup> The present Jaina temple is, however, not old. I gather from this damaged inscription that one Droṇoraka Yaśodeva had the Jina image built by the architect Śivanāga. There is little doubt that the temple, where this icon was installed, existed in the seventh century AD. There is other evidence to show that Jainism was quite popular in Rajasthan in the post-Gupta period. Udyotanasūri, who wrote his *Kuvalayamālā* in Śaka 700 during the time of Pratīhāra Vatsarāja, refers<sup>13</sup> to the fact that Śivacandragani, the disciple of Mahākavi Devagupta and disciple's disciple of Harigupta, the *ācārya* of Hūṇa



Toramāṇa, visited Bhinnamāla on pilgrimage. This certainly testifies that Bhinnamāla or Bhīnmāl (Jalor district) was a great Jaina centre from the seventh century, if not earlier. Jinaprabha<sup>14</sup> refers to this place as sacred to Mahāvīra. It was the capital of the Cāpa king Vyāghramukha in the AD 628 as we learn from Brahmagupta.<sup>15</sup> From a later inscription we learn that Mahāvīra himself visited this city.<sup>16</sup> The kings of the Cāpa dynasty, as we will later note, were great patrons of Jainism. It further appears from the *Kuvalayamālā* that some of the spiritual predecessors of Udyotanasūri were specially connected with Rajasthan. We must further remember that Jāvālipura (modern Jalor) was a very well-known Jaina centre and the native town of Udyotanasūri. That author further informs us that his work was completed in the Rṣabhadeva temple of that city which also had a large number of Jaina shrines. The temple of Rṣabha, according to Udyotanasūri,<sup>17</sup> was built by one Ravibhadra. A number of Jaina saints, according to the author of the *Kuvalayamālā*, lived in this town. Another place, called Agāsavaṇā, which was probably situated not far from Jalor, was also had a large number of Jaina temples. This place was connected, according to the author, with the activities of Vedasāra, who lived in the second half of the seventh century AD.

That Jainism flourished in Rajasthan during the days of Vatsarāja is further testified by an inscription,<sup>18</sup> discovered from Osia (Jodhpur district) and is dated vs 1013 (AD 956). We learn from this inscription that there was a temple dedicated to Mahāvīra in the large city of Ukeśa, which existed during the days of Vatsarāja. The temple later fell into disrepair and was renovated by a merchant called Jindaka in vs 1013 (AD 956). It is clear from the inscription that the Mahāvīra temple here existed even before the days of Vatsarāja and was probably built a century or two before his time. It is interesting that Jinaprabha, the famous author of the *Vividhatīrthakalpa*, mentions Upakeśa (Ukeśa of this inscription) as a place sacred to Lord Mahāvīra.<sup>19</sup> The well-known Upakeśa *gaccha* apparently derived its name from this place.<sup>20</sup>

It was during the days of Vatsarāja in Śaka 705 that another Jaina poet Jinasena II, the author of the *Harivaṃśapurāṇa*,<sup>21</sup> produced a work of considerable merit. There is however nothing to show that Vatsarāja himself took active part in the promotion of Jainism. He, however, appears to be a person of religious catholicity. His personal religion was Śaivism, as we learn from one of the records of

his great-grandson Bhoja I.<sup>22</sup>

Chronologically, the next important Jaina record from Rajasthan is the Ghaṭiyālā inscription<sup>23</sup> of Kakkuka, which supplies the date vs 918 (AD 861). Ghaṭiyālā is some 20 miles north of Jodhpur city. We learn from this record that the chief Kakkuka, who is described as belonging to the Pratihāra family, founded a Jaina temple in AD 861 and handed it over to a Jaina community of Gaccha Dhaneśvara. The same chief also erected two pillars at the village of Rohiṅkūpa (probably situated not far from where inscription was discovered). The Gaccha mentioned here is otherwise unknown. This inscription of Osia proves the immense popularity of Jainism in the Jodhpur area from the days of Vatsarāja, if not earlier.

Then we must refer to an extremely important inscription<sup>24</sup> now preserved in the Ajmer Museum. It was discovered by Captain Burt, and according to local report it was fixed in the wall of a solitary temple situated two miles from the village of Vijāpura in the present Pālī district of Rajasthan. There are altogether three dates 973, 996 and 1053, corresponding to AD 915, 938, and 997, respectively.

We learn from this inscription that king Vidagdha, who is described as the *Rāṣṭrakūṭa-kulakānanakalpavṛkṣa*, and who was the son of Harivarman, being induced by his spiritual preceptor (*ācārya*) Vāsudeva, built a temple for the God Jina (Rṣabha) at the town of Hastikuṇḍī (modern Hathuṇḍī close to the village of Bijapur, 10 miles south of Bali) in the year 973 corresponding to AD 915. The king then weighed himself against gold, of which two-thirds were allotted to the god and the remainder to the Jaina preceptor (i.e., Vāsudeva). This inscription further mentions the disciple of Vāsudeva, Sūri Śāntibhadra. We are then told that the *gosthī* of Hastikuṇḍī renovated the temple (of Rṣabhanātha), originally built by Vidagdha and after its restoration the image was installed by Śāntibhadra in vs 1053 corresponding to AD 997. We also learn that the original grant of Vidagdha, which was made in vs 973 was renewed in 996, i.e., AD 938 by Mammaṭa, the son of Vidagdha. This Mammaṭa, as we learn from this inscription, played a very prominent part in the political affairs of northern India in his time. The son of Mammaṭa, Dhavala is also mentioned in the inscription as having given the gift of a well called Pippala to the temple. The *praśasti* of the first part of the inscription, which was actually inscribed later in AD 997, according to the epigraph, was composed by the Jaina saint Sūryācārya. We further learn from the first part that

the original image, before restoration, had been set up by certain members of the *goṣṭhī*, whose names are enumerated.

The second part of this inscription, which is an independent record, was engraved earlier. Here one Balabhadra appears as the *guru* of Vidagdha. It records that Vidagdha had erected a *caityagrha* for his *guru* Balabhadra and gave certain endowments in the year 973. Some interesting details regarding the nature of the grant by Vidagdha are given in this part of the record. These details are extremely important for students of economic history.<sup>25</sup> Two-thirds of these proceeds were to go to the Jina (Arhat) and a third to Balabhadra as *vidyādhana*, i.e., fees for imparting knowledge. The closing verse of the second half expresses the wish that these endowments may be enjoyed by the spiritual progeny of Keśavasūri.

The inscription discussed above,<sup>26</sup> not only discloses the names of a number of Jaina saints who lived in the tenth century AD in western Rajasthan, but also a number of royal personages of this Rāṣṭrakūṭa branch who actively helped the Jaina religion. The Jaina poet-saint Sūryācārya, the author of the first part of the inscription, was certainly a very accomplished man of letters, as is evident from the language of this inscription. These Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings were not only sincere patrons of Jainism but also successful military generals. It is also evident from the inscription that the king Vidagdha, who flourished in the first quarter of the tenth century, had two Jaina preceptors, Balabhadra and Vāsudeva, in honour of whom he built two Jaina temples. His son and successor Mammaṭa also patronized the Jinas, a policy followed by the next king Dhavala, who probably became a Jaina *sādhu* before his death. The first and the last verse of the first part of the inscription, composed by Sūryācārya, are in praise of the Jina.

Several other Jaina inscriptions from Rajasthan, belonging to the tenth century AD, have been discovered. I should particularly mention the recently discovered<sup>27</sup> epigraph from Rajogarh (Alwar district) which gives the date vs 979 (AD 923). It discloses the existence of a temple dedicated to Śāntinātha, which was built by the Jaina architect Sarvadeva, son of Dedullaka and grandson of Arbhata of the Dharkaṭa family of Pūrṇatallaka. The ancient name of Rajogarh, according to this inscription, was Rājyapura.<sup>28</sup> Another recently discovered inscription<sup>29</sup> comes from Bharatpur district. It gives the year vs 1051 corresponding to AD 994. This inscription, incised on the pedestal of a Jina image,<sup>30</sup> refers to a *guru* called Śrī Śūrasena of

Vāgaṭa Saṁgha. Mahāsenā, the author of the *Pradyumnacaritakāvya*<sup>31</sup> belonged to this *saṁgha*.

A few other Jaina inscriptions of Rajasthan prior to AD 1000 are also known. G.H. Ojha in his monumental work on the history of Rajputana<sup>32</sup> has referred to a damaged, fragmentary inscription of the time of Guhila king Allaṭa, who reigned in the mid-tenth century AD. This Jaina inscription was discovered from Ahar near Udaipur, a place still known for its Jaina shrines. For the reign of Śaktikumāra, another Guhila prince, who reigned in the last quarter of the tenth century, we have two undated Jaina inscriptions<sup>33</sup> also from Ahar.

Ojha also refers to a number of other Jaina inscriptions found from different old Jaina temples of Rajasthan.<sup>34</sup> The efflorescence of Jainism in Rajasthan is also evident from an intimate study of the *Vividhatīrthakalpa* of Jinaprabha who refers to a number of Jaina centres of pilgrimage, quite a number of which were situated in Rajasthan. I should particularly mention Satyapura, which according to Jinaprabha, was first attacked by the Muslims under Mahmūd of Ghaznī in the Vikrama year 1081 corresponding to AD 1024. The temple, according to Jinaprabha, was built even before the destruction of Valabhī in vs 845. Satyapura, which Jinaprabha places in Marumaṇḍala is the modern Sanchor in Jalor district and is near the Gujarat border. The temple of Satyapura was dedicated to Mahāvīra and is also mentioned in a later inscription found from Sanchor.<sup>35</sup>

The famous Chitor or Citrakūṭa, which was the native town of the celebrated Jaina savant Haribhadra, who probably flourished a few years before Udyotanasūri,<sup>36</sup> in the mid-eighth century AD, was another well-known Jaina centre of pilgrimage. Even today Chitor has remains of old Jaina temples. He belonged to the Vidyādhara *kūla* and was the disciple of Jinadatta.<sup>37</sup> His literary activities will be discussed in a later chapter. Another Jaina savant Elācārya was also probably a native of Citrakūṭa and was a contemporary of Haribhadra.<sup>38</sup> A few years ago a fragmentary Dīgambara Jaina inscription was discovered from Chitor.<sup>39</sup>

Let us now turn our attention to the condition of the Jaina religion from AD 600 to 1000 in Gujarat. We have already seen that Gujarat was connected with the activities of Jaina monks from the Mauryan period and by AD 600, it was firmly entrenched in Gujarat and numerous cities and villages of this state could boast of splen-

did Jaina temples. Quite a number of Jaina writers have fortunately mentioned the religious shrines in Gujarat from AD 600 to 1000. We have already taken note of the fact that Jinasena II, the author of the *Harivamśapurāṇa*, has referred to two Jaina temples of Vardhamāna and Dostaṭikā, both situated in Gujarat. The temple of Vardhamāna (Vadavān) was dedicated to Pārśvanātha and that of Dostaṭikā to Śāntinātha, both Digambara shrines built probably around AD 600. It was at Vardhamāna that another Digambara poet Hariṣeṇa, composed his *Bṛhatkathakośa* in AD 931.<sup>40</sup> In the vs 1361, corresponding to AD 1302, Merutuṅga completed his *Prabandha-cintāmaṇi* at this town,<sup>41</sup> which was therefore, well-known to both the Digambaras and Śvetāmbaras.

The great city of Valabhī, which was an important centre of Jainism in the Gupta period, continued its existence till the last quarter of the eighth century AD. The city was well-known for its celebrated shrine of Candraprabha and was also a famous temple there, dedicated to Mahāvīra. We are told in several Jaina texts that the famous Jaina icons of Valabhī were taken to various other towns before its destruction by the Muslims in vs 845 (AD 787). Jinaprabha<sup>42</sup> tells us that icon of Candraprabha at Valabhī, which was established by Gautamasvāmin, the great disciple of Mahāvīra, was transferred to Prabhāsa also known as Devapattana or Śivapattana before vs 845. The confirmation of this account is found in another Jaina historical text, the *Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha*.<sup>43</sup> There is little doubt that the shrine of Candraprabha was established in all probability centuries before it was transferred to Prabhāsa. We further learn from the *Vividhatīrthakalpa*<sup>44</sup> and *Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha*<sup>45</sup> that the icon of Vīra or Mahāvīra was transferred before the destruction of Valabhī to Śrīmāla or Bhīmāl. Some other icons of this town were taken to various other Jaina holy places including Śatruñjaya.

The great Jaina saint Mallavādi, according to the Jaina tradition, was a resident of Valabhī, and it was because of his influence that Jainism became popular in Gujarat at the cost of the Buddhism.<sup>46</sup> Another town of Gujarat which was associated with Jainism from early days was Bhṛgukaccha. The great Śakunikāvihāra of this town was one of the greatest and most celebrated Jaina shrines of western India. Several Jaina texts<sup>47</sup> refer to this *vihāra* which was apparently built during the Gupta period. A number of Jaina works were subsequently written to sing the glory of this *vihāra*.<sup>48</sup> Later, some of the greatest Jainas of western India, including Hemacandra, visited

this *vihāra* and did all they could to beautify it. The eighth-century Jaina commentary, the *Vyavahārabhāṣya*,<sup>49</sup> describes Bhṛgukaccha as a place sacred to the Jains. A recently discovered<sup>50</sup> bronze image inscription from there refers to the Mūlavasati of Bhṛgukaccha. The inscription which is incised on the pedestal of an image of Pārśva has the date Śaka 908 corresponding to AD 986. It refers to a work called Pārśvilla, the disciple of Śīlabhadragani, who belonged to the *anvaya* of Lakṣmaṇasūri of Nāgendrakula. It is apparent from the inscription that the temple called Mūlavasati existed at Bhṛgukaccha in the early medieval period.

I should then refer to the great Jaina centre of Girnar, also called Urjayanta. We have already noted that this hill was associated with the Jaina religion from a very early period. In the tenth century a great Jaina lay devotee called Ratna, hailing from Kashmir,<sup>51</sup> donated a golden image of Neminātha to the Jaina *saṃgha* here. From very early times it was considered to be the sacred duty for every pious Jaina to undertake a trip to this holy hill, believed to be the site of *nirvāṇa* of Neminātha. Like Girnar, the hill at Palitana in Gujarat, which is known as Śatruṅjaya, was considered sacred from a very early period, but became well-known only after the tenth century AD.

The Cāpas of Gujarat, who started their political career even before the downfall of the Valabhī kingdom, were devoted patrons of the Jaina religion. Nothing is known regarding the religious leaning of the earliest Cāpa king Vyāghramukha, whose name is disclosed by Brahmagupta and who ruled in Śaka 550. According to the Jaina writers Vanarāja of Pañcāsara, who later founded the city of Aṇahillapura, was the earliest prince of this dynasty, but as we have already noted, one Vyāghramukha was a prince of this dynasty and ruled around AD 628 at Bhinnamāla.

Several Jaina writers have claimed that Vanarāja, like Mādhava of the Gaṅga dynasty, was helped by a Jaina saint in his attempt to carve out an independent kingdom. The *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*<sup>52</sup> distinctly states that Vanarāja was helped in his childhood by a Jaina monk named Śīlaguṇasūri. That Jaina saint was convinced from the very outset that the boy Vanarāja would in future become a *jinaśāsanaprabhāvaka*, i.e., 'a propagator of the Jaina faith'. We are further told by the learned author of the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* that the boy Vanarāja was brought up by *gaṇinī* (head nun) Vīramatī. The Jaina monk Śīlaguṇasūri foresaw from the horoscope of the

boy that he was to become a great king. Later Vanarāja founded, according to Merutuṅga, in vs 802 corresponding to AD 744, the city of Aṇahillapura. Initially he offered his *guru* Śīlaguṇasūri his entire kingdom which the latter naturally declined to accept. Then, at the instance of his Jaina preceptor, Vanarāja built in the capital a temple dedicated to Pārśvanātha.<sup>53</sup> According to an earlier Jaina text called *Nemināthacarīyu*,<sup>54</sup> written in AD 1160, in the capital of Vanarāja, a Jaina merchant of the name of Ninnaya built a temple dedicated to the first Tīrthānkara, Ādinātha or Rṣabha. The combined evidence of these two texts show therefore, that Vanarāja was definitely a patron of the Jains and a number of Jaina shrines were founded during his reign in his kingdom. The account regarding Śīlaguṇasūri's connection with Vanarāja is confirmed by the *Purātanaprabandhasaṅgraha*.<sup>55</sup> It is interesting to note that a Jaina inscription<sup>56</sup> of Vanarāja gives the date vs 802 which is found in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* of Merutuṅga. It is evident that the Jaina tradition regarding Vanarāja is based on historical facts. The temple of Pañcāsara Pārśvanātha is still to be seen at Pattana, although it is embellished with later additions. The *Prabhāvākaraṇa* also refers to the concessions given to the *caityavāsī* monks by Vanarāja.<sup>57</sup> Practically nothing is known of the Jaina connection of Vanarāja's successors. However, a verse, quoted in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, shows that the Cāpas were patrons of Jainism. The translation of the verse runs thus: 'This kingdom of Gurjaras, even from the time of king Vanarāja, was established with the Jaina *mantras* [counsels], its enemies indeed have no cause to rejoice.'<sup>58</sup>

Before a discussion on the condition of the Jaina religion during the successors of the Cāpas in Gujarat, I must turn my attention to the available epigraphic records, discovered from Gujarat, throwing light on the Jaina religion. The earliest of such records are the well-known Surat plates of Karkarāja Suvarṇavarṣa dated Śaka 743 corresponding to AD 821. This inscription is an extremely important Jaina record. It not only discloses the names of Jaina saints who lived in the eighth century AD in Gujarat but also throws welcome light on the exact condition of the Jaina religion at that time.

The record opens with a homage to the gospel of Jinendra. It runs thus: 'Victorious is the gracious gospel, propounded by the best of the Jinas, which is perpetual abode of prosperity, which is clear in its entirety, which is based on *Syādvāda* and which brings about beatitude to one with a controlled mind. This inscription

records the grant of a piece of land to a Jaina savant called Aparājita, who is described as the disciple of Sumati, and a grand-disciple of Mallavādi,<sup>59</sup> belonging to the Sena Saṃgha branch of the Mūla Saṃgha. According to the Digambara *Paṭṭāvalīs*, Mūla Saṃgha branched off into three subsections known as Deva Saṃgha, Nandi Saṃgha and Sena Saṃgha.<sup>60</sup> This inscription, therefore, confirms the veracity of the testimony of the *Paṭṭāvalīs*. I have already mentioned in connection with my discussion of south Indian Jainism that Nandi Saṃgha was in existence in the far south even as early as the sixth century AD. It appears that within a few years of the emergence of the Digambara sect it was subdivided into a number of smaller schools, both in the north and the south.

The field which was granted to Aparājita in the Śaka year 743 is described in the inscription as situated near Nāgasārikā (modern Navsari, 20 miles south of Surat) which was one of the greatest cities of ancient Gujarat. The grant was made for the purpose of daily worship, cooked rice offerings, and repairs and renovation of the monastery (*vasatikā*) which is described as an ornament of Sambapura and was attached to the temple of Arhat situated within the boundaries of Śrī Nāgasārikā. There is no doubt that the temple of Arhat at Nāgasārikā, mentioned in his inscription, was built before the eighth century AD. The last two verses of the inscription are in praise of the Jina and the religion preached by him. The donor Karkarāja Suvarṇavarṣa was a cousin of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa emperor Amoghavarṣa I and was a feudatory under him in the Gujarat region. It appears that this branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family, like the main branch, actively patronized the Jains, but today there is no trace of any Digambara temple at Navsari. There is however a Śvetāmbara shrine which was built in the thirteenth century.<sup>61</sup>

Jaina inscriptions before AD 1000 are extremely rare in Gujarat. We have just discussed the Surat plates of Karkarāja. A few epigraphs of Girnar were probably inscribed before AD 1000. The only other significant Jaina inscription is that known as Varuṇāśarmaka<sup>62</sup> grant dated in vs 1033 corresponding to AD 975. It was issued during the reign of Mūlarāja I by his son *yuvarāja* Cāmuṇḍarāja. We are told that the latter granted a field for the benefit of a Jaina temple at Varuṇāśarmaka which is identified with Vadasama in Mehsana district of eastern Gujarat. The inscription significantly refers to *jinabhavana* and *jinabimba*. This shows that the early kings of the Caulukya dynasty of Gujarat were not against Jainism, but we cannot



say that all of them were sincere patrons of Jainism, but at least one of the officers of Mūlarāja was a Jaina.<sup>63</sup> There is no doubt however that Jainism was very popular in Gujarat during the reign of the early Caulukya kings. In the second part of this work I shall discuss in greater detail the position of the Jaina religion in Gujarat after AD 1000.

Let us now turn our attention to Madhya Pradesh which, as we have already noticed, had several influential Jaina centres from early times. It should however be remembered that the ruling dynasties of this state openly favoured orthodox Hinduism or Brahmanical religion. The Jaina religion was however held in esteem by individual kings of different dynasties ruling in this state in our period, i.e., between AD 600 and 1000. Let us first take note of the available Jaina inscriptions.

From the well-known Jaina temple complex at Sonagiri (Datia district, M.P.) an epigraph of the seventh century<sup>64</sup> has been discovered which provides direct evidence of the great antiquity of the Jaina centre. It refers to a Jaina devotee called Vadāka, who was the son of Siṅghadeva. A very large number of Jaina temples of quite an early period have been discovered from different parts of M.P., but not many inscriptions of this period are known. Among the few Jaina inscriptions from M.P. belonging to our period, the most important is, however, the Khajuraho inscription<sup>65</sup> of the reign of Candella Dhaṅga dated in vs 1011 corresponding to AD 955. It is carved on the left doorjamb of the temple of Jinanātha at Khajuraho. The inscription records a number of gifts in favour of the temple by one Pāhilla, and who is described as being held in honour by king Dhaṅga. He is further described in the earlier part of the inscription as endowed with the qualities of tranquillity and self-control, and as possessing compassion for all beings. A number of gardens are mentioned as gifts to the temple of Jinanātha. The inscription further refers to Śrī Vāsavacandra, who is described as the *guru* of the Mahārāja, who is no other than Dhaṅga. This inscription, which is the earliest dated Candella record, is conclusive evidence of the tremendous popularity Jainism enjoyed in the Candella dominion, and this is also directly testified to by the beautiful Jaina temples of the Candella territory including Khajuraho.

A few other Jaina inscriptions of our period from M.P. are also known. An inscription<sup>66</sup> near Mandasor refers to Ācāryas Śubhakīrti and Vimalakīrti. The script of this inscription is datable to the tenth

century AD. An earlier Jaina inscription<sup>67</sup> from M.P., giving the date AD 875, has also been discovered.

From the literary sources we get more meaningful and extensive information regarding the state of Jainism in M.P. before AD 1000. The existence of a temple, dedicated to Pārśvanātha at Dhārā, the famous capital of the Paramāras, is disclosed by the *Darśanasāra*<sup>68</sup> of Devasena, which was composed in that shrine in vs 990 corresponding to AD 933. It may be suggested that the ruler of Dhārā at that time was Vairisimha, the father of Harṣa Sīyaka of the Harsola grant.<sup>69</sup> The temple of Pārśva, mentioned by Devasena, was evidently a Digambara shrine and probably shows that soon after the foundation of this city, the Digambaras were permitted to build their temples there. Remnants of ruined Jaina temples have been noticed at Dhar,<sup>70</sup> the ancient Dhārā. The Muslims destroyed both the Hindu and Jaina temples there.<sup>71</sup>

During the rule of Harṣa Sīyaka, the Jainas enjoyed great popularity in the Paramāra kingdom. A number of Jaina writers flourished during his rule and during that of his successor Muñja. During the closing period of the rule of Harṣa Sīyaka the celebrated Jaina writer Dhanapāla composed his *Pāiyalacchī* in vs 1029 corresponding to AD 1072.<sup>72</sup> We are told by the poet that he composed this text for his sister Sundarī at Dhārā. From the later works like the *Prabhāvākacārita* and *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* we learn that his grandfather, Devarṣi, was originally a Brāhmaṇa of Sāṅkāśya and later migrated to Ujjayinī.<sup>73</sup> Dhanapāla, we are told, became a Jaina under the influence of his younger brother Śobhana. The year in which Dhanapāla prepared his *Pāiyalacchī*, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa capital Mānyakheṭa was ransacked by the army of the Mālava king. From the *Tilakamañjarī*, which was composed during the rule of Bhoja, we learn that he was honoured by king Muñja who conferred upon him the title of Sarasvatī.<sup>74</sup> It thus appears that Dhanapāla was an honourable member of the Paramāra royal court during the reign of the three kings, namely Harṣa Sīyaka, Vākpati Muñja, and Bhoja.

Another poet who flourished in the second half of the tenth century during the reign of the Paramāra kings was Mahāsenasūri, belonging to Lāṭavargaṭa Saṅgha. His *guru* was Guṇākarasena, who was a disciple of Jayasena. From a short *prasasti* discovered from Kārañjā Jaina *bhāṇḍāra*, we learn that the poet, who was the author of the *Pradyumnacaritakāvya*,<sup>75</sup> was honoured by no less a person than Muñja. Subsequently a high official of Muñja's brother,

Sindhurāja, became his devotee. The name of this high official (*mahattama*) is given as Parpaṭa. This shows that not only the Paramāra kings themselves, but also their officials, were patrons of Jainism. Sindhurāja, it appears ruled for a short time in the closing years of the tenth century.<sup>76</sup>

Another Jaina who lived during the time of Muñja was Ācārya Amitagati who wrote his *Subhāṣitaratnasandoha* in the vs 1050 when Muñja was 'ruling the earth'.<sup>77</sup> Subsequently the same *ācārya* composed his celebrated *Dharmaparīkṣā* during the reign of Bhoja in the vs 1070. He belonged to the Kāṣṭhā Saṃgha. The names of his spiritual predecessors are: Virasena, Devasena, Amitagati I, Nemiṣeṇa, and Mādhavasena.<sup>78</sup> The earliest *guru* Virasena therefore, lived in the ninth century AD. Incidentally, the date supplied by Amitagati regarding Muñja is the last known date of that celebrated king.<sup>79</sup>

Let us turn our attention to the state of Jainism in Maharashtra after AD 600. We have already seen that Jainism was introduced in this state in the Mauryan period. Not many Jaina inscriptions of this period from Maharashtra are, however, known but we definitely know that during the rule of the western Cālukyas and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, Jainism was extremely popular not only in the Lower Deccan, but also in modern Maharashtra state. According to Jinaprabha,<sup>80</sup> Tīrthaṃkara Candraprabha was worshipped from very early times as Jīvantasvāmin at Nāsik. At Pratiṣṭhāna, another ancient city of Maharashtra, which is identified with Paithan, there was a famous shrine, dedicated to Muni Suvrata.<sup>81</sup> Recently an important Jaina inscription of the early tenth century AD<sup>82</sup> was discovered from Nāsik district of Maharashtra. The inscription is incised on three plates which were found from a place called Vajirkheda, four miles east of Malegaon in Nāsik district. The inscription tells us that at the time of his *paṭṭabandha* ceremony Rāṣṭrakūṭa Nityavarṣadeva (Indra III), who meditated at the feet of his grandfather Kṛṣṇa II (Akālavarṣa), in Śāka 836 (AD 915) granted two villages to a Jaina monastery called Amoghavasati, and the site of the monastery itself to the preceptor Vardhamāna, who was the disciple of Lokabhadra of the Draviḍa Saṃgha. The *gaṇa* and *anvaya* of Vardhamāna were Vīra and Virṇṇāya, respectively. We are further told that Amoghavasati was situated at Candanāpurī, which is the present Candanpurī situated two miles south of Malegaon. It has been suggested<sup>83</sup> that Amoghavasati, referred to in the inscription,

was built by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Amoghavarṣa, who was a great Jaina patron, as we will see in the next chapter. It is also quite likely that the emperor Amoghavarṣa I himself gave grants to this Jaina temple of Candanāpurī. The undated Kalvan plates<sup>84</sup> of the time of Paramāra Bhoja (early eleventh century) show that the Śvetāmbara Jains too had their monastery at Muktāpalī in Nāsik district. It is apparent from that inscription that the temple of Suvratasvāmin was built there centuries before the time of Bhoja I. The record under discussion further shows that the monks of the Draviḍa Saṁgha had later migrated to Nāsik district. Such migrations of Jaina monks were quite common in those days, as we will see later.

The second part of the same grant registers a gift of six villages to the Jaina monastery of Uriamma in the town of Vaḍanera and the residential monastery itself to the same preceptor Vardhamāna. Uriamma is a Kannaḍa name for Jvālāmālinī, the *yakṣiṇī* of Candra-prabha. The villages which were given away as gift are in the Nāsik district, and Vaḍanera is modern Vadner, 15 miles north-west of Malegaon. Both parts of the grant, we are told, were written by the poet Rājasēkhara, who is probably to be identified with the celebrated poet of that name. The decipherers of this inscription believes that Rājasēkhara, after Mahendrapāla's demise, in AD 910 probably went to the royal court of Indra III. It has further been pointed out that v. 2 of the first part of the record is a *maṅgalaśloka* in the *Pramāṇa-saṁgraha* of Akalaṅka.<sup>85</sup>

The inscription, discussed above, not only discloses the existence of two Jaina shrines in Nāsik district of Maharashtra in the early mediaeval period, but also bears testimony to the great royal patronage the religion enjoyed during the days of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. In the next chapter we will have something more to say on this. It also appears that the well-known poet Rājasēkhara became a Jaina during the latter part of his life, but in the absence of further evidence, we cannot be categorical about this.

The popularity of Jainism in Maharashtra in our period is further proved by the beautiful Jaina caves of Ellora, most of which were excavated by AD 800.<sup>86</sup> I shall discuss their artistic value in the vol. II of this work. In the last chapter I had occasion to refer to the spurious Altem copperplates discovered from Kolhapur district of Maharashtra. The inscription testifies to the existence of a great Jaina temple in Kolhapur district in the ancient period. The other details in this inscription cannot be accepted without further verifi-

ation. There is, however, no reason to disbelieve that a feudatory of the western Cālukyas did not build a Jaina temple at Alaktakanagara (Altem) sometime around AD 600.<sup>87</sup>

Several places in modern U.P. were directly connected with the Jaina religion in our period. We should first refer to the celebrated group of Deogarh temples<sup>88</sup> in Jhansi district, situated on the river Betwa (Vetravatī). Some of the temples here were probably built during the Gupta period but a majority of them came into existence only in our period. The most important inscription of Deogarh is that of the time of Pratīhāra Bhoja<sup>89</sup> which gives the date both in the Vikrama and Śāka eras. The date given in the Vikrama era is 919 and in the Śāka 784, corresponding to AD 862. The inscription was discovered in the temple of Śāntinātha, and proves that the shrine existed before AD 826. We further learn that Deogarh was formerly known as Luacchāgira. It further mentions Mahāsāmanta Viṣṇurāma who had the title *pañcamahāśabda* given to him by *paramabhaṭṭāraka*, *mahārājādhirāja paramēśvara Śrī Bhojadeva*. The inscription which is incised on a pillar (*stambha*) of the temple further refers to one Śrīdeva who was the disciple of *ācārya* Kamaladeva. Another inscription,<sup>90</sup> dated vs 1016, mentions Tribhuvanakīrti, a disciple of Devdrakīrti, who was a disciple of Ratnakīrti of the Sarasvatī *gaccha* of Śrī Mūlasamgha. Ratnakīrti, therefore, lived around AD 850, if not earlier. A third inscription<sup>91</sup> of the ninth century AD from here refers to a Jaina *muni* called Nāgasenācārya. Another inscription<sup>92</sup> has the date vs 1051 corresponding to AD 994. A substantial number of inscriptions from Deogarh belong to the period after AD 1000, and will be discussed in vol. II of this work.

It should be remembered that Deogarh continues to be a sacred place for the Jains to this day. The celebrated Viṣṇu temple dating to the Gupta period there is undoubtedly the oldest shrine of Deogarh. It, however, appears that this place was not known to Jinaprabha, the author of the celebrated *Vividhatīrthakalpa*.

Let us now turn our attention to Mathurā which, as we have already seen, had been a great Jaina centre from the second century BC, if not earlier. In the literary texts, composed in our period, Mathurā is repeatedly mentioned as a celebrated Jaina centre. The *Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya*,<sup>93</sup> composed in the eighth century, refers to the Jaina shrines in residential areas of Mathurā. The *Bṛhatkathakośa*<sup>94</sup> of Hariṣeṇa, composed in AD 931, describes Mathurā as *jināyatana-maṇḍitā*, i.e., 'abounding in Jaina temples'. Jinaprabha<sup>95</sup> informs us

that in the vs 826 corresponding to AD 768 the great Śvetāmbara savant Bappabhaṭṭi established an image of Mahāvīra (*vīrabimba*) at Mathurā. This is also confirmed by the evidence of the *Prabandha-kośa*.<sup>96</sup> According to Devasena, in vs 953 corresponding to AD 895 Rāmasena established the Māthura Saṅgha at Mathurā.<sup>97</sup> This shows that Mathurā continued as a favourite resort for both the Śvetāmbaras and Digambaras.

A few Jaina inscriptions of our period<sup>98</sup> have been discovered from Mathurā which also testify that Mathurā retained its popularity as a Jaina centre between AD 600 and 1000. It should, however, be remembered that the popularity of Jainism at Mathurā gradually diminished in course of time with the migration of the Jaina monks towards Rajasthan, Gujarat and Karnataka. The ruling dynasties of northern India did not patronize Jainism like the ruling dynasties of the three above-mentioned states. This we will discuss later. For the present, let us turn our attention to some other places in U.P.

Several ancient cities of U.P. such as Ahicchatra, Kāmpilya, Kāśī, Sāṅkāśya, Śrāvastī, Kauśāmbī, etc. had Jaina centres, and Jina images from these cities of our period have been discovered and they will be discussed in vol. II. A few small Jaina inscriptions and images of our period have also been discovered from various places in U.P.<sup>99</sup> In this connection we should take note of the statement of the author of the *Prabodhacandrodaya*,<sup>100</sup> a play written in the eleventh century, that as a result of persecution by the Brāhmaṇas, the Digambara Jainas and Buddhists fled to Pañcāla, Mālava, Ābhīra, and Ānarta. We should remember that the play was staged in the court of Candella Kīrtivarman and therefore, its evidence is of real value.<sup>101</sup> There is very great reason to believe that by AD 1000. Jainism had been almost completely eclipsed from a majority of places in U.P., Bihar, Bengal and Orissa.

In the Śvetāmbara Jaina works, we are told about the achievements of a great Jaina saint of the name of Bappabhaṭṭi, who is described as a contemporary of king Āma of Kanauj, Dharmapāla of Bengal, and Vākpati, the author of the celebrated Prākṛta poem *Gauḍavaho*.<sup>102</sup> This great Jaina saint was responsible, according to the Śvetāmbara works, for the promotion of Jainism in different places in northern India in the eighth century AD. However, his chief patron king Āma is not known from epigraphic sources. It has been conjectured<sup>103</sup> that he should either be identified with Nāgabhaṭṭa II or Indrāyudha-Indrarāja. Bappabhaṭṭi set up in his lifetime Jaina

shrines at Mathurā, Gopagiri (Gwalior), Anahillapura and other places.<sup>104</sup> Elsewhere, we are told, that it was due to him that the Śvetāmbaras could regain control over the famous Raivataka hill.<sup>105</sup>

Turning now to the extreme northern part of India, we find only a few cases of evidence regarding the existence of Jainism in Punjab, Himachal Pradesh, and Haryana. There is an important inscription<sup>106</sup> from Kangra, Himachal Pradesh, which discloses the names of two Jaina saints belonging to Rājakula *gaccha*, which is probably the same as Rāja *gaccha*. A certain Siddharāja is described as a disciple of Sūri Amalacandra, a pupil of Sūri Abhayacandra. Siddharāja's son was Dhaṅga and Dhaṅga's son Caṣṭaka. The wife of Caṣṭaka was Ralhā, and the two sons were born of her and both of them were devoted to the law of Jina (*Jainadharmaparāyaṇau*). The elder was called Kuṇḍalaka and the younger Kumāra. We are told that they were responsible for the construction of the image (of Pārśvanātha). The date given is Saṃvat 30, which according to Bühler is equivalent to AD 854.<sup>107</sup> The earliest Sūri Abhayacandra should be placed around AD 700.

We have already noted that one *śrāvaka* Ratna (Rayaṇa) from Kashmir founded a *maṇibimba* of Neminātha<sup>108</sup> in vs 990 corresponding to AD 932 on the sacred hill of Raivataka. This shows that there were a few Jainas in Kashmir in the tenth century AD. Kalhaṇa, however, in his *Rājataranṅiṇī* has not mentioned the Jainas even once. However, archaeological evidence<sup>109</sup> at our disposal testify that Jainism was not entirely unknown in some places in Kashmir, but was regarded only as one of the minor religious sects in Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh, Punjab, and Haryana.

Recently a few Śvetāmbara and Digambara Jaina images, belonging to the eighth and ninth centuries AD have been discovered from Punjab.<sup>110</sup> We have later Jaina inscriptions from the Himalayan areas which show that Jainism somehow lingered in those areas till a very late period.

In eastern India Jainism maintained its existence till the end of the tenth century AD but no important Jaina inscription has been found either in West Bengal or Bangladesh which can be assigned between AD 600 and 1000. The only Jaina record<sup>111</sup> of the Pāla period has been discovered from Bargaon near Nālandā (Bihar). The inscription belongs to the twenty-fourth year of Rājyapāla, who ruled in the first half of the tenth century AD.<sup>112</sup> The record is incised on a pillar near a ruined Jaina temple and refers to one Vaidyanātha,

son of Manoratha of Vaṇīkakula. There is, however, no dearth of Jaina images of the Pāla period, either in Bengal or Bihar. Some of these Jaina icons will be discussed in the vol. II of this work.

From Orissa a number of Jaina inscriptions, belonging to the post-Gupta period, have been found. The earliest of such inscriptions is a Śailodbhava grant, of the seventh century AD. This inscription<sup>113</sup> mentions a Jaina *muni* called Prabuddhacandra and his teacher Arhadācārya Nāsīcandra, and testifies to the prevalence of Jainism in Orissa in the seventh century AD. We have another seventh-century inscription<sup>114</sup> found from Ratnagiri hills (Cuttack district) which is a Jaina record of four lines in east Indian script from the seventh century AD. It refers to the installation of Jaina images and points to the existence of an early Jaina establishment on these hills, which are famous for their Buddhist ruins.

Two Digambara Jaina inscriptions have been discovered from Udaygiri-Khaṇḍagiri caves. They belong to the tenth century AD, and were inscribed during the reign of Udyotakeśarī of the Kesarī dynasty of Orissa. The first inscription<sup>115</sup> discovered in what is called Lalitendu Kesarī's cave was incised in the fifth year of the reign of Udyotakesarī and refers to the repair of old Jaina temples. It also preserves the name of a Digambara saint called Yaśanandi. It is interesting to note that the inscription refers to the Udayagiri-Khaṇḍagiri hills as Kumāraparvata, which reminds us of the Kumārīparvata of Khāavela's record. I have been able to locate the only literary reference to this hill, in the *Bṛhathkathākośa*<sup>116</sup> of Hariṣeṇa, composed in AD 931, which mentions Kumāragiri of Oḍraviṣaya. It is evidently the same as Kumāragiri or Kumārigiri.

The second inscription<sup>117</sup> was inscribed in the eighteenth year of Udyotakesarī's reign and mentions Śubhacandra, the disciple of Kulacandra, belonging to the Deśī *gaṇa* and Āryasaṅghagraha *kula*. The Deśī *gaṇa* is also known from inscriptions found from various places of Karnataka and M.P.<sup>118</sup> However, the *kula* mentioned here is not otherwise known. Another inscription found from the same hill refers to the above-mentioned Jaina *munis*.<sup>119</sup>

These inscriptions show that Jainism continued to flourish in Orissa as late as the tenth century AD. After AD 1000, Jainism gradually lost popularity, and with the rise of new theistic sects, almost completely disappeared from Orissa.

I am strongly of the opinion that the celebrated Somadeva, the author of the *Yaśastilakacampū*, who is also mentioned in an inscrip-



tion<sup>120</sup> dated Śaka 888, and who is described there as belonging to the Gauḍa Saṃgha was originally a Jaina saint from Bengal. There is no reason to suppose the existence of *saṃgha* of that name in U.P.<sup>121</sup> We must remember that Jainism was very popular in Bengal, and since the latter was connected with the religion from early times it is natural to suppose that the Jaina monks belonging to this state were held in esteem by monks from the other states of India. With the decline of Jainism in Bengal in the tenth century AD, the monks of this state naturally sought asylum in other parts of the country. It is also interesting to note that probably Somadeva in his *Yaśastilakacampū*<sup>122</sup> refers to a Jaina shrine of Tāmralipta, the ancient port of southern Bengal.

To sum up, we must repeat that with the exception of Gujarat and Rajasthan, and a few select pockets elsewhere, Jainism was fighting a losing battle in northern India. In Rajasthan and Gujarat it was because of the enthusiasm of traders that this religion managed to retain its hold. In other parts of India Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism became the dominant religious systems. In eastern India the Pālas largely patronized Buddhists. In central India the kings of the Kalacuri, Candella, Cāhamāna, Guhila, and other dynasties did practically nothing to promote the cause of Jainism. In northernmost parts of India, the ruling dynasties never cared for Jainism. Kashmir was a citadel of the Śaivas and Punjab of both the Śaivas and Vaiṣṇavas. In south India, however, especially in Karnataka the picture was different, and I shall now turn my attention once more to the south.

#### REFERENCES

1. Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, I, p. 123.
2. *Ibid.*, I, p. 251.
3. *Ibid.*, II, p. 154.
4. *Ibid.*, II, p. 184.
5. *Ibid.*, II, p. 187.
6. See *Annual Progress Report of the Superintendent, Hindu and Buddhist Monuments, Northern Circle*, 1918-19, p. 12.
7. Watters, *op. cit.*, II, p. 154.
8. D. Mitra, 'Some Jaina Antiquities from Bankura', *JASB*, 1958, 24, no. 2.
9. See *Jaina Journal*, 1969, IV, no. 4; see also R.D. Banerji, *Eastern Indian School of Mediaeval Sculpture*, p. 145; see also *Jaina Journal*, V, no. 1.

10. *ASIAR* (Western Circle), 1905-6, p. 52; see also *ASIAR*, 1936-37, p. 122.
11. *ASIAR* (Western Circle), 1905-6, pp. 48 ff.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 50.
13. *SJGM*, no. 45 (ed., A.N. Upadhye), colophon, vs 6.
14. *Vividhatīrthakalpa*, p. 86.
15. Quoted in p. 200, n. 1, *Political History of Northern India from Jaina Sources*.
16. *ASIAR* (Western Circle), 1906-7, p. 39.
17. vv. 18-20.
18. Bhandarkar, *List*, no. 72; See also P.C. Nahar, *Jaina Lekha Saṅgraha*, I, pp. 192 ff.; also *ASIAR*, 1908-9, p. 108.
19. p. 86.
20. See *IA*, 19, pp. 233 ff.
21. See A.K. Chatterjee, *Ancient Indian Literary and Cultural Tradition*, pp. 89 ff.
22. Bhandarkar, *List*, no. 25.
23. *EI*, IX, pp. 280 ff.
24. See *JASB*, LXII, pt. I, pp. 309 ff.; See also *EI*, 10.
25. *EI*, 10, p. 19; this portion of the inscription also contains some interesting names of coins.
26. See also H.C. Ray, *Dynastic History of Northern India*, I, pp. 560 ff.
27. See *Jaina Śīlālekha Saṅgraha*, V, no. 16; also *Indian Epigraphy (Annual Report)*, 1961-2, B 128.
28. See *Indian Archaeology*, 1961-2, p. 85.
29. See *JASB* (Letters), 1953, 19, pp. 109-10.
30. *Loc. cit.*
31. See *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, vol. 6, p. 476.
32. II, p. 428.
33. *Ibid.*, pp. 434-7.
34. See IV, pt. I, p. 58; V, pt. I, pp. 63ff.
35. See *ASIAR* (Western Circle), 1906-7, p. 36.
36. In the colophon of his work the *Kuvalayamālā* Udyotanasūri (vv. 14-15) refers to Haribhadra as one of his teachers.
37. See the colophon of the *Āvaśyakavṛtti* quoted in *The Jaina Sources of the History of Ancient India* by J.P. Jain, p. 190, n. 5.
38. See Jain, *op. cit.*, p. 188, n. 4.
39. See *Indian Archaeology*, 1955-6, p. 31.
40. Ed., A.N. Upadhye, *praśasti*, vs 4.
41. Ed., Jinavijaya, *praśasti*, concluding line.
42. See *Vividhatīrthakalpa*, p. 29.
43. Ed., Jinavijaya, p. 83.
44. p. 29.
45. p. 83.
46. See *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, p. 107; *Purātaṅaprabandhasaṅgraha*, p. 130;

*Prabandhakośa*, pp. 21 ff.

47. See *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, vol. 6, pp. 131, 363, 438.
48. See especially the *Sudamaṣaṅcariya* by Devendrasūri who composed the text in the twelfth century. See for further details J.C. Jain, *Prākṛta Sāhitya kā Itihāsa*, pp. 561 ff. According to Muni Puṇyavijaya this text is based on an earlier work; see Jain, op. cit., p. 561, n. 1. A detailed account regarding it will be found in the *Vividhatīrthakalpa*, pp. 20 ff.
49. See J.C. Jain, op. cit., p. 219.
50. See *Lalit Kalā*, nos. 1–2, 1955–6, pl. XII, fig. 10A.
51. See *Purātanaṅprabandhasaṅgraha*, p. 97.
52. p. 12.
53. Ibid., p. 13.
54. Ed., Jacobi, p. 152.
55. p. 12.
56. Guérinot, *List*, no. 116; see also Burgess and Cousens, *Antiquities of Northern Gujarat (ASI, 32)*, p. 45.
57. p. 136.
58. p. 13.
59. *EI*, XXI, pp. 133 ff.
60. See *ERE*, VII, p. 474 and also *EI*, XXI, pp. 133 ff.
61. See *EI*, XXI, pp. 133 ff.
62. *Bhāratiya Vidyā*, I, p. 73; also *HIG*, III, no. 136A.
63. See A.K. Majumdar, *The Caulukyās of Gujarat*, p. 32; also *AIOC*, 7, p. 1157.
64. *Jaina Lekha Saṅgraha (MDJM)*, V, no. 5; also *Indian Epigraphy (Annual Report)*, 1962–3, B 381.
65. See *EI*, I, pp. 135–6.
66. See *Jaina Lekha Saṅgraha*, IV, no. 114; also *Indian Epigraphy (Annual Report)*, 1954–5, p. 45.
67. See *Jaina Lekha Saṅgraha*, II, no. 129; also Cunningham, *ASI*, 10, p. 74.
68. vv. 49–50; quoted in N.L. Premi's *Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihāsa*, p. 175, fn. 1.
69. *EI*, XIX, pp. 236 ff.
70. See *Prog. Report of ASI, N.W. Provinces and Oudh Circle*, 1892–3, pp. 21–8.
71. Loc. cit.
72. See vs. 276.
73. See Premi, op. cit., p. 409; see also *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, pp. 36 ff.
74. See G.C. Choudhary, *PHNI*, p. 88.
75. See Premi, op. cit., p. 411, n. 2.
76. See *DHNI*, vol. II, pp. 858 ff.
77. See Premi, op. cit., p. 283.
78. Ibid., p. 278.
79. See Bühler in *EI*, I, p. 228.
80. See pp. 53 ff; also p. 85.
81. *Vividhatīrthakalpa*, pp. 59 f.

82. See *EI*, XXXVIII, pp. 5–22.
83. *Ibid.*, p. 11.
84. *EI*, XIX, pp. 71 ff.
85. *EI*, XXXVIII, p. 8; also *NIA*, 2, pp. 111 ff.
86. See *The Classical Age*, p. 499.
87. For the text of the inscription, see *Jaina Śilālekha Saṃgraha*, 2, pp. 85 ff.
88. See *Jaina Siddhānta Bhāskara*, 8, pp. 67–73. See also *Bhārat ke Digambara Jaina Tīrtha*, I, pp. 179–95.
89. *EI*, IV, pp. 309–10.
90. Ins. 148 (App. to *Jaina Inscriptions from Deogarh*).
91. See *Jaina Śilālekha Saṃgraha*, 5, no. 26.
92. *Ibid.*, no. 20.
93. See J.C. Jain, *Prākṛta Sāhitya kā Itihāsa*, p. 223.
94. 2.1; see story no. 12 where we have an account of the founding of 5 *stūpas* at Mathurā.
95. *Vividhatīrthakalpa*, p. 19.
96. p. 41.
97. See J.C. Jain, *op. cit.*, p. 321.
98. See *Antiquities of Mathurā*, p. 53; see also *Jaina Śilālekha Saṃgraha*, 2, no. 161; 4, no. 112.
99. See *Jaina Śilālekha Saṃgraha*, 4, no. 116; 5, no. 19.
100. See Cunningham, *ASI*, 20, p. 104.
101. See *DHNI*, II, p. 695.
102. See *Prabandhakośa*, pp. 26–46.
103. *PHNI*, pp. 24 ff.
104. *Prabandhakośa*, p. 41.
105. See *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, p. 123; *Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha*, pp. 98 ff.
106. See *EI*, I, p. 120.
107. *Loc. cit.*
108. See *Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha*, p. 97; see *Vividhatīrthakalpa*, p. 9.
109. See *Annual Progress Report of the Archaeological Deptt. Jammu and Kashmir*, 1917–18, p. 7; 1918–19, p. 3.
110. All India Radio News Bulletin, 30.6.1975.
111. *IA*, 47, p. 111; see also *JRASB*, 1949, 15, pp. 7 ff. and pl. I.
112. See R.C. Majumdar, *History of Ancient Bengal*, p. 124.
113. See *EI*, XXIX, pp. 38 ff.
114. See *Indian Archaeology, A Review*, 1954–5, p. 29.
115. See *EI*, XIII, pp. 165 ff.
116. 61.67 (ed., A.N. Upadhye).
117. See *EI*, XIII, pp. 165 ff.; see also *Jaina Śilālekha Saṃgraha*, 4, no. 94.
118. See *Jaina Śilālekha Saṃgraha*, 4, *prastāvanā*, pp. 7 ff.
119. *Ibid.*, 4, no., 95.
120. For the text of this inscription, which was originally discovered from Parbhani, Maharashtra, see *Premi*, *op. cit.*, pp. 193 ff.; see also N.

Venkataramanayya, *The Cālukyas of Vemulavāḍa*, pp. 92 ff. The other details regarding this inscription will be discussed in the next chapter.

121. See Premi, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

122. See in this connection K.K. Handiqui, *Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture*, p. 414.

## CHAPTER X

### Jainism in South India (AD 600–1000)

We have already seen that Jainism was more popular in the southern states than in those of the north. Apart from parts of Gujarat and Rajasthan it was steadily losing ground in other areas of northern India. The picture was somewhat different at least in one south Indian state namely Karnataka, where the ruling dynasties actively befriended it. I propose to discuss first the condition of Jainism under the western Cālukyas, who were the masters of large parts of southern and western India for quite a long time.

We have already seen that a few of the earlier kings of this dynasty, who ruled before AD 600 were favourably disposed to Jainism. Kīrtivarman I, who ruled up to AD 597 was succeeded by his brother Maṅgaleśa. Recently, a new inscription of his reign has been discovered, which testifies the popularity of Jainism during his time. The inscription<sup>1</sup> is in Telugu-Kannaḍa characters and the language is Sanskrit. There are altogether three plates which were found in Hūli, district Belgaum of Karnataka. The inscription is undated but refers to Maṅgalarāja, who is no other than Maṅgaleśa of the Badami house and it should therefore be assigned to c. AD 600. It records a grant of land to a Jaina monastery by the Sendraka chief Raviśakti, son of Kannaśakti. Hūli continued as a Jaina centre for a long time and we have another Jaina inscription from there dated AD 1043.<sup>2</sup> This is the second copperplate record of Maṅgaleśa, the other being, the Nerur grant.<sup>3</sup>

The Jaina religion received a new impetus during the reign of Maṅgaleśa's illustrious successor Pulakeśin II, the son of Kīrtivarman I. The well-known Aihole stone inscription<sup>4</sup> which is dated in the Śaka era 556 and composed by the poet Ravikīrti is undoubtedly the most important historical western Cālukya record. The inscription was discovered from an old temple at Aihole in Hungund *tāluk* of Bijapur district. It was composed, according to the poet Ravikīrti, 3735 years after the Bhārata war. The record opens with the follow-

ing words, 'Victorious is the holy Jinendra, he who is exempt from old-age, death and birth—in the sea of whose knowledge, the whole world is comprised like an island.' After describing the exploits of Pulakeśin II and his predecessors, the poet Ravikīrti informs us in v. 35 that 'this stone mansion of Jinendra, a mansion of every kind of greatness, has been caused to be built by the wise Ravikīrti, who has obtained the highest favour of that Satyāśraya, whose rule is bounded by the three oceans.' This Satyāśraya is not other than Pulakeśin II, the conqueror of Harṣa. The concluding verse is also very interesting. It runs thus: 'May that Ravikīrti, be victorious who, full of discernment, has used, the abode of the Jina, built of stone, for a new treatment of his theme, and who thus by his poetic power, has attained the fame of Kālidāsa and Bhāravī.' There is little doubt that the poet Ravikīrti was not only a sincere and dedicated Jaina, but also one of the celebrated men of letters of his time. It is evident from the inscription that he was well regarded by emperor Pulakeśin II, which indirectly indicates that the Cālukyan monarch himself had deference and love for the religion of the Jinas. It has been suggested<sup>5</sup> that the poet Ravikīrti was a monk of the Yāpaniya Saṃgha. There is however really no evidence to prove this but he must have been a Digambara Jaina.

A long stone tablet, discovered from Lakṣmeśvara in Dharwar district, has several inscriptions of different dynasties.<sup>6</sup> The second part<sup>7</sup> of this record mentions king Satyāśraya and Cālukya Raṇaparākramāṅka and his son Ereya. A contemporary of this Satyāśraya was Durgāśakti. These kings, who were evidently the feudatories of Satyāśraya, are described as Sendra kings, belonging to the line of Bhujagendras, i.e., Nāga family. It records a grant of land to the *caitya* of the god called Śaṅkha Jinendra at Puligere (modern Lakṣmeśvara). According to Fleet,<sup>8</sup> the inscription is of early date, repeated here for the sake of confirmation and preservation. He further believes that "Raṇaparākramāṅka is perhaps intended for 'Raṇarāga', the father of Pulakeśin I and son of Jayasimha I." In that case, this inscription is referable to early sixth century AD. So far as the Sendra kings are concerned, we have already noted that, they were from the very outset patrons of the Jaina religion. However, the identity of Satyāśraya of this inscription is yet to be unravelled. If this Satyāśraya is Pulakeśin I, then the inscription should be taken as a record of the mid-sixth century AD, and we actually know that Pulakeśin I had the titles *Satyāśraya* and *Raṇavikrama*.<sup>9</sup> That

Pulakeśin I himself was a Jaina patron is known from the spurious Altem record, which has already been discussed. We should further remember that the record under discussion was inscribed in the tenth century AD, and possibly represents a later copy of an original copperplate.<sup>10</sup> We have already seen that in a genuine copperplate of about AD 600, a few Sendra kings are mentioned and they bear Śakti-ending names, and this inscription too refers to two Sendra kings who bear similar names. This probably shows that the contents of the present record are accurate.

Another long stone tablet from the same site, namely Lakṣmeśvara, has several interesting inscriptions.<sup>11</sup> All the records are later copies of original copperplate or stone inscriptions. The earliest inscription<sup>12</sup> refers to the reign of Vinayāditya's fifth or seventh regnal year corresponding to Śaka 608 i.e., AD 686. It records a grant to an *ācārya* of Mūlasaṃgha *anvaya* and Devagaṇa sect. The king was at that time stationed at Raktapura. Then we must refer to another part of the same stone tablet which is dated in the thirty-fourth year of Vijayāditya,<sup>13</sup> corresponding to Śaka 651 when he was encamped at Raktapura. The village which was given away as grant was situated near the town Pulikara. The donee was his father's priest Udayadeva-panḍita, also called Niravadya-panḍita, who was the home-pupil of Śrī Pūjyapāda and belonged to the Devagaṇa sect of Mūlasaṃgha. We are further told that the grant was made for the benefit of the temple of Śaṅkha Jinendra at the city of Pulikara, the present Lakṣmeśvara. I have already said that the inscriptions of Lakṣmeśvara are later copies of earlier records, which is why they are regarded as being spurious.<sup>14</sup> There is however no reason why we should disbelieve their contents. The Jaina priest Udayadeva-panḍita was surely looked upon with respect by the Cālukyan king Vijayāditya. It is apparent from the inscription that Udayadeva-panḍita was not the immediate pupil of Pūjyapāda but definitely belonged to his *anvaya*. It is quite likely that this Pūjyapāda was the well-known Jaina savant of the same name who lived a few centuries before Vijayāditya's time.

Then I must mention yet another inscription from the same place.<sup>15</sup> It belongs to the time of Vikramāditya II and gives the date Śaka 656 corresponding to AD 734. We are told that in the second year of king Vikramāditya Śaṅkhatīrthavasati of the city of Pulikara (Puligere of other inscriptions) and the temple called White Jinālaya were embellished and repaired and that certain land was given to



maintain the worship of Jina. It was issued from Raktapura. The donee was Vijayadevapaṇḍita who was the disciple of Jayadevapaṇḍita and the latter of Rāmadeva Ācārya belonging to Mūlasaṅgha and Devagaṇa. There were thus two prominent Jaina shrines at this place, one called Śaṅkhatīrtha and the other of the name of Dhavala Jinālaya. It further appears that this Dhavala Jinālaya was then in a dilapidated condition and shortly in need of repair. It is interesting to note that in the *Vividhatīrthakalpa*<sup>16</sup> Śaṅkha Jinālaya is mentioned as one of the holy places, connected with the Jaina religion. This inscription of Vikramāditya II, as Fleet observes,<sup>17</sup> was copied from a previous stone tablet or copperplate for the sake of confirmation and preservation.

Three other inscriptions, belonging to the time of western Cālukyas, should now be cited. The first from Dharwar district<sup>18</sup> and belongs to the eleventh year of Vijayāditya and Śaka 630. This copperplate refers to a Jina temple of Puligere, built by queen Kuṅkumadevī. The second,<sup>19</sup> which is more important also comes from Dharwar district and belongs to the sixth year of Kīrtivarman II. It therefore corresponds to AD 751. The inscription was discovered from a place called Annigeri situated in Navalgund, *tāluk* of Dharwar district. The object of the inscription is to record the construction of a *cediya* (Jaina temple) by Kaliyamma, who was holding the office of the headman of Jebuḷageri and the erection in front of it a sculpture by a certain Koṇḍīśularakuppa, whose other name was Kīrtivarma-Gosāsi. The latter is clearly the name of his master (*prabhu*), as set out in the last line. The writer was one Diśapāla. Another inscription<sup>20</sup> of the time of Kīrtivarman II comes from Adur situated in the Hangal *tāluk* of Dharwar district. It records some land grants to the temple of Jinendra.

Quite a few short label inscriptions have been found from Aihole,<sup>21</sup> and have been assigned to the seventh century AD. They are engraved on a pillar in the Jaina temple close to the Meguti temple at Aihole (the site of Ravikīrti's inscription). A few such names are also preserved at Badami and have also been assigned to the seventh century AD.<sup>22</sup>

Hariṣeṇa in his *Bṛhatkathākośa*<sup>23</sup> refers to a king Vijayāditya of Dakṣiṇāpatha, who may correspond to the Cālukyan king of the same name. Elsewhere also he refers to the glorious condition of the Jaina religion in south India. As we have already noted, another south Indian Jaina poet Raviṣeṇa, who lived in the seventh century

AD, has repeatedly mentioned the prosperity of the Jainas in south India.

It should not, however, be supposed that the Cālukyans themselves were Jainas, majority of their inscriptions indicate that they were devout Hindus, strongly believing in the traditional form of Brahmanical religion. Like their predecessors, the Kadambas, however, right from the very beginning they extended their hand of cooperation to the Jaina religion. It should also be remembered that all the Jaina inscriptions of the western Cālukyas of Badami have been found from the state of Karnataka, which was so strongly associated with the Jaina religion from the early centuries of the Christian era.

Let us now once more turn our attention to the state of the Jaina religion in the Gaṅga territory. We have already seen that the western Gaṅga rulers actively associated themselves with the progress of the Jaina religion from the days of their founder. We will now briefly examine the Jaina inscriptions of this dynasty which were written after AD 600.

Durvinīta was succeeded by his son Muṣkara or Mokkara,<sup>24</sup> probably before the end of the sixth century AD. A Jaina temple was erected in his name at Lakṣmeśvara and was called Mokkaravasati.<sup>25</sup> The erection of this temple indicates the extension of the Gaṅga kingdom in that direction.<sup>26</sup> Muṣkara was succeeded by Śrīvikrama, and it appears that both of them ruled for very short periods. This is evident from the fact that we have a genuine, dated inscription<sup>27</sup> of Śrīvikrama's son Bhūvikrama, which indicates that the latter ascended the throne in Śaka 531 corresponding to AD 609. No Jaina inscription of either Śrīvikrama or Bhūvikrama is known, but we have evidence to show that during the reign of Śivamāra I (AD 670–713), the son of Bhūvikrama, the Jainas enjoyed royal patronage. An inscription<sup>28</sup> from Kulagāṇa in Cāmarājnagar *tāluk* of Mysore district belongs to his reign. The second line of this inscription refers to Mādhava I's indebtedness to a Śramaṇācārya. The king Śivamāra I is here called *Avanimahendra* (l. 16) and the lord of whole Pāṇāṭa and Puṇṇāṭa. According to this inscription, several persons granted lands and dwelling sites with the approval of the king, who is also called Koṅgaṇi Muttarasa. The king himself also made a grant to the Jaina Candrasenācārya, the *kartārar* (manager) of the temple. The fact that so many persons contributed for the temple shows that it was an important shrine in this part of Karnataka. The in-

scription is undated, but there cannot be any doubt regarding its genuineness. Śivamāra I, it appears, like many of his predecessors, openly befriended the Jains.<sup>29</sup>

The successor of Śivamāra I was Śrīpuruṣa, his grandson. He had a very long reign extending from AD 725 to the last quarter of the eighth century AD,<sup>30</sup> and was a great patron of the Jaina religion. The well-known Devarhalli plates,<sup>31</sup> found from Mysore district, is dated in Śaka 698 (AD 776) and the fiftieth year of the king's reign. The village of Devarhalli is situated in the Nāgamaṅgala *tāluk* of Mysore district. The inscription refers to a line of Jaina *gurus* belonging to Nandisaṅgha of Mūlagaṇa. The name of the *gaccha* is given as Pulikal, which is probably connected with Puligere or Pulikara, the ancient name of Lakṣmeśvara, famous for its Jaina temples. The earliest *muni* was Candranandin, who was succeeded by his disciple Kumāranandin, who in his turn was succeeded by Kīrtinandi Ācārya and the latter by Ācārya Vimalacandra. The earliest *guru* Candranandin therefore lived in the mid-seventh century AD. We are then introduced to a line of feudatory kings and the names of two members of this line are given, namely Nirgunda *alias* Paramagūḷa. The wife of the latter, Kundācci, was the daughter of Maruvarman and her mother a daughter of the Pallava overlord (*adhirāja*). This lady, Kundācci, had built a Jaina temple called Lokatilaka on the northern side of Śrīpura (near Gūdalūr which is to the west of the Nilgiris). The inscription refers to the grant of the village of Ponnaḷli for the repair, maintenance, etc. of this temple. There is a long list of other grants made by several persons. The inscription was written by Viśvakarmācārya and the epithet *ācārya* shows that he too was a Jaina ascetic. According to the last two lines of the grant, he too also received some land.

There is little doubt that the Jaina temple by Kundācci, who had Pallava blood in her veins, was a celebrated shrine of Śrīpura. It is quite likely, and as the inscription indicates Śrīpuruṣa himself took personal interest in the welfare of this Jaina temple. A stone inscription of AD 801, belonging to his reign,<sup>32</sup> also indirectly shows his love for the Jaina religion. The destruction of *basadis* is regarded in that inscription as equivalent to the destruction of Vārāṇasī. Another genuine copperplate inscription of Śrīpuruṣa<sup>33</sup> refers to a grant made to a Jaina *caityālaya*. This inscription also refers to his successor Śivamāra II. This particular record was discovered from Narasimharaḷapura in Belur *tāluk* of Chikmagalur district. It is incised on five

copperplates. The inner side of the first plate, the two sides of the second and the inner side of the third contains the inscription of Śrīpuruṣa. It opens with an invocation of Jina, 'Victorious is the sole sun of the world, who has witnessed all the worlds and who by the rays of the *Syādvāda* has illuminated the veil of darkness of the other creeds.' This inscription, it is interesting to note, also refers to the feat of cutting down a stone pillar on the part of Mādhava I, by order of a Nirgrantha ascetic. The inscription surprisingly refers to Śrīpuruṣa as the son of Śrīvikrama. Then the record goes on to say that the chief of his friends Nāgavarma of the Paṣiṇḍi Gaṅga family (a new Gaṅga family), who was anointed as Gaṅga-rāja, and his sister's brother, a son in the Kadamba family named Tulu-ādi, united in making a grant, with pouring of water of the village of Mallavalli situated in Tagare country, to the *caityālaya* in the Toḷḷa village, also situated there. A few gifts are also recorded. The first part of the record ends with an obeisance to the Jina. This record of Śrīpuruṣa is undated; the decipherer assigns it to AD 780.<sup>34</sup> Tagare country is also referred to in an inscription of Kadamaba Bhogivarman.<sup>35</sup>

The outer side of the third plate<sup>36</sup> of the inscription from Narasiṃharājapura contains a Jaina record of Śivamāra II. According to it, when the illustrious Śivamārar was ruling the earth, Viṭṭarasa, a Kadamba chief under him was the governor of Sindanāḍu 8000 and Tagarenāḍu 70. This Kadamba chief granted a village called Karimani to the *cediya* of Toḷḷar, apparently the same village, mentioned in the inscription of Śrīpuruṣa. The last two plates contain yet another undated inscription<sup>37</sup> of Śivamāra II. It states that while the illustrious Śivamārar was ruling, his maternal uncle Vijayaśakti-araśa granted to the *cediya* of Muḷivalli some land, and parts of two villages. The same record, contains an account of few other gifts. It is interesting that a few of the witnesses mentioned in this inscription are also mentioned in the record of Śrīpuruṣa contained in the first three plates. This testifies that this inscription of Śivamāra II cannot be far removed from that of his father. It is also evident from the second inscription of Śivamāra II that there was another Jaina shrine in the same locality.

That Śivamāra II was a staunch and sincere patron of the Jainas is further shown by two other inscriptions. The first is from Belgaum district,<sup>38</sup> which tells us that he had erected a *basadi* in Kummadavāḍa (modern Kalbhāvi). It is a stone inscription. The second is also a stone inscription.<sup>39</sup> The epigraph was found on a boulder near

Candranāthasvāmin *basadi* at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa and contains only two words: *Śivamārana basadi*, in Kannaḍa. It has been suggested that the Candranāthasvāmin temple was the *basadi* menat in this inscription.<sup>40</sup>

There is an important Jaina inscription<sup>41</sup> of Yuvarāja Mārasimha, the son of Śivamāra II dated Śaka 719, corresponding to AD 797, which was found from Manne in Bangalore district. His father was still alive at that time, but a prisoner in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa court. Yuvarāja Mārasimha is here described as ruling the entire Gaṅga-maṇḍala. 'The plates must have been engraved after the father was at liberty and in power for fifteen years or so after the grant was made, and probably at that time Mārasimha, the son, was dead.'<sup>42</sup> This grant refers to a *senādhipati* (commander) called Śrīvijaya, who is described as holding 'Arhat as supreme' and who built a Jina temple at Mānyanagara (Manne). By this grant a village called Kiruvekkura was given as gift by prince Mārasimha. It then refers to a line of Jaina teachers, beginning from Toraṇācārya of Koṇḍakundānvaya. His original home was the village called Śālmalī, and his disciple was Puṣpanandin and the latter's disciple Prabhācandra. The earliest *guru* Toraṇācārya therefore lived around AD 700. The *śāsana* was written by Viśvakarmācārya, who too was probably a Jaina ascetic. Another set of copperplates from Manne<sup>43</sup> gives the date Śaka 724 corresponding to AD 802, but this record refers to Prabhutavarṣa Govindarājadeva (Govinda III), the Rāṣṭrakūṭa sovereign, as the overlord. This inscription, although a Jaina record, opens with an adoration to Viṣṇu. It further refers to Govinda III's elder brother Raṇāvaloka, who had accepted his younger brother Govinda III's command and was at that time the supreme governor of the Gaṅga territory. We are told that on the application of the son of Bappayya, who was a disciple of Prabhācandra (mentioned in the earlier record dated Śaka 719) of Udāragaṇa, living in the Śālmalī village, famous in the Taidat Viṣaya, the king Prabhutavarṣa made a grant for the Jina temple of Mānyapura, built by the victorious ruler Śrīvijayarāja. It appears that this feudatory of the Gaṅgas, after Śaka 719 had transferred his allegiance to the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and was apparently a favourite of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa provincial governor. The grant was made to 'provide for dances, performed by dancing girls, singing, drums, sandal and worship of the god'. A full village and a part of another were given as gift. This inscription therefore testifies that the Rāṣṭrakūṭas continued the religious policy of the Gaṅgas in the

conquered provinces.

Śivamāra II was succeeded in the main line by his nephew Rājamalla I (AD 817–53).<sup>44</sup> His own son Mārasimha, mentioned in the Manne grant of Śaka 719, founded another Gaṅga line and probably predeceased his father.<sup>45</sup> The younger brother of this Mārasimha was known as Pṛthivīpati and was a staunch Jain. This is proved by an inscription from Śravaṇa Belgoḷa. We are told that along with his queen, he witnessed the *nirvāṇa* of the Jain *ācārya* Ariṣṭanemi on the Katvapra hill at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa.<sup>46</sup> The king of the principal line, Rājamalla I, was a Jain patron. He was the founder of a cave, dedicated to the Jains at Vallimalai in North Arcot district. This is testified to by a short inscription in *grantha* characters found there.<sup>47</sup> Rājamalla I was succeeded by his son Nītimārga I (AD 853–70), who is described in the well-known Kudlur plates of Śaka 884 of Mārasimha III<sup>48</sup> as a ‘bee at the lotus feet of adorable Arhat Bhaṭṭāraka’. This shows that not only was the king a Jain patron, but also a converted Jain. Another well-known name for him was Eregaṅgadeva.

We should now refer to an earlier Gaṅga inscription of prince Duggamāra,<sup>49</sup> the younger brother of king Śivamāra II, discovered from Hebbalaguppe from Heggadade Vankote *tāluk* of Mysore district. According to it Śrī Narasingere Appor Duggamāra gave arable land to the Jain temple (*koyilvasadi*) constructed by the great architect Nārāyaṇa, and the local inhabitants also donated land to the temple. The approximate date of this inscription, according to decipherer, is AD 825.<sup>50</sup>

The next king, in the principal line was Rājamalla II, who ascended the throne, according to the Biliur stone inscription<sup>51</sup> in AD 870, the Śaka 809 being his eighteenth regnal year. Two Jain inscriptions of his reign are known. The first is the above stone inscription from Biliur, Virajapet *tāluk* of Coorg district. It is a royal grant of twelve villages, the Biliur 12, to the Jain monk Sarvanandideva, disciple of Śivanandisiddhānta Bhaṭṭāra for the maintenance of the temple called Satyavākya Jinālaya at Peṅṅegaḍaṅga. Since Rājamalla II bore the title of Satyavākya, the temple appears to have been named after him. However, we should remember that a few of his predecessors also bore that title, and the Jain temple referred to in this inscription could have been built by any one of them.

The second Jain inscription of his reign is the Narasapura in-

scription<sup>52</sup> dated Śaka 824, corresponding to AD 903, discovered from Kolar *tāluk* of Kolar district. One of the plates is missing. The inscription was issued on the bright fortnight of Phālguna, an auspicious day for the Jains. According to it the king gave a grant for the Jaina *basadi* at Koṅṇamaṅgala, erected by Megante-Nandāka Gādeya. It also mentions a female disciple called Kamuṅgare Kanti of Uttanandipuri Maṅḍalabhaṭāra. Another Jaina *basadi*, built by one Śrīvarmayya, is also mentioned in this inscription and for this, some land was donated by the king.

The younger brother of Rājamalla II, Būtuga I, was also a devout Jaina. This is testified to the Kudlur inscription, which has already been referred to. Here Būtuga, who married a daughter of the illustrious Amoghavarṣa I, is described as a 'devout Jain'. This is also confirmed by the Gaṭṭivādīpura plates dated AD 904.<sup>53</sup>

The next king in the principal line was Nītimārga II (AD 907–35). In the Kudlur plates he is called a Jain.<sup>54</sup> An inscription of his reign<sup>55</sup> refers to the setting up a tombstone for a Jaina teacher named Elācārya, who it is said lived on water only for one month and expired after a fast of another eight days.

After Nītimārga II, his two sons Narasimha and Rājamalla III ruled successively for very short periods. The youngest son Būtuga II, also known as Nanniya Gaṅga, ascended the throne around AD 937. In the Kudlur plates he is described as a Jaina devotee and we have Jaina inscriptions of his reign. In the Sudi plates dated Śaka 860, found from Ron *tāluk* of Dharwar district,<sup>56</sup> we are told that the king while he was staying at Purikara during the Nandīśvara festival gratified six female mendicants with gifts, and having washed the feet of Nāgadevapaṇḍita of the holy Vadiyūr *gaṇa* at Suṅḍī gave sixty *nivartanas* of land to the Jaina *cāityālaya*, built by his wife Divalāmbikā. She is described here as the symbol of manifest goodness through the purity of her accurate perception. The Sudi inscription, however, has been declared spurious by Fleet; Narasimhachar however regards it as genuine.<sup>57</sup>

A fragmentary stone inscription<sup>58</sup> of Nanniya Gaṅga, i.e., Būtuga II from Ichāvādi (Shimoga *tāluk*, Shimoga district) is a very important Jaina records, undated. The inscription records the grant of irrigated fields by the king and his queen to a Jaina temple. It then refers to a long line of Jaina teachers, belonging to Krāṇura *gaṇa*, beginning from Nandibhaṭṭāraka. The other names in chronological order are as follows: Bālacandrabhaṭṭāraka, Meghacandra,

Guṇanandi (described as expert in logic and literature), Śabda-brahma, Akalaṅka (who defeated the Buddhists and Sāṅkhyas), Meghanandi, Prabhācandra, Śāntakīrti; then a few names are erased after which there is Muniandrasiddhāntadeva and then his disciple, whose name is erased. It appears that during the time of this unnamed Jaina saint the king Nanniya Gaṅga built the Jaina temple. The inscription shows that not only Nanniya Gaṅga himself, but other kings of his dynasty openly favoured the Jains. We propose to identify Akalaṅka of this inscription with the celebrated Jaina philosopher of the name; this will however be discussed in a later chapter. From the Kudlur grant too it appears that Nanniya Gaṅga was a Jaina scholar and defeated the Buddhists in debate.<sup>59</sup>

The elder son of Būtuga II, Maruladeva, probably died before his father. This prince too was a devout Jain.<sup>60</sup> He married the daughter of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa III. His younger brother Mārasimha III was probably a direct successor of Būtuga II.

Mārasimha III (AD 960–74) was undoubtedly one of the greatest Jains of the tenth century. Several important Jaina inscriptions of his reign conclusively establish that he was not only a great Jaina himself, but did all in his power to promote Jainism in Karnataka. I must first refer to the two inscriptions found from Kadlur (Mandya *tāluk*, Mysore district), both of which are dated in Śaka 884. The earlier one was issued in December AD 962.<sup>61</sup> A line of Jaina teachers, beginning from Prabhācandra of Mūlasaṅgha and Sūrasta *gaṇa*, has been introduced in this inscription, which consists of three plates. His disciple was Kalaneledeva, and this saint was the *guru* of Ravicandra. Ravicandra had as his disciple one Elācārya, the donee of this grant. Verse 45 and the lengthy passage in prose refer to the gift of the village Kadlur in Kongal-deśa made to Elācārya by Mārasimha III to provide worship and offerings to the *jinālaya* constructed by his mother called Kallabbā, who was the daughter of Simhavarman Cālukya. It is apparent from this inscription that Mārasimha was a loyal feudatory of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and was crowned by Kṛṣṇa III.<sup>62</sup> We are further told in this inscription that another purpose of the grant was the worship of *sudhācitra* (stucco painting) and *citra* (painting) as well as for the four kinds of *dānas* to the Jaina deities and ascetics. The king Mārasimha was at that time stationed at Melpāṭi, a place mentioned in an earlier grant of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa III.<sup>63</sup> The second Jaina inscription<sup>64</sup> from Kadlur is dated March, AD 963, and is one of the most important Jaina records of the tenth



century. This inscription not only shows Mārasimha III as a sincere and devout Jaina but also gives additional information about a few of his predecessors, which have already been noticed. Mārasimha here is described as one 'who washed out all taints with the water of the daily bath of Jina and one who was devoted to the worship *gurus*'. We are then given a brief life-history of the Jaina saint Vādighanghala, who was originally a Brāhmaṇa of Parāśara *gotra*, his first name Muñjārya. His ancestors lived in the Virāṭadeśa of the north. This individual, it appears from the inscription, was a Jaina teacher of vast learning and was well versed in Lokāyata, Sāṅkhya, Vedānta, Bauddha and, above all, in Jaina philosophy. Like a sun he destroyed the mass of darkness represented by the misleading teachings of other schools, we are told. 'His eloquence in the exposition of literature made king Gaṅga Gāṅgeya Satyavākya, a cuckoo in the grove of delights of all learning his pupil'. Gaṅga Gāṅgeya was a title of Būtuga II. We are further told that he was held in the highest esteem by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa sovereign Kṛṣṇa III. This great Jaina saint is further described as worshipping the 'lotus feet of Jineśvara'. To this celebrated Brāhmaṇa Jaina saint king, Mārasimha III in March AD 963 gave as *śrutaguru*'s fee (religious teacher's fee) a village called Bagiyur included in Baḍagara 300 of the Punāṭu 6000 in Gaṅgapāṭi. The income of this village was 20 *gadyānas*.<sup>65</sup>

A stone pillar inscription<sup>66</sup> of extraordinary importance, relating to the achievements of Mārasimha III, has been discovered from Śravaṇa Belgoḷa. It refers to several military feats of this great Gaṅga king. We are however not concerned here with Mārasimha's achievements. A crucial passage from our point of view is that which says that 'he maintained the doctrine of Jina and erected Jaina temples (*vasati*) and *mānastambhas* at various places.' This passage is sufficient to show his tremendous zeal for the Jaina religion. The record closes with the statement that he relinquished sovereignty and keeping the vow of *sallekhanā* for three days in the presence of Ajitasenabhaṭṭāraka, died at Baṅkāpura in Śaka 896 corresponding to AD 974.<sup>67</sup> I cannot resist the temptation of reproducing the last few lines of this inscription. 'O Cola king, calm your failing heart by gentle rubbing; O Pāṇḍya, you have escaped slaughter, stay on. O Pallava, run not away in fear from your territory; do not retreat, but remain; the Gaṅga chieftain Nolambāntaka has gone to the abode of gods.'

I should now take brief cognizance of a very interesting rock

inscription<sup>68</sup> found from Gopīnātha Guṭṭa in Chikballapur *tāluk* of Kolar district. This is a low hill at the north-eastern base of Nandidroog. The inscription, according to Rice, resembles the early inscriptions of the Gaṅgas and should be assigned to the eighth century AD.<sup>69</sup> It opens with a homage to Rṣabha. It refers to the Jaina shrine of this hill, which according to it, was formerly built by Rāma in Dvāpara and later rebuilt by Kuntī. This Jinendra *caitya* had caves for *ṛsis*. This description, according to Rice, applies to Nandidroog. At present the shrine at the site where the inscription has been discovered, is dedicated to Gopālasvāmin, but the description in the inscription shows that this place had a very important Jaina temple complex from a much earlier period. It can be said with conviction that the Jaina temple here was one of the earliest Karnataka, shrines.

Let us return once more to the Gaṅgas. The successor of Mārasimha III was Rājamalla IV, who had an able minister in the person of Cāmuṅḍarāya, one of the greatest Jains Karnataka has ever produced. He is the author of the celebrated Kannaḍa work the *Cāmuṅḍarāyaṣurāṇa*, written in AD 978. In this text we have an account of the twenty-four Jaina Tīrthamkaras, but the greatest achievement of this Gaṅga minister was the erection of the colossal image of Gommaṭeśvara at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa round about AD 982.<sup>70</sup> I will have more to say on Cāmuṅḍarāya in connection with a discussion of the inscriptions of Śravaṇa Belgoḷa. An earlier Gaṅga Jaina minister ended his life in *sallekhaṇā* fashion at this town, i.e., Narasinga who died in around AD 950 and was a minister of Eregaṅga or Nītimāra II.<sup>71</sup> A few other persons, connected with the Gaṅgas are also mentioned in some Jaina inscriptions from Śravaṇa Belgoḷa. For the reign of Rājamalla IV we have a Jaina inscription<sup>72</sup> dated Śaka 899 found from Coorg district.

The above discussion regarding the state of Jainism during the rule of the Gaṅgas proves that in almost every part of the territory ruled by the western Gaṅga kings, there were Jaina shrines. Most of these temples gave shelter to eminent Jaina saints who were respected by even non-Jainas for their purity and godliness. It also appears that some other kings from contemporary dynasties were influenced by the religious outlook of the western Gaṅga kings.

Before discussing the state of the Jaina religion during the rule of the Rāṣtrakūṭas, we must briefly discuss its condition during the rule under a particular line of feudatory kings, namely the Raṭṭas of

Saundatti (Belgaum district, Karnataka). The ancient name of Saundatti was Sugandhavarti. This place apparently sprang into prominence in the ninth century AD. The earliest inscription<sup>73</sup> from this place is dated in the Śaka 797 corresponding to AD 875. It refers to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa as the overlord and it appears that this Kṛṣṇa is no other than Kṛṣṇa II.<sup>74</sup> This stone epigraph is found in the present Ankeśvara temple at Saundatti. The founder of the house was one Mecaḍa, who had a son named Pṛthvīrāma; this gentleman is described as a *mahāsāmanta* under Kṛṣṇa II. We are further told that he was a lay disciple of Indrakīrti. This Indrakīrti was a disciple of Guṇakīrti and the latter of Mūlabhaṭṭāraka of Kāreya *gaṇa* hailing from Mailāpatīrtha. It is evident that the earliest preceptor of this line was a resident of Mailāpatīrtha. In Śaka 797 the feudatory king Pṛthvīrāma granted some land for a Jinendrabhavana (temple dedicated to Jinendra) which was constructed by him at Sugandhavarti. It further appears that during his time Pṛthvīrāma was a very insignificant chieftain as his *adhiṣṭhāna* (capital) is described only as a village (*grāma*) in this epigraph. From some other inscriptions we further learn that the Krāreya *gaṇa*, to which Indrakīrti and others belonged, was a branch of the well-known Yāpanīya Saṃgha.<sup>75</sup> The language of this epigraph clearly indicates that Raṭṭa Pṛthvīrāma was a converted Jaina, and his successors too, as we will now see, were also Jainas.

Chronologically the next inscription of the Raṭṭas is dated in the Śaka 902, corresponding to AD 980. This is another stone epigraph<sup>76</sup> from the same temple; it discloses the name of Mahāsāmanta Śāntivarman, who was a grandson of Pṛthvīrāma. At this time, according to this epigraph, Cālukya Tailapadeva, i.e., Taila II, was the overlord of this chieftain. It appears that the Raṭṭas quietly transferred their allegiance, after the fall of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, to the Cālukyas. The Jaina temple complex there, it appears was a family shrine of the Raṭṭas. This why there is the expression 'Raṭṭara-paṭṭa Jinālaya' in the introductory part of the epigraph. The mother of Śāntivarman also made donations to the Jaina temple there. The gift was received by the preceptor Bāhubali Bhaṭṭāraka. It appears from the epigraph that the earliest preceptor of Bāhubali's line was Ravicandra, who was succeeded by the following: Arhanandin, Śubhacandra, Maunideva, and Prabhācandra. The earliest *sādhu* Ravicandra therefore lived during the first half of the ninth century AD. These preceptors belonged to the Kaṇḍūra *gaṇa*, which also was

a branch of the Yāpanīya Saṃgha.<sup>77</sup>

A few later inscriptions<sup>78</sup> from Saundatti also show that even after AD 1000, Jainism continued to flourish in this area and the kings of the Raṭṭa family throughout their history maintained a close relationship with it.

From Belgaum district we have another very interesting Jain inscription, which on palaeographic grounds, can be assigned to the seventh century AD. It is known as Gokak plates<sup>79</sup> and discloses the name of a king called Deĵja Mahārāja, who is described as belonging to the *anvaya* of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas (l. 5). The inscription records a gift of 50 *nivartanas* of land in Jalāragrāma of Kasmāṇḍi *viṣaya* for the continuous worship of the divine *arhat* and for the maintenance of learned Jaina ascetics, devoted to the teaching of this religion. Ācārya Āryanandin, belonging to Jambūbhaṇḍagaṇa, a savant of exceptional learning, received the gift from king Indrananda, son of Vijayānanda Madhyamarāja of the Sendraka family. He is described as a feudatory of Deĵja Mahārāja, whose relationship with any known branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas is not yet known. Another intriguing feature of this inscription is its date. It is dated in the year 845 of the Āguptāyika kings, the significance of which remains a mystery. If it is equivalent to the era of 58 BC, then the inscription will have to be assigned to the last quarter of the eighth century AD, but it is just possible that some earlier era,<sup>80</sup> is referred to in this inscription.

The Nolamba Pallavas,<sup>81</sup> who ruled after AD 800 were good patrons of the Jaina religion. We have two inscriptions before AD 1000 which testify that the kings of this dynasty extended patronage to the Jainas. An inscription of Mahendra Nolamba dated Śaka 800 corresponding to AD 878 records a grant to a Jaina temple in Dharmapuri district in present Tamil Nadu.<sup>82</sup> The inscription is in Kanarese. From the compound of the famous Mallikārjuna temple of Dharmapuri another Jaina inscription<sup>83</sup> has been discovered of the reign of the same king. It is dated Śaka 815, corresponding to AD 893. This epigraph records a grant to a Jaina *vasadi* by two persons called Nidhiyaṇṇa and Caṇḍiyaṇṇa. The former received from the king the village of Mūlapaḷli, which he made over to Kanakasena Siddhānta Bhaṭāra, the pupil of Vinayasena Siddhānta Bhaṭāra. These monks belonged to the Senānvaya of Mūlasaṃgha. The particular *gaṇa* to which they belonged is given as Pogariya. The revenue of the village was to be utilised for the repair of the temple.

Before turning my attention to the Andhra Pradesh I must refer to two famous places now included in Karnataka, which were associated with Jainism from early times. The first place is Śravaṇa Belgoḷa in Hassan district, which was associated with Jainism from at least AD 600. The earliest inscription, discovered from this celebrated centre of Jainism, is dated in AD 600.<sup>84</sup> This inscription mentions ancient Jaina saints like Gautaiṃ Gaṇadhara, Lohārya, Jambu, Viṣṇudeva, Aparājita, Govardhana, Bhadrabāhu, Viśākha, Proṣṭhila, Kṛttikārya, Jayanāman, Siddhārtha, Dhṛtiṣeṇa, Buddhila, and other teachers. It then mentions that Prabhācandra, an eminent Jaina divine, attained *samādhi* or *nirvāṇa* at Kaṭavapra or Candragiri hill of Belgoḷa. After him 700 more saints likewise attained *nirvāṇa* on the same hill. It has been suggested that the inscription on the stone was made long after Pabhācandra's death, and its palaeography suggests that it was inscribed in *c.* AD 600.

Quite a number of inscriptions, discovered from the same hill, belong to the period between AD 650 and 800. They record<sup>85</sup> the *samādhi* of a few prominent Jaina saints including one female ascetic.<sup>86</sup> No. 11 records the *samādhi* of one Ācārya Ariṣṭanemi (*c.* AD 650) and mentions one king Diṇḍika as witness, but he cannot however be correctly identified. No. 21 mentions a monk called Akṣayakīrti, who is described as a resident of Southern Madhurā (Madura), which shows that this old city continued as a leading Jaina centre even after AD 600. We have already discussed a few historical inscriptions of Śravaṇa Belgoḷa in connection with the discussion of the state of Jainism during the rule of the western Gaṅgas. A few others will be discussed in connection with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas.

The second Jaina holy place of Karnataka was Kopaṇa or Kopbal in modern Raichur district. This site has yielded a number of Jaina inscriptions which show that from the seventh century onwards, it was known as a celebrated Jaina *tīrtha*. It has been suggested that Kopaṇa should be identified with Kung-kan-na-pu-lo of Yuan Chwang,<sup>87</sup> which according to that pilgrim, was situated some 2000 *li* north of Draviḍa country. The earliest epigraphic reference to this town is found in an inscription<sup>88</sup> of the time of the Bādāmī Cālukya king Vijayāditya who reigned from AD 696 to 733. There is however nothing in that epigraph to show that it was then considered a Jaina sacred place. The earliest Jaina inscription<sup>89</sup> from the ere is dated Śaka 803, corresponding to AD 881. It states that the

Jaina teacher Sarvanandin Bhaṭāra, a disciple of Ekācaṭṭugada Bhaṭāra of the Kuṇḍakunda lineage, having stayed there and graciously imparted the teachings of the holy doctrine to the residents of the town, and after practising austerities for a considerable time, attained final emancipation the *saṁnyasana* or *sallekhaṇā*.

Among other important inscriptions from there dating prior to AD 1000, we should refer to the short epigraph,<sup>90</sup> found near Kopbal mentioning Jaṭāsīmhanandin. It has been suggested that this saint should be identified with the Jaina poet of the same name who was the author of the *Varāṅgacarita*.<sup>91</sup> This sacred place is also mentioned in inscriptions, discovered from other places. In an inscription of about AD 800 of Gaṅga king Mārasīmha Ereyappa there is a reference to a witness named Mādhava of Kuppāl.<sup>92</sup> The earliest reference to this Jaina *īrtha* in the Śravaṇa Belgoḷa inscriptions is assigned to AD 1000.<sup>93</sup> A few other inscriptions from there also have references to the Jaina pilgrims hailing from Kopbal.<sup>94</sup>

We must now turn our attention to the condition of the Jaina religion in A.P. during the days of the Veṅgī Cālukyas. I have already briefly referred to the Musinikonda grant, which was renewed during the reign of Viṣṇuvardhana III<sup>95</sup> in Śāka 684 corresponding to AD 762. According to this inscription Ayyaṇa Mahādevī, the wife of Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana AD 624–41, gave a grant of the village of Musinikuṇḍa in Toṅka Natavāḍi *viṣaya* to a Jaina saint called Kālibhadrācārya for the benefit of the Jaina temple called Nadumbivasati at Vezwada, which was probably built by that queen herself. This grant was to be utilized for the purpose of performing uninterrupted *pūjā* of the venerable Arhats. The saint Kālibhadrācārya is spoken of as having made the entire circle of kings obedient to him by the power of his spiritual knowledge, *aṣṭāṅgadvijānāna*. There is little doubt that this great Jaina saint of Andhra was held in special veneration by the queen of Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana, the founder of the Veṅgī Cālukya line. I have already commented on his spiritual predecessors who flourished before AD 600. They belonged to the Kavarūri or Surasta *gaṇa* and Saṁgha *anvaya*.

Chronologically, the next Jaina record of the Eastern Cālukyas, belongs to the reign of Jayasīmha II (AD 696–709). This was found on a broken slab near Macherla in Palnad *tāluk* of Guntur district.<sup>96</sup> It refers to Sarvalokāśraya Jayasīmhavallabha and registers a grant of land by Kalyāṇavasantulu to 'Arahanta Bhaṭṭāra'. The gift was to be maintained by the family of Raṭṭagudis of Koṁthuru. This

inscription therefore testifies to the existence of a Jaina temple in this part of Guntur district in A.P. in the seventh century AD.

A Jaina record<sup>97</sup> dated in the thirtyseventh year of Viṣṇuvardhana III found from Sattenapalle *tāluk* of Guntur district refers to a temple of Jaina at Munugoḍu. There is also a reference to a *muni* called Suvratatīrtha. It further mentions that a certain person called Boyugaṭṭa, a servant of king Goṅka, effected some repairs to this temple, which was built by one Aggoti. Another short epigraph in the same stone slab mentions Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara Goṅkaya, evidently the person of the same name of the earlier epigraph. It registers a gift of land to the Sita Jineśvarālaya at Munugoḍu. Another inscription of the same slab refers to the gift of land to a *vasadi* called Pṛthivītilaka, evidently a Jaina temple built by an earlier eastern Cālukya king. It also mentions a certain Billama Nāyaka.

No eastern Cālukya Jaina inscription, pertaining to the ninth century AD is known. We have, however, three Jaina inscriptions of the time of Amma II Vijayāditya who ruled in the middle mid-tenth century AD.<sup>98</sup> The first is known as the Maliyapundi grant and the other two Kuluchumbarru and Masulipatnam grants. The Maliyapundi grant<sup>99</sup> was originally discovered from Madanur, ten miles from Ongole, which is now the headquarters of a district of the same name in A.P. The inscription opens with a beautiful verse addressed to Jinendra. The donee was a *jinālaya* called Kaṭākābharāṇa, founded by Durgarāja, an officer of Amma II. This temple, according to the inscription was situated to the south of Dharmavuramu (Dharmapurī) in Nellore district. Durgarāja bore the designation Kaṭakarāja, which suggests that he was a superintendent of the royal camp. At the request of this officer, king Vijayāditya, i.e., Amma II, made a gift of the village of Maliyapūṇḍi for the benefit of the temple in Śaka 867 i.e., AD 945 which was the twelfth year of his reign. This Jaina temple was in charge of Śrī Māṇdiradeva, the disciple of Divākara, and grand-disciple of Jinanandin belonging to the Yāpanīya Saṅgha, Nandigaccha, and Koṭimaḍuvagaṇa. The language of the inscription indicates that king Amma II himself had great reverence both for the Jaina temple there and Māṇdiradeva, its manager. The preceptor and grand-preceptor of Māṇdiradeva, who belonged to the famous Yāpanīya Saṅgha, were evidently very learned Jaina ascetics and lived in the ninth century AD.

The second Jaina inscription during the reign of Amma II is an

undated copperplate record, its place of discovery unknown. The plates are now in the British Museum. It registers the grant of a village named Kuluchumbarru<sup>100</sup> in Attilināṇḍu *viśaya* to a Jaina teacher called Arhanandin, belonging to the Valahāri *gaṇa* and Aḍḍakali *gaccha*, for the purpose of providing for repairs to the charitable dining hall of a Jaina temple called Sarvalokāśraya Jinabhavana. The very name of the temple suggests that it was built by one of Amma II's predecessors, many of whom bore the title *sarvalokāśraya*. The grant was evidently made by Amma II, but it was caused to be given by a certain lady called Cāmekāmbā, who belonged to the Paṭṭavardhika lineage and was a pupil of Arhanandin. The later part of the inscription is in Telugū and records a present made by Arhanandin himself to the writer of the record, whose name was Bhaṭṭadeva. Fleet successfully locates the village Kūluchumbarru near the town of Attili in the present West Godavari district of A.P. The lady, Cāmekāmbā, belonged to the Cālukya lineage and was a favourite mistress of the king.<sup>101</sup> She is described as a lay pupil of Arhanandin, who was a disciple of Ayyapoṭi and the latter of Sakalacandrasiddhānta, who is described as well-versed in the Siddhānta writings. This particular inscription definitely shows that both Amma II and his favourite mistress had a soft corner for the Jaina religion.

The third Jaina inscription of the time of Amma II is the undated Masulipatnam grant<sup>102</sup> consisting of five plates, first found from the district court of Masulipatnam or Machilipatnam in Krishna district of A.P. The record, it is interesting to note, begins with an invocation to Viṣṇu. The king Amma II, however, was a *paramamāheśvara*.<sup>103</sup> The inscription refers to a Jaina pontiff (*ācārya*), the preceptor of two nobles Bhīma and Naravāhana II. He was the renowned Jayasena, who bore the surname Nāthasena and was a disciple of the illustrious Candrasena, who is described as well-versed in the Siddhānta and who attained proficiency in *parasamaya*, which signifies that his soul became absorbed in the non-self for the liberation of mankind from bondage. He was honoured, according to this inscription, by the *śrāvakas*, *kṣapaṇakas* (Jaina ascetics), *kṣullakas* (*śrāvakas* of high order), and *ajjakas*, probably meaning educated laymen. For the benefit of this celebrated Jaina savant, Bhīma and Naravāhana II constructed two Jaina temples (*jinabhavana*) at Vijayavāṭikā (Bezwada or Vijayawada) and for that purpose the king Ammarāja himself granted the village of Pedda-Gāḷiḍiparru, having



converted it into a *devabhoga* and exempted it from all forms of tax and other vexations. The village was situated in the Velaṅṅḍu *viṣaya* in modern Guntur district. The engraver, Jayantācārya, too, was probably a Jaina. The present sites of two Jaina temples, mentioned in this inscription cannot be properly identified. The two chieftains Bhīma and Naravāhana II, according to the decipherer of the inscription were Śūdra chiefs; they are further described as devoted to Jinadharmā (*Jinadharmaniratacaritrau*).

The above discussion of the Jaina inscriptions of the Eastern Cālukya kings abundantly testify that Jainism was more or less flourishing in the eastern districts of modern A.P. from AD 600 to 1000. Let us now turn our attention to other parts of A.P. I should first refer to the Cālukyas of Vemulavāḍa, who were great Jaina patrons and who ruled in the modern Karimnagar district of A.P., roughly coterminous with ancient Sapādalakṣa country. The earliest Jaina inscription of the rulers of this feudatory Cālukya dynasty is the Kurkyala stone inscription of the time of Arikeśari AD 930–58. The importance of this inscription,<sup>104</sup> which is inscribed on a hillock called Bommalaguṭṭa at Kurkyala, thirteen miles west of Karimnagar, can hardly be overemphasized. It refers to a Jaina devotee called Jinavallabha, who is described as the brother of the great Jaina poet Pampa, the celebrated author of the *Vikramārjunaviṣaya*, also called *Pāmpabhārata* and the *Ādipurāṇa*. In this inscription the two brothers are described as Brāhmaṇas of Vatsa *gotra*. This is supported by the evidence of the *Pāmpabhārata*.<sup>105</sup>

Jinavallabha himself, according to this inscription, constructed a *vasadi* called Tribhuvanatilaka, a tank called Kavitāguṅṅarṇava, and a garden called Madanavilāsa. The inscription further records the installation by Jinavallabha of the images of the first and the last Tirthamkara, i.e., Ṛṣabha and Vardhamāna, at the *vasadi* constructed by him. A *caityālaya*, dedicated to the first Tirthamkara, is also mentioned in this connection. Jinavallabha, we are told, used to celebrate the festival of bathing the Jina at Vṛṣabhādri, the exact location of which has not yet been determined but which is near Dharamvaram. He is further described as the disciple of Jayamṅḍa Siddhānta Bhaṭṭāra of the Deśiya *gaṇa* and Koṅḍakunda *anvaya*.

The same inscription tells us that Jinavallabha's *caityālaya* at Vṛṣabhādri became as famous as the fame of Pampa. He used to offer food to the Jaina ascetics and during festivals entertained pilgrims visiting the shrine. King Arikeśari II of Vemulavāḍa, we are

told, in this inscription, gave Pampa as a mark of his appreciation of the *Vikramārjunavijaya*, the village Dharmavura, described as an abode of the Brāhmaṇas, resembling the famous Kalāpagrāma, as *agrahāra*. We are then told

the incredulous who would ask stupidly again and again whether a copper plate inscription has been written, whether the famous Arikeśārī had actually granted Dharmavura as *agrahāra* and whether the celebrated Pampa had accepted it, should repair to the Vṛṣabhādri which proclaims the fame of Pampa as well as the greatness of *Jinadharmā* and see the letters of the inscription carved thereon and satisfy themselves.

The details given in this epigraph regarding Pampa, tally generally with those given by that poet in his works.<sup>106</sup> In this inscription Jinavallabha is described as a devotee of Ādyanta Tīrthamkaras, i.e., Ṛṣabha and Mahāvīra and also Cakreśvarī. In his *Ādipurāna*, his brother too calls himself a devotee of Vardhamāna, Ṛṣabha, and Cakreśvarī. The gift of village granted to Pampa by Arikeśārī is also mentioned in the *Vikramārjunavijaya*.<sup>107</sup> We should also remember that Pampa composed his *Ādipurāna* in Śaka 863 corresponding to AD 931, and his *Vikramārjunavijaya* was composed afterwards as it mentions the *Ādipurāna*. The inscription should therefore be placed around AD 945.

Another inscription<sup>108</sup> of the time of Arikeśārī II dated Śaka 869, it is interesting to note, contains five verses from the *Vikramārjunavijaya* or *Pampabhārata*. It has further been pointed out that the site of Pampa's *samādhi* has actually been referred to in a Sanskrit inscription from Bodhan,<sup>109</sup> but this cannot be confirmed at the present state of our knowledge.

We have several Jaina inscriptions of the Vemulavāḍa kings, bearing the date Śaka 888 corresponding to AD 966. A stone inscription<sup>110</sup> of that date from Repaka (Karimnagar district) introduces a chief named Vijaya, who bears a string of titles and records his gift of land to a *jinālaya* built by him. The latter half of this inscription refers to the genealogy of a family of disciples of the Jaina faith who were holding a fief comprising Atukuru 70 and Pammi 12. The members of this family comprised Kāma, Rāma, Tukya, Revaṇa, Puṇyarāma, Kommaya, and others. The names of a line of Jaina ascetics are also given. In the end we are told that the *jinālaya* was built by king Arikeśārī, who was probably Arikeśārī II. A brief stone inscription<sup>111</sup> from Vemulavāḍa states that Baddega, the king of Sapādalaḥṣa, constructed a *jinālaya* for Somadeva, the chief of Gauḍa

Samgha. This Somadeva, as we have already observed, was probably a Jain monk from Bengal, who migrated to the Sapādalakṣa country in the third quarter of the tenth century AD. From the Parbhani plates<sup>112</sup> dated Śaka 888 of the time of Arikeśarī III we learn that a village of the name of Vanikaṭupula was given to Somadeva Śūri, the disciple of Nemideva and grand-disciple of Yaśodeva, belonging to Gauḍa Samgha. It also refers to the fact that a Jain temple of the name of Śubhadhāma Jinālaya, built by Arikeśarī's father Baddega was under the supervision of this Jain savant, who is further described as the author of the *Yaśodharacarita*, i.e., *Yaśastilakacampū*, and *Syādvāadopaniṣad*. High praise has been bestowed on him for his encyclopaedic knowledge. We also learn from this inscription that Arikeśarī was a feudatory of Kṛṣṇarājadeva, son of Akālavarṣa, Pṛthvivallabha, Mahārājādhirāja, Amoghavarṣa. This Kṛṣṇarāja is evidently the Rāṣṭrakūṭa overlord Kṛṣṇa III, the celebrated son and successor of Amoghavarṣa III. We should remember that Somadeva had completed his *Yaśastilakacampū*<sup>113</sup> during the reign of the same Rāṣṭrakūṭa emperor Kṛṣṇa III on the thirteenth day of Caitra, Śaka 881 when Kṛṣṇa III was encamping at Melapāṭī after conquering the kings of Pāṇḍya, Siṃhala, Cola, and Cera countries. He further states in this work that he was at this time a resident of Gaṅgadhārā, the capital of Baddiga, the son of Arikeśarī II. That Somadeva was a disciple of Nemideva is also known from that poet's *Nītivākyaṃyā*.<sup>114</sup> In the *Yaśastilakacampū*<sup>115</sup> Somadeva is described as belonging to the Devasamgha, which is probably another name for the Gauḍasamgha.

The two inscriptions, mentioned above certainly show that the kings belonging to this feudatory Cālukya line, were genuine patrons of Jainism. Two great Jain poets of the tenth century, namely Pampa and Somadeva, lived in their kingdom and were favoured by them. In a later chapter I shall have something more to say on the achievements of these two literary giants.

We should now turn our attention to the condition of the Jain religion during the days of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings. I have already referred to a few Jain epigraphs where some Rāṣṭrakūṭa monarchs have been mentioned. That the kings of this great dynasty were good patrons of Jainism will not only be evident from some inscriptions but also a very large number of Jain literary works completed during the Rāṣṭrakūṭa period.

No Jain inscription relating to the earlier members of the

Rāṣṭrakūṭa family is yet known, but it has been suggested on the basis of a Śravaṇa Belgola inscription dated AD 1129 that Akalaṅka, the great Jaina philosopher, was patronized by Dantidurga.<sup>116</sup> The earliest Rāṣṭrakūṭa Jaina inscription comes from Śravaṇa Belgola,<sup>117</sup> and refers to the reign of Raṇāvaloka Kambayya, son of Dhruva and elder brother of Govinda III. This prince was the eldest son of Dhruva and was the governor of Gaṅgavāḍi under his illustrious father. Dhruva was apparently alive at the time of this inscription. He is described here as the son of Śrīvallabha Mahārājādhirāja Parameśvara Mahārāja. The inscription records a grant and testifies to Kambayya's (Stambha) affection for the Jaina religion. Though the inscription is undated, we can assign it to the last quarter of the eighth century AD. I have already discussed the contents of the Manne plates<sup>118</sup> dated Śaka 724 which also shows that the prince's partiality for the Jaina religion.

Govinda III, the younger brother of Stambha and the successor of Dhruva, who is mentioned as the overlord in Manne plates of his elder brother, was probably an admirer of Jainism. The Kadaba plates<sup>119</sup> dated Śaka 753 corresponding to AD 814 and found from Tumkur district of Karnataka, refers to the reign of Prabhūtavarṣa, who is no other than Govinda III. This inscription discloses the existence of a line of Jaina monks of the Nandī Saṃgha of the Yāpaniyas. The name of the *gaṇa* is given as Punnāgavṛkṣamūla. The earliest *ācārya* was Śrīkīrti, his disciple was Kuli-Ācārya, followed by Vijayakīrti and the latter's disciple Arkakīrti. The last-named saint, we are told, was successful in eradicating an evil influence of Saturn on Vimalāditya, who was the sister's son of Cākirāja, the ruler of the entire province of the Gaṅgas. It is clear from the inscription that Vimalāditya was a Cālukya chief under Cākirāja, the supreme Rāṣṭrakūṭa governor of Gaṅgavāḍi. The grateful Vimalāditya and his uncle Cākirāja were pleased to grant an entire village called Jālamaṅgala at Śīlāgrāma, on the western side of Mānyapura, for a Jaina temple. This Mānyapura was probably coterminous with the town of the same name mentioned in the Gaṅga inscriptions. Vimalāditya was the son of Yaśovarman and grandson of Balavarman. There is absolutely no valid reason to doubt the authenticity of this record. Recently another Jaina inscription<sup>120</sup> of the time of Govinda III from Dharwar district has been discovered.

The successor of Govinda III, Amoghavarṣa I, who ascended the throne in AD 814 was one of the greatest patrons of the Jaina reli-

gion in the ninth century. We have already seen that there existed a Jaina shrine in Nāsik district, which was named after him. I shall at first discuss the available Jaina inscriptions of his reign and then turn my attention to the evidence supplied by the Jaina literary texts.

From a broken slab found from Ranebennur in Dharwar district an important Jaina inscription<sup>121</sup> has been discovered bearing the year Śaka 781, corresponding to AD 859. Although the epigraph does not disclose the name of the reigning monarch, it was evidently written during Amoghavarṣa's reign and within his empire. The inscription refers to a Jaina shrine constructed by one Nāgalūra Pollabe and therefore it was known as Nāgula *vasadi*. Lines 12 to the end record the gift of land made as a lifetime donation (*jīva-śāsana*) for this temple by several villagers. The gift, we are told, was received on behalf of the temple, by Nāganandin Ācārya of the Siṅghavura *gana*.

Much more important than the above-mentioned record is the Konnur stone inscription<sup>122</sup> dated Śaka 782 of the reign of the same king. The inscription was discovered from a place called Konnur, which is situated on the south bank of the river Malaprabhā in Nawalgund *tāluk* of Dharwar district. At present the inscribed stone is built into a wall of the local Parameśvara temple. Above the writing there are a few sculptures of Tīrthaṅkaras. The Śaka date corresponds to AD 860. The epigraph has altogether 72 lines, of which ll. 1–59 represent the inscription of the time of Amoghavarṣa I. According to this the emperor Amoghavarṣa, while residing at Mānyakhēṭa, at the request of his subordinate Baṅkeśa (Baṅkeya) in recognition of the important services, rendered by him, granted the village of Taleyura (l. 38) and some land of other villages for the benefit of a Jaina sanctuary founded by Baṅkeya at Kolanura to the sage Devendra, who was a disciple of Trikālayogīśa, belonging to the Pustaka *gaccha*, Deśīya *gana* and Mūla Saṅgha. It is interesting to note that the opening verse of the inscription invokes the blessing of both Viṣṇu and Jinendra. There is a magnificent tribute in v. 44 to the doctrine of the Jinās:

Ever victorious, like a royal edict be this doctrine of the Jinās, which destroys the false doctrines of peoples, who are filled with an excessive pride, arising from ignorance; which brings about the true happiness of all, who act in obedience to the commands of the wise; which is the place of glory of the excellent Syādvāda by which things appear under manifold forms, and grants the quintessence of good conduct.

The date, according to Kielhorn,<sup>123</sup> is absolutely correct, but it is a later copy of an original copperplate, according to the inscription itself<sup>124</sup> and there is no reason to disbelieve this clear statement. The later portion, after l. 59, refers to the Jaina monks who, lived in the twelfth century.

A number of literary works very clearly prove that Amoghavarṣa I was a converted Jaina. Guṇabhadra, the author of the *Uttarapurāṇa* and a contemporary of Amoghavarṣa I, asserts that his preceptor Jinasena was a *guru* of that celebrated Rāṣṭrakūṭa monarch.<sup>125</sup> Altekar refers to the fact that Jinasena in his *Pārśvābhyudaya* claims himself to be the chief preceptor (*paramaguru*) of Amoghavarṣa.<sup>126</sup> This is however impossible because that poem was written before AD 783 as it is mentioned in Jinasena II's *Harivamśa* composed in Śaka 705, and Amoghavarṣa ascended the throne only in AD 814 and at that time was a very young. However, another later writer<sup>127</sup> asserts that the *Pārśvābhyudaya* was composed in the court of Amoghavarṣa. That Amoghavarṣa was a believer in the doctrine of *Syādvāda* is also repeated in the *Gaṇītasārasaṅgraha*<sup>128</sup> of Mahāvīrācārya, who was a contemporary of that monarch. Amoghavarṣa himself in his *Prāśnottararatnamālā*<sup>129</sup> pays homage to Vardhamāna. Now, it is definitely known that this work was written by that king.<sup>130</sup> However, it should not be supposed that because of his Jaina leanings, he was indifferent to Hindu deities; that he was a devotee of Mahālakṣmī is known from one of the inscriptions.<sup>131</sup>

A few contemporary Jaina writers have clearly shown their bias for this great Rāṣṭrakūṭa king. Śākaṭāyana, a contemporary Jaina grammarian, wrote a commentary on his own grammatical work and named it as *Amoghavṛtti*. This shows his respect for that Rāṣṭrakūṭa monarch. In that *vṛtti* there is a reference to Amoghavarṣa's burning down his enemies (*adhadamoghavarṣorāṭin*).<sup>132</sup> Jinasena himself is full of praise for this great Rāṣṭrakūṭa monarch.<sup>133</sup> Yet another contemporary Jaina writer, Ugrāditya, the author of the medical treatise *Kalyāṇakāraka*,<sup>134</sup> which was composed on Mount Rāmagiri, situated in the level plains of Veṅgī in the country of Trikalīṅga, refers to the fact that he delivered a discourse on the uselessness of meat diet in the court of Śrī Nṛpatuṅga Vallabha Mahārājādhirāja, who is no other than Amoghavarṣa I. I should also mention that a few verses of the *Kavirājamārga* are in praise of Jina.<sup>135</sup> However, in the very beginning of this work, Amoghavarṣa has paid glowing tribute to Viṣṇu, which suggests his equal deference for the

Brahmanical deities. It should also be pointed out that the two famous Digambara commentaries, *Dhavalā* and *Jayadhavalā*, were named after Amoghavarṣa I, who was also known as Dhavala and Atiśaya Dhavala.

The successor of Amoghavarṣa I was Kṛṣṇa II for whose reign we have the Saundatti inscription dated AD 897 which has already been discussed. Another Jaina inscription<sup>136</sup> of his reign is the Mulgund inscription dated Śaka 824, corresponding to AD 902. Mulgund was a renowned Jaina centre and is situated in the Gadag *tāluk* of Dharwar district. We are told in this stone inscription that during the time of Kṛṣṇa II, his governor Cikārya, son of Candrārya, the governor of Dhavala-*viśaya* and belonging to Varavaśya caste, constructed a lofty temple of Jina at the town of Mulgunda. His younger son Arasārya (the brother of Nāgārya), who is described as proficient in the new Āgama (*nayāgamakuśalaḥ*) and a man of great liberality, made an endowment for the maintenance of the *jinālaya*, built by his father (*pitṛkārītajinālayāya*). The gift was entrusted to his preceptor Kanakasena Sūri, who was the disciple of *munīpati* Virasena and who in turn, was the pupil of *pūjyapāda* Kumārasena Ācārya of Candikavāṭa (Candrikāvāṭa), belonging to Senānvaya. Kumārasena, Vīrasena, etc. are also mentioned in the *Cāmuṇḍarāyapurāṇa*,<sup>137</sup> and it has been suggested<sup>138</sup> that Kumārasena was the fourth predecessor preceptor from Cāmuṇḍarāya. In that case, Kumārasena should be placed in the mid-ninth century AD.

Kṛṣṇa II was probably the patron of Guṇabhadra, the author of the *Uttarapurāṇa*.<sup>139</sup> This work was completed in Śaka 820 by Guṇabhadra's disciple Lokasena in the reign of Akālavarṣa or Kṛṣṇa II. His patron was Lokāditya, who was a governor of Baṅkāpura in Vanavāsī under that Rāṣṭrakūṭa king. This Lokāditya was a patron of Jainism, as we learn from the *praśasti* of the *Uttarapurāṇa*.<sup>140</sup> Guṇabhadra himself claims that Kṛṣṇa II was his disciple,<sup>141</sup> and there is no reason why we should disbelieve this. An interesting inscription<sup>142</sup> from Śravaṇa Belgoḷa which has already been referred to, connects a Jaina saint called Paravādimalla with one Kṛṣṇarājā, who has been identified with this Rāṣṭrakūṭa monarch. There is another Jaina inscription<sup>143</sup> which mentions Lokāditya (called Lokateyarasa) and his overlord Kṛṣṇa II. This inscription is dated AD 902 and was discovered from Bandalike, ancient Bāndhavanagara in Shikarpur *tāluk* of Shimoga district. It appears from the inscription that this place was looked upon as a Jaina *tīrtha* (sacred place).

The next king Indra III also had some fascination for the Jaina religion. We have a number of Jaina inscriptions of his reign. We must first refer to the well-known Dānavulapāḍu pillar inscription, discovered from Jammalmaḍugu *tāluk* of Cuddapah<sup>144</sup> district, A.P. The record is not dated and is partly in Sanskrit and partly Kanarese. The first part of it refers to the military prowess of Śrīvijaya, who was a *daṇḍanāyaka* (general) of king Indra III. The second part opens with an invocatory verse which proclaims glory to the prosperous doctrine of the Jina. It appears from the inscription that Śrīvijaya voluntarily resigned this world and became a Jaina ascetic in order to attain eternal bliss. This general Śrīvijaya is otherwise unknown. From the same place another Jaina inscription<sup>145</sup> of a single Sanskrit verse mentioning Nityavarṣa or Indra III has been discovered. Two other Śrīvijayas are known to Kanarese literature, both of whom flourished long before this Śrīvijaya and both were men of letters.<sup>146</sup> This Śrīvijaya too, it is interesting to note, is described in this epigraph as *anupamakavi*, meaning an accomplished poet. The *aṣṭavidha karma*, referred to in this inscription, consists of *jñānāvaranīya*, *darśanāvaranīya*, *vedanīya*, *mohanīya*, *āyuṣya*, *nāma*, *gotra*, and *antarāya*. This Śrīvijaya, it is evident from the inscription, was a very important general of Indra III and was one of the pillars of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire.

Another Jaina inscription<sup>147</sup> of the reign of Indra III, called Hatti Mattur stone inscription, has been discovered from Karajgi *tāluk* of Dharwar district, Karnataka. This is dated in the Śaka 838, corresponding to AD 916. It records the grant of a village called Vutavura by the Mahāsāmanta Leṇḍeyarasa. Later the Jaina establishment here was converted into a Śaiva temple, as is evident from the second part of the record, which was inscribed a few centuries thereafter.

In the last chapter I discussed an important Jaina inscription of Indra III found in Nāsik district. I should also mention in this connection an inscription from Belgaum district, Karnataka, which states that a Jaina saint called Neminātha, the preceptor of Maṇicandra, was like a moon in the ocean, which was the dynasty of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas.<sup>148</sup> Evidently this Jaina monk was held in the highest esteem by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings of his time. The inscription has been assigned to c. AD 900.

For the reign of Govinda IV we have two Jaina inscriptions<sup>149</sup> dated Śaka 847 or AD 925 and Śaka 854 or AD 932, both of which were



discovered from modern Karnataka state. The first dated Śaka 847, discovered from Gadag *tāluk* of Dharwar district, refers to a *jinālaya* built by one Nāgaya.<sup>150</sup> It also refers to another *jinālaya* called Dhora Jinālaya at Baṅkāpura with the preceptor Candraprabha Bhaṭāra as its head. It is interesting to note that this Jaina priest is described as administering a village called Pasuṅḍi (modern Asuṅḍi), which probably shows that the village was an endowment of this Jaina temple. The second inscription dated Śaka 854 or AD 932 discovered from Adoni *tāluk* of Bellary district refers to a Jaina temple<sup>151</sup> built by the queen Chandiyabbe, wife of Kannara, the governor (*mahāsāmanta*) of Sindavādi, 1000. We are told that this queen constructed a Jaina temple at Nandavara and made suitable provision for its maintenance. The inscription also refers to a Jaina teacher called Padmanandin. It has been suggested that this Kannara is prince Kṛṣṇa III, and at this time he was a governor under his cousin Govinda IV,<sup>152</sup> but it is more appropriate to regard the Kannara of this inscription as a feudatory of Govinda IV.

Kṛṣṇa III was one of the greatest members of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty. From the holy Kopbal area in Raichur district of Karnataka we have two inscriptions of his reign. The earlier one<sup>153</sup> has been assigned to c. AD 940 and refers to Akālarvaṣa Kannardeva, and he was no other than Kṛṣṇa III. However excepting a reference to Kopaṇa, there is nothing typically Jaina regarding this inscription. The second inscription,<sup>154</sup> which is fortunately dated Śaka 887, corresponding to AD 964 found near Kopbal from a place called Uppina Beṭḡiri is a very important Jaina record. It reveals the existence of a feudatory king of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas called Śaṅkaraṅḍa II who erected a Jaina shrine called Jayadhīra Jinālaya which was apparently named after him, 'Jayadhīra' being one of his titles. As noted by Desai, this particular feudatory of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas is mentioned in several inscriptions of northern Karnataka.<sup>155</sup> That scholar has also drawn our attention to the fact that this chief is mentioned in the *Ajīta-tīrthakarapurāṇatīlakam*<sup>156</sup> of the Kanarese poet Ranna, who wrote this work in AD 993. According to that poet Śaṅkaraṅḍa was a great Jaina patron. It appears therefore from the combined testimony of these two sources (epigraphic and literary) that this Rāṣṭrakūṭa governor was a great promoter of Jainism in Karnataka in the second half of the tenth century AD. It further appears from the title Rattameru given to him in this inscription that Śaṅkaraṅḍa was of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa extraction. We also learn from

this epigraph that another Rāṣṭrakūṭa feudatory, namely Rāṭṭayya, who was of Cālukya lineage, donated some land, for the temple erected by Śaṅkaraḡaṇḡa II, and Nāḡanandi Paṇḡita Bhaṭāra received the endowment on behalf of the temple. This saint is described here as a disciple of Vinayanandi, who in turn was a pupil of Śrīnandi of Śūrastha *gaṇa*. From other inscriptions we learn that Śūrastha or Sūrastha *gaṇa* was associated with the Sena *gaṇa* of Mūla Saṁgha.<sup>157</sup>

A few other Jaina inscriptions of the reign of Kṛṣṇa III are known. One such inscription<sup>158</sup> has been discovered from Tirumalai hill near Polūr (North Arcot) in Tamil Nadu, which records the gift of a lamp made to the *yakṣa* on the sacred Tirumalai hill by a servant of the queen of Kṛṣṇa III. This hill was associated with the Jaina religion from early times. Over a dozen Jaina epigraphs and a number of rock-cut Jaina figures have been discovered from the same hill. The village near this hill, which bears same name, still harbours a few Jaina families.<sup>159</sup> We should also mention another Jaina inscription<sup>160</sup> of the time of Kṛṣṇa III, found from Naregal in the Roṇ *tāluk* of Dharwar district. According to this, the wife of Gaṅga Būtuga II, called Padmabbarasi, constructed a Jaina temple at Naregal, and in AD 950 the grant of a tank to the charity house attached to the temple was made by a subordinate chief called Namayara Mārasimḡhayya. The gift was received by Guṇacandra, the pupil of Viranandi, who was a pupil of Mahendra Paṇḡita belonging to the Koṇḡakunda *anvaya* of Deśiya *gaṇa*.

The celebrated Jaina poet Somadeva wrote his encyclopaedic work *Yaśastilakacampū* during the reign of this great Rāṣṭrakūṭa monarch in the Śaka year 881 when that emperor was stationed at Melapāṭī<sup>161</sup> which has been identified with Melpāḡi in North Arcot district of Tamil Nadu. The same place is also mentioned in the Karhad plates<sup>162</sup> of Kṛṣṇa III dated Śaka 880 and Karjol inscription<sup>163</sup> dated Śaka 879. I shall have more to say on Somadeva's literary achievements in a later chapter of this volume. Another Jaina literary figure, namely Indranandi Yogīndra, composed his *Jvālāmālinīkalpa*<sup>164</sup> at Malkhed in Śaka 861 during the reign of Kṛṣṇa III.

We have a few Jaina inscriptions of the reign of Khoṭṭiga, the brother and successor of Kṛṣṇa III. An inscription from Chitaldurg district dated AD 968 mentions the fact that Jakki Sundarī, the wife of Pandayya, a Cālukyan feudatory of Khoṭṭiga built a Jaina temple, for which her husband gave a grant.<sup>165</sup> Another inscription, prais-

ing the Jaina religion of his reign, has been discovered from Dharwar district.<sup>166</sup>

The last representative of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty was the valiant Indra IV, who unsuccessfully sought to restore the tottering fortune of the empire with the aid of his maternal uncle Gaṅga Mārasimha. An inscription from Śravaṇa Belgola<sup>167</sup> dated AD 982 (Śaka 904) shows that he died like a true Jaina. The epigraph describes his wonderful skill in playing polo, and also bestows lavish praise on him. We are told that as a believer in the doctrine of Mahāvīra, he never uttered a falsehood.

Let us now turn our attention to the state of Tamil Nadu. We have already seen that Jainism flourished in the southern district of India from quite early times. In the seventh century too it maintained its great popularity in Tamil Nadu. This is directly shown by the testimony of Yuan Chwang. In all the three southern states of India, namely Cola, Draviḍa and Mo-lo-ku-ta (Malakuṭa), he noticed numerous Digambaras and their shrines.<sup>168</sup> This testimony from the pen of a person who was a diehard Buddhist, and who had practically no respect for his religious opponents, is extremely valuable. The same pilgrim laments the absence of Buddhists and the ruined condition of *vihāras* particularly in countries of south India. In the *Mattavilāsaprahasana* of Mahendravarman I, who was a senior contemporary of Yuan Chwang, we have a veiled yet strong criticism of the Jains,<sup>169</sup> which indirectly shows that they were present almost everywhere in his kingdom. We have already seen that the Pallavas were not hostile to the Jainas. They themselves were however Brahmanical Hindus and had a special affection for theistic Hindu deities. There is also reason to suspect that during the rule of some of the Pallava kings a few over-zealous Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava teachers instigated the nobles and the common people against the Jainas and Buddhists. A few later Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva works gleefully narrate the cruel accounts of the persecution of the Jainas.<sup>170</sup> There is also reason to believe that Pallava Mahendravarman I was himself a Jaina in his early life.<sup>171</sup> Let us not forget that his father Simhaviṣṇu was a patron of the Jainas. It is however evident from the *Mattavilāsaprahasana* that Mahendravarman I became a Śaiva later in his life. According to the Śaiva literary tradition, current in south India, Mahendravarman I became a Śaiva under the influence of Appar, the noted south Indian Śaiva philosopher. After his conversion this king became a persecutor of the Jainas.<sup>172</sup> The earliest Pallava in-

scription, connected with Jainism of our period (AD 600–1000) probably belongs to the reign of Parameśvaravarman I (AD 670–95). This is the Nalajanampadu stone inscription<sup>173</sup> from Nellore district, A.P. The Parameśvara Pallavāditya of this record is identified with Parameśvara I, and he is described here as meditating at the feet on the supreme master, the Lord Arhat. The rest of this Telugu inscription is useless for our purpose.

A few Jaina Pallava inscriptions of the reign of Nandivarman II Pallavamalla (AD 730–800) are known. A rock inscription<sup>174</sup> from Kil-Sattamaṅgalam dated in the fourteenth year of that king, in Wandiwash *tāluk* of North Arcot district in Tamil Nadu records an endowment of seven *kalañju* of gold by Andai Ilaiyār Pavaṇandi of the village for feeding ascetics, excluding the manager of the monastery. There is an imprecation in the concluding part of the epigraph for incurring the sin of destroying Kāmakoṭṭam, probably the famous Śiva temple of Kāñcī.<sup>175</sup> From the same site two other Jaina inscriptions of the reign of the same king have been discovered. Both the epigraphs are dated in the fifty-sixth year of Nandivarman II. One of them<sup>176</sup> records an endowment of seventeen *kalañju* of gold to a *paḷli* called Pavanandivar (evidently named after the ascetic who is mentioned in the epigraph of the fourteenth year) for the merit of Pūṇḍi Muppavai, daughter of Jinadiyār of Vilukkam, which is identified with the village of the same name in Tindivaram *tāluk* in South Arcot district. The Jaina saint Pavanandi may be identified with the person of the same name, the author of the *nanṇūl*, a Tamil grammatical text.<sup>177</sup>

Another Jaina shrine is mentioned in an inscription found from Agalur, Gingee *tāluk* of South Arcot district. This is dated<sup>178</sup> in the fiftieth year of Nandivarman II. An undated inscription<sup>179</sup> which has been assigned to this king was discovered from Kāñcī in Chingleput district and records the gift to an Arhat temple. This epigraph, it is interesting to note, mentions an *ācārya* of Ājivikadarśana, who probably cured Lokamahādevī, the queen of Narasiṃhavarman II. This proves that the Ājivikas maintained their separate existence in south India as late as the eighth century.

The next Jaina Pallava inscription<sup>180</sup> belongs to the reign of Kampavarman, who is identified with Dantivarman,<sup>181</sup> son of Nandivarman II, who ruled in the first half of the ninth century AD. The inscription is dated in the sixth year of Kampavarman's reign and was found from the same site from where three Jaina inscrip-

tions of Nandivarman II were discovered. This is an extremely interesting record as it gives us a very clear idea regarding a Jaina temple complex of the Pallava period. The inscription records the renovation of the temple (i.e. the one established by Pavanandi) and the addition of *mukhamaṇḍapa* to it, the renovation of a *pāḷi*, the construction of a temple of Yakṣī Bhaṭārī (*iyakkīpadārī*) and the gift of a big bell to the *paḷli* by Mādevī, the wife of Kāḍagadiyariyar.<sup>182</sup> It appears that this entire temple complex was possibly called *paḷli*. It had a main shrine dedicated to Jina, with a *maṇḍapa* in front, a subsidiary shrine of *yakṣī*, and the monastery (*pāḷi*) where the Jaina monks lived. It is clear from the inscription that in this temple complex the main shrine and the monastery, which were built some fifty years earlier were renovated, while the *mukha-maṇḍapa* and the shrine for the *yakṣī* were added. The entire establishment called *paḷli* in this record is again mentioned in an inscription from the same site belonging to the reign of Rājarāja I, dated in his thirteenth regnal year, which is equivalent to AD 997–8.<sup>183</sup> This *paḷli* there is called the temple of Tīrthamkara Vimāla. The epigraph records the sale of land by one Baladevapidāran, a disciple of Śrī Nandidevar, for the maintenance of a perpetual lamp in the temple. At present, however there is no trace of this temple, but there is a temple dedicated to Candranātha in another part of the village.

The Nolamba Pallavas, who came into prominence during the ninth and tenth centuries AD, ruled in parts of modern Karnataka and were feudatories of the Western Gaṅgas. Three inscriptions of the time of Nolamba Mahendra are connected with the Jaina religion. The earliest epigraph dated Śaka 800, corresponding to AD 878 discovered from the fort at Dharmapuri, which is the headquarters of the district of the same name in Tamil Nadu, records a grant<sup>184</sup> to a Jaina temple. The second Jaina inscription<sup>185</sup> of his reign bears the date Śaka 815 corresponding to AD 893. It records that two citizens called Candiyāṇṇa and Nandiyāṇṇa, after receiving the gift of the village of Mullapaḷli from the king, gave it as a gift to Kanakasena Siddhānta, the pupil of Vinayasena Siddhānta of the Pogariya *gaṇa*, Senānvaya and Mūlasaṅgha, for the repairs of the *basadi* at Dharmapuri. Even now this place has a few Jaina antiquities. Dharmapuri was known in ancient times as Tagaḍūru.<sup>186</sup> The village Mūllapaḷli is now represented by the modern village of Mūlakāḍu, nine miles west of Dharmapuri.<sup>187</sup> The inscription further informs us that the *basadi* was originally built by two above-mentioned citizens,

who are described as sons of the *setti* of Śrīmaṅgala.

The third Jaina inscription of Mahendra's reign has been found from Hemāvati in Anantapur district of A.P. This damaged stone inscription<sup>188</sup> records some donations to a local Jaina temple by Mahendra and his son Ayyapa. Another Jaina inscription<sup>189</sup> of this Ayyapa has been found from the same site, which contains the second inscription of his father Mahendra. It records that Ayyapadeva presented the village called Budugūru to Lokāyya, who was the younger brother of Dasaya and who is described as the illuminator of the doctrine of the Arhats. Lokāyya in turn presented it to the Jaina *basadi* built by Nidhiyaṅṅa, apparently the same temple, mentioned in Mahendra's inscription of Śaka 815. This stone epigraphs show that Mahendra and his son were patrons of Jainism. The undated inscription of Ayyapa is assigned<sup>190</sup> to the early tenth century AD. It should also be pointed out that Mahendra's epigraph of Śaka 815 begins with an invocation to Jinendra.<sup>191</sup> All the above-mentioned inscriptions are in Kanarese.

We should also refer to a Bāṇa epigraph<sup>192</sup> found from Vallimalai (North Arcot) which records the setting up of an image of Devasena, the pupil of Bhavanandin and spiritual preceptor to the king. The inscription is in Kanarese *grantha* characters and may be assigned to the ninth century AD.

The Imperial Colas, who started ruling from the last quarter of the ninth century AD, were Brahmanical Hindus and chiefly patronized theistic Hindu deities like Śiva and Viṣṇu. We have, however, quite a large number of inscriptions connected with Jainism, belonging to the Cola period, which show that the Jainas were present almost everywhere in the vast Cola empire. The earliest Jaina epigraph of the time of the Imperial Colas belongs to the reign of Āditya I (AD 871–907) and was discovered from Veḍal in Arkonam *tāluk* of North Arcot district.<sup>193</sup> It is incised on a boulder in front of the natural cave known as Āṇḍar-Maḍam. The epigraph records an undertaking given by the lay disciples at Viḍal, *alias* Mādevi-Arandai-maṅgalam in Śingapura-nāḍu, to protect and feed along with her lady pupils, Kanakavīra Kurattiyār, a woman ascetic and disciple of the teacher Guṇakīrtibhaṭṭāraka. This epigraph, which is dated in the fourteenth regnal year of Āditya (Rājakeśarivarman) further refers to the dispute between 500 male pupils and 400 female ascetics. It was evidently a very large Jaina establishment, and it appears that the female ascetic mentioned in this epigraph, was the daugh-

ter of an influential person. An earlier epigraph from the same site belongs to the reign of Nandivarman II,<sup>194</sup> where the Jaina temple-complex is called Vidārpalli. Mādevi-Arandaimaṅgalam, mentioned in the epigraph of the time of Āditya I, was another name for Viḍāl. An earlier Jaina inscription,<sup>195</sup> dated in the second year of Rājakeśarivarman's reign probably also belongs to the reign of Āditya I. It was found from Tirunāgeśvaram on the southern bank of the Kāverī. It registers gifts made by merchants of Kumāramārtaṇḍapuram to meet the cost of repairs to the enclosure called Mauna-kumāramārtaṇḍan and the *gopura* of Milāḍiyar-palli. From another epigraph it appears<sup>196</sup> that Kumāramārtaṇḍan was a surname of the Pallava king Nandivarman II.

For the reign of Parāntaka I (AD 907–55) we have a number of Jaina inscriptions. The first epigraph<sup>197</sup> is dated in the third regnal year of Parāntaka I. It was found from Toṇḍur in Gingee *tāluk* of South Arcot district. It records the endowment of a village with two gardens and wells as *paḷḷiccandam* to the Jaina teacher Vacciraśiṅga Ilamperumānandīgal at Parambūr and his disciple by the chief Vannakovaraiyan Vayiri Malaiyaṅ. We have another Jaina epigraph<sup>198</sup> of the same year from Tirakkol in Wandiwash *tāluk* of North Arcot district. It records a gift of 200 sheep for the Jaina temple called Maisitta Perumballi at Śrīdaṇḍapuram in Ponnur Nāḍu by one Era Nandi alias Naratoṅga Pallavariyam of Nelveli, which is probably situated in Tanjore district.<sup>199</sup> The same Jaina shrine is also mentioned in another Tamil record of the tenth century.<sup>200</sup>

For the fourth year of Parāntaka we have an epigraph<sup>201</sup> from Polur *tāluk* of North Arcot district. It is incised on a rock at Tirumalai, a hill known for its Jaina antiquities. We have already noted an inscription from this hill of the time of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa III. The inscription of Parāntaka records a gift to the Jaina temple of this place by two persons recruited from Karṇāṭa country. The gift was made for feeding a devotee and for daily offering to Palliyālvār, i.e., Jaina Tirthamkara. The hill was also known at that time as Vaigavūr. A somewhat later Cola inscription<sup>202</sup> (dated in the twelfth year of Rājendra I) refers to the fact that in an earlier time a Pallava queen had made provision for the burning of a perpetual lamp in the Jaina shrine on this hill.

An inscription<sup>203</sup> of about AD 945 of the reign of Parāntaka I found from Viḷāpakkam in North Arcot district refers to the sinking of a well by a nun called Paṭṭini Kuratti Aḍīgal. As the very name signi-

fies, she was an eminent lady teacher. According to the same source she was a disciple of a saint called Ariṣṭanemi Bhaṭārar of the Jaina establishment of Tiruppānmalai. We further learn from this inscription that the Jaina residents of the place had organized themselves and constituted a representative council of twenty-four members to look after their interests.

A number of Jaina inscriptions belonging to the immediate successors of Parāntaka I are known. The most important of these is the copperplate record<sup>204</sup> from Paḷḷankovil situated in Tirutturraipundi *tāluk* of Tanjore district. It consists of six plates, but unfortunately the plate which contained the name of the reigning king is lost. The inscription discloses the existence of a Jaina temple (*paḷḷi*) founded by Śalettī Kuḍḍiyan. The name of the shrine is given as Sundaraśolapperumbalḷi, apparently named after Sundara Cola, the grandson of Parāntaka I. The gift provided for the maintenance of Candranandi Bhaṭāra *alias* Maunidevar of Nandisaṃgha, who most probably presided over the Jaina establishment to which male and female ascetics were attached. Since the temple was named after Sundara Cola (AD 956–73), it was built in the third quarter of the tenth century AD. In this connection we should also refer to the Udayendiram plates of Hastimalla<sup>205</sup> according to which the Digambara Jinas had an ancient *paḷḷiccandam* comprising two *paḷḷis* of land which were specially excluded from the gift of the village of Kadaikkottūr made in the reign of Parāntaka I.

At Śīrrāmūr in South Arcot district an inscription of the seventeenth year of a Rājakeśari (probably Sundara Cola, AD 956–73) records the provision of a lamp in the *maṇḍapa* of the temple of Pārśvanātha in which the scripture was expounded.<sup>206</sup> So far as the reign of Rājarāja I (985–1014) is concerned, we have already referred to a Jaina inscription of his time. We have another Jaina inscription<sup>207</sup> of the eighth year of his reign which mentions one Lāṭarāja Vira Cola, who was a tributary of the Cola king. At the request of his wife he assigned to the god Tiruppānmalai certain income derived from the village Kuraganapāḍi (probably modern Kurambadi, two miles east from Pañcapāṇḍavamalai which is four miles to the southwest of Arcot town). This Cola feudatory is described as a worshipper at the holy feet of the god of Tiruppānmalai. The elder sister of Rājarāja I, Kundavai, had strong affection for the Jaina religion. I shall discuss this in vol. II of this work.

Now we should turn our attention to the state of Jainism during



the rule of the Pāṇḍyas. The earliest Jaina inscription<sup>208</sup> of this dynasty comes from Chitalar in the former Travancore state. The record in Tamil language and Vaṭṭeluttu characters, belongs to the twenty-eighth year of the reign of Varaguṇa I (c. AD 765–815),<sup>209</sup> *alias* Neduñjadayan. The epigraph belongs to the last quarter of the eighth century AD. It records a gift of golden ornaments to the Bhaṭāriyār of Tirucchāranattumalai, popularly known as the holy hill of the Cāraṇas, made by the lady teacher Guṇandāṅgi Kurattigal, disciple of Ariṣṭanemi Bhaṭāra of Perayakkuḍi. Two other inscriptions of the reign of this king are known and both come from Rāmanāthapuram district. They make mention<sup>210</sup> of Tirukkāṭṭāmpalli, which seems to have been a Jaina temple at Kurandai, an important Jaina centre<sup>211</sup> at Veṅbunādu.

We have an important Jaina inscription of the reign of Varaguṇa II, which is also important from the historical point of view. This is the Aivarmalai stone inscription<sup>212</sup> found from Palni *tāluk* of Madurai district. The epigraph is incised above the natural cave on the Aivarmalai hill, so well-known for its Jaina relics. Unlike most of the Pāṇḍyan epigraphs, it yields a definite date, Śaka 792 corresponding to AD 870 which, according to the epigraph, was the eighth regnal year of Varaguṇa II. It registers a gift of 500 *kāṇam* of gold by Śāntivīrakkuravar of Kālam, the disciple of Guṇavīrakkuravaḍigal for offerings to the images of Pārśva Bhaṭāra (i.e., Pārśvanātha) and of the attendant *yakṣīs*, and for feeding one ascetic. The inscription, therefore indirectly testifies that the temple-complex of this hill, dedicated to Pārśva existed before the date of this inscription. A few other short epigraphs of this hill will be discussed below.

Another important Pāṇḍyan Jaina inscription is dated in the twentieth regnal year of Śaḍayan Māran,<sup>213</sup> who is identified by some with Rājasimha II (c. AD 900–920), although K.A.N. Sastri, it appears believes that he was a different person.<sup>214</sup> The inscription was discovered from Uttamapaliyam in Periyakulam *tāluk* of Madurai district. The epigraph is much damaged but definitely refers to a Jaina shrine of this hill, which is known for its Jaina antiquities. The Pāṇḍyan king Rājasimha II is said to have endowed several Jaina temples,<sup>215</sup> showing that he was a Jaina patron.

Let us turn our attention to some of the epigraphs of Tamil Nadu, Kerala, etc., which are not connected with any ruling dynasty. We have a very early epigraph which was probably incised even prior to AD 600 and one that is also important from the palaeographical point

of view. The epigraph was discovered from Tirunātharkunru<sup>216</sup> in Gingee *tāluk* of South Arcot. It records the fast unto death (*nīśidikā*) in 57 days by Candranandi Āśiriyar. The inscription, according to the decipherer, marks the transition from Brāhmī to Vaṭṭeluṭṭu, and may be assigned to the sixth century AD, if not earlier.

We should now discuss the activities of a great Jaina saint of south India, who did so much to popularize his religion amongst the masses. I am referring to Ajjanandi, who was responsible for fashioning a number of images in different parts of the southern states of India. His name is mentioned in brief epigraphs found from Vallimalai in Chittoor district of A.P., and from Anaimalai, Aivarmalai, Alagarmalai, Karungālakkudi and Uttamapaliyam in Madurai district. His name is also found in the natural cavern at Eruvāḍi in Tinnevely district and near Chitalar in Kerala. Therefore the three present states of India, A.P., Tamil Nadu, and Kerala were traversed by this great Jaina, who left no stone unturned to counteract the hostile propaganda of Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava fanatics, who were bent upon destroying the religion of Pārśva and Mahāvīra in south India. From palaeographical considerations, Ajjanandi should be placed around AD 800.

In an epigraph<sup>217</sup> found from Pecchipallam in Madurai *tāluk* of Madurai district, Ajjanandi's mother Guṇamatīyār is mentioned. One of the epigraphs of Kongar Puliyagulam is actually engraved under the image of that saint,<sup>218</sup> which was probably set up by one of Ajjanandi's disciples, who must have been numerous in the early ninth century. An epigraph found from Vallimalai (Chittoor district) shows that the name of his preceptor was Bālacandra.<sup>219</sup> It further appears that Ajjanandi was a native of the great city of Madura. It has been pointed that this Ajjanandi is to be identified with his namesake, mentioned in the *Jivakacintāmaṇi*, a Tamil Jaina classic.<sup>220</sup> Quite a number of other Jaina saints are also mentioned in the epigraphs found from different Jaina sites of south India. A few, like Indusena, Mallisena, etc., were probably the contemporaries of Ajjanandi.<sup>221</sup> Needless to say, these saints did much to popularize the message of the Tīrthamkaras in south India.

#### REFERENCES

1. See *Indian Archaeology, A Review*, 1968–9, p. 47, pl. LIIB.
2. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 172 ff.; see also P.B. Desai, *Jainism in South India*,

- pp. 117 ff.
3. *IA*, 7, pp. 161–2.
  4. See *Revised List of Antiquarian Remains, Bombay Presidency*, p. 183; see also *IA*, 5, pp. 67 ff., and 8, pp. 239 ff. This important epigraph was later edited by Kielhorn in *EI*, 6, pp. 1 ff. See also Kielhorn's *List*, no. 10.
  5. See A.N. Upadhye's paper in the *Journal of Bombay University, Arts and Law*, 1933, May, p. 230.
  6. See *IA*, 7, pp. 101 ff.
  7. *Ibid.*, p. 103.
  8. *Loc. cit.*
  9. See G.C. Raychaudhuri, *History of the Western Cālukyas (JAIH, VIII)*, p. 28.
  10. *IA*, 7, p. 103.
  11. *Ibid.*, pp. 111 ff.
  12. *Ibid.*, p. 112.
  13. *Loc. cit.*, see also Kielhorn, *List*, no. 37.
  14. See Fleet in *IA*, 30, p. 218.
  15. *IA*, 7, pp. 106 ff.
  16. p. 86.
  17. See *IA*, 7, p. 104.
  18. *Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy*, 1945–6, A-49. See also *Jaina Śilālekha Saṃgraha*, IV, no. 45.
  19. *EI*, XXI, pp. 204 ff.
  20. See Naik, *A List of the Inscriptions of the Deccan*, 1949, no. 73.
  21. See *Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy*, B. 212–18.
  22. *Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy*, 1927–8, E. 93–238; 1928–9, E. 101–31.
  23. See 123.2; 146.1.
  24. See *Mysore Gazetteer* (new edn.), II (1930), p. 629.
  25. *Loc. cit.*
  26. *Loc. cit.*
  27. *MAR*, 1925, no. 105.
  28. *Ibid.*, pp. 90 ff.; see also *Jaina Śilālekha Saṃgraha*, 4, no. 24.
  29. See Saletore, *Mediaeval Jainism*, pp. 23 ff.
  30. See *Mysore Gazetteer*, II, pp. 634 ff.
  31. See *EC*, IV, Nāgamaṅgala, no. 85; see also *Jaina Śilālekha Saṃgraha*, II, no. 121.
  32. *MAR*, 1933, pp. 237–8.
  33. *Ibid.*, 1920, pp. 27 ff.
  34. *Ibid.*, p. 29.
  35. See *MAR*, 1918, para 71.
  36. Pl. XXIA and also p. 29.
  37. pp. 29 ff. and pl. XXI B.

38. See Rice, *Mysore and Coorg*, p. 41; see also *Mysore Gazetteer*, p. 642; *IA*, 18, p. 313.
39. *EC*, II, p. 180 (text); also *Introd.*, p. 43; see *MAR*, 1911, p. 24.
40. See *Mysore Gazetteer*, II, p. 642.
41. See *EC*, IX, no. 60.
42. See *ibid.*, *Introd.*, p. 4.
43. *Ibid.*, no. 61.
44. See *The Age of Imperial Kanauj*, p. 160.
45. See *Mysore Gazetteer*, II, p. 657.
46. *Ibid.*, p. 650, also *MAR*, 1909, para 45.
47. See *EI*, IV, p. 140.
48. See *MAR*, 1921, pp. 18 ff.
49. See *ibid.*, 1932, pp. 240-1.
50. *Ibid.*, p. 241.
51. See *EC*, I, (rev. edn., 1972), no. 96 and *Introd.*, p. xl.
52. *EC*, X, pp. 25 ff. (trans.); no. 90 (text).
53. *Ibid.*, XII, p. 135.
54. See *MAR*, 1921, p. 22.
55. *Ibid.*, 1914, para 63.
56. See *EI*, III, pp. 158 ff.
57. *MAR*, 1921, para 55.
58. *Ibid.*, 1923, no. 113.
59. See *Mysore Gazetteer*, II, p. 675; see also *The Age of Imperial Unity*, p. 161.
60. *Mysore Gazetteer*, II, p. 676.
61. *EI*, XXXVI, pp. 97 ff.
62. *Ibid.*, p. 98; see also *Mysore Gazetteer*, II, pp. 678 ff.
63. See *EI*, IV, p. 281.
64. *MAR*, 1921, pp. 18 ff.; see also pls. X, 1-6.
65. For this term see Sircar, *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*, p. 108.
66. See *EC*, II (revised), no. 59, pl. LXIII. See also *Introduction*, pp. 44 ff.
67. See also *EC*, X, Mūlbāgal, 84.
68. *Ibid.*, X, CB, 29.
69. *Ibid.*, *Introd.*, pp. ix ff.
70. See *Mysore Gazetteer*, II, p. 686.
71. See *EC*, II (revised), no. 150.
72. See *EC*, I (1972), no. 98. The date corresponds to AD 877; it was issued on Phālguna Nandīśvara day. It registers a grant of two villages to Anantavīrya, a disciple of Guṇasena-panḍita, for the maintenance of a Jaina *vasadi* at Peggadūr.
73. See *JBBRAS*, 10, pp. 194 ff.; see also *Jaina Śilālekha Saṅgraha*, II, no. 130.
74. See Altekar, *The Rāṣṭrakūṭas and Their Times*, p. 89, n. 52. Desai following Fleet, identifies Kṛṣṇa of this inscription with Kṛṣṇa III, see *Jainism in South India*, p. 112. However, the date of the record, which is given in words, definitely goes against the view of Fleet and Desai.

Although, Amoghavarṣa, I, the father of Kṛṣṇa II, was still living, the son was practically the *de facto* king at that time.

75. See Desai, op. cit., p. 113.
76. See *JBBRAS*, X, pp. 204 ff.
77. Desai, op. cit., p. 113.
78. See *ibid.*, pp. 113 ff.
79. See *EI*, XXI, pp. 291 ff.
80. For some further details see Desai, op. cit., p. 111.
81. See *Mysore Gazetteer*, II, pp. 570 ff.; see also *The Age of Imperial Kanauj*, pp. 162 ff.
82. See V. Rangacharya, *A Topographical List of the Inscriptions of Madras Presidency*, Salem, no. 81.
83. *Ibid.*, no. 74.
84. See *EC*, II (revised), no. 1; see also *EI*, IV, pp. 24 ff.
85. *EC*, II, nos. 2–9.
86. See no. 7 dated c. AD 700.
87. See Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, II, p. 237.
88. See Inscription no. 47 in P.B. Desai's *Jainism in South India*, pp. 374 ff.
89. See *Kannada Inscriptions of A.P.*, no. 57; see also Desai, op. cit., pp. 339 ff.
90. See Desai, op. cit., no. 20, pp. 343 ff.,
91. *Ibid.*, p. 344; also *Varāṅgacarita*, *Introd.*, p. 22.
92. See *EC*, IV, sr. 160, p. 143. We should also mention in this connection, the reference to the death of Sukumārasena *muni* on the hill of Kopaṇa (Kaopaṇādri) mentioned by Cāmuṇḍarāja in his celebrated *Cāmuṇḍarāyapurāṇa*; see Saletore, op. cit., p. 193, n. 2.
93. See *EC*, II, p. 88.
94. *Ibid.*, nos., 127, 191, 345, 384. For some further details on this great *ūrtha* see Saletore, op. cit., pp. 187–97; see also Desai, op. cit., pp. 200 ff.
95. *Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy*, 1916–17, copperplate no. 16; see also *JAHS*, 13, pp. 185 ff., and *The Classical Age*, p. 253.
96. *Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy*, 1941–2, no. 18.
97. *Ibid.*, 1929–30, p. 6, nos. 17–19.
98. See *The Age of Imperial Kanauj*, pp. 137 ff.
99. See *EI*, IX, pp. 47 ff.; see also Butterworth and Chetti, *Nellore Inscriptions*, pp. 164 ff.
100. See *EI*, VII, pp. 177 ff.
101. *Ibid.*, p. 182; cf. the case of Vināpoti, the mistress of Badami Cālukya Vijayāditya (Mahākūṭa pillar inscription) and Divalāmikā (Sudi plates of Būtuga).
102. See *EI*, vol. XXIV, pp. 268 ff.
103. See *JAHS*, 13, p. 195, n. 1.
104. See *Epigraphia Andhrica*, II, pp. 21 ff.

105. Ibid., pp. 22 ff.
106. Loc. cit.
107. Loc. cit.
108. See no. 1 of *Epigraphia Andhrica*, II.
109. Ibid., pp. 31 ff.
110. See *Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh (Karimnagar district)* ed., P.V. Parabrahma Sastry, no. 5.
111. Ibid., no. 4.
112. See *The Cālukyas of Vemulavāda*, pp. 92 ff.; see also N.L. Premi, *Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihāsa*, pp. 190 ff.
113. See Premi, op. cit., p. 179, n. 1.
114. Ibid., pp. 178 ff., 179 n.
115. Ibid., p. 193.
116. *EC*, II (revised), no. 67.
117. Ibid., no. 35.
118. *EC*, IX, no. 61.
119. *EI*, IV, pp. 332 ff.; also *IA*, 12, pp. 11 ff.
120. See *Annual Report of Indian Epigraphy*, 1958–9, B-582.
121. See *Karnatak Inscriptions* (1951), II, pp. 14–16.
122. See *EI*, VI, pp. 25 ff.
123. Ibid., p. 26.
124. Ibid., p. 25.
125. See Premi, op. cit., p. 150, n. 4 where the original verses from Guṇabhadra's *praśasti* have been reproduced.
126. See *The Rāṣtrakūtas and Their Times*, p. 311.
127. See Premi, op. cit., pp. 134 ff.
128. Ibid., pp. 151 ff. and n. 6 on p. 151.
129. Loc. cit.; see also R.G. Bhandarkar, *Early History of the Deccan*, p. 95.
130. See Altekar, op. cit., p. 411; see also *JBBRAS*, 22, pp. 80 ff.
131. See *EI*, XVIII, p. 248; also Altekar, op. cit., p. 311.
132. See Premi, op. cit., p. 163.
133. Ibid., p. 153.
134. See J.P. Jain, *The Jaina Sources of the History of Ancient India*, pp. 204 ff.; see also *Praśastisamgraha* (pp. 56–7) of that text published from Sholapur. Premi, op. cit., p. 49n, however, doubts the authenticity of this *praśasti*.
135. See *Mysore Gazetteer*, II, p. 741 (cf. vv. I.84, 114, and III.5 of that work).
136. See *EI*, XIII, pp. 190 ff.; see also *Jaina Śilālekha Samgraha*, II, no. 137.
137. See Desai, op. cit., pp. 134 ff.
138. Loc. cit.
139. See *JBBRAS*, 22, p. 85; see also Altekar, op. cit., p. 99.
140. See Saletore, op. cit., p. 89; see also Premi, op. cit., p. 150, n. 3.
141. See *JBBRAS*, 22, p. 85; and Saletore, op. cit., p. 39.
142. *EC*, II, no. 67.

143. *MAR*, 1911, p. 38; see also Saletore, op. cit., p. 207; see also *Jaina Śilālekha Saṃgraha*, 4, no. 77.
144. See *EI*, X, pp. 147 ff.
145. *ASIAR*, 1905–6, pp. 121 ff. According to this inscription, king Indra (Nityavarṣa) caused the pedestal to be constructed for the Śāntinātha bathing ceremony. See also V. Rangacharya, *A Topographical List of the Inscriptions of Madras Presidency*, pp. 589–90; see also C.L. Jain, *Jaina Bibliography*, p. 199.
146. See *EI*, X, p. 149.
147. See *IA*, 12, pp. 224 ff.
148. *ASIAR*, 1928–9, p. 125.
149. According to some, the earlier inscription dated Śaka 847 belongs to the reign of Indra III; see Desai, op. cit., p. 139. But Indra III, it appears, died in AD 922; see *The Age of Imperial Kanauj*, p. 13.
150. See *Bombay Karnataka Inscriptions*, I, pt. I, no. 34.
151. *Annual Report of South Indian Epigraphy*, 1916, App. B, no. 540. See also Desai, op. cit., p. 149.
152. Desai, op. cit., p. 149.
153. See *Jaina Epigraphs*, pt. III, no. 48 in Desai's work *Jainism in South India*, etc.
154. *Ibid.*, no. 46.
155. See *ibid.*, pp. 369 ff.
156. Āśvāra XII, vs 9; see also Desai, op. cit., p. 370.
157. Desai, op. cit., p. 372.
158. *Annual Report of South Indian Epigraphy*, App. B, no. 65.
159. Desai, op. cit., p. 42.
160. See *Bombay Karnataka Inscriptions*, I, pt. I, no. 38.
161. For the relevant passage from that text see Premi, op. cit., p. 179, n. 1.
162. See Naik, *A List of the Inscriptions of the Deccan*, 1949, no. 173.
163. *Ibid.*, no. 172.
164. See Desai, op. cit., p. 48; see also *Jainism and Karnataka Culture*, p. 34.
165. See *Mysore Gazetteer*, II, pp. 769–70.
166. See *Jaina Śilālekha Saṃgraha*, 4, no. 87.
167. *EC*, II, (revised), no. 133. It has been suggested that no. 134 from the same place belongs to time of Indra IV (see *EC*, II, no. 134).
168. See Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, II, pp. 224, 226, 228.
169. Chowkhambha edn., p. 9. P.B. Desai, therefore, is incorrect when he says that this play does not refer to the Jainas (see op. cit., p. 35).
170. See in this connection *IA*, 40, p. 215; 42, p. 307. See also Desai, op. cit., pp. 33 ff. See also *SII*, I, p. 29.
171. See Desai, op. cit., p. 34.
172. The *Periyapurāṇam* refers to the destruction of several structural monuments of the Jainas at Cuddalore by Mahendravarman I, see *IA*, 40, p.

215. See also *The Classical Age*, p. 260.
173. See *EI*, XXVII, pp. 203 ff.; also *Nellore Inscriptions*, p. 676.
174. *Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy*, 1968-9, p. 60 and no. B. 219.
175. Loc. cit.
176. Loc. cit. see also B. 220.
177. See *ibid.*, p. 6.
178. *Ibid.*, B. 268.
179. *Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy*, 1954-5, B. 360.
180. *Ibid.*, 1968-9, B. 221.
181. See *The Age of Imperial Kanauj*, pp. 165 ff.
182. See *Seminar on Inscriptions*, Madras, p. 159.
183. *Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy*, 1968-9, B. 223.
184. See Rangacharya, *op. cit.*, Salem, 81.
185. See *EI*, X, pp. 54 ff.
186. *Ibid.*, p. 64.
187. Loc. cit.
188. *SII*, IX, pt. 1, no. 19.
189. See *EI*, X, p. 70.
190. *Ibid.*, p. 65.
191. *Ibid.*, p. 68.
192. See *EI*, IV, pp. 141 ff.
193. See *SII*, III, pt. 3, no. 92; XIII, no. 245.
194. *Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy*, 1909, App. B. 82.
195. *SII*, III, pt. 3, no. 91.
196. *Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy*, 1907, no. 199.
197. See *SII*, XIX, no. 80.
198. *Ibid.*, no. 51.
199. *Ibid.*, p. 25.
200. *Ibid.*, XIII, no. 297.
201. *Ibid.*, XIX, no. 89; also pt. 3, no. 97 and *AR*, of 1907, no. 66.
202. See *SII*, I, no. 68.
203. *Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy*, 1900, App. B. 53.
204. *Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy*, 1961-2, pp. 4-5; see also *Transactions of the Archaeological Society of South India*, 1958-9, pp. 84 ff.
205. *SII*, II (no. 76), p. 387.
206. 201 of 1902 (*Annual Report on Epigraphy*, Madras).
207. *EI*, 4, p. 137.
208. *Travancore Archaeological Series*, I, pp. 193 ff.; see also Rangacharya, *op. cit.*, Tiruvankur, 2.
209. Rangacharya has followed the chronology proposed by K.A.N. Sastri in *The Pandyan Kingdom*, pp. 36 ff.
210. *Annual Report on Epigraphy* (Madras), 1914, 430-31.
211. See Desai, *op. cit.*, p. 62.
212. See *SII*, XIV, no. 22; see also *EI*, 32, pp. 337 ff.



213. *SI*, XIV, no. 69.
214. Sastri, op. cit., pp. 74 ff.
215. *Ibid.*, p. 84.
216. *SI*, XVII, no. 262; see also the plate facing Introd., p. 1.
217. Rangacharya, op. cit., Madura, no. 101.
218. *Ibid.*, Madura, no. 389.
219. See *EI*, IV, no. 15, D.
220. See *SI*, XIV, nos. 107 ff.; see also C.L. Jain, *Jaina Bibliography*, p. 228.
221. *SI*, XIV, nos. 197-219.

## CHAPTER XI

### Śvetāmbara Canonical Literature

According to the tradition, current among the Śvetāmbara Jinas, the Jaina sacred texts were first collected and edited at Pāṭaliputra over 160 years after the demise of Lord Mahāvīra. The earliest version of this tradition is to be found in the *Āvaśyakacūṛṇī*<sup>1</sup> of Jinadāsagaṇi Mahattara, who lived in the second half of the seventh century AD.<sup>2</sup> The great Śvetāmbara writer Haribhadra, who lived in the mid-eighth century AD, has also referred to this council.<sup>3</sup> The following story is told regarding this council.

Sthūlabhadra was one of the two sons of Śakaṭāla, the minister of king Mahāpadma. After living with Kośā, a famous courtesan of the city of Pāṭaliputra for a period of twelve years, he renounced the world under Sambhūtavijaya without suffering any transgression. Now it so happened that there was a famine at Pāṭaliputra during the time of the ninth Nanda<sup>4</sup> and the monks were forced to leave the city. The famine lasted for twelve years, and when the monks returned, they discovered that many portions of the canon were lost. Sthūlabhadra then, on his own initiative, convened a council of learned Jaina monks at Pāṭaliputra to collect the entire canon. The monks however discovered that the twelfth Aṅga, the *Drṣṭivāda*, could not be recollected and the council decided to send 500 monks including Sthūlabhadra, to Bhadrabāhu, who was then living in Nepal and was engaged in *mahāpāṇa-mahāpṛāṇa* meditation there. He was the only monk alive at that time who had the complete knowledge of the *Drṣṭivāda*. Within a short time however all but Sthūlabhadra left Nepal as they could not face the situation there. Bhadrabāhu, we are told, taught Sthūlabhadra the fourteen Pūrvas (an important part of the *Drṣṭivāda*) withholding the meaning of the last four texts because for some reason he was not permitted to teach these to anyone else. Later on, with the death of Sthūlabhadra (215 years after the demise of Mahāvīra), even the verbal embodiment of these four Pūrvas came to an end. Since then the knowl-

edge of the Pūrvas went on decreasing and it was completely forgotten by vs 1000.<sup>5</sup>

It is clear from the above account that at least the eleven Aṅgas were extant during the council which was held some 160 years after Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa*. However, during the course of our discussion of the Aṅga texts, we will see that portions of those texts were added after the fourth century BC. It should further be remembered that there were three more Jaina councils in which the Āgama texts were subjected to further revision and alteration. A few of the later additions to the Āgamic texts will be discussed in connection with the scrutiny of the individual texts. Let us now turn our attention to the Aṅga texts, most of which were composed in pre-Mauryan times. The following eleven Aṅga texts are known: *Ācārāṅga*, *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*, *Sthānāṅga*, *Samavāyāṅga*, *Bhagavati* or *Vyākhyāprajñapti*, *Jñātr-dharmakathā*, *Upāsakadaśā*, *Antakṛddāśā*, *Anuttaropapātikadaśā*, *Praśnavyākaraṇa*, and *Vipākāśruta*.

The *Ācārāṅga*<sup>6</sup> undoubtedly is one of the oldest and most authoritative Jaina Āgamic texts. The language and spirit of this work indicate that a major part of it was composed within 50 years of Mahāvīra's demise. A few sections, especially those dealing with the birth of Mahāvīra, were added probably a couple of centuries later. The work is divided into two major sections called Śrutaskandha and it appears that the earlier Śrutaskandha was composed long before the second. This is also vouched for by the evidence of its *Niryukti*,<sup>7</sup> which suggests that this portion was composed by the *theras* who were *śrutakevalīns*. The style too of the second part is radically different from that of the first.

The names of the nine chapters (*adhyāyana*) of the first Śrutaskandha are as follows: Śastraparijñā, Lokavijaya, Sītoṣṇīya, Sanvyaktva, Lokasāra, Dhūta, Mahāparijñā, Vimokṣa, and Upadhāna. Of these, the seventh Mahāparijñā, is now no longer extant.<sup>8</sup> The second section contains five *cūlās* (*cūlikā*), of which the fifth, called *Niśūtha*, is now a separate Āgamic text. The first two *cūlās* contain seven chapters each, and the third and the fourth one each. We have a *niryukti*<sup>9</sup> on this work by Bhadrabāhu, a *cūṃṇī*<sup>10</sup> by Jinadāsagaṇi (seventh century) and also a *ṭikā*<sup>11</sup> by Śīlāṅka (c. AD 850). Śīlāṅka in his commentary<sup>12</sup> has referred to an earlier commentator of the *Ācārāṅga* called Gandhahastin.

In the earlier parts of the *Ācārāṅga* there is a distinct emphasis on *ahimsā*. A few sentences from that part are reproduced below:

Some slay [animals] for sacrificial purposes, some kill [animals] for the sake of their skin, some kill [them] for the sake of their blood, thus for the sake of their heart, their bile, the feathers of their tail, their big or small horns, their teeth, their tusks, their sinews, their bones; with a purpose or without a purpose. Some kill animals because they have been wounded by them, or are wounded or will be wounded.

He who injures these [animals] does not comprehend and renounce the sinful acts; he who does not injure these, comprehends and renounces the sinful acts. Knowing them, a wise man should not act sinfully towards animals, nor cause others to act so. He who knows these causes of sin relating to animals, is called a reward-knowing sage.<sup>13</sup>

Some of the finest teachings of Jainism are incorporated in this Aṅga text. 'He who sees by himself, needs no instruction. But the miserable, afflicted fool who delights in pleasures, and whose miseries do not cease, is turned round in the whirl of pains.'<sup>14</sup> The author of this work repeatedly asks the *śramaṇas* to be careful regarding women and similar sentiments are expressed almost everywhere in Indian literature. The truly liberated is one who is not attached to the objects of the senses.<sup>15</sup> Similar teachings are however to be found in the Buddhist texts too. We should always remember that both Jainism and Buddhism look upon this world as a place of suffering, and this is why in the religious texts of both the systems we encounter identical metaphysical speculations.

The *Ācārāṅgasūtra* provides interesting information regarding the religious and social life of pre-Mauryan India. A number of popular festivals in honour of Brahmanical deities like Indra, Skanda, Rudra and Mukunda are mentioned in it.<sup>16</sup> We should remember that the *Mahābhārata*<sup>17</sup> also refers to the festivals in honour of Paśupati, i.e., Rudra and Brahman. References to the festival in honour of Indra are to be found not only in the later Vedic texts, but also in Aśvaghoṣa and other writers including Varāhamihira.<sup>18</sup> The festival of Indra, according to the *Mahābhārata*, was introduced by Vasu Uparicara, the Cedi monarch.<sup>19</sup>

The *Ācārāṅga* in the same passage also refers to the festivals of *yakṣas*, snakes, tree, hill, river, sea, etc. These were simply popular assemblies (*samāja*) which had practically no religious significance. Such *samājas* were not liked by Aśoka as we learn from one of his rock edicts.<sup>20</sup> References to various types of cloth, including those made in China, Bengal, and Malaya, are to be found in this text.<sup>21</sup> It is interesting to note that *cīnāñśuka* is also mentioned in the *Arthaśāstra*<sup>22</sup> of Kauṭilya which probably suggests that the Chinese

cloth was known in India even in pre-Mauryan times. There is no need to suppose that the name 'Cīna' is not older than the third century BC, as it could have been the name of a particular province of China, from a much earlier period. References to various types of musical instruments, including *myḍaṅga*, *nandimḍaṅga*, *jhallaṛī*, *vīṇā*, *tumbavīṇā*, *paṇava*, *tuṇaya*, etc. are also quite interesting.<sup>23</sup> They probably prove that these instruments were used in Jain temples in those days.

The section on Mahāvīra's life has already been discussed in an earlier chapter. There is little doubt that this part of the *Ācārāṅga* was utilized by the author of the *Kalpasūtra*. However, in another part of the *Ācārāṅga*<sup>24</sup> there is a reference to Mahāvīra's wanderings in various parts of Bengal. This part is written in verse and it appears to have been composed a few years after Lord Mahāvīra's demise. We learn from this section that at first the people of Lāḍha were in no mood to listen to the teachings of Mahāvīra. The people there made the dogs bite Mahāvīra and he was subjected to various other humiliations. It appears however that within a few years of Lord Mahāvīra's death, Jainism was firmly established in Bengal, and as we have already suggested, it was from Bengal that the Jain religion spread to Orissa.

The *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*,<sup>25</sup> which is the second Aṅga text, is undoubtedly another very ancient Jain Āgamic text. We have various commentaries on this text including *niryukti*,<sup>26</sup> *cūṛṇī*,<sup>27</sup> and a *līkā*.<sup>28</sup> Like the *Ācārāṅga* it has two *śrutaskandhas*. In the first there are sixteen *adhyāyanas* and in the second, seven. The major part of the first *śrutaskandha* is in verse and the greater part of the second Book is in prose. Compared to the *Ācārāṅga* it is a more readable work and replete with numerous interesting references. In the earlier sections of this text there is a detailed discussion on the metaphysical doctrines of various schools of thought. For a student of pre-Buddhist Indian philosophy, this part of the *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* is an invaluable source-book. This work, it is interesting to note,<sup>29</sup> knows the four ages, Kṛta, Kali, Tretā, and Dvāpara. The author of this text shows his close acquaintance with the Second Book of the *Mahābhārata* by referring to the Śīsupāla episode. I quote the relevant passage from Jacobi's translation:<sup>30</sup> 'A man believes himself a hero as long as he does not behold the foe, as did Śīsupāla [before he beheld] the valourously-fighting great warrior.' It is apparent from the passage that the Jain author had read with enthusiasm

and interest the exciting Śiśupāla story so beautifully told in the Sabhāparvan. Elsewhere our author refers<sup>31</sup> to Dvaipāyana and Parāśara, which also indirectly shows his acquaintance with the *Mahābhārata*. The Videhan monarch Nami is also mentioned,<sup>32</sup> and he is to be identified with the famous Nimi of Brahmanical and Buddhist texts. Reference to the *Strīveda*<sup>33</sup> shows that works on the science of erotics existed in India in the fifth century BC. The earliest systematic work on this subject as we learn from Vātsyāyana,<sup>31</sup> was written by Bābharvya Pāñcāla, who probably lived in pre-Buddhist times.

It is extremely interesting to note that the author of the *sūtrakṛtāṅga* calls Lord Mahāvīra a wise Brāhmaṇa (*māhaṇa*) at least in two places.<sup>35</sup> The Buddhist canonical authors also make a similar claim on behalf of Gautama Buddha. In the work entitled *Itivuttaka* the Buddha directly calls himself a Brāhmaṇa.<sup>36</sup> In the *Anguttara Nikāya*<sup>37</sup> the Buddha is called Aṅgīras, who was a great ancient Ṛgvedic seer. Both Mahāvīra and the Buddha believed that by deeds one becomes a Brāhmaṇa and not by birth. The *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*<sup>38</sup> declares that a Brāhmaṇa is one who has ceased from all sinful actions, namely love, hate, quarrel, calumny, backbiting, reviling others, aversion to control and love of pleasures, deceit, untruth, and the sin of wrong belief. He is never proud and angry and always exerts himself. Similar definition of a Brāhmaṇa will not be difficult to find in the vast *Tripitāka* literature. That seeing of a *śramaṇa*, was considered a bad omen is indirectly confirmed by this text.<sup>39</sup> In the play *Mṛcchakatika*<sup>40</sup> the hero Cārudatta himself expressed a similar sentiment when he saw a *śramaṇa*.

In this text people living in Gandhāra, Gauḍa, Kaśīṅga, Draviḍa are mentioned along with the Śavaras and Caṇḍālas.<sup>41</sup> Probably even in the days of the Buddha and Mahāvīra peoples living in the extreme northwest, south, and east were looked upon with contempt by the people of Madhyadeśa. This does not necessarily prove that in the sixth century BC eastern or southern India were culturally more backward than the centrally located states. It is merely a question of attitude. Indeed, the metropolis of an eastern state, namely Pāṭaliputra, became from the sixth century BC, the cultural capital of northern India.

Several types of coins like *māṣa*, *ardha-māṣa*, *rūpaka* are mentioned in this text.<sup>42</sup> Elsewhere in the Jaina canon,<sup>43</sup> *kāṛṣāpaṇa* (including false *kāṛṣāpaṇa*), *suvarṇa-māṣa*, *rūppamāṣa* are referred to. We will

later notice that in another Jaina text, composed in the early centuries of the Christian era, there is an exhaustive and valuable list of coins current in India in pre-Gupta times. This work also refers to a number of musical instruments.<sup>44</sup> It is also of interest to note that, unlike the other Jaina texts, Brāhmaṇas are mentioned first in a list of four castes given in this canonical work.<sup>45</sup> It appears that the earlier Jaina canonical writers had a less affected attitude towards the Brāhmaṇas than the later writers.

There is a short description in this text of Nālandā,<sup>46</sup> which as we learn from this work, was a prosperous town, a description confirmed by the account, given in the Buddhist texts.<sup>47</sup> It further refers to a householder called Lepa who was in possession of a bathing hall called Śeṣadravyā, which was situated to the north-east of Nālandā. As the name suggests, the hall was built of materials not used for building houses. At this town Gautama Indrabhūti, the famous disciple of Lord Mahāvīra met Udaka Peḍhālaputta of the Medārya gotra, who was a follower of Lord Pārśvanātha. The conversation<sup>48</sup> that took place between the two can be compared with the dialogue between a follower of Pārśva and Gautama Indrabhūti recorded in the twenty-third chapter of the *Uttarādhyayana*, which will be discussed later. From this conversation we further learn that some of the followers of Gautama Indrabhūti were also known as Kumāraputras,<sup>49</sup> which probably indicates that they belonged to aristocratic families.

The *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*, like the *Ācārāṅga*, contains beautiful and thought-provoking philosophical expressions that are in no way inferior to those of the Pāli Buddhist texts. The doctrines of Gośāla and Buddha have been cleverly refuted by Ārdraka, a follower of Mahāvīra in the second half of this text.<sup>50</sup> It should however be added that the views of other schools have not been properly presented in this text. Such distortions of the philosophical views of other teachers are common in the religious works of almost all schools of thought in India. The Pāli Buddhist texts show that the Buddha had absolutely no deference for other teachers, and he had branded all of them as ignorant and unworthy of serious attention.<sup>51</sup> I have already said that with the exception of a few passages, nowhere in the Jaina canon have the Buddhists been attacked directly, but the poor Ājīvikas have been mercilessly assailed by both Buddha and Mahāvīra.

The *Sthānāṅgasūtra*,<sup>52</sup> which is the third Aṅga text, unlike the first two, does not say anything about the teaching of Mahāvīra. On

the other hand, this work contains information on various dogmatic topics, which can be grouped in 1–10 categories. He has a slight resemblance to the *Āṅguttara Nikāya* of the Buddhists, although there are major differences between the two texts. There are ten *adhyayanās* and 787 *sūtras* and the only reliable commentary<sup>53</sup> on this text is by Abhayadeva Sūri, who wrote it in vs 1120, corresponding to AD 1062. However, as the commentator himself admits, it was not an easy task for him to write an authentic commentary on such a work.<sup>54</sup> There are, however, interesting references in this *Āṅga* text. Among the holy places, the name of Prabhāsa,<sup>55</sup> is conspicuous by its presence, and this shows that even the canonical Jaina writers looked upon this Vaiṣṇava holy place as a *tīrtha*. The name of this place also appears in the *Rājaprasānīya*,<sup>56</sup> the second Upāṅga text. This is not surprising if we remember that Kṛṣṇa and Baladeva are included in the list of sixty-three holy men (*śalākāpuruṣa*). The four types of severe austerities engaged in by the Ājīvikas are also mentioned.<sup>57</sup> The difficult penances, performed by the Ājīvikas, are also referred to in the *Naṅguṭṭha Jātaka* (no. 144).<sup>58</sup> We are further told that a Jaina monk should not cross more than once a month the following five great rivers: Gaṅgā, Yamunā, Erāvātī (Pāli, Acirāvātī), Sarayū, and Mahī. These five rivers are mentioned together in several Pāli canonical texts<sup>59</sup> which indirectly show the contemporaneity of the Pāli and Jaina canonical works. Then the epics, Mahī and Acirāvātī are not treated as great rivers. It should further be remembered that this Mahī should be distinguished from the Mahī of western India, which is the ‘the great river called Mais’ of the *Periplus* (para 42), Mophis of Ptolemy.<sup>60</sup> Sarayū is mentioned as Sarabhū<sup>61</sup> in the Pāli texts, which reminds me of the word ‘Sarabos’ used by Ptolemy<sup>62</sup> for that river. The well-known capital of Kosala in Mahāvīra’s time, Śrāvastī, was situated on the river Erāvātī or Acirāvātī, modern Rapti.

Among the Jaina rebels (Niṅhavas), the first seven are mentioned: Jamāli, Tīsyagupta, Aśāḍha, Aśvamiṭra, Gaṅga, Rohagupta, and Goṣṭhamāhila. Since the last one lived 584 years after the *nirvāṇa* of Mahāvīra, this section of the *Sthānāṅga*<sup>63</sup> was composed not before the beginning of the second century AD. It is, however, quite possible that the list of these seven rebels were added during the Valabhī council, when the Jaina canonical texts received their final shape. Nine *gaṇas* under Mahāvīra are mentioned by name:<sup>64</sup> Godāsa, Uttarabalissaha, Uddeha, Cāraṇa, Uḍuvaṭika (Uḍuvaḍiya), Viśvavā-dika, Kāmardhika (Kāmiḍḍhiya), Māṇava, and Koḍiya. Of these,



Viśvavādika (Vissavāiya), it appears, is an otherwise unknown *gaṇa* and not mentioned in the *Therāvalī*. It should, however, be remembered that these *gaṇas* could not have existed in the fifth century BC, as, according to the *Therāvalī*, they had originated only after Bhadrabāhu.

Ten great cities are mentioned in this text<sup>65</sup> Campā, Mathurā, Vārāṇasī, Śrāvastī, Sāketa, Hastināpura, Kāmpilya, Mithilā, Kauśāmbī, and Rājagṛha. Six of these cities, as we have already noticed, are mentioned in the *Dīgha Nikāya* in the list of six great cities. Regarding Hastināpura, however, we can say, that it disappeared from the map of northern India long before the sixth century BC. The Jaina canonical author has included the city in his list probably because of its past fame.

The fourth Aṅga text, the *Samavāyāṅga*,<sup>66</sup> is like *Sthānāṅga* a descriptive work. There is a commentary<sup>67</sup> on it by Abhayadeva, which was completed at the town of Aṇahilapāṭaka in vs 1120, corresponding to AD 1062. Almost all the authorities believe it to be one of latest of the canonical texts, for it not only mentions other Aṅga texts but also the *Nandīsūtra*. The subject-matter of the first two-thirds of the work is arranged in numerical groups just as in the *Sthānāṅga*, but in this case the numbers do not stop at ten, but go up to a million. Under no. 18, eighteen scripts are enumerated and they include the Dāmīlī and Polindī scripts.<sup>68</sup> This list can be compared with the list in the *Mahāvastu*<sup>69</sup> and the more exhaustive list given in the *Lalitavistara*,<sup>70</sup> both being Buddhist Sanskrit texts. The 72 arts are also mentioned by name.<sup>71</sup> Reference to gods like Vijaya, Vaijayanta, Jayanta, and Aparājita remind us of the four gods Aparājita, Apratihata, Jayanta, and Vaijayanta mentioned in the *Arthaśāstra*<sup>72</sup> of Kauṭilya.

The author of the *Samavāyāṅga* shows his thorough acquaintance with the devotional Vaiṣṇava literature. In *sūtra* no. 158 there are some typical Vaiṣṇava expressions and the emblems of Baladeva and Kṛṣṇa are correctly described. The *Samavāyāṅga* not only betrays knowledge about Kṛṣṇa's life, but also a thorough acquaintance with the later myths that grew around Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa.

The fifth Aṅga text, the *Vyākhyāprajñapti* or the *Bhagavatī*,<sup>73</sup> is undoubtedly the most important canonical work of the Śvetāmbara Jains. Abhayadeva wrote a commentary on this work in the vs 1128, corresponding to AD 1070 at Aṇahilapāṭaka.<sup>74</sup> This voluminous text extends to 41 *śatakas*. Since I consider this work to be very impor-

tant, I would like to make a detailed analysis of its contents.

The work opens with an adoration of Jina and also very significantly of the Brāhmī script. In the first *śataka* several types of ascetic groups are mentioned, including *tāpasas*, *ājīvikas*, and *parivrajakas*. Lord Mahāvīra is represented as giving a discourse on various topics to Gautama Indrabhūti in the Guṇaśīla shrine which was situated near Rājagṛha. The most important information that we find in the first *śataka* relates to Kālāsavesiyaputta, a follower of Pārśva, who was converted by Mahāvīra. This monk, it appears, first had misgivings regarding Mahāvīra's religion, based on five restraints. In the second *śataka* there is a reference to Kayaṅgalā town, which is the same as Kajaṅgalā of the Pāli canon. The canonical writer is not however correct in saying that it was not far from Śrāvastī.<sup>75</sup> This *śataka* refers to the conversion of Khamda of the Kātyāyana *gotra* who was a disciple of a teacher well-versed in the Brahmanical philosophy. We are further told that Mahāvīra for sometime lived on the Vipula mountain of Rājagṛha.<sup>76</sup> In this *śataka* too, Mahāvīra is represented as having converted a few of Pārśva's followers.<sup>77</sup> It is interesting to note that the hot-spring of Rājagṛha is mentioned in this *śataka* and the name given to it here is Mahātavovati<sup>78</sup> which reminds us of Tapodā of the Pāli canonical texts.<sup>79</sup> It also appears from this *śataka* that even in the fifth century BC there were shrines, dedicated to the Jina, for we encounter the expression *jinaghara*.<sup>80</sup> In the third *śataka* there are several interesting references. The four Lokapālas,<sup>81</sup> the god Śūlapāṇi or Śīva, who is described as *Vasahavāhana*,<sup>82</sup> i.e., *vṛṣabhavāhana*, and other gods like Indra, Skanda, Vaiśravaṇa, etc. are mentioned.<sup>83</sup> It appears from this *śataka* that gods like Indra, Skanda, Durgā, Rudra and Vaiśravaṇa were very popular. This will be confirmed by the evidence of other canonical texts, to be discussed later in this chapter. This *śataka* also contains an interesting account of Tāmālī Moriyaputta of Tāmralipta city.<sup>84</sup> We are told that he was initially a great merchant of that famous city-port and later gave up everything to become a recluse. The expression 'Moriyaputta' does not necessarily mean that he was a scion of the Moriya or Maurya family. It further appears from this *śataka*<sup>85</sup> that the art of drama was fully developed in the sixth century BC, an assumption which is supported by the evidence of Pāṇini. A few malignant spirits like Indragraha, Skandagraha, Kumāragraha, Yukṣagraha, and Bhūtagraha are also mentioned.<sup>86</sup> Needless to say, these *grahas* were supposed to inflict bodily

harm both to children and adults. The fourth *śataka* has little of interest. In the fifth there is a reference to the famous Pūrṇabhadra shrine of Campā,<sup>87</sup> which was often visited by Mahāvīra. A beautiful and detailed description of this *yakṣa* temple is given in the *Aupapātikasūtra*, which will be discussed later in this chapter. We also have an exhaustive list of various types of musical instruments in this *śataka*.<sup>88</sup> The god Hariṇegameṣī, who is generally identified with Kārttikeya, and who was responsible, according to the *Kalpa-sūtra*, for transferring the embryo of Mahāvīra from the womb of Devānandā to Triśalā, is conspicuously mentioned.<sup>89</sup> Among other interesting references in the fifth *śataka* we have *stūpa*, *devakula*,<sup>90</sup> etc. The *devakulas* or the Brahmanical shrines are also mentioned elsewhere in the *Bhagavatī*.<sup>91</sup> There is little doubt that the shrines, dedicated to *devas*, *yakṣas*, etc., existed in pre-Buddhist days,<sup>92</sup> but as they were built of wood, no trace of them remains today. This *śataka* also refers to the disciples of Pārśva.<sup>93</sup> In the sixth *śataka* there is nothing particular of interest except a reference to various types of measures.<sup>94</sup>

The seventh *śataka* is important for interesting information on the political history of the fifth century BC. Here we have an elaborate description of the war between Ajātaśatru and eighteen confederate kings of Kāśī and Kosala.<sup>95</sup> It must certainly have been a bloody war which lasted for a considerable length of time and came to be known as the Rathamusala battle. The ethics of war were scrupulously followed,<sup>96</sup> and this reminds us of the ethics of war which were agreed upon by both the parties before the Bhārata war.<sup>97</sup> A person called Varuṇa, belonging to the Nāga lineage took part in this war, according to the *Bhagavatī*.<sup>98</sup> The account of the war is however very realistic, unlike those in the two epics, and we are told, that king Ajātaśatru, who was helped by the Vaijis, ultimately emerged victorious. A similar account of war is found in the *Nirayavalikā*, an Upāṅga text, which will be discussed later.

The eighth *śataka* has interesting references to the Ājīvikas and also the lay followers of the Ājīvika religion.<sup>99</sup> There is an elaborate account of various professions<sup>100</sup> and this indirectly shows that the struggle for existence had become quite difficult by the sixth century BC. False weights and measures are also referred to.<sup>101</sup> The ninth *śataka* also recounts the conversion of the followers of Pārśva<sup>102</sup> by Mahāvīra, and this once more underlines the testimony of the *Ācārāṅga*, according to which Jainism reached north Bihar even

before the birth of Mahāvīra. This particular *śataka* contains the poignant account<sup>103</sup> of Mahāvīra's meeting with Devānandā, his mother, which we have already discussed in the account of Mahāvīra's life. We are further told that Lord Mahāvīra converted his mother to the Nirgrantha religion and she became a nun under Āryā Candanā.<sup>104</sup> The most important section of this *śataka* is however that dealing with Jamāli,<sup>105</sup> which has already been briefly discussed in connection with the discussion on the life of Mahāvīra. There is nothing here to indicate that he was the son-in-law of Mahāvīra. Like the Master, he too belonged to the Kṣatriya-Kuṇḍagrāma. In this section<sup>106</sup> some festivals, connected with Indra, Skanda, Mukunda, Nāga, etc. are also mentioned. There is a reference to Chinese silk<sup>107</sup> and to the stick of Indra<sup>108</sup> which was obviously used in the Indra-festival. The tenth *śataka* has little of any importance, but the eleventh is full of interesting things. Mahāvīra's visit to Hastināpura is recorded here,<sup>109</sup> which at that time, was probably a mere village. Here also, there are references to such terms as *pecchāghara*<sup>110</sup> (i.e., *prekṣāgrha*) and *raṅgasthāna*,<sup>111</sup> which must indicate that drama, as a form of entertainment, was very popular in those days. There is also the term *yavanikā*,<sup>112</sup> which also occurs elsewhere in the Jaina canon. Let us not forget that even in the Brahmajāla Sutta of the *Dīgha Nikāya* the term *prekṣāgrha* is conspicuous by its presence and one of the monks under the Buddha was an actor in his earlier life.<sup>113</sup> The town of Ālabhiyā, which is mentioned more than once in this *śataka*<sup>114</sup> was often visited by the Buddha.<sup>115</sup> Lord Mahāvīra too, according to this *śataka* visited this town, and an account of the conversion of Poggala Parivrājaka is also given. The twelfth *śataka* records the account of Mahāvīra's visit to Kauśāmbī during the reign of Udayana. This king, according to the *Bhagavatī*, was the daughter's son (*dauhitra*) of Ceṭaka of Vaiśālī.<sup>116</sup> This statement gets unexpected confirmation from one of the plays of Bhāsa<sup>117</sup> where Udayana is called the son of Vaidehī, and Vaiśālī was at that time included in Videha *janapada*. We must also remember that another daughter of Ceṭaka, Cellaṇā, was the mother of Ajātaśatru and this prince is frequently called Vedehiputta in the Pāli texts.<sup>118</sup> The *śataka* further represents Jayantī, a sister of Śatānīka, as a great devotee of Lord Mahāvīra. The thirteenth *śataka* encapsulates the story of Mahāvīra's visit to Vitūbhaya,<sup>119</sup> the capital of Sindhu-Sauvīra. We are told that the Master travelled all the way from Campā to Vitūbhaya in order to convert the king of Sindhu-

Sauvīra. As I have already said, this was surely the longest journey this Nirgrantha prophet undertook, and compared to this 'long march' all the achievements of Buddha pale into insignificance. The fourteenth *śataka* refers to the worship of the Pāṭali tree at Pāṭaliputra<sup>120</sup> and mentions Ambaḍa *parivrājaka* of Kāmpilyapura.<sup>121</sup>

The famous fifteenth *śataka* which is entitled Gośāla gives an elaborate and highly authentic account of the career of Gośāla Maṅkhaliputra, the famous Ājīvika philosopher. I have briefly discussed the career of Gośāla in a previous chapter and propose to make an elaborate study of Gośāla and his religion in a separate Appendix to this volume. According to this account, Gośāla died sixteen years before Mahāvīra and there is little doubt that his untimely death was welcomed by the followers of both Mahāvīra and Buddha. The Pāli canonical texts also show that Gautama Buddha regarded the Ājīvikas as the greatest enemies of his religion. This *śataka* refers to a few pre-Buddhist shrines including Aṅgamandira of Campā<sup>122</sup> and Kāmamahāvana of Vārāṅasī.<sup>123</sup> It further refers to sixteen *mahājanapadas* of those days,<sup>124</sup> a list that differs considerably from that in the Pāli texts.<sup>125</sup> This *śataka* further provides the very revealing information that Lord Mahāvīra ate the flesh of a cat (*majjārakaḍa*) and wild cock (*kukkuḍamaṃsa*)<sup>126</sup> when he was down with fever after a debate with Gośāla. The Jainas of modern times find this account quite shocking and hasten to offer various explanations for these terms. Such attempts can be compared with those offered by the devout Buddhists for the term *śūkaramaddava* which Buddha ate in Cunda's mango grove at Pāvā. Needless to say, the prophets of the sixth century BC, like other people of that time, were addicted to both vegetarian and non-vegetarian food. Eating of fish and flesh did not clash with their ideas of non-violence. There is other evidence to show that the Jainas of earlier times were non-vegetarians like others, although by the Gupta period, they became strictly vegetarians. This *śataka* also refers to the fact that a king of Puṇḍra country called Devasena later became a devout Ājīvika.<sup>127</sup> This suggests that after the demise of Gośāla, Ājīvikism spread to northern Bengal. It also appears that this fifteenth *śataka* of the *Bhagavatī* was edited more than once during the councils held later.

In the sixteenth *śataka* we find Indra paying homage to Mahāvīra.<sup>128</sup> Indeed, the religious opponents of Brahmanical Hindus always loved to paint the king of gods as a devotee of their prophet. In almost every non-canonical work of the later Jaina writ-

ers we have a *praśasti* addressed by Indra to the Jina. The Buddhist canonical writers have gone a step further; even the chief disciples like Moggallāna and Sāriputta are represented as being worshipped by Sakka (Śakra); this section also refers<sup>129</sup> to Vāsudeva and Baladeva. The seventeenth *śataka* has nothing new to tell. The eighteenth is quite interesting. There is a reference to the Bahuputta shrine of Vaiśālī,<sup>130</sup> and this is the only shrine or temple that is referred to in the canonical texts of both the Jainas or the Buddhists, for a historian the importance of this reference is indeed very great. It fully justifies our assumption that the *Bhagavatīsūtra* is a text of great antiquity. This particular temple is mentioned in the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta of the *Dīgha Nikāya*,<sup>131</sup> which is regarded as one of oldest canonical Buddhist texts. Mahāvīra is represented as having stayed in this shrine. It is therefore exciting to discover that both these great prophets stayed for sometime in this famous temple of the celebrated city of Vaiśālī. Let us remember that Lord Mahāvīra himself used to pass nights in the *deva* and *yakṣa* shrines of those days. This is shown by a passage of this *śataka*.<sup>132</sup> It also refers to gold and silver coins (*suvaṇṇamāsā, rūppamāsā*).<sup>133</sup> The lovely story of the conversion of Brāhmaṇa (*māhaṇa*) Somila is told in this section.<sup>134</sup> The remaining *śatakas* of the *Bhagavatī* are largely useless for our purpose.

The above analysis of this celebrated Aṅga text, though brief, amply shows that the *Bhagavatī* is an important source-book of contemporary social and cultural history of Eastern India. It is a matter of regret that we have no early authentic commentary on it and the *ṛtti* of Abhayadeva is almost wholly useless, like his other *ṛttis*. It was simply impossible for a monk of Gujarat, living in the eleventh century, to write a faithful commentary on a work, composed in the pre-Mauryan period. This remark holds good for other Jaina commentaries too.

The sixth Aṅga text, the *Nāyādhammakahāo* (*Jñātydharmakathā*),<sup>135</sup> is another important Jaina canonical work. It contains a number of stories which make it the most readable of all the Jaina canonical works. The work is divided into two *śrutaskandhas*, of which the first, which is divided into nineteen chapters (*adhyayana*) is important for our purpose. The second *śrutaskandha* is virtually a repetition of the first.

The first *adhyayana* called Utkṣipta records the story of prince Meghakumāra, the son of Bimbisāra, by his wife Dhāriṇī, the name

of this prince is, however, absent in the Buddhist texts. This prince, we are told, later embraced the religion of Mahāvīra and became a Jaina monk. The second *adhyayana* relates the story of merchant Dhaṇṇa (Dhanya) of Rājagṛha. Once he was sentenced to imprisonment for committing a crime. He and robber Vijaya (a majority of thieves and robbers in Jaina literature bear this name), the murderer of his son Devadatta, were fettered together. This pious merchant, we are told, shared with that thief in jail a food packet (*bhoyāna-piḍaga*) sent to him daily by his wife Bhadrā.<sup>136</sup> Later the merchant became a *sādhu* under the Jaina ascetic Dharmaghoṣa. The third *adhyayana* contains an account of the famous prostitute of Campā called Devadattā, who was loved by the sons of the two merchants Jinadatta and Sāgaradatta. This prostitute appears again in a later *adhyayana* of this canonical text. The fourth *adhyayana* relates the story of two turtles and a jackal. The first turtle is killed by the jackal as it exposed itself to danger, another, being cautious, remained unhurt in its shell since it waited until that animal had left. The tenth *adhyayana* is quite interesting as it tells us something about Ariṣṭanemi and other Vṛṣṇis of Dvārakā (Bāravāi). There is also a description of the Surapriya *yakṣāyatana* (shrine) which was situated near the city. It is interesting that the five Vṛṣṇi heroes led by Baladeva, mentioned in the *Vāyupurāṇa*, as *manuṣyapṛakṛti* gods, are also referred to in this section of this text.<sup>137</sup> A few other Vṛṣṇi heroes are also mentioned in this section. The mountain Raivaiḷka, which is mentioned for the first time, in the *Mahābhārata*,<sup>138</sup> is described here as situated near Dvārakā. It should however be pointed out that this mountain is not near Dvārakā but Girinagara and in the *Mahābhārata* passage Kuśasthalī is described as situated near this mountain (*kuśasthalīm puṛīm ramyām raivatenopasobhitām*). It follows therefore that ancient Kuśasthalī is not Dvārakā but Girinagara.<sup>139</sup> The Jaina writer of this canonical text, it appears, was not much acquainted with the topography of this area. We have already said that Baladeva, Vāsudeva and others had a place in the Jaina mythology, and it is therefore not surprising to find a detailed description of them in this canonical text. However, like other Jaina texts, Ariṣṭanemi, who was supposed to be a scion of the Vṛṣṇi race, is described as much superior to Kṛṣṇa and Baladeva in this section of the *Nāyādhammakahāo*.

This work also refutes the philosophy of the Sāṃkhya teacher.<sup>140</sup> We are told in the fifth *adhyayana* that the Sāṃkhya teacher Śuka

(Sua) was converted to Jainism by the Nirgrantha saint Thāvaccā-putta. This particular Sāṃkhya teacher, who was well-versed in the *Ṣaṣṭitantra*,<sup>141</sup> used to move about with a trident. The detailed description of the various implements of this philosopher shows that in spite of his Sāṃkhya leanings, he was a Śaiva. In this connection we get the words *tridaṇḍa*, *kuṇḍikā*, *chatra*, *karotikā*, *kamaṇḍalu*, *rudrākṣamālā*, *mṛttikābhājana*, *trikāṣṭhikā*, *aṅkuśa*, etc. Probably the earliest reference to the word *yāpanīya* is to be found in this section of this Aṅga text.

In the seventh *adhyayana* we have the story of Rohiṇī which has interesting similarity with the parable of talents in Matthew<sup>142</sup> and Luke.<sup>143</sup> Surprisingly enough, the Jaina writer finds a few words of praise for women. The eighth *adhyayana* is more interesting as it contains the story of Mallī, the nineteenth Tīrthaṅkara. In this *adhyayana* there is a reference to a Nāga temple near Sāketa.<sup>144</sup> There is a description of a sea voyage and we further learn that Indian ships used to voyage to various foreign countries from the river ports of those days, including Campā. Here also we have names of those popular Hindu gods and goddesses,<sup>145</sup> mentioned in the *Bhagavatī* and elsewhere. The ninth *adhyayana* contains an account of shipwreck and there is an interesting reference to Lavaṇasamudra and Ratnadvīpa. The tenth to twelfth *adhyayanās* are less interesting, but the thirteenth gives an interesting account of the philanthropic works done by Nanda, a gem merchant (*maṇiyāra*) of Rājagrha. He built a number of beautiful garden complexes, which included hospitals, painting houses, kitchens with water-tanks, music schools, etc. The fourteenth *adhyayana* contains the story of the conversion of a lady called Poṭṭilā by a Jaina nun called Suvratā. The fifteenth refers to monks belonging to other sects like Raktapaṭa (Buddhist), Paṇḍaraṅga (Ājīvika), Gautama, Caraka, etc.

The most important book of this Aṅga text is the sixteenth *adhyayana* called *Avarakamkā* which is largely based on the *Mahābhārata* as it relates the story of Draupadī and her five husbands. We are told that in her previous birth Draupadī (Dovai) was the daughter of a merchant of Campā and her name was Sukumārikā. One day she saw a prostitute named Devadattā enjoying the company of five young men at a Bohemian club of the city called Lalitā.<sup>146</sup> This lady thereupon made a *nidāna* to marry five husbands in her next life and accordingly was born as Draupadī. It is interesting that even some of the minor details of the *Mahābhārata* are repeated in this



section of the *Nāyādhammakahāo*.<sup>147</sup> The Pāṇḍavas are however represented as inferior heroes and mere subordinates of Kṛṣṇa. This section further represents Kṛṣṇa as becoming disgusted with the behaviour of the Pāṇḍavas and asking them to leave for the south. We are then told the story of the foundation of Madura, called Paṁḍamahurā in their text, by the five Pāṇḍavas, a story that has interesting parallels with the story of Paṇḍia or Paṇḍaia, related by Megasthenes, who lived in the last quarter of the fourth century BC.<sup>148</sup> The story told regarding the foundation of Madura in this work was later taken up by the Jaina narrative writers, who did their best to make it as absorbing as possible.<sup>149</sup> The Pāṇḍavas died like many other devout Jainas on the summit of Śatruṅjaya, according to this work. The other three *adhyayanas* are less interesting. However, the robber Vijaya once more appears in the eighteenth *adhyayana*.

The seventh Aṅga text,<sup>150</sup> the *Upāsakadaśā*, is also an absorbing and readable work. There is a commentary on this work by Abhayadeva,<sup>151</sup> which is practically of no help to us. This work contains stories regarding ten lay disciples of Lord Mahāvīra. The first story concerns Ānanda, who was a *śramaṇopāsaka* of Vāṇiyagāma near Vaiśālī. There is a reference to the Dūipalāsa shrine there. This millionaire disciple of Mahāvīra reminds us of Anānthapiṇḍika of the Pāli canon. He is even depicted as superior to Indrabhūti. The second story is told regarding one Kāmadeva of Campā. It is interesting that in this story there is a reference to Lambodara (Gaṇeśa),<sup>152</sup> which shows that this god was worshipped even in the pre-Christian period. A newly discovered coin of Hermaeus (first century AD) has the representation of elephant-headed Gaṇeśa. The Ājīvikas are referred in the sixth and seventh *adhyayanas*, of which the latter is particularly interesting. From this section we learn that at the town of Polāsapura there was one Saddālaputta, a famous potter, who had 500 potter shops under him and was a lay Ājīvika votary. The potters, who worked under him are described as *bhattaveyaṇā*,<sup>153</sup> which suggests that they received regular wages for their work. Pāṇini's *sūtra*, *vetanādibhyo jīvati* (4.4.12) suggests that even from pre-Buddhist times the system of regular payment in cash to workers and servants was known. The evidence of the *Mahābhārata*<sup>154</sup> also shows that the system of *vetana* was well-known from quite early times. This follower of the Ājīvikas, according to the story, was converted by Mahāvīra. The eighth *adhyayana* shows one pious

lay worshipper called Mahāśataka, whose chief wife Revatī, we are told, used to consume cow flesh.<sup>155</sup> The last two *adhyāyanas* are of little interest.

The eighth Aṅga text, which is known as the *Antagaḍadasāo* (*Antakṛtadaśā*),<sup>156</sup> too is not a barren work, replete as it is with narratives. The accounts of the Vṛṣṇis, led by Vāsudeva, occupy much of the text. Some of the details, given here are however also to be found in the sixth Aṅga text. There is a list of peoples living in different *janapadas* and this list<sup>157</sup> includes such names as the Arabs, Barbaras, Yavanas, Siṃhala, Pārasika, etc. A full list of 72 Arts are also given.<sup>158</sup> There is a very interesting reference<sup>159</sup> to the Mahākāla śmaśāna (cemetery) of Ujjayinī. Like many other Jaina texts this work also represents Vāsudeva as inferior to Ariṣṭanemi;<sup>160</sup> that great Indian philosopher and hero is even pictured as a devotee of this Jaina Tirthaṅkara.<sup>161</sup> Two of Kṛṣṇa's wives are distinctly mentioned, Rukmiṇī<sup>162</sup> and Jāmbavatī the mother of Sāmba.<sup>163</sup> In another place we have the complete list of Kṛṣṇa's wives. There is a very interesting story regarding the Moggarapāṇi<sup>164</sup> yakṣa shrine of Rājagṛha, and it appears from the description of the icon that it was made of wood. The curse of Dvaipāyana, mentioned in the *Ghaṭa Jātaka*<sup>165</sup> and Kauṭilya<sup>166</sup> on the Vṛṣṇis, is also mentioned here.<sup>167</sup>

The ninth Aṅga, the *Anuttaropapātikadaśā*,<sup>168</sup> is practically devoid of any interest. There is a *vṛtti* by Abhayadeva.<sup>169</sup> There are only two original pieces in this text and they concern legends of persons who were reborn in the uppermost heavens.

The tenth Aṅga text, the *Praśnavyākaraṇa*,<sup>170</sup> is not the same text<sup>171</sup> described in the *Sthānāṅga* and *Nandīsūtra*. We have a *vṛtti* by Abhayadeva.<sup>172</sup> There are two *śrutaskandhas* called *āsrava* and *samvara*. The work throws considerable light on the social life of those days. There are sections on crimes and punishments.<sup>173</sup> Accurate descriptions of Baladeva and Vāsudeva<sup>174</sup> show that the images of these hero gods were quite popular, and some of these descriptions were no doubt copied from contemporary Vaiṣṇava literature. There are indirect references to terrible wars described in the two epics, which were fought over women like Sītā and Draupadī.<sup>175</sup> There are many other useful details which can only be discussed in a separate volume. It is certainly much more than a mere 'loquacious treatise',<sup>176</sup> and there is nothing in it that can be termed interpolations of the post-Christian period.

The eleventh Aṅga text, the *Vipākāśruta*,<sup>177</sup> is once again an

interesting and readable canonical work. We have a *vytti* on it by Abhayadeva.<sup>178</sup> It has two *śrutaskandhas* with ten chapters (*adhyayanās*) each. The first *śrutaskandha* is entitled *Dukhavipāka*, which is much longer, and the second *Sukhavipāka*, which is less interesting.

This work contains some references which are otherwise unknown. The most valuable information is supplied regarding Udayana, whose priest was condemned to death for an illicit relationship with the queen *Padmāvati*.<sup>179</sup> It is interesting that in the sixth century BC even a *Brāhmaṇa* could be executed for serious crimes, and it was clearly against the *Smṛti* laws. However, we have in the story of *Cārudatta* in the *Mṛcchakaṭīka* another such example. A licentious person was condemned to death by embracing a red hot image of woman (*itthipaḍimam*),<sup>180</sup> a punishment approved for such persons in the *Manusmṛti*.<sup>181</sup> There are descriptions of various instruments<sup>182</sup> of torture, and we are further told how prisoners were tortured in jail in those days.<sup>183</sup> The great physician *Dhanvantari*<sup>184</sup> is condemned in the strongest possible language because he prescribed 'meat diet'. A ludicrous story is told in this connection regarding the fate of this physician. We learn that the *yakṣas* like the *devas* were worshipped with flowers, leaves, incense, etc.<sup>185</sup> It is possible that the *Vardhamānapura*, mentioned in this text, is *Burdwan* in Bengal, which we are told visited by *Mahāvīra* himself.<sup>186</sup> *Rohiḍa* of this text (p. 275) may be identical with *Rohītaka* of the *Mahābhārata*.<sup>187</sup> These two towns were known for shrines dedicated to the *Maṇibhadra* and *Dharaṇa yakṣas*, respectively. There is a story in which a daughter-in-law is shown as killing her mother-in-law.<sup>188</sup>

In the *Sukhavipāla*<sup>189</sup> we have a reference to *Majjhimiya*, which is identical to *Mādhyamika* in Rajasthan. It appears from both the parts of this canonical text that there were *yakṣa* shrines almost throughout northern India. In the earlier *śrutaskandha* there is a valuable description of a village inhabited by robbers (*corapallī*).<sup>190</sup> Here too the leader of the robbers is a person called *Vijaya*,<sup>191</sup> who, we are told, had spies (*cārapurisā*) like the king. The king of the country in which this *corapallī* was situated, by adopting *Machiavellian* tactics, succeeded in capturing alive the son of this robber chief. The role played by prostitutes is also described in an attractive style.<sup>192</sup>

Let us now turn our attention to the *Upāṅga* texts which are twelve in number. They are: *Aupapātika*, *Rājapraśniya*, *Jivajīvābhigama*, *Prajñāpanā*, *Sūryaprajñapti*, *Jambūdvīpaprajñapti*, *Candraprajñapti*, *Nirayavalikā*, *Kalpāvataṁśikā*, *Puṣpikā*, *Puṣpacūlikā*,

and *Vṛṣṇidaśā*. The first Upāṅga text, the *Aupapātika* (*Ovavāiya*),<sup>193</sup> is probably the most important among the Upāṅga works. We have in the very beginning<sup>194</sup> of this text, an elegant and lovely description of the celebrated Pūrṇabhadra *yakṣa* shrine of the city of Campā. This description leaves no room to doubt that it was a great temple complex of the sixth century BC. It was probably built a few centuries earlier, but nothing of it has survived simply because the entire complex was built of wood. At the time when Lord Mahāvīra visited the city of Campā, Kūṇika-Ajātaśatru was the king of Aṅga-Magadha with his temporary capital in that city. This text further shows that Kūṇika held Mahāvīra in great respect.<sup>195</sup> The name of his queen is given as Dhāriṇī, which is however, a stock name for queens in Jaina literature. Let us further remember that the Pūrṇabhadra shrine of Campā was one of Mahāvīra's favourite resorts. The Buddhist texts describe Yakṣa Pūrṇabhadra,<sup>196</sup> but do not show any acquaintance with this shrine of Campā. This text also relates the tragic story of the death of the Brāhmaṇa, Ambaḍa *parivṛājaka*, with his seven disciples,<sup>197</sup> when he was travelling from Kāmpilya to Purimatāla. It is interesting that, according to the description of the text, the city of Kāmpilya (Kāmpillapura) was spread over both the banks of the Ganges.<sup>198</sup> The 72 Arts are enumerated in this text too,<sup>199</sup> which also refers to several types of *parivṛājakas* belonging to Brāhmaṇa and Kṣatriya castes.<sup>200</sup> The following eight types of Brāhmaṇa (*māhaṇa*) *parivṛājakas* are enumerated: Kṛṣṇa, Karakaṇḍa, Ambaṣṭha, Parāśara, Kṛṣṇa (2), Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyana, Devagupta, and Nārada. The eight types of Kṣatriya *parivṛājakas* are: Silāi, Sasihāra, Naggai, Bhaggai, Videha, Rājarāja, Rājarāma, and Bala. I am not aware of any other similar list of *parivṛājakas* elsewhere in Indian literature. The text also refers to the Ājivikas<sup>201</sup> and Niṇhavas.<sup>202</sup>

The second Upāṅga work, *Rājaprasānīya*,<sup>203</sup> is an equally important Āgamic text. There is a commentary on it by Malayagiri, a contemporary of the celebrated Hemaçandra,<sup>204</sup> who lived in the mid-twelfth century AD. The text is divided into two parts. The first contains a few interesting references, as for example, *cinapaṭṭa*,<sup>205</sup> *picchāghara*<sup>206</sup> (*prekṣāgrha*), *devakula*,<sup>207</sup> *thūva* (*stūpa*),<sup>208</sup> etc. Some of the descriptions remind us of the *Aupapātikasūtra*. The second part which contains an account of the conversation between king Paesī of Seyaviyā and Kumāraśramaṇa Keśin, a follower of Pārśva, is more important and it reminds us of the 'Pāyāsi Suttanta' of the *Dīgha Nikāya*.<sup>209</sup> The Kumāraśramaṇa monks were known to Pāṇini.<sup>210</sup> There

is strong reason to believe that the Buddhist author of the *Pāyāsi Suttanta* was influenced by this Jaina text. In the Buddhist poem too, the scene of the conversation is said to be Setavyā, which is evidently the same as Seyaviyā. There is no evidence to connect this king with Prasenajit of Śrāvastī.<sup>211</sup> It is quite interesting that a few of the conversations<sup>212</sup> are similar to those in the *Milindapañha*. Among the other important references in this part we have horses of Kāamboja,<sup>213</sup> festivals of popular gods,<sup>214</sup> different types of punishments for different castes, etc.<sup>215</sup>

The third Upāṅga text *Jivājivābhigama*<sup>216</sup> has nine sections and altogether 272 *sūtras*. There is a commentary<sup>217</sup> on it by Malayagiri, who has referred to the various readings of the text. According to him it is an Upāṅga belonging to the *Sthānāṅga*. Although it is not a very extensive text, it contains a large number of useful references, some of which will be noticed below. Almost all the important information is to be found in the third section (*pratipatti*) of this work. Among the various types of wine mentioned here, we have a wine called Kāpiśāyana which is also mentioned by Pāṇini (IV.1.29) and Kauṭilya (II.25). This wine was produced in the Kāpiśī country (Afghanistan). This section also refers to the cloth produced in Sindhu, Draviḍa, Vaṅga, and Kaliṅga countries. Among the ornaments, there is a reference to the necklace made of *dīnāra* coins which is also referred to in the *Kalpasūtra*.<sup>218</sup> There are also useful lists of *ratnas*, weapons, metals, *bhavanas*, *naṭas*, *utsavas*, *yānas*, diseases, scripts, servants, utensils, etc.

The fourth Upāṅga is called *Prajñāpanā*.<sup>219</sup> Its author was Ārya Śyāma, who flourished some 376 years after Mahāvīra. There are commentaries on it by Haribhadra<sup>220</sup> (eighth century) and Malayagiri. It is the largest Upāṅga text and has altogether 349 *sūtras*. Like the third Upāṅga it also contains lists of various things. The most significant however is the list of 25½ *janapadas* with their capitals.<sup>221</sup> The list is reproduced with the names of their capitals in parenthesis: Magadha (Rājagrha), Aṅga (Campā), Vaṅga (Tāmralipti), Kaliṅga (Kāñcanapura), Kāśī (Vārāṇasī), Kośala (Sāketa), Kuru (Gajapura), Kuśāvarta (Śauripura), Pañcāla (Kāmpilya), Jāṅgala (Ahicchatra), Saurāṣṭra (Dvārāvati), Videha (Mithilā), Vatsa (Kausāmbī), Śāṅḍilya (Nandipura), Malaya (Bhadrilapura), Matsya (Vairāṭa), Varāṇā (Acchā), Daśārṇa (Mṛtikāvati), Cedi (Śukti), Sindhu-Sauvīra (Vītibhaya), Śūrasena (Mathurā), Bhaṅgi (Pāpā), Vaṭṭā (Māsapurī), Kuṅāla (Śrāvastī),

Lāḍha (Koṭivarṣa), Kekaya (Śvetikā). In the same *sūtra* a number of so-called non-Aryan tribes like Śaka, Yavana, Cina, Hūṇa, Romaka, Andhra, Pārasa, etc. are mentioned. A large number of professional classes are also referred to. The various scripts, which have already been noticed, are also mentioned in this *sūtra*.

The fifth and sixth Upāṅga texts, *Sūryaprajñapti*<sup>222</sup> and *Candra-prajñapti*, throw a flood of light on ancient Indian knowledge of astronomy. The present *Candra-prajñapti* is not in any way different from the *Sūryaprajñapti*. The seventh Upāṅga text, the *Jambū-dvīpaprajñapti*,<sup>223</sup> throws some light not only on astronomy but also geography. It has altogether 176 *sūtras*. The most significant is the reference to Alasamḍa, i.e., Alexandria, in *sūtra* no. 52. The same *sūtra* refers to Ārabaka, Romaka, Yavanadvīpa, Simhala, Barbara, etc. The god Naigameṣī (Kārttikeya) is mentioned in *sūtra* no. 115.

The last five Upāṅga texts are actually five *vargas* (sections) of one Upāṅga work, the *Nirayavalikā*.<sup>224</sup> As I have already said, this particular work throws some welcome light on contemporary history. I have already referred to the fight between Ceṭaka and Ajātaśatru described in this Upāṅga text. It has a *vytti*<sup>225</sup> by Candrasūri, who lived in the early twelfth century AD. We are told that one of the sons of Śreṇika, called Kāla (his mother was one Kāli,<sup>226</sup> described as *cullamāuyā*, i.e., stepmother of Kūṇika) was killed by Ceṭaka in the Rathamusala war. According to the author<sup>227</sup> of the text, Kāla went to Naraka because he was killed in a war. Unlike the author of the *Gītā*, the Jaina writer of the *Nirayavalikā* never believes that the death in the battlefield enables the hero to attain *svarga*. According to this text Śreṇika-Bimbisāra committed suicide,<sup>228</sup> a statement contradicted by the evidence of the Buddhist canon. We further learn that afterwards the remorse-stricken Kūṇika-Ajātaśatru transferred his capital to Campā.<sup>229</sup> However, the description of the war<sup>230</sup> appears to be exaggerated. Ten other brothers of Ajātaśatru are also named in this text, including Vehalla, son of Cellaṇā.<sup>231</sup> Abhaya is described as the eldest son of Śreṇika by his wife Nandā, but according to the Buddhists his mother was Padmāvātī, a prostitute of Ujjayinī.<sup>232</sup> The Buddhist texts, however, confirm the Jaina account that this prince was originally a devotee of Mahāvīra.<sup>233</sup> We are told by the Jaina author of this Upāṅga text that with the help of this prince Śreṇika fulfilled the *dohada*—longing<sup>234</sup> stage—of Cellaṇā.

The second *varga* of this text called Kalpāvataṁśikā does not contain much information, but in the third called Puṣpikā, there is a

good deal of information. The story of the conversion of Brāhmaṇa Somilla by Pārśva is told in the third chapter. From the fourth *adhyayana* of this text we learn that cousin-marriage was not unpopular in those days. Here the goddess Bahuputrikā is described as the goddess looking after the welfare of children. It therefore appears that the Bahuputta shrine of Vaiśālī, mentioned in the *Bhagavatī* and the Buddhist canon, was dedicated to this goddess. The fourth *varga* entitled Puṣpacūlikā describes the conversion of an old spinster (*buddhahumārī*) called Bhūtā by Pārśva's principal lady-disciple Puppacūlā. The fifth *varga* entitled Vṛṣṇidaśā, as the name indicates, describes the story of the Vṛṣṇis, but adds nothing new. There is also a reference to the Maṇidatta *yakṣa* shrine of Rohitaka.

Let us now turn our attention to the Mūlasūtra texts, which are actually three<sup>235</sup> in number. They are: *Uttarādhyayana*, *Āvaśyaka* and *Daśavaikālika*. There is little doubt that all these three are works of hoary antiquity and were probably composed in the pre-Mauryan period. For the historian, however, the most important is the *Uttarādhyayanasūtra*.<sup>236</sup> The first commentary on this important work is ascribed to Bhadrabāhu and is known as the *Uttarādhyayana-niryukti*.<sup>237</sup> It was followed by the *cūrṇī* written by Jinadāsagaṇi Mahattara in the seventh century AD. There are also a number of later commentaries<sup>238</sup> which testify that it was always regarded as one of the most important Āgamic works.

The work is divided into 36 *adhyayanas*. The first is entitled Vinayaśruta. It deals with the everyday conduct of a Jaina ascetic. The very character of this chapter shows, that it incorporates the personal teachings of Mahāvīra and was probably composed in the fifth century BC. 'Better', says Mahāvīra 'I should subdue myself by self-control than be subdued by others with fetters and corporal punishment.' Some of the finest teachings of Lord Mahāvīra are incorporated in this poem, which does not compare unfavourably with the *Dhammapada* of the Buddhists. A few of the references in it are quite valuable as they throw light on the social, cultural, and political history of the earlier period. It further appears that the author of this *sūtra* was quite at home with Vaiṣṇava literature and had perhaps some reverence for Vāsudeva and Viṣṇu. I quote here a passage<sup>239</sup> from the eleventh chapter. 'As Vāsudeva, the god with conch, discus, who fights with an irresistible strength [has no equal], neither has a very learned monk.' This shows that at the time this

poem was composed, the worship of Viṣṇu and Vasudeva was quite popular and their images were also known. A well-known verse regarding the burning of Mithilā put in the mouth of one of the Janakas of Mithilā occurs both in the *Dhammapada* and this text.<sup>240</sup> Among the interesting geographical names we have Kāmboja,<sup>241</sup> Hastināpura,<sup>242</sup> Kāmpilya,<sup>243</sup> Daśārṇa,<sup>244</sup> Kālāñjara,<sup>245</sup> Sauvīra.<sup>246</sup> The king Karakaṇḍu of Kaliṅga,<sup>247</sup> mentioned in this poem was a pious and good-fearing person and is also mentioned in the Buddhist canon,<sup>248</sup> which probably goes to show that he was a historical figure and lived not later than the sixth century BC. Kings like Nagnajit,<sup>249</sup> Dvimukha,<sup>250</sup> etc. are also mentioned in the earlier Indian literature.<sup>251</sup> There are also interesting references to false *kārṣāpāna* (*kūḍakahāvaṇa*)<sup>252</sup> and *kākinī*,<sup>253</sup> which show that different types of coins were quite well-known at the time of its composition. From the mythological point of view, we have references to Kāmadhenu,<sup>254</sup> Vaiśramaṇa,<sup>255</sup> and Nalakūvara.<sup>256</sup>

There are at least two chapters of this *sūtra* which deserve our special attention. The first is the twenty-third chapter recording the conversation between Keśin, a follower of Pārśva and Gautama Indrabhūti, the famous disciple of Lord Mahāvīra. Both were men of great learning, both respected one another. However, the disciple of Mahāvīra, by his superior knowledge, succeeded in allaying Keśin's doubts and converting him to the faith of the last Tirthamkara. The twenty-fifth chapter is another magnificent piece of poetic creation. Here the Brahmanical bloody sacrifice is the subject of criticism. The utter hollowness of such practices is demonstrated by Jayaghoṣa, who was a Jaina recluse belonging to the Brāhmaṇa caste. The definition of a Brāhmaṇa is given thus by Jayaghoṣa: 'He who is not defiled by pleasures as a lotus growing in the water is not wetted by it, him we call a Brāhmaṇa.' Then Jayaghoṣa declares: 'One does not become a *śramaṇa* by the tonsure, nor a Brāhmaṇa by the sacred syllable *Om* nor a *muni* by living in the woods, nor a *tāpasa* by wearing clothes of *kuśa* grass and bark.' According to him, one becomes a *śramaṇa* by equanimity, a Brāhmaṇa by chastity, a *muni* by knowledge, and a *tāpasa* by penance. This great Nirgrantha Brāhmaṇa, Jayaghoṣa, according to this chapter, later succeeded in converting Vijayaghoṣa, a sacrificing Brāhmaṇa of Vārāṇasī.

The *Āvaśyaka*<sup>257</sup> is also considered an extremely important Jaina Āgamic poem. It has six *adhyāyas*. There is a *niryukti*<sup>258</sup> on it by



Bhadrabāhu. There is also the magnificent *Vīśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya*<sup>259</sup> by Jinabhadraṅgaṇi written in Śaka 531 and the *cūṛṇī*<sup>260</sup> by Jinadāsagaṇi Mahattara, a work of the seventh century AD. We have a *īkā*<sup>261</sup> by Haribhadra (eighth century) and also quite a number of later commentaries. From the historian's point of view, however, the poem does not seem to be of much importance. However, for a student of Jaina monachism this text is of great significance. The *Daśavaikālika*,<sup>262</sup> according to tradition, was composed by the Brāhmaṇa Nirgrantha ascetic Sayyambhava (Sejjambhava) for his son Manaka. This Sayyambhava was a resident of Rājagrha,<sup>263</sup> and a disciple of Prabhava, who in turn was a pupil of Jambūsvāmin. Sayyambhava, therefore, should be assigned to the early fourth century BC, and this poem should be regarded as a product of that date. It has an extremely valuable *niryukti*<sup>264</sup> by Bhadrabāhu, a *cūṛṇī*<sup>265</sup> by Jinadāsagaṇi, and a *īkā*<sup>266</sup> by Haribhadra. There are altogether twelve *adhyāyanas* including two *cūlikās*. Like the *Uttarādhyāyana*, this poem is full of noble sentiments. There are verses which could only be composed by a supreme poet-philosopher. Most of the verses speak of the monastic life to be led by a Jaina monk. However, the teachings of Sayyambhava, I feel, are meant for every right-thinking monk or even worldly people. The poem has a universal appeal.

There are altogether six Chedasūtras; they are—*Niśītha*, *Mahāniśītha*, *Vyavahāra*, *Dāsāśrutaskandha*, *Brhatkalpa*, and *Pañcakalpa*. The Chedasūtras may be compared with the Buddhists Vinaya texts, although they are somewhat later works.

The first Chedasūtra is the *Niśītha*,<sup>267</sup> which is the largest text of this group and was originally the fifth section of the second Śrutaskandha of the *Ācārāṅga*. It is also known as the *Ācāraprakalpa*. It has a *niryukti*,<sup>268</sup> a *bhāṣya*<sup>269</sup> by Saṅghadāsagaṇi, and *cūṛṇī* by Jinadāsa.<sup>270</sup> The text has altogether twenty chapters. Unlike many other Jaina canonical texts, this work throws considerable light on the social, religious, and cultural condition of India at the time of its composition. In a very large number of *sūtras* the monk is asked not to be tempted by women who are always ready to destroy their chastity. Several festivals are mentioned in the eighth chapter, including those mentioned elsewhere in the Jaina canon.

The *Mahāniśītha*<sup>271</sup> is probably the work of a somewhat later period and is closely linked with the *Niśītha*. Jinabhadraṅgaṇi Kṣamāśramaṇa, who lived in the sixth century AD, is said to have rescued this text from complete destruction.<sup>272</sup> Several Jaina savants

like Haribhadra, Devagupta, Yaśovardhana, Ravigupta, Nemicandra, etc. had honoured this text.<sup>273</sup> It has six *adhyañanas* and two *cūlikās*. There are a few interesting stories which make it fairly readable. The *Vyavahāra*<sup>274</sup> is also an interesting canonical text dealing with rules of the Jaina church. It is ascribed to Bhadrabāhu and has altogether ten chapters. The *niryukti* on this text is written by Bhadrabāhu himself; there is a *bhāṣya* on it by an unknown author, and a commentary by, Malayagiri. This text also throws considerable light on the everyday life of the Jaina monks. The fourth Chedasūtra text *Daśāśrutaskandha*,<sup>275</sup> is quite well-known because its eighth chapter (*adhyañana*) is the famous *Kalpasūtra*.<sup>276</sup> The work is ascribed to Bhadrabāhu, who it appears, should be distinguished from Bhadrabāhu the author of several *niryuktis*. The earlier sections of the *Daśāśrutaskandha*, like other Chedasūtra texts, deals with the disciplinary rules of the Jaina monks. The eighth section, i.e., the *Kalpasūtra* gives a very authentic account of Mahāvīra's life, which we have already discussed. In the ninth chapter of this work Kūṇika is represented as meeting Lord Mahāvīra in the Pūrṇabhadra shrine of Campā. This reminds me of the *Auṣapātikasūtra*, where the meeting of the two has been elaborately described. The last section refers to Śreṇika's meeting with Mahāvīra at Rājagṛha.

The fifth Chedasūtra text is the *Kalpa* or the *Bṛhatkalpa*.<sup>277</sup> There is a *niryukti*, a *bhāṣya* and a *vivarāṇa* on it. The *niryukti* and *bhāṣya* verses are, however, indistinguishable. The work is divided into six sections. In an important passage in the first section a monk is asked not go beyond Aṅga-Magadha in the east, Kauśāmbī in the south, Thūṇā (possibly Sthāneśvara) in the west, and Kuṇḍālaviṣaya (North Kośala) in the north. This possibly proves that the text was composed at a time when Jainism had not reached Gujarat, Kāliṅga, or any other distant part of India. There are interesting details in other sections of this text. The *Pañcakalpa*<sup>278</sup> is the same as the present *Pañcakalpamahābhāṣya*, which was formerly a part of the *Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya*. The *bhāṣya* is written by Saṅghadāsagaṇi. A few regard *Jitakalpasūtra*<sup>279</sup> written by Jinabhadragaṇi as a Chedasūtra text.

We should now turn our attention to the two texts, the *Nandīsūtra* and the *Anuyogadvāra*, which are not strictly canonical works, but were regarded as sacred texts from very early times. The *Nandīsūtra*<sup>280</sup> has a *cūṃṛī*<sup>281</sup> by Jinadāsagaṇi and a *ṭikā*<sup>282</sup> by Haribhadra. Malayagiri also wrote a commentary on it.<sup>283</sup> The original *Nandīsūtra* has 90 *gāthās* and 59 *sūtras*. It even refers to teachers who lived in the fifth

century AD, like Skandila, Nāgārjuna, etc. The *Bhārata* (or *Mahābhārata*), *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya, *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, *Pātañjala*, etc. are mentioned in a passage<sup>284</sup> of the text. The reference to the *Bhāgavata* is interesting since it shows that this particular Purāṇa existed at such an early date. The *Anuyogadvāra*<sup>285</sup> is ascribed to Āryarakṣita. It too has a *cūṛṇī* by Jinadāsagaṇi and a *ṭikā* by Haribhadra. The passage that refers to the *Bhārata*, *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Arthaśāstra*, *Bhāgavata*, etc. also occurs with slight variation in this text.<sup>286</sup>

The two works *Pinḍa*<sup>287</sup> and *Oghaniryukti*<sup>288</sup> are also sometimes regarded as Āgamic texts. They too contain various rules for the monks and are ascribed to Bhadrabāhu. There is a quotation from Cāṇakya in the *Oghaniryukti*.<sup>289</sup> Both the texts have commentaries.

The *Āṅgavijjā*,<sup>290</sup> or the text dealing with the science of prognostication, though not a part of the Jaina canon, is one of the most remarkable Jaina sacred texts. This science was known to the Buddhists<sup>291</sup> and Brahmanical Hindus<sup>292</sup> from quite early times. The present text of the *Āṅgavijjā* is a product of the early centuries of the Christian era and has altogether sixty chapters. This work has been fittingly described as a treasure-house for the cultural history of India of the early Christian period.<sup>293</sup> Like the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya, it throws light on administration, social and cultural life. We have long lists of professions,<sup>294</sup> ornaments,<sup>295</sup> food-grains,<sup>296</sup> conveyances,<sup>297</sup> textiles,<sup>298</sup> eatables,<sup>299</sup> deities,<sup>300</sup> and many other important items. The list of coins<sup>301</sup> given in this text is extremely interesting and as informative. We not only have the names of well-known coins like *dīnāra*, *suvarṇa*, *kāhāpaṇa*, *purāṇa*, *nāṇaka*, *kākanī*, etc., but also two new names not found elsewhere in the early Indian literature. They are *ḷṣatrapaka*<sup>302</sup> and *sateraka*.<sup>303</sup> The first type was obviously the coins issued by Kṣatrapa kings of Ujjayinī. This type has been identified by scholars with the *rudradāmaka*<sup>304</sup> coins mentioned by Buddhaghōṣa. The second type of coin, the *sateraka*, is the Sanskrit or Prākṛta equivalent of Greek 'stater' which was introduced by Indo-Greek kings.

This text also throws welcome light on the different types of boats. Among the more interesting are the Koṭṭimba, Tappaka, and Saṅghāḍa.<sup>305</sup> It is of great interest that all these three types of boats are mentioned by the author of the *Periplus*,<sup>306</sup> a text of the second half of the first century AD. Tappaka of this text is evidently identical with Trappaga of *Periplus* and Koṭṭimba with Cotymba; Saṅghāḍa

has been identified with Saṅgara of *Periplus*. All these three types of boats are described as middle-sized (*majjhimakāya*) boats in the *Āṅgavijjā*.

In the list of female deities<sup>307</sup> we have a number of foreign names, which are not found elsewhere in the Indian literature. They are: Apalā, Aṇādītā, Airāṇi, Sālimālinī, etc. Apalā is the Greek goddess Pallas Athene, Aṇādītā is the Avestan Anahita, Airāṇi is the Roman goddess Irene, and Sālimālinī is the Moon-goddess Selene. There are interesting references<sup>308</sup> to women belonging to Lāṭa (Lāḍi), Yavana (Joṇikā), Barbara (Babbarī), Pulinda (Pulindī), Andhra (Andhī), Dravida (Babbri), etc. We have an exhaustive list of architectural terms<sup>309</sup> in this text; the list of *gotras* are also equally exhaustive.<sup>310</sup> There is also a section<sup>311</sup> on sexual love. Among the male gods,<sup>312</sup> Vaiśravaṇa is pictured as the god of merchants and rich people; Śiva was the lord of cows, buffaloes, and sheep. Senāpati Kārtikeya is associated with the cock and peacock, and Viśākha with sheep, ram, boy, and sword. Several other gods are mentioned and they are also known from other sources.

The *Āṅgavijjā* is undoubtedly one of the most useful works of the early Christian period. Since it refers to Śaka and Indo-Greek coins it appears that the work was written by AD 300, although it incorporates materials of a much earlier period. The language is frankly difficult, but it was undoubtedly composed in western India. The absence of any commentary creates great difficulty for modern scholars. The long lists of objects of daily use make it possible for us to understand some of the basic features of early Indian life.

Commentaries: The earliest among the canonical commentaries are the *niryuktis* (*nijjuti*), which are written in the Āryā metre and are in a mixed Prākṛta. They are ascribed to Bhadrabāhu, who should be distinguished from his namesake, the celebrated author of the *Kalpasūtra*. This is definitely established by the fact that in the *Daśāśrutaskandhaniryukti* there is a verse addressed to Śrutakevalin Bhadrabāhu.<sup>313</sup> Further, quite a number of other Jaina savants of a much later period are referred to in other *niryukti* works, which also show that these *niryuktis* could not have been composed before the Gupta period. There are however reasons to believe that some of the *niryukti* verses go back to an earlier period.<sup>314</sup> The *niryuktis* on following Āgamic texts are known: *Āvaśyaka*, *Daśavaikālika*, *Uttarādhyayana*, *Ācārāṅga*, *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*, *Daśāśrutaskandha*, *Bṛhatkalpa*, *Vyavahāra*, *Sūryaprajñapti*, and *Ṛṣibhāṣita*. Of these, the last two have

not yet been discovered.

The *Āvaśyakaniryukti*<sup>315</sup> is undoubtedly the most important *niryukti* text. A number of commentaries on it are known.<sup>316</sup> This work refers to several later Jaina monks, including Ārya Maṅgu of Mathurā, who has been identified by me with his namesake, mentioned in a Mathurā inscription. Since it refers to Śālivāhana or Śātavāhana, we have to assume that the work was composed after the Śātavāhana period. The war between Nahapāna and Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi was known to the Jaina commentators, including the author of this *niryukti*.<sup>317</sup> The author of this text refers to the *Nandīsūtra* which attests that this particular *niryukti* text was written after the composition of that text. This work is referred to in the *Mūlācāra* (6.193), an early Digambara text.

The *Daśavaikālikaniryukti* is a much shorter work consisting of only 371 *gāthās*,<sup>318</sup> and also has a few interesting references.<sup>319</sup> In the *Uttarādhyayaniryukti*<sup>320</sup> there is a reference to Vāsavadattā, the famous queen of Udayana, the king of Kauśāmbī.<sup>321</sup> The *Ācārāṅganiryukti*<sup>322</sup> refers to the Buddhists (Śauddhodani) in one place. This text is otherwise useless for our purpose. The *Sūtrakṛtāṅganiryukti*<sup>323</sup> refers to Nālandā and informs us that it is near Rājagṛha. The *Daśaśrutaskandhaniryukti*<sup>324</sup> begins with an invocation to Bhadrabāhu, who is obviously Bhadrabāhu I. The *Bṛhatkalpaniryukti*<sup>325</sup> and *Vyavahāraniryukti*<sup>326</sup> do not contain much information.

We do not obtain much information from the *niryukti* texts simply because they are written concisely and tersely. The *bhāṣya* commentaries, like the *niryuktis*, are written in verse and closely follow the style of the latter. There are altogether 10 *bhāṣya* commentaries on the following texts: *Āvaśyaka*, *Daśavaikālika*, *Uttarādhyayana*, *Bṛhatkalpa*, *Vyavahāra*, *Niśītha*, *Jitakalpa*, *Oghaniryukti*, and *Pinḍaniryukti*. In a few cases, it is difficult to separate the *bhāṣya* from the *niryukti*. Among the *bhāṣya* writers, only two names are known, i.e., Jinabhadra and Saṅghadāsagaṇi. As we have already seen, Jinabhadragaṇi, lived in Śaka 531 according to a manuscript of the *Viśeṣāvaśyakahāṣya*. He has further been identified with the monk Jinabhadra Vācanācārya mentioned in an image inscription from Akota (near Baroda). We have further seen that this monk was responsible for rescuing the *Mahāniśītha* manuscript, while living in Mathurā. Among his commentaries *Viśeṣāvaśyakahāṣya* and *Jitakalpahāṣya* are known. We further learn from the above-men-

tioned inscription that be belonged to the Nivṛtti *kula*.

The *Viśeṣāvāśyakabhāṣya*<sup>327</sup> is undoubtedly one of the most remarkable creations from the doctrinal point of view. In his other work, the *Jitakalpabhāṣya*, this great Jaina savant has also demonstrated his great erudition.<sup>328</sup> The later writers had great deference for this Jaina philosopher.<sup>329</sup>

Saṅghadāsagaṇi is the reputed author of the *Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya*, *Niśīthabhāṣya* and *Vyavahārabhāṣya*. According to a few, he should be identified with Saṅghadāsagaṇi Vācaka, the author of the first half of the *Vasudevahiṇḍī*, a Prākṛta romance.<sup>330</sup> There is no reason<sup>331</sup> why this identification should be rejected. If we accept this identification, we have to place Saṅghadāsa before Jinabhadra, who in his *Viśeṣaṇavati*<sup>332</sup> has referred to the *Vasudevahiṇḍī*. That author has further shown his intimate acquaintance with the *Vyavahārabhāṣya*.<sup>333</sup>

The *Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya*<sup>334</sup> is a work of considerable length. It has altogether 6490 verses and it is divided into six parts. It refers to preceptor Kālakācārya of Ujjayinī who, according to it,<sup>335</sup> went to Suvarṇabhūmi (Burma). This Kālakācārya was a contemporary of Gardhabhila of Ujjayinī, and appears to have lived in the first century BC. This text also refers to the thriving state of Jainism in the Mathurā region. There are also a few romantic verses in this poem which attest that the Jaina monks perfectly understood sentiments connected with the heart. This text also throws some light on the coinage of those days. According to it, the value of two silver coins of Dakṣiṇāpatha was equivalent to one *nelaka* of Kāñcīpura, and that of two silver coins of Kāñcī was equivalent to one silver coin of Pāṭaliputra city.<sup>336</sup> This work also refers to the *devanirmita stūpa* of Mathurā, which has already been discussed in a previous chapter.

The *Niśīthabhāṣya*<sup>337</sup> has a very large number of verses that are in common with those in the *Vyavahāra* and *Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya*. In the beginning of this commentary we have the story of the four cunning people (*dhūrta*), which was afterwards used by Haribhadra in his *Dhūrtākhyāna*. It also refers to the philosopher Siddhasena and the commentator Govindavācaka, who composed the *Govindanīryukti*.<sup>338</sup> A few poetic and romantic verses are also to be found in this *bhāṣya*. It also refers to Tālodaka (lake) of Tosālī and the hot-spring of Rājagrha. The *Vyavahārabhāṣya*<sup>339</sup> is also a work of considerable size. There are many verses against women which remind us of the Smṛti writers. We further learn that people

celebrated with great pomp the *stūpamaha* festival at Mathurā. Stories are told regarding Kālaka, Śātavāhana, Muruṇḍa, Cāṇakya, and others.<sup>340</sup> The Śakas of Ujjayinī are also mentioned.<sup>341</sup> The other *bhāṣyas* are not so important and we do not get much information in them.<sup>342</sup>

Let us now turn our attention to the *cūṛṇī* texts which unlike the *niryukti* and *bhāṣya*, are written in prose. The most important *cūṛṇī* writer was Jinadāsagaṇi Mahattara, for whom we have a definite date. According to his *Nandīcūṛṇī*<sup>343</sup> he wrote this work in Śaka 598 corresponding to AD 676. The following *cūṛṇīs* are generally attributed to him: *Niśīthaviśeṣacūṛṇī*, *Nandīcūṛṇī*, *Anuyogadvāracūṛṇī*, *Āvaśyakacūṛṇī*, *Daśavaikālikacūṛṇī*, *Uttarādhyayanacūṛṇī*, and *Sūtrakṛtāṅgacūṛṇī*.

The *Niśīthaviśeṣacūṛṇī*<sup>344</sup> is an important Jaina commentary. It refers to the Mauryan emperor Samprati as a great patron of Jainism.<sup>345</sup> He, according to this work, made Jainism popular in Saurāṣṭra, Andhra, Damila, Marahaṭṭa, etc. The detailed story of Kālakācārya and Gardabhila is told here and in this connection we are told that the Jaina monk Kālakācārya brought the army of Pārasa (Persia) to Hīṃdugadeśa (Hindusthan) in order to destroy the dynasty of Gardabhila of Ujjayinī (3.59). He refers to the philosopher Siddhasena and to the work called *Kālaṇṇāṇa* written by Pādalipta. The stories of Naravāhanadatta, Taraṅgavatī, Malayavatī, Magadhasenā, etc. were known to him. He was also at home with texts like the *Setubandha*, *Vasudevacarita*, *Cetakakathā*, etc. Among other *cūṛṇīs*, written by Jinadāsa, the *Āvaśyakacūṛṇī*<sup>346</sup> has a prominent place. It gives a detailed account of Lord Mahāvīra's wanderings, obviously based on the accounts of the *Bhagavatī* and *Ācārāṅga*. The account of the Jaina monk Vajrasena and his visit to the city Śūrpāraka are related in this commentary. Jinadāsa also was an expert story-teller and some of the stories, related by him, were copied by later writers. He further quotes a verse from Bhāsa's *Pratijñāyugandharāyaṇa* (3.9). Jinadāsa also refers to a terrible flood that visited Śrāvastī thirteen years after Mahāvīra's enlightenment.<sup>347</sup> The *Nandīcūṛṇī*<sup>348</sup> mentions the council held at Mathurā under Skandila. This work, as we have already seen was completed in Śaka 598. The *Daśavaikālikacūṛṇī*<sup>349</sup> too has a few interesting stories. In one of them<sup>350</sup> the Buddhists are ridiculed for their unmonk-like habits. There is another *Daśavaikālikacūṛṇī*,<sup>351</sup> which was written by Agastyasimha, who belonged to the Verasāmi (Vajrasvāmī) *śākhā* of the Koḍigaṇa (Koḍiya of the *Therāvatī*). The Verasāmi *śākhā* is the

same as Vairī of that text. Agastyasiṃha was the disciple of one Ṛṣiguṇya and it appears that he lived before Jinadāsa. The *Sūtra-kṛtāṅgacūmī*<sup>352</sup> refers to the mosquito menace in the Tāmralipta country.<sup>353</sup>

Haribhadra, who lived in the mid-eighth century AD, and was a senior contemporary of Udyotanasūri, has left a number of Sanskrit commentaries called *ṛttis*. He was a disciple of Jinabhaṭṭa<sup>354</sup> and belonged to the Vidyādhara *kula*. As we have already seen he was a native of Citrakūṭa (Chitor) and one of most learned men of his time. His commentaries on the following Āgamic texts are well known: *Āvaśyaka*, *Daśavaikālika*, *Jivābhigama*, *Prajñāpanā*, *Nandisūtra*, *Anuyogadvāra*, and *Piṇḍaniryukti*. He has expressed his indebtedness to the earlier commentators, including Jinadāsa. Śīlāṅka,<sup>355</sup> who lived a century later, also wrote several commentaries, of which the *Ācārāṅga*<sup>356</sup> and the *Sūtrakṛtāṅgavivaraṇas*<sup>357</sup> have survived. Another commentator was Śāntisūri who lived in the early eleventh century AD, and was a contemporary of Paramāra Bhoja, Caulukya Bhīma, and the poet Dhanapāla. We have his *Uttarādhyayanaṭīkā*.<sup>358</sup> In this commentary he has referred to the text, accepted in the council, held under the presidentship of Nāgārjuna. Śāntisūri belonged to the Koṭikagaṇa and Vaira-śākhā.<sup>359</sup>

Abhayadeva, who lived in the eleventh century AD, wrote commentaries on all the Aṅga texts, except the first two, and also one on the *Aupapātika*. We have two definite dates for him; they are vs 1120 and 1128, corresponding to AD 1062 and 1070.<sup>360</sup> It is evident from his works that he spent the major part of his life at Aṇahilapāṭaka (Patan, Gujarat). His preceptor was Jineśvara of Candrakula.<sup>361</sup> He further admits his indebtedness to Droṇācārya of Aṇahilapāṭaka who corrected the texts of his commentaries. It should, however, be pointed out that the commentaries of Abhayadeva do not help us much in understanding the Jaina Āgamic texts. The Jaina commentators of the post-Gupta period had practically no idea regarding eastern India where the canonical texts were composed, and also no understanding of the teachings of the contemporaries of Mahāvīra. Unlike Buddhaghoṣa, they received no help from their predecessors, and it is also doubtful whether they fully understood the Ardhamāgadhī language in which the Jaina canon is written.

Lastly I should mention the name of Malayagiri, who was a contemporary of the celebrated Hemacandra. We have at least twenty



of his *vṛttis* and *ṭikās*,<sup>362</sup> but like the commentaries of Abhayadeva these voluminous texts are not particularly enlightening.

## REFERENCES

1. II, p. 187.
2. We have a definite date for him Śaka 598; see *Nandīsūtracūrnī* (Prākṛta Text Society), p. 83: 'Śakarājño pañcasu varṣaśteṣu vyatikrānteṣu aṣṭanavateṣu Namdyadhyayanacūrnī samāptā iti.'
3. See J. C. Jain, *Prākṛta Sāhitya kā Itihāsa*, p. 37, n. 1.
4. See *Uttarādhyayanavṛtti* by Kamalsamyama, p. 23. It should however be remembered that this statement comes from the pen of a later writer.
5. See *Prakrit Proper Names*, pt. I, pp. 368 ff.
6. Ed., Āgamodaya Samiti, Surat, vs 1972-3 (AD 916); see also Jacobi's translation in *SBE*, 22, pp. 1-213. My personal copy is the edition published from Thāngadh (Saurāṣṭra), vs 2489 (1963). For a list of various other editions, see *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, Varanasi, 1966, 1, p. 62 fn.
7. See *Prakrit Proper Names*, pt. I, p. 87.
8. Loc. cit.
9. Ed., Dhanpat Singh, Calcutta, vs 1936; also Āgamodaya Samiti, Surat, vs 1972-3.
10. Ṛṣabhadeva Kesarīmalji Śvetāmbara Saṁsthā, Raḍam, 1928-9.
11. See Jainānanda Pustakālaya, Surat, 1935.
12. See *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 3, p. 384.
13. See *SBE*, 22, pp. 12-13.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 20.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 92.
17. I.131.3-4 (cr. ed.); IV.12.12-13.
18. See A.K. Chatterjee, *Ancient Indian Literary and Cultural Tradition*, p. 167.
19. I.63.18-19.
20. First Rock Edict (see Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, pp. 15-16).
21. See Jacobi, *SBE*, 22, p. 158; see also for the original Thāngadh edn., p. 139 (XIV.1).
22. II, 11 (the word there is *cinapaṭṭa*).
23. Jacobi, op. cit., p. 183.
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 84-5; (original) IX.3.
25. Ed., Āgamodaya Samiti, 1917; for the English translation see *SBE*, 45, pp. 235-451. Hindi translation by Amolaka Rṣi, Hyderabad, vs 2446. For various other editions see *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 1, p. 127, n. 1.

26. Ed., P.L. Vaidya, Poona, 1928; also included in Āgamodaya edition.
27. Ṛṣabhadeva Kesarīmala Śvetāmbara Saṁsthā, Ratlam, 1941.
28. Included in the Āgamodaya edn., known as the *Vivaraṇa of Śīlāṅka*.
29. *SBE*, 45, p. 256.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 261.
31. *Ibid.*, pp. 268–9.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 268.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 274.
34. I.1.10 (Chowkhambha edn.).
35. Jacobi, *op. cit.*, pp. 301, 310.
36. Trans., F.L. Woodward, *Minor Anthologies of the Pāli Canon*, pt. II, p. 188.
37. III, tr., E.M. Hare, p. 175.
38. Jacobi's trans., p. 333.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 370.
40. Act VII, Chowkhambha edn., p. 371.
41. Jacobi, trans., p. 366.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 374.
43. See *Uttarādhyayana*, XX.42 (*SBE*, 45, p. 105); *Bhagavatī* (Sailana edn.), p. 2662.
44. Jacobi, trans., p. 371.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 418.
46. *Ibid.*, pp. 419–20.
47. See Malalasekera, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 56–7.
48. Jacobi, *op. cit.*, pp. 420 ff.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 421.
50. *Ibid.*, pp. 409 ff.
51. See especially *Saṁyutta* (I, trans., Mrs. R. Davids), pp. 89 ff.
52. Ed. by the Āgamodaya Samiti, Bombay, 1918–20. For other editions, see *Jaina Sāhitya kā Brhad Itihāsa*, 1, p. 171, n. 1.
53. The commentary is included in the Āgamodaya edition.
54. See J.C. Jain, *op. cit.*, p. 57, n. 1; see also *Jaina Sāhitya kā Brhad Itihāsa*, 1, pp. 172 ff.
55. See third *adhyayana*; see also Jain, *op. cit.*, p. 57.
56. Ed., Bechardas, p. 243.
57. See Jain, *op. cit.*, p. 58 (fourth *adhyayana*).
58. See Malalasekera, *op. cit.*, II, p. 8.
59. See *Vin.*, II.237; *Anguttara*, IV.101; V.22; *Saṁyutta*, II.135; V.38.
60. McCrindle, *Ancient India*, p. 38.
61. See Malalasekera, *op. cit.*, II, p. 1073.
62. McCrindle, *op. cit.*, p. 97.
63. *Sūtra* no. 587.
64. *Sūtra* no. 680.
65. See Jain, *op. cit.*, p. 61 (tenth *adhyayana*).
66. Āgamodaya edn., Surat, 1929; for other edns. see *Jaina Sāhitya kā Brhad Itihāsa*, 1, p. 172, n. 2.

67. The commentary is included in the Āgamodaya edn.; see also *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 3, pp. 400 ff.
68. *Sūtra* no. 18.
69. Ed., R.G. Basak, I, p. 160.
70. Ed., P.L. Vaidya, p. 125.
71. *Sūtra* no. 72.
72. II.4.17.
73. Ed. with Abhayadeva's *vṛtti* by the Āgamodaya Samiti, Bombay, 1918–21. For some other edns. see *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 1, p. 187, n. 1. My personal copy's edition is published in seven volumes by the Akhila Bhāratīya Jaina Saṃskṛti Rakṣaka Saṃgha, Sailana.
74. See *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 3, pp. 402 ff.
75. (Sailana edn.) p. 391.
76. p. 440.
77. pp. 473 ff.
78. p. 496.
79. See Malalasekera, op. cit., I, p. 992.
80. p. 509.
81. p. 550; from p. 708 (third *śataka*) we learn that these four *lokapālas* were Soma, Yama, Varuṇa, and Vaiśravaṇa.
82. p. 567.
83. p. 578.
84. pp. 572 ff.
85. See pp. 606, 648.
86. p. 716.
87. p. 752.
88. p. 794.
89. p. 803.
90. p. 887.
91. See pp. 1478, 2759.
92. This is also confirmed by the evidence of the Pāli Buddhist works and Brahmanical *sūtra* literature.
93. p. 921.
94. p. 1037.
95. pp. 1190 ff.
96. See p. 1206.
97. Gītā Press edn., VI, 1.27 ff.
98. p. 1203.
99. pp. 1385 ff.
100. p. 1387.
101. p. 1523.
102. pp. 1614 ff.
103. pp. 1698 ff.
104. p. 1704.

105. pp. 1705 ff.
106. p. 1707.
107. p. 1695.
108. p. 1715.
109. p. 1888.
110. p. 1948.
111. p. 1912.
112. p. 1933.
113. See Malalasekera, op. cit., I, pp. 1000 ff.
114. pp. 1960, 1966.
115. pp. 1966 ff.
116. p. 1986.
117. *Svapnavāsavadattā* (Chowkhambha edn.), sixth Act.
118. See Malalasekera, op. cit., II, pp. 923 ff.
119. pp. 2231 ff.
120. p. 2346.
121. p. 2348.
122. p. 2425.
123. Loc. cit.
124. p. 2443.
125. See Raychaudhuri, *PHAI*, pp. 95 ff.
126. p. 2468.
127. p. 2476.
128. p. 2519.
129. p. 2558.
130. p. 2665.
131. See Malalasekera, op. cit., II, p. 273.
132. p. 2759.
133. p. 2762.
134. pp. 2554 ff.
135. Āgamodaya edition with Abhayadeva's *vṛtti*, Bombay, 1916. For other editions see *Jaina Sāhitya kā Brhad Itihāsa*, 1, p. 217, n. 1.
136. Āgamodaya edn., p. 33–42.
137. See also trans., N.V. Vaidya, para 7.
138. Gītā Press edn., II, 14.50.
139. This place is mentioned in the second century Junagarh inscription of Rudradāman, see Lüders' *List*, no. 965.
140. See Vaidya's trans., para 60.
141. Loc. cit.
142. Section 25.
143. 10.12 ff.
144. Para 73.
145. Para 74.
146. Vaidya's trans., para 118.

147. For further details see my paper in *JAIH*, VII, pp. 159 ff.
148. See Majumdar, *The Classical Accounts of India*, pp. 223, 456.
149. *Harivamśa* of Jinasena, ed., P.L. Jain, ch. 54.
150. Āgamodaya edn., Bombay, 1920; English trans., Hoernle, Calcutta, 1885–8. I have used the text of the work published from Poona, 1953. It includes a translation by N.A. Gore. For other references see *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 1, p. 227, n. 1.
151. Included in the Āgamodaya edn.
152. Ed., Gore, text, p. 21.
153. *Ibid.*, p. 40.
154. Gītā Press edn., III.15.21.
155. Trans., p. 138.
156. Āgamodaya edn., Bombay, 1920; English trans., L.D. Barnett, 1907. For other edns. see, *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 1, p. 233, n. 1.
157. Trans., Barnett, p. 29; other references are from Barnett's trans.
158. *Ibid.*, pp. 30-31.
159. *Ibid.*, p. 74.
160. *Ibid.*, pp. 76 ff.
161. Loc. cit.
162. See pp. 77 ff.
163. Loc. cit.
164. p. 86.
165. Jātaka no. 454.
166. I.6.
167. p. 80.
168. Āgamodaya edn., Surat, 1920. For other references see *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 1, n. 1.
169. Included in the Āgamodaya edn.
170. Āgamodaya edn., Bombay, 1919. I have used the edn. from Sailana, 1975. For other edns., see *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 1, p. 247, n. 1.
171. See Schubring, *The Doctrine of the Jainas*, trans., W. Beurten, pp. 94 ff.
172. Included in the Āgamodaya edn.
173. Sailana edn., pp. 136 ff., 149 ff.
174. pp. 212 ff.
175. p. 235.
176. Cf. Schubring, op. cit., p. 94.
177. Āgamodaya edn., Bombay, 1920. I have used the edition published from Kota in 1935. For other edns. see *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 1, p. 255, n. 1.
178. Included in the Āgamodaya edn.
179. Kota edn., 200. The condemned priest was Bṛhaspatidatta, the son of Somadatta. He was 64 at the time of his execution, according to our text.

180. p. 185.
181. VIII.372; see also XI.104.
182. pp. 211 ff.
183. pp. 215 ff.
184. Seventh *adhyayana*.
185. pp. 244, 248.
186. p. 314.
187. II.32.4.
188. p. 308.
189. p. 369.
190. pp. 118 ff.
191. p. 149.
192. pp. 66, 175.
193. Āgamodaya edn., Bombay, 1916. This edition also contains the *vr̥tti* of Abhayadeva. My personal copy is the edition published from Sailana (1963).
194. Sailana edn., pp. 10 ff.
195. Ibid., pp. 56 ff.
196. See Malalasekera, op. cit., II, p. 225.
197. pp. 278 ff.
198. p. 279: *gaṃgāe mahānaīe ubhaokūleṇaṃ kaṃpillapurāo*.
199. p. 302.
200. p. 270.
201. pp. 212 ff.
202. pp. 215 ff.
203. Āgamodaya edn., Bombay, 1925. I have consulted the edition of Bechardas, Ahmedabad, vs. 1994. This edition has a Gujarati translation. For other edition, see, *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 2, p. 37, n. 1.
204. See *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 3, pp. 415 ff.
205. Ed., Bechardas, p. 88.
206. Ibid., p. 197.
207. p. 63.
208. p. 218.
209. See Malalasekera, op. cit., II, p. 188.
210. II.1.70.
211. See Schubring, op. cit., pp. 96 ff.
212. For an analysis of these conversations see *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 2, pp. 58 ff.
213. p. 301.
214. p. 284.
215. p. 321.
216. Nirṇayasāgara edn., Bombay, 1919.
217. Included in the Bombay edn.

218. Jacobi (*SBE*, 22), p. 233.
219. Āgamodaya edn., Bombay, 1918–19.
220. Rṣabhadeva Keśarīmalajī Śvetāmbara Saṁsthā, Ratlam, 1947.
221. *Sūtra* no. 37.
222. Āgamodaya edn., with the *ṛtti* of Malayagiri, Bombay, 1929.
223. Ed. with the *ṛtti* of Śāntīcandra, Bombay, 1920.
224. Āgamodaya edn., with the *ṛtti* of Candrasūri, Surat, 1922. I have used the edition published from Rajkot, 1960.
225. See *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 3, p. 449.
226. Rajkot edn., p. 11.
227. *Ibid.*, p. 22.
228. *Ibid.*, p. 39.
229. *Loc. cit.*
230. pp. 44 ff.
231. p. 40.
232. See Malalasekera, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 127 ff.
233. *Loc. cit.*
234. pp. 30–1.
235. According to some of the *Piṇḍaniryukti* and the *Oghaniryukti* are also Mūlasūtra texts. See J.C. Jain, *Prākṛta Sāhitya kā Itihāsa*, p. 163n.
236. Ed. by J. Charpentier, Uppasala, 1922. For other edns., see *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 2, p. 144, n. 2. The standard English translation is by Jacobi in *SBE*, 45, pp. 1–232.
237. Ed. along with Śāntīsūri's commentary, Bombay, 1916–17.
238. See J.C. Jain, *op. cit.*, p. 164.
239. v. 21.
240. p. 37 (Jacobi's translation).
241. *Ibid.*, p. 47.
242. *Ibid.*, p. 56.
243. *Ibid.*, p. 57.
244. *Loc. cit.*
245. *Loc. cit.*
246. p. 87.
247. *Loc. cit.*
248. See Malalasekera, *op. cit.*, I, p. 531. The story of the four kings Naggaji, Nimi and Dummukha is told in the *Kumbhakāra Jātaka* (no. 408). It is therefore, apparent that both the Jaina and Buddhist authors have used the same source.
249. See *Mbh.*, III.254.21 (Gītā Press edn.).
250. *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, 8.23; the name here is Durmukha Pāñcāla.
251. By earlier Indian literature I mean the Vedic and epic texts.
252. p. 105, Jacobi's trans.
253. p. 28.
254. p. 104.

255. p. 117.
256. Loc. cit.
257. Āgamodaya edn., Bombay, 1928 and 1932. For other edns. see, *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 2, p. 173, n. 1.
258. See Āgamodaya Samiti edn., Bombay, 1916–17.
259. Yaśovijaya Jaina Granthamālā, vs 2427–41.
260. Rṣabhadevji Kesarīmalji Śvetāmbara Saṁsthā, Ratlam, 1928.
261. Included in Āgamodaya edn., Bombay, 1916–17.
262. Ed., Leumann in *ZDMG*, 46, pp. 581–663. For other edns. see, *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 2, p. 179, n. 1. My personal copy is the edition published at Sailana, rep., 1973.
263. See *Prakrit Proper Names*, pt. II, p. 854.
264. Included in Leumann's edn.
265. Ratlam edn., 1933. There is also the newly discovered *cūṛṇī* by Agastyasiṁha (Kalaśabhavamrgendra) which has recently been published from Varanasi.
266. Bhimsī Māṅek, Bombay, 1900.
267. Sanmati Jñānapīṭha, Agra, 1957–60.
268. Included in the Agra edn. of the *Niśītha*.
269. Included in the same edn.
270. See the Agra edn.
271. Ed., W. Schubring, Berlin, 1918.
272. See *Vividhatīrthakalpa*, p. 19.
273. See *Prākṛta Sāhitya kā Itihāsa*, p. 147; also *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 2, p. 292.
274. Ed., W. Schubring, Leipzig, 1918, the text, edited along with the *niryukti*, *bhāṣya* and *vivarana* of Malayagiri, Ahmedabad, vs 1982–5.
275. Ed., Bhavnagar, vs 2011; this edition contains also the *niryukti* and the *cūṛṇī*.
276. English trans. Jacobi in *SBE*, 22, pp. 217–311. For different edition of this valuable text see, *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 2, p. 217n.
277. Ed. by Puṇyavijaya, Bhavnagar, 1933–42; this edition contains the *bhāṣya* of Saṅghadaśa and the *ṭīkā*s of Malayagiri and Kṣemakīrti.
278. This work has not yet been edited; see *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 3, pp. 276 ff.
279. Ed., Jinavijaya along with *cūṛṇī* and *ṭīkā*, Ahmedabad, vs 1983.
280. Ed., Puṇyavijaya in *Prākṛta Text Society Series*, Varanasi, 1966.
281. Included in Puṇyavijaya's edn.
282. Ed., Rṣabhadevji Kesarīmalji Śvetāmbara Saṁsthā, Ratlam, 1928.
283. Āgamodaya Samiti edn., Bombay, 1924.
284. PTS edn., p. 49 and n.
285. Ed., Ratlam, 1928.
286. Para 41 (Āgamodaya Samiti).
287. Devachand Lalbhai Series, Surat, 1918.



288. Āgamodaya edn., Bombay, 1919.
289. p. 152.
290. Edited by Puṇyavijaya in Prākṛta Text Society, Varanasi, 1957.
291. See *Brahmajāla Sutta*, tr., Rhys Davids, 16–18.
292. *Manusmṛti*, VI.20.
293. See PTS edn., Introd., p. 55.
294. pp. 159–61.
295. Ibid., pp. 162–3.
296. Ibid., pp. 165–6.
297. Ibid., pp. 164–5.
298. Ibid., pp. 163–4.
299. Ibid., pp. 174–82.
300. Ibid., pp. 204–6; see also p. 69.
301. See in this connection the paper 'Coin Names in the *Aṅgavijjā*' by V.S. Agrawala included in the Introd., pp. 87 ff. of the PTS edn.
302. p. 66.
303. Loc. cit.
304. See *Aṅgavijjā*, Introd., p. 90, n. 1.
305. p. 166.
306. Paras 44 and 60.
307. p. 69.
308. p. 68.
309. pp. 136 ff.
310. p. 150.
311. pp. 182 ff.
312. pp. 204 ff.
313. See *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 3, p. 120.
314. Ibid., p. 68, n. 1; see also Muni Puṇyavijaya in *Muni Śrī Hajarimala Smṛtigrantha*, pp. 718–19.
315. See Āgamodaya edn., Bombay, 1928–32; for various other editions see, *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 3, p. 71, n. 1.
316. Loc. cit.
317. See *Prakrit Proper Names*, I, p. 315.
318. Ed., Leumann, *ZDMG*, 46, pp. 581–663.
319. See *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 3, pp. 97 ff.
320. Ed. (D.L.J.P.), Bombay, 1919–27; see also *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 3, p. 107.
321. *Gāthā* nos. 146–8.
322. Āgamodaya edn., Surat, vs 1972–3; see also J.C. Jain, op. cit., p. 201.
323. Āgamodaya edn., Bombay, 1917; see also *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, III, p. 119.
324. See *JSBI*, III, p. 120.
325. Ibid., pp. 123 ff.
326. Ibid., p. 125.

327. Ed., Yaśovijaya Jaina Granthamālā, Varanasi, vs 2427–41.
328. For an analysis of this text *JSBI*, 3, pp. 130–201.
329. See *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 3, pp. 132 ff.
330. *Ibid.*, pp. 135 f.
331. J.C. Jain, op. cit., p. 211; rejects this identification, but gives no reason in support of his stand.
332. See *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 6, p. 143; also J.C. Jain, op. cit., p. 381.
333. See *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 3, p. 137.
334. Ed., Caturavijaya and Puṇyavijaya in six vols. *Jaina Ātmānanda Sabhā*, Bhavnagar, 1933–42). For an analysis of this text, see *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 3, pp. 213–51.
335. See Jain, op. cit., p. 220; see also v. 229.
336. *Ibid.*, p. 227.
337. Ed., Sanmati Jñānapīṭha, Agra, 1957–60.
338. See Jain, op. cit., p. 217.
339. Ed., K.P. Modi and Ugarchand, Ahmedabad, vs 1982–5.
340. See Jain, op. cit., p. 219.
341. *JSBI*, III, p. 271.
342. The *Pinḍaniryuktibhāṣya* (see Jain, op. cit., p. 231) refers to the famine during the days of Candragupta which is also repeatedly mentioned in the Digambara works.
343. See PTS edn., p. 83.
344. Edited in four volumes by Sanmati Jñānapīṭha, Agra, 1957–60. For a detailed analysis see, *JSBI*, III, pp. 321 ff.
345. *Ibid.*, 4, pp. 128–31.
346. Ratlam edn., 1928–9.
347. p. 601.
348. *PTS* edn., p. 9.
349. Ratlam edn., 1933.
350. See Jain, op. cit., pp. 257 ff.
351. See for detailed description of this text *JSBI*, III, pp. 315 ff.
352. Ratlam, 1941.
353. See Jain, op. cit., p. 237.
354. Cf. The concluding words of the *Āvaśyakaṭikā* quoted in *JSBI*, III, p. 377.
355. See *JSBI*, III, p. 382.
356. Āgamodaya edn., vs 1972–3.
357. Āgamodaya edn., Mehsana, 1917.
358. Ed., Bombay, 1916–17.
359. See *JSBI*, III, p. 393.
360. *Ibid.*, p. 396.
361. *Ibid.*, p. 414.
362. *Ibid.*, p. 417.

## CHAPTER XII

### Non-Canonical Śvetāmbara Literature

The earliest Śvetāmbara non-canonical literary text is the missing *Taraṅgavatī*, a Prakṛta poem written by Pādaliptasūri who, according to the tradition, was a contemporary of the Śātavāhana king Hāla. There are some details about this poet in the *Prabhāvācarita*<sup>1</sup> and *Prabandhakośa*,<sup>2</sup> according to which he was a resident of Kosala and later visited several places of India. We are further told that he cured king Muṛuṅḍa of Pāṭaliputra of an apparently incurable disease. His work is referred to in the *Anuyogadvāra* (sūtra no. 130) and the *Viśeṣāvāśyakabhāṣya*<sup>3</sup> of Jinabhadra. This shows that it was recognized as a well-known literary text in the early centuries of the Christian era. Later poets and writers like Jinadāsagaṇi Kṣamāśramaṇa, Udyotanasūri, Dhanapāla, and other have mentioned Pādalipta with deference and affection.

An abridged version of this work is the *Taraṅgalolā*<sup>4</sup> by Nemicaandra written about a 1000 years after the original. It has altogether 1642 verses. It appears from this abridged version that the original author was probably influenced by the *Bṛhatkathā* of Guṇāḍhya as it refers to the story of Udayana of Kauśāmbī and his heroine Vāsavadattā.

However, the earliest extant non-canonical literary Śvetāmbara work appears to be the *Paumacariyaṃ* of Vimāla, the Jaina *Rāmāyaṇa*, written, according to the testimony of the poet himself, 530 years after the emancipation (*siddhi*) of Lord Mahāvīra. There is absolutely no reason why this date for the composition of this text should not be accepted as genuine.<sup>5</sup> If this date is accepted, then we have to assign this work to the first century AD, and there is nothing in the body of this text that contradicts this date.<sup>6</sup>

This celebrated poem of Vimāla is also known as *Rāghavacaritam*. From a few verses of the second chapter we can understand his attitude towards the Brahmanical Rāma story (obviously that represented by Vālmīki). I give below a free translation of those lines: 'When I consider the *Padmacarita*, I wonder how the petty and in-

significant monkeys could kill the powerful and aristocratic *rākṣasas*, who were versed in different sciences and *who had complete faith in the jinas*.<sup>7</sup> We are further told by the native chronicler (apparently Vālmīki) that all the *rākṣasas*, including Rāvaṇa, used to consume flesh, fat, and blood. Also that Rāvaṇa's illustrious and valiant brother Kumbhakarṇa used to sleep undisturbed for six months at a time. Even when struck by large hills, he could not be awakened; he remained asleep even if his ears were filled with jars of oil. Loud sounds of a drum, which could even pierce thunder, had no effect on him, and when he awake he felt so hungry that he could serenely swallow elephants, buffaloes, and anything that came in his way. After consuming gods, men, elephants, he went to sleep once more for six months. We have further heard that Rāvaṇa, after vanquishing Indra on the battlefield brought him in chains to the city of Laṅkā. But who can conquer the mighty Indra, who is capable of uprooting the whole of Jambudvīpa, who has Airāvata as his *vāhana*, and the terrible *vajra* as his weapon? By his very thought the [i.e., Indra] can reduce to ashes any god or man. "The deer killed the lion, and dog, the elephant", such contradictory sentences are found everywhere in the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

I have deliberately reproduced this long passage in order to show the deep familiarity Vimāla had with the original *Rāmāyaṇa* ascribed to Vālmīki. Not only has he referred to the work of Vālmīki by name, but at the same time has mentioned events described in the original version, using almost the same language. What he has said about Kumbhakarṇa and his undisturbed sleep for six months are actually found in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, VI.60.27–63; 61.28. There is absolutely no doubt that Vimāla is indebted to the original *Rāmāyaṇa* so far as the above-mentioned passages of his work are concerned. As a devout Jaina and a firm believer in the doctrine of *ahimsā*, he is not prepared to believe that the *rākṣasas* of Laṅkā consumed animal flesh. They are everywhere delineated in his work as *vidyādharas*, although sometimes he forgetfully calls them also *rākṣasas* (cf. 2.105; 7.92 et seq.).

These so-called *vidyādharas*, led by Rāvaṇa, are everywhere portrayed as staunch Jainas. Although Vimāla is committed to writing the story of Padma (i.e., Rāma), his actual hero, at least in the first half of his work, is Rāvaṇa, who like Naravāhanadatta, appears in this poem as a perfect knight-errant. Indeed, the ghost of Naravāhanadatta looms large in all the literary works beginning from

Vimalasūri down to Hemacandra.

We have already seen that Vimala had a thorough knowledge, not only of the events narrated in the original *Rāmāyaṇa*, but also with its language. Although he contemptuously bestows on the earlier poets epithets like *kukavi*, *mūdhāh*, etc., he actually follows the path trodden by them. Sometimes he does not hesitate to borrow words and phrases of the original *Rāmāyaṇa*. However, while telling the story of Rāma and Rāvaṇa, he also says something about the different Jaina Tīrthaṅkaras and other interesting details are also found in his work for which he is indebted to none but his own imagination.

The principal details of Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa*, i.e., the birth of the four sons of Daśaratha, Rāma's marriage with Sītā, the daughter of Janaka, his departure for the forest along with Lakṣmaṇa and Sītā, Rāvaṇa's kidnapping of Sītā, death of Jaṭāyu at Rāvaṇa's hands, Rāma's meeting with Sugrīva, Hanumat's departure for Laṅkā, his meeting with Sītā, the battle of Laṅkā, the rescue and ultimate banishment of Sītā are all described in Vimala's poem. Mere similarity of broad facts do not however concern us much here. After a thorough examination of Vimala's entire Prākṛta poem<sup>8</sup> I have been able identify a large number of small yet important details which also occur in the original *Rāmāyaṇa*. I give those below in parallel for the two volumes:

<i>Paumacariyaṃ</i>	<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>
1	2
1. Description of Rājagṛha (2.8–14)	1. Description of Ayodhyā (I, ch. 5).
2. Rāvaṇa's encounter with Bālin and lifting of Kailāsa (9.24 ff.)	2. VII, ch. 34, VII.16.25 ff.
3. Description of the Narmadā (10.29 ff.)	3. VII.31.5 ff.
4. Sahasrakiraṇa's play in the water of the Narmadā (10.33 ff.)	4. VII.32.2 ff. (In this epic he is called Arjuna of <i>sahasra</i> hands.)
5. Rāvaṇa's worship of the Jina image near the bank of the Narmadā (10.45 ff.)	5. VII.31.37 ff. (He is shown as worshipping the Śivaliṅga.)

1	2
6. Nalakūbara-Uparambhā-Rāvaṇa affair (12.38 ff.)	6. VII, ch. 26 (Rambhā is the heroine here).
7. Indra-Rāvaṇa encounter (12.73 ff.)	7. VII, ch. 29.
8. Añjanā-Pavanañjaya love affair and birth of Hanumat (ch. 15-17)	8. VII, ch. 35.
9. Rāvaṇa-Varuṇa encounter (ch. 19).	9. VII, ch. 23.
10. Killing of Śambūka (43.48 ff.)	10. VII, ch. 76.
11. Khara-Dūṣaṇa and their 14,000 associates (43.17; 44.11)	11. III, ch. 19-20.
12. Candranakhā's amorous advances (43.37 ff.)	12. Śūrpaṇakhā affair (III, ch. 17).
13. Rāma's lament (45.51 ff.)	13. III, chs. 62 ff.
14. Sugrīva severely rebuked by Lakṣmaṇa (48.7 ff.)	14. IV, ch. 34.
15. Dadhimukha affair (ch. 49)	15. V, ch. 62.
16. Sītā gives Hanumat the <i>cūḍāmaṇi</i> (53.72 ff.)	16. V, ch. 38 ff.
17. Hanumat overpowered by Indrajit (53.118 f.)	17. V, ch. 48.
18. Hanumat returns to Rāma the <i>cūḍāmaṇi</i> given by Sītā (54.3 ff.)	18. V, ch. 65.
19. Indrajit's quarrel with Vibhīṣaṇa [55.8 ff.]	19. VI, ch. 15.
20. Rāvaṇa's quarrel with Vibhīṣaṇa [55.18 ff.]	20. VI, ch. 16.
21. Doubts raised in Rāma's camp about Vibhīṣaṇa (55.29 ff.)	21. VI, ch. 17.
22. Rāma's lament (after Lakṣmaṇa was hit by Rāvaṇa's <i>śaktiśela</i> 62.4 ff.)	22. VI, ch. 101.
23. Description of Mathurā (88.2 ff.)	23. VII.70.9 ff.

1	2
24. Rāma becomes a target of hostile criticism at Ayodhyā [93.22 ff.]	24. VII.43.16 ff.
25. Sītā's lament in the forest [94.87 ff.]	25. VII.48 ff.

This tabular presentation shows that Vimāla has very faithfully followed in his Prākṛta poem the original *Rāmāyaṇa*, including its First and Seventh Books which are considered late additions to the original poem. A very large number of incidents, narrated in the Uttarakāṇḍa, have been recorded by the author of the *Paumacariyaṇi*. We have, for example, in this poem the story of Marutta's *yaġña*, and Vimāla mentions even the name Marutta's priest Saṁvarta (11.71). Vimāla, to whom Rāvaṇa is a great Jaina and *vidyādhara*, has cleverly changed the passages of the Uttarakāṇḍa which describe Rāvaṇa's discomfiture. As for example, in the Uttarakāṇḍa story Arjuna, king of Māhiṣmatī, is represented as having made Rāvaṇa his prisoner; but the *PC* just gives the opposite version. In another Uttarakāṇḍa story Rāvaṇa is shown as having suffered a humiliating defeat at the hands of Bālin, but in the *PC* Bālin appears as a Jaina ascetic and is further shown as having pressed the mount Kailāsa with the toe of his foot when Rāvaṇa lifted it, and Daśamukha, in utter distress, cried out and earned the name Rāvaṇa. It is not little amusing to see how the Jaina poet has cleverly assigned to Bālin the role of Śiva of the Uttarakāṇḍa (16.25–38). Let no one suppose from this that Vimāla has here followed a different tradition, and not that recorded by the author of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

The above discussion abundantly testifies that the Jaina author, writing in the first century AD, deliberately followed the original Rāma story, although interspersed with Jaina bias. Characters like Daśaratha, Bharata, Kumbhakarṇa, Indrajit, and others are represented as embracing the ascetic life of Jaina *munis*. Rāvaṇa's killer, however, is not Rāma in this poem, but Lakṣmaṇa, who takes a more important part in the battle of Laṅkā than Rāma. Vimāla has however done a grave injustice to this great brother of Rāma by representing him as a love-sick, sentimental hero.

Vimāla according to his own testimony was a disciple of Vijaya

and grand-disciple of Rāhu, who belonged to the Nāila or Nāgila *kula*, which according to the *Therāvālī*,<sup>9</sup> originated from the preceptor Ārya Vajrasena. Nothing is known about Vimala's home, but from the detailed and eulogistic description of Mathurā it appears that he was a monk of that city.

Vimala's work is the foundation on which later Jaina writers built lofty edifices. We have the *Padmaṣpurāṇa* of Digambara Raviṣeṇa, which will be discussed in the next chapter. A number of other writers, including Svayambhū, also wrote on the Rāma story and his work too will be dealt within the next chapter.

I should now turn my attention to the *Vasudevahinḍī*<sup>10</sup> written by Saṅghadāsagaṇi Vācaka and Dharmasenagaṇi. This work, according to the eminent Prākṛta scholar Alsdorf,<sup>11</sup> was written in all probability in the Gupta period as its Prākṛta shows quite a number archaic forms, and for the students of Prākṛta the work offers a fruitful field of study. Only the first part of it has so far been published, and even that edition, according to Alsdorf,<sup>12</sup> is full of errors. The original work extends to 100 *lambakas*; the first part extending to 29 *lambakas* is a continuous prose work of 370 quarto pages. Let us remember that this work was known to both Jinabhadaragaraṇi,<sup>13</sup> who lived in the sixth century AD and Jinadāsagaṇi Kṣamāśramaṇa.<sup>14</sup> There is therefore little doubt that this work was quite popular from the Gupta period.

The *Vasudevahinḍī* is probably the earliest imitation of the famous *Bṛhatkathā* written in the Śātavāhana period by Guṇādhyā in the Paiśācī language. It has not yet been discovered, but we have a number of Sanskrit versions. Vasudeva, the father of Kṛṣṇa, who is the romantic hero of this novel, evidently reminds us of Naravāhana-datta, the hero of Guṇādhyā. Unlike the *Bṛhatkathā*, it is written in the Mahārāṣṭrī Prākṛta, the language in which the well-known *Aṅgaviḷḷā* was written. Besides the *Bṛhatkathā*, materials from the popular Vaiṣṇava Purāṇas including the *Harivaṃśa* and *Viṣṇu* have been incorporated. The language is heavily influenced by the canonical, and sometimes we have the entire passages from the *Samavāyāṅga* and *Sthānāṅga* which attest that the author had little originality.

After the Introduction we have the story of Dhammilla, the son of a merchant. A number of his adventures have been recorded, including his passion for prostitutes. Vasantatilakā, the mistress of Dhammilla, reminds us of Vasantasenā of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* of Śūdraka



and *Cārudatta* of Bhāsa. It is interesting that there is a direct reference to the *Bhagavadgītā* in this section of the *Vasudevahiṇḍī*.<sup>15</sup> This, I believe, to be the earliest reference to that famous poem in a non-Brahmanical text. The author shows his intimate acquaintance with various places of western India. He refers to Kalyāṇa,<sup>16</sup> Bharukaccha,<sup>17</sup> Girinagara,<sup>18</sup> and also Yavana-viṣaya.<sup>19</sup> He further mentions the well-known temple of Vāsupūjya<sup>20</sup> of Campā. He quotes also a passage<sup>21</sup> from the *Arthasāstra* of Kauṭilya and mentions a *nāga* temple.<sup>22</sup>

In the section entitled 'Pīṭhikā'<sup>23</sup> we have the story of the Vṛṣṇis of Dvārakā, and here he has mainly followed the Vaiṣṇava Purāṇas. The highly poetic description of Kṛṣṇa<sup>24</sup> has a theistic ring. The author has competently described the rivalry between Rukmiṇī and Satyabhāmā and the story of Kṛṣṇa's elopement with Jāmbavatī and his son's love affair with Vaidarbhī are also given. Sāmba too appears here as a romantic hero as in the Vaiṣṇava works.

A number of sections or *lambakas* of this work were evidently named in imitation of the *Bṛhatkathā*. We have, for example Gandharvadattā, Vegavatī, and a few other *lambakas*. The text also refers to *dīnāra*<sup>25</sup> and *kāṛṣāpaṇā*<sup>26</sup> coins. There was a brisk commercial intercourse with Cīna, Suvarṇabhūmi, and Yavadvīpa.<sup>27</sup> It also refers to the popular Indra festival.<sup>28</sup> The picture of the society, painted in this text is no different from that Bhāsa and Śūdraka.<sup>29</sup>

The story of Rāma, given in this text,<sup>30</sup> is almost entirely lifted from the original *Rāmāyaṇa* although, as in the *PC*, the killer of Rāvaṇa here is Lakṣmaṇa.<sup>31</sup> Some of the minor details of Vālmiki's *Rāmāyaṇa* are also to be found in the text, and there is even a reference to the *krodhāgāra*<sup>32</sup> of Kaikeyī. Unlike Vimala, the author of this text has not changed the name of Śūrpaṇakhā. The description of the rivalry between Bālin and Sugrīva<sup>33</sup> is evidently based on that of the Fourth Book of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

In the present published edition of this text, Books 19–20 and a part of the Book 28 are missing. Book 28, entitled *Devakī Lambaka*, closely follows the *Harivamśa* and later Jaina writers, including the author of the Jaina *Harivamśa*, have followed the version given in the *Vasudevahiṇḍī*. The text also contains details of the lives of the Tīrthamkaras like Kunthu and Arhanātha, and Ṛṣabha too receives very special treatment.<sup>34</sup>

The celebrated Haribhadra, who lived in the mid-eighth century, was not only a great philosopher, but also one of the finest literary

figures of the early medieval period. Not much is however known about his personal life. We only know that he was a native of Citrakūṭa (Chitor) and was a Brāhmaṇa by caste. He informs us that he obeyed the command of Jinabhāṭa, a Śvetāmbara *ācārya*, and was a pupil of Jinadatta, who belonged to the Vidyādhara *kula*. We further learn from the colophons of his works that he was a spiritual son of the nun Yākinī Mahattarā. From Udyotana's *Kuvalayamālā*,<sup>35</sup> which was written in Śaka 700, we learn that its author was taught the science of logic by Haribhadra, the author of several treatises. This Haribhadra is no other than our Haribhadra who was also a great logician, as we will see in a later chapter. Jacobi opines<sup>36</sup> that Haribhadra in the later part of his life migrated to western Rajasthan and probably founded the clan of Porevals, who according to the *Nemināthacariyu* originated at Śrīmāla (Bhinmal). That scholar further believes that Haribhadra, as a *yati*, probably wandered in various parts of India, including the eastern regions and learnt the logical system of the Buddhists in the Buddhist schools of these regions.

According to the Jaina tradition, Haribhadra was the author of some 1440 works, clearly an absurd figure. The earliest writer that refers to this figure is Abhayadeva who finished his *ṭīkā* on Haribhadra's *Pañcāśaka* in AD 1068. We have a list of 88 works of Haribhadra given by Muni Kalyāṇavijaya.<sup>37</sup> A sketch of Haribhadra's life has been given in the *Prabhāvākacariṭa*, which is however not very reliable.<sup>38</sup> Rājaśekhara in his *Prabandhakośa*<sup>39</sup> has also given a sketch of his life.

Haribhadra's fame as a creative literary writer rests chiefly on his Prākṛta *Samarāiccakahā*,<sup>40</sup> a work which the author himself describes as *dharmakathā* and which Winternitz<sup>41</sup> fittingly terms a religious novel. The fortune of the hero Samarāditya is traced through his nine births (*bhava*). Underlying all the narratives, there is the Jaina doctrine of *karman*. For the study of the cultural, religious, and economic history of northern India of the eighth century AD, the work offers a unique scope. In the first Book there is a reference to the well-known Madana-festival. The second provides an interesting description of marriage of those days and mentions a *nāga* temple and also refers to the cloth of Cīna and Ardha-Cīna. The third Book refers to the philosophy of Cārvāka and in the fourth we not only have a reference to Tāmralipta port but also to Kaṭāha-dvīpa, which is also mentioned in the Cola inscriptions<sup>42</sup> and the

*Kathāsaritsāgara*.<sup>43</sup> It appears from this Book of the *Samarāiccakahā* that there was brisk commerce between eastern India and the islands of East Indies in those days. The fifth Book refers to Suvarṇabhūmi and Mahākaṭāha. The sixth contains a wealth of information. Here we have the confirmation of the belief that the god Skanda was looked upon as the presiding god of thieves. We are told that Skanda-Rudra was the inventor of a thief's pill called Coraguliyā, which was used as *paradr̥ṣṭimohanī* (charmer of other's sight). There is also a detailed description of the temple of Kātyāyanī which had a four-armed icon of that goddess with the implements *kodaṇḍa*, *ghaṇṭā*, *khaḍga*, and the tail of Maḥiṣāsura. It further refers to the town of Devapura, which was situated near China, and also Suvarṇadvīpa and Ratnadvīpa. We come across an interesting character in the figure of Ṭoppa, a merchant of Devapura. The town of Tagara is also mentioned. There are a few interesting geographical names in other Books, including Madanapura of Kāmarūpa, mentioned in the ninth Book.

That Haribhadra was an accomplished storyteller is also attested by his well-known satire *Dhūrtākhyāna*<sup>44</sup> which is also written in Prākṛta. That there was an earlier Jaina text of this name is shown by the evidence of the *Niṣīthaviśeṣacūṛṇī*.<sup>45</sup> Haribhadra's only purpose was to ridicule the stories of the Hindu epics and Purāṇas and, in order to belittle them, he relates the tales of five rogues called Mūlaśrī, Kaṇḍarīka, Elāṣāḍha, Śasa, and Khaṇḍapāṇā. Such satire can be expected from the pen of a writer who was a renegade. It does not however merit the lavish praise bestowed on it by Upadhye,<sup>46</sup> and the stories related by the rogues are only weak satires. It is a matter of regret that the Jainas, who have written so many works in imitation of the epics, should indulge in senseless condemnation of these two great poems. This once more proves my contention that the Jainas, like the Buddhists, suffered from a form of inferiority-complex from the very outset.

The next Śvetāmbara writer is Udyotanasūri, the author of the *Kuvalayamālā*, which was completed according to the colophon of the work in the last month of the Śaka year 700, which is equivalent to AD 779 at Jāvālipura, modern Jalor (Rajasthan), when Vatsarāja was the reigning sovereign.<sup>47</sup> The *praśasti* given at the end of the work, as I have already pointed out, has great historical value. His immediate *guru* was Tattvācārya and he was taught Siddhānta by Virabhadra and logic by Haribhadra. Vatsarāja, who is mentioned

here, is the celebrated Pratihāra king, a contemporary of Dharmapāla and Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dhruva. The same Pratihāra king is also mentioned in the *Harivamśa* of Jinasena II as we shall see in the next chapter.

The *Kuvalayamālā* is probably the most interesting and complex Jaina literary next of the eighth century AD. The poet has shown his great power of observation and learning in this exceedingly readable work written in the Mahārāṣṭrī Prakṛta. It has been argued that the author was influenced by Bāṇa and Haribhadra. He has shown this thorough acquaintance with the works of previous writers by referring to them, among whom a few were Brahmanical writers and a few Digambara poets. He has graphically described the corrupt city life. It also appears from his text that Indian cities enjoyed rare prosperity in the eighth century, and in this connection he has referred to the affluence of the inhabitants of Pratiṣṭhāna. An interesting passage quoted by J.C. Jain in his work<sup>48</sup> throws a flood of light on the everyday religious life of those days. This passage alludes to the popularity of the *Bhagavadgītā* among the Vaiṣṇavas and also mentions the temples dedicated to Buddha, Jina, Śiva, Śakti (Koṭṭajjā), and Kārttikeya.

The poet has very successfully depicted romantic love-scenes and it is quite certain that he had first-hand experience of love and romance. In their descriptions of romantic episodes, the Jaina writers could even put to shame the author of the *Śiśupālavadhā*, and in this respect, as we will see later, the Digambaras did not lag much behind. There is an interesting description of the life led by students in a large educational institution in which pupils from Lāṭa, Kannaḍa, Mālava, Kānyakubja, Golla, Marahaṭṭha, Ṭakka, Śrīkaṇṭha, and Sindhudeśa pursued their study. In this institution they were given lessons by experienced teachers on almost all the sciences and philosophies.<sup>49</sup> Not all the students were equally serious and there is a humorous picture of college life, which was probably not very different from that which we encounter in modern colleges and university hostels. The poet has given us some idea regarding the characteristics of the peoples of different *janapadas*. The inhabitants of Golla (the country around the Godāvārī) were dark, rude, licentious and shameless; those of Magadha were ugly, careless, and knew no sexual restraints. The people of Antarvedī (the land between the Gaṅgā and Yamunā) were brown, with reddish-brown eyes and were fond of good food and table-talk. The people of Kīra

(Himalayan regions) were tall, fair, had flat nose and could carry big loads. The inhabitants of Ṭakka (Punjab) were lacking in the finer qualities and were close-fisted. They could not appreciate knowledge and were unchivalrous. The Sindhu people were thoroughly well-bred and soft-spoken, and at the same time had a passion for music. They were proud of their own country. The residents of the Maru country (Rajasthan) were crooked, foolish, and were given to over-eating. The people of Gurjara country were fond of butter and ghee, were religious in temperament, and at the same time, had a partiality to both peace and war. The people of Lāṭa were fond of perfumes and were conscious about their dress. The Mālavas were of short in stature and had dark complexions. They were both conceited and wrathful. The Karnataka people were exceedingly proud and, at the same time, addicted to women. They too were violent in temperament. The Tājikas (Muslims) were mainly non-vegetarians and knew only wine and women. The Kosalans possessed all the finer qualities of character and were easily excitable and proud. They were generally strongly built. The people of Mahārāṣṭra were tolerant and physically quite fit, but were however somewhat conceited and quarrelsome. The Āndhras were good fighters and were handsome, but they were fond of women and known for their extravagant food habits. Elsewhere the poet has praised the people of the Lāṭa country. We must remember that the original home of Udyotanasūri was situated not far from Lāṭadeśa, and that explains why he had soft corner for that country.

Śilānka's *Caupaṇṇamahāpurīṣacariyam*<sup>50</sup> is the earliest Śvetāmbara work on the lives of 54 great men. This work is written in Prākṛta and, according to the *Bṛhatṭippanikā*, was completed in the vs 925 corresponding to AD 867. In his *Ācārāṅgaṭīkā* we have three dates for Śilānka, Śaka 772, 784, and 798. The earliest date for this writer is therefore AD 840<sup>51</sup> and the latest AD 876. A few scholars<sup>52</sup> think that Śilānka, the commentator of the *Ācārāṅga* and *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* should be distinguished from Śilānka the author of the *Caupaṇṇamahāpurīṣacariyam*. We should however remember that both these Śilānkas belonged to the Nivṛtti *kula*<sup>53</sup> and lived in the middle of the ninth century AD. There is therefore no valid reason why these two Śilānkas should not be regarded as identical. The *Ācārāṅgaṭīkā* has an additional name for Śilānka, Tattvāditya, and the *Caupaṇṇamahāpurīṣacariyam* gives another name, Vimalamati. It appears that Vimalamati was his original name and Śilānka or Śilācārya the name given to

him after he became a Jaina *sādhu*. The name Tattvāditya appears to be a title conferred upon him for his vast learning. His *guru*, according to the *praśasti* of the *Caupañnamahāpurīṣacariyam*, was Mānadeva.

The work runs to 10,800 *ślokas* and he has very skilfully utilized the earlier sources including the Āgamas and the available Śvetāmbara commentaries and other non-canonical texts including Vimala's *Paumacaryam*. Among 54 characters, only 19 have received extensive treatment. About 21 characters have been dismissed in only a few pages. Characters like Rṣabha, Bharata, Śānti, Sumati, Mallī, Sagara, Neminātha, Pārśva, Baladeva, and Vardhamāna have naturally been allotted much greater space. One interesting feature of the work is the drama *Vibudhānanda*<sup>54</sup> which has been inserted in the story of one of the former births of Rṣabha. We are told that king Mahābala (fourth *bhava* of Rṣabha) was led to *vairāgya* after this dramatic performance. It appears that Śīlāṅka got the idea of writing this play from a statement of Jinadāsa Mahattara,<sup>55</sup> and it is constructed in all respects on the model of classical drama. However, the tragic end (i.e., the death of the hero) violates the rules of Sanskrit drama.

There is quite a lot of valuable cultural material scattered in this vast work. The writer refers to an old Jaina shrine at Ānandapura (Vaḍnagar) of Gujarat,<sup>56</sup> and informs us elsewhere that the court of Śātavāhana was graced by over a hundred poets.<sup>57</sup> That the official religion of Sri Lanka was Buddhism was known to Śīlāṅka.<sup>58</sup> He refers to the great prosperity of the Kāśī kingdom.<sup>59</sup> On p. 38 he refers to the following texts: Pādalipta's *Taraṅgavatī*, Bharata's *Nātyaśāstra*, Samudra's *Puruṣalakṣaṇaśāstra*, Citraratha's *Sanḡitaśāstra*, Naggai's *Citrakalāśāstra*, Dhanvantari's *Āyurvedaśāstra*, Śālibhadra's *Aśvaśāstra*, Vihāṇa's *Dyūtaśāstra*, Bubbuha's *Hastiśāstra*, Aṅgīrasa's *Yuddhaśāstra*, Śābara's *Indrajālaśāstra*, Kātyāyana's *Strīlakṣaṇaśāstra*, Senāpati's *Śakunaśāstra*, Gajendra's *Svapnalakṣaṇaśāstra*, Nala's *Pākaśāstra*, and Vidyādhara's *Patrachedyaśāstra*. Śīlāṅka further refers to the worship of Kāmadeva<sup>60</sup> who was propitiated by women desirous of good husband. *Yakṣa*-worship was also popular<sup>61</sup> and there is a vivid description of a Kāpālika.<sup>62</sup> It has been argued<sup>63</sup> that even Hemacandra was inspired by Śīlāṅka's work when he wrote his famous *Triṣaṣṭīśālākāpuruṣacaritra*.

Another well-known Śvetāmbara work of the ninth century is Jayasimha's *Dharmopadeśamālā*<sup>64</sup> written according to the testimony

of the poet himself in vs 915; and he provides the vital information that at this time king Bhoja was ruling the earth. There is absolutely no doubt that the poet has referred to the Pratihāra king Bhoja for whom we have dates ranging from vs 893 to 936,<sup>65</sup> vs 915 corresponding to AD 867. The work was composed in the Jaina shrine of Nāgapura (i.e., Nagaur) which is in Rajasthan. He also gives some information regarding the activities of his spiritual predecessors.

The work has a number of *gāthās* written by Jayasīmha, and to illustrate those he has himself composed 156 stories, most of which are based on earlier Jaina literature. The style of Jayasīmha is superior to most other Jaina writers. It appears that the original home of this writer was at Vasantapura, which is mentioned over 25 times in the work and which has yielded, as we have already seen, a seventh-century Jaina inscription and is identified with the present Vasantagaḍh in Sirohi district of Rajasthan. Jayasīmha, interestingly, describes Mathurā as adorned with Jaina temples.<sup>66</sup> He further refers to the town of Acalapura and its king Arikeśari,<sup>67</sup> who is described as a devotee of the Digambaras. It further appears from this work<sup>68</sup> that there was intense rivalry between the Śvetāmbaras and the Digambaras in the ninth century, and this is also confirmed by the statements of the contemporary Digambara writers. Probably the earliest reference to the famous Śakunikāvihāra of Bhṛgukaccha, which was dedicated to Muni Suvrata, is to be found in this work.<sup>69</sup> It is apparent from this that the famous temple of Suvrata at this well-known port was built much earlier. The author describes the popularity of the Jaina religion at Ujjayinī.<sup>70</sup> The holy hill of Śatruñjaya has also been mentioned.<sup>71</sup> He also shows his acquaintance with the philosophy of Siddhasena Divākara,<sup>72</sup> and there are also interesting stories about Subandhu, Cāṇakya, Śālibhadra, Mūladeva, Āryarakṣita, and others. Some of these stories are also told in contemporary Digambara works.

Let us now turn our attention to one of the most interesting texts written in the beginning of the tenth century AD, the *Upamitibhavaṣṭra-ṣaṅkathā*.<sup>73</sup> This work was composed by Siddharṣi in vs 962 corresponding to AD 906. The *praśasti* of this work gives some valuable information about the spiritual predecessors of this writer. He at first mentions Sūryācārya of Nivṛtti *kula*, who lived in Lāṭadeśa. His disciple was Dellamahattara, who was an expert in astronomy and prognostics. His disciple was Durgasvāmin, a rich Brāhmaṇa, who had become a Jaina monk and died, interestingly, at Bhīllamāla

(Bhinmal). Durgasvāmin was Siddharṣi's teacher, and is praised by him chiefly on account of his exemplary piety. Both teacher and pupil had been ordained by Gargasvāmin, about whom we are not told anything more. The highest praise is however reserved for Haribhadra, who as we learn from the *praśasti* was the source of his inspiration. It must, however, not be supposed that Haribhadra was a contemporary of Siddharṣi. The former lived some two centuries earlier, as is indicated in the *Kuvalayamālā* written in Śaka 700.

In the *Prabhāvākacārīta*<sup>74</sup> we have a romantic account of Siddharṣi's conversion from Buddhism which has, however, been rightly rejected by Jacobi.<sup>75</sup> That work further represents Siddharṣi as a cousin of Māgha, the author of the *Śiśupālavadhā*, which is surely impossible, as Māgha lived in the mid-seventh century AD as his grandfather served under king Varmalāta, who is definitely known from an inscription<sup>76</sup> to have lived in AD 625.

The work of Siddharṣi is an elaborate and extensive allegory. Probably the earliest specimen of such an allegory is the unnamed play of Aśvaghōṣa, discovered from Central Asia.<sup>77</sup> This work of Siddharṣi is however the first extensive allegory in Indian literature and it was followed two centuries later by Kṛṣṇa Mīśra's great allegory *Prabodhacandrodaya*. Siddharṣi's work is a narrative consisting of a series of birth stories, i.e. the hero of all stories is a single person in different births. This is an ancient device known to the earlier Buddhist and Jaina writers, including Haribhadra whose *Samarāiccakahā* is openly acknowledged by Siddharṣi<sup>78</sup> as his model.

Siddharṣi proposes to explain the mundane career of the Soul (*jīva*) under the name Saṁsārījīva from the lowest stage of existence to the final liberation, but only six births are narrated a few others sketched, and the rest summarily taken cognizance of. In the lives fully narrated, Saṁsārījīva is described as being under the influence of four cardinal passions (*krodha* in the third Prastāva, *māna* in the fourth, *māyā* in the fifth, and *lobha* in the sixth); and to similarly governed by the five cardinal vices (*himsā* in the third, *anṛta* in the fourth, *steṇa* in the fifth, *abrahma* in the sixth, *parigraha* in the seventh). Also in the Prastāvas are inserted allegorical stories which illustrate the baleful influence of the five senses, *sparśana*, *rasana*, *ghrāṇa*, *dṛṣṭi* and *śruti*. The chief intention of the author was to illustrate the Jaina religion, not as dogmatist but as a moralist. The order followed by Siddharṣi is to be found also in the *Tattvārthādhigama-sūtra*,<sup>79</sup> and the work has been compared to *Pilgrim's Progress*.<sup>80</sup> The



author deliberately uses Sanskrit and not Prākṛta, because Sanskrit was the language of the educated people. His language is however very easy to understand, and he does not care, like Dhanapāla or Somadeva, to imitate the style of Subandhu or Bāṇa.

Dhanapāla,<sup>81</sup> who lived in the last quarter of the tenth century AD, is the author of the *Tilakamañjarī*,<sup>82</sup> which was probably composed in the very beginning of the reign of Paramāra Bhoja. This author had written his Prākṛta *Pāyīlacchī*<sup>83</sup> in the vs 1029 corresponding to AD 972 when Mānyakheta was sacked by the Mālava army. In the *Tilakamañjarī*,<sup>84</sup> some extremely valuable information regarding the early kings of the Paramāra dynasty has been given. The author is a conscious imitator of Bāṇa, but he is only a very inferior imitator. The hero Harivāhana reminds us of Candrāpīḍa of the *Kādambarī*, and his friend Samaraketu is modelled on Vaiśampāyana of Bāṇa's work. The heroine, Tilakamañjarī, instinctively reminds us of Kādambarī and Malayavatī and is in every respect like Mahāśvetā, the immortal creation of Bāṇa. In Bāṇa's work the childless king Tārāpīḍa worships Śiva in the Mahākāla temple, and here in the *Tilakamañjarī*, Meghavāhana for his son worships Jina in the temple of Śakrāvatāra Siddhāyatana of Ayodhyā. It appears from Dhanapāla's work that this temple of Jina at Ayodhyā was established long before its composition. It is extremely interesting that this Jaina shrine of Ayodhyā is mentioned in Jinaprabha's *Vividhatīrthakalpa*.<sup>85</sup> We should remember that the grandfather of the poet was originally a resident of Sāṅkāśya<sup>86</sup> and Dhanapāla had probably himself personally visited this shrine of Ayodhyā.

Dhanapāla, as we learn from later works like the *Prabhāvakaṅkṣā*<sup>87</sup> and *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*,<sup>88</sup> received favours from both Muñja and Bhoja. This is also confirmed by his own work. A summary of this work, entitled *Tilakamañjarīkathāsāra*,<sup>89</sup> was written by another poet of the same name at Patan in vs 1261.

Another work of Dhanapāla is the *Ṛṣabhapañcāsikā*,<sup>90</sup> a poem of 50 stanzas. This is written in Prākṛta and the first twenty verses contain allusions to the events of the life of the first Tīrthamkara; the remaining thirty stanzas are devoted exclusively to praise of Ṛṣabha. This poem contains probably the earliest reference to chess board.<sup>91</sup>

Quite a number of other works by Śvetāmbara writers were written before AD 1000. I should mention here the *Ajitasāntistava*<sup>92</sup> (*Ajīyasantithaya*) by Nandiṣeṇa who lived before the ninth century. This poem, written in rare but artificial metres in Prākṛta, glorifies

Ajita, the second and Śāntinātha, the sixteenth Tīrthaṅkara. It is also probable that the original *Satruñjayamāhātmya*<sup>93</sup> was written, as claimed by the poet, during the reign of one of the Śīlādityas of Valabhī, and afterwards in the later period interpolations were made in the body of this Jaina *Māhātmya*. If this is accepted, then we have to assign the original work before the last quarter of the eighth century, which is the date for the last king of Valabhī, bearing that name.

## REFERENCES

1. *SGJM*, XII, Calcutta, 1940, p. 29.
2. pp. 11 ff.
3. v. 1508.
4. Ed. in *Nemivijñānagranthamālā*, vs 2000. It was translated into German by Leumann as *Die Nonne* in 1921 in *ZB*, III, 193 ff. and 272 ff. A separate offprint was also published. A Gujarati translation was published from Ahmedabad in 1924.
5. See my paper in *Ancient Indian Literary and Cultural Tradition*, pp. 177 ff.
6. Loc. cit.
7. Emphasis mine.
8. Ed., Jacobi, Bhavnagar, 1914; recently Prākṛta Text Society, Varanasi has published the work in two parts.
9. *SBE*, 22, p. 293.
10. Edited in *Ātmānanda Jaina Granthamālā*, Bhavnagar, 1930–31. A Gujarati translation of this text was done by Prof. Sandesara in vs 2003.
11. See his paper in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, London, vol. VIII, 1935–7, pp. 319–33.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 320, n. 1.
13. See Jain, *Prākṛta Sāhitya kā Itihāsa*, p. 381. The *Viśeṣanavati* has been published by Rṣabhadeva Kesarimala Śvetāmbara Saṁsthā, Ratlam, 1927.
14. See *Niś. Cū.*, IV, p. 26; see also *Āva. Cū.*, I, pp. 164, 460; II, p. 324.
15. p. 50; see also Gujarati trans., p. 60.
16. p. 66.
17. p. 74.
18. p. 50.
19. pp. 38, 62.
20. p. 155.
21. p. 38.
22. p. 65.
23. Trans. (Gujarati), pp. 92–130.

24. Ibid., pp. 92–3.
25. Ibid., p. 378.
26. Ibid., p. 350.
27. Ibid., p. 189.
28. Ibid., p. 287.
29. See also Introd., Gujarati trans., pp. 33 ff.
30. Trans., pp. 313 ff.
31. Ibid., p. 319.
32. Ibid., p. 314.
33. Ibid., p. 317.
34. Ibid., pp. 202 ff.
35. Ed., A.N. Upadhye, p. 282.
36. See his Introd., *Samarāiccakahā*, I, p. vi.
37. See his Sanskrit Introduction entitled *Granthakāraparicaya* in his edn., of Haribhadra's *Dharmasaṃgrahīṇī* Bombay, 1918.
38. IX, 48–206.
39. pp. 24 ff.
40. Ed., Jacobi, Calcutta, 1926. It was later edited in two parts by Bhagwandas with Sanskrit *chāyā* and published from Ahmedabad (1938, 1942). There is an abstract of this text compiled by Pradyumna in AD 1214 and edited by Jacobi, Ahmedabad, 1905.
41. *History of Indian Literature*, II, p. 523.
42. See Sastri, *The Coḷas*, p. 217.
43. Ed., Durgaprasad and Parab, XIII.74; for some useful information on Kaṭāha, see *The Ocean of Story* (Tawney & Penzer), I, p. 155, n. 1. In this work Kaṭāha has been mentioned several times.
44. Ed., A.N. Upadhye, Bombay, 1944.
45. See Pīṭhikā, p. 105.
46. See pp. 20 ff. of his 'Critical Study' of the *Dhūrtākhyāna* given in his edn. of that text.
47. Edited in two parts by A.N. Upadhye in Singhi Jaina Granthamālā, Bombay, 1959 and 1970. There is a valuable introduction in the second part by the same scholar.
48. Jain, op. cit., p. 420.
49. Ibid., p. 423.
50. Prākṛta Text Society, Varanasi, 1961.
51. The date 772 is actually given in some manuscripts in the Gupta Saṃvat, which according to Fleet is an error for the Śaka year; see *A Hist. of the Canonical Literature of the Jainas* by Kapadia, p. 197.
52. See *Prastāvanā* in Hindi by A.M. Bhojak in the PTS edn., pp. 54 ff; see also *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 6, p. 70.
53. In the concluding line of his *ṣikā* on the first *Śrutaskandha* of the *Ācārāṅga* we have the information that Śīlācārya belonged to the Nivṛtti *kula*; see *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 3, p. 382, n. 1.
54. pp. 17–27.

55. See Introd. by Klaus Bruhn, p. 29.
56. p. 189.
57. p. 138.
58. p. 154.
59. p. 86.
60. p. 110.
61. p. 232.
62. p. 228.
63. Cf. Alsdorf's view quoted in Klaus Bruhn's Introd., p. 9.
64. Ed., L.B. Gandhi, Singhi Jaina Granthamālā, Bombay, 1949.
65. See D.R. Bhandarkar, *A List of the Inscriptions of Northern India*, nos. 25, 28, 33, and 36.
66. p. 32.
67. p. 177.
68. pp. 177–9.
69. p. 160.
70. p. 148.
71. p. 220.
72. p. 37.
73. Ed. by P. Peterson and Jacobi in *Bibliotheca Indica Series* (Calcutta, 1914). For another edn. see, D.L.P. no. 46.
74. V.22 ff.
75. See Preface, pp. xiii ff.
76. D.R. Bhandarkar, *List*, no. 11.
77. See *HIL*, Winternitz, III, pt. I, pp. 222.
78. See p. 147.
79. II.20; VII.1; VIII.10.
80. Jacobi, op. cit., p. xviii.
81. See the paper entitled 'Mahākavi Dhanapāla aur Unkī *Tīlakamañjari*', in Guru Gopaladas Baraiya Smṛtigrantha, pp. 484–91. See Merutuṅga, *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, pp. 36 ff.
82. Ed., Kāvya-mālā Series, Bombay, 1938.
83. See G.C. Chowdhary, *PHNI*, p. 85.
84. *Ibid.*, pp. 85 ff.
85. Ed., Muni Jinavijaya, Santiniketan, 1934, p. 73.
86. See *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, ed., Muni Jinavijaya, p. 36.
87. See the Prabandha entitled 'Mahendrasūriprabandha'.
88. pp. 36 ff.
89. Ed., Ahmedabad, 1970.
90. Ed. in Kāvya-mālā Series, pt. VII; see also *Jinaratnakośa*, p. 3. A German trans. along with the original text, ed., Klatt was published in *ZDMG*, 33, pp. 445 ff.
91. See Klatt, op. cit., pp. 465 ff.
92. Ed., Vīravijaya, Ahmedabad, vs 1992.
93. See *IA*, 30, pp. 239 ff; 288 ff.

## CHAPTER XIII

### Digambara Literature

The Digambaras, who formally separated themselves from the original *saṃgha* in the early years of the second century AD, can rightly boast of an exceedingly rich literature. However, the so-called canonical texts of this sect, unlike the Śvetāmbara canon, is devoid of any interest for students of history. The subject treated in these canonical works are technical in nature and of interest only to students of metaphysics. The canonical texts of the Digambaras were discovered from Mudbidri in South Kanara district of Karnataka some fifty years ago. The first part of the canon is known both as the *Karmaṣrābhṛta* and the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*. The earliest available commentary on it is the *Dhavalā* written by Vīrasena, who describes himself as a disciple of Āryanandin and a grand-disciple of Candrasena of the Pañcastūpānvaya who had studied the Siddhānta under Elācārya. The commentary was completed in Śaka 738 corresponding to AD 816 when Amoghavarṣa I was the reigning king.<sup>1</sup> That commentator gives us some information regarding the original authors of the *Karmaṣrābhṛta*.

According to Vīrasena,<sup>2</sup> after the death of Lohācārya, the twenty-eighth *guru* in succession to Mahāvīra, the knowledge of ancient scriptures became practically extinct. There was only one saint, Dharasena who had some knowledge of those ancient texts. This saint was originally a resident of Girinagara (Girnar). While he was engaged in penances in the Candragumphā Cave of Girnar hill, he decided to send a letter to the monks of Dakṣiṇāpatha warning them against the danger of the complete extinction of the knowledge of early scriptures. The monks, on receipt of that letter sent two intelligent monks called Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali to Dharasena who taught them ancient scriptures. These two monks later composed the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* and, according to Vīrasena, that work was completed 683 years after the *nirvāṇa* of Mahāvīra. We further learn that Puṣpadanta composed the first 20 cardinal *sūtras* and the rest of the work running to 6000 *sūtras* was completed by Bhūtabali.

The above discussion shows that the earliest Digambara canon, according to their own testimony, is not earlier than the second century AD. This indirectly supports the Śvetāmbara tradition regarding the date of the formal separation of the Digambaras from the original *saṃgha*. We have already seen, that according to the Śvetāmbaras, the Digambaras separated 609 years after the *nirvāṇa* of Mahāvīra. It is natural that after their separation they should be in search of a separate canon for themselves. The testimony of Virasena shows that the Digambara canon was originally compiled in western India in which the monks of the south also took part. Although the Digambaras reject the authenticity of the Śvetāmbara sacred texts, their early writers do not hesitate to quote from the Śvetāmbara canon, and even Virasena has shown complete acquaintance with a number of these sacred texts.<sup>3</sup>

Virasena further informs us that at the time of the compilation of the sacred texts, the Digambara monks of the south were assembled at the town of Mahimā which was situated on the bank of the river Veṅyā (modern Bena) in Andhra country, and which is identified with Mahimānagar in the district of Satārā in present-day Maharashtra. The commentary written by Virasena runs to 72,000 *ślokas* and was based, according to his own statement, on the earlier commentaries, including that written by the celebrated Kundakunda. A number of earlier commentaries are also mentioned in Indranandi's *Śrutāvātāra*,<sup>4</sup> but none of these has survived. The *Dhavalā* commentary was written at Vāṭagrāmapura, which has not yet been properly identified.<sup>5</sup>

The second part of the Digambara canon is known as the *Kaṣāyaprabhṛta*<sup>6</sup> which was written by one Guṇadhara Ācārya, who was probably a contemporary of Bhūtabali and Puṣpadanta.<sup>7</sup> The work runs into 233 verses, of which probably the first 180 were written by Guṇadhara.<sup>8</sup> The earliest commentary on it is the *Cūmīsūtra* of Yativṛṣabha, who as we will see afterwards, probably flourished in the last quarter of the sixth century AD. Yativṛṣabha, we are told, followed the commentary of Ārya Maṅkhu and Nāgahastin.<sup>9</sup> Later, according to Indranandi two other commentators wrote their learned treatises on this work and finally Virasena composed the first 20,000 *ślokas* of his *Jayadhavalā*, which was later completed in 60,000 *ślokas* by his disciple Jinasena. This great commentary<sup>10</sup> was completed in Śaka 759, when Amoghavarṣa I was reigning.<sup>11</sup> We should also refer to the last part of the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* called

*Mahābandha* written by Bhūtabali<sup>12</sup> which runs to 40,000 *ślokas*, and on which Vīrasena has not written any commentary.

I have already said that the Digambara Āgamic texts are devoid of any interest, at least for the historian. However, students of Jaina philosophy and metaphysics treat them as source-books, and later Jaina philosophers have freely borrowed from these texts. Let us then turn our attention to a few other Digambara Jaina texts, which also deal with abstruse points of Digambara philosophy. I shall not discuss here the works of the celebrated Digambara philosophers, which I propose to do in the next chapter, but only refer to a few classics which deal with doctrinal matters.

The *Mūlācāra*<sup>13</sup> of Vaṭṭakera which runs to 1252 verses is one of the earliest non-canonical Digambara works dealing with various practices of Jaina ascetics. The work is divided into 12 parts (*adhikāra*). There are a few interesting stories for which the author is indebted to the earlier Śvetāmbara canon. Like the *Nandīsūtra* and *Anuyogadvāra* it condemns works like the *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Mahābhārata*, *Arthasāstra*, etc. Some of the rules for the Jaina monks are directly taken from the Śvetāmbara canonical texts, including the *Bṛhatkalpa* and a few of the verses remind us of the *Daśavaikālika*.<sup>14</sup> It has been claimed<sup>15</sup> that the author, Vaṭṭakera, should be identified with Kundakunda; but there is no genuine basis for such a suggestion. From the linguistic point of view, the work should be assigned to the fifth century AD.

The *Bhagavatī Ārāadhanā*<sup>16</sup> appears to be a work of the same period. It has little over 2,100 verses and its Prākṛta bears close similarity with the Prākṛta of the *Mūlācāra*.<sup>17</sup> It was composed, according to the colophon of the work, by Pāṇitalabhojī Śivārya, who studied the Mūlasūtras at the feet of Ārya Jinanandi Gaṇī, Ārya Śarvagupta Gaṇī, and Ārya Mitranandi Gaṇī. We have already seen in a previous chapter<sup>18</sup> that there was a Pāṇitalabhojī Digambara ascetic during the reign of Rāmagupta, who lived in the latter half of the fourth century AD. Prabhācandra, who wrote his *Kathākośa* during the reign of Jayasīmha of Dhārā (mid-eleventh century AD) claims that this Śivārya (also called Śivakoṭi) was previously a king and later converted by the celebrated Samantabhadra.<sup>19</sup> We are further told by him that his work was based on the *Ārāadhanā* of Lohācārya which ran to 84,000 verses. We must however note that Hariṣeṇa who wrote his *Kathākośa* much earlier, does not represent Śivārya as a disciple of the great Samantabhadra, although his work too, like that of Prabhācandra,

is based on the work written by Śivārya.

Śivārya refers to a number of Śvetāmbara texts, including *Kalpa*, *Vyavahāra*, *Ācārāṅga*, and *Īṭakalpa*. This work, which deals with the conduct of Jaina ascetics, has verses common with the *Mūlācāra* and a few Śvetāmbara canonical texts. Some scholars identify its author Śivārya with Śivabhūti, which can be rejected outright.<sup>20</sup> The probable date of Śivabhūti is the second century AD, while Śivārya lived in the Gupta period. There is a Sanskrit commentary on the *Ārāḍhanā* written by Aparājita called *Śrīvijayodayā*. This individual was a disciple of one Baladevasūri and grand-disciple of Candranandi, and tells us too that he was inspired by Nāganandi. He also wrote, interestingly, a commentary on the celebrated Śvetāmbara Āgamic poem *Daśavaikālika*. He shows his acquaintance with the philosophy of Pūjyapāda and the *Varāṅgacarita* of Jaṭāsīmhanandin. In all probability, Aparājita lived in the eighth century AD. A number of later commentaries are also known,<sup>21</sup> which shows that *Ārāḍhanā* was looked upon as an extremely valuable work by the Digambara monks of later times. In the early tenth century Hariṣeṇa composed his *Bṛhatkathākośa*, which according to his own testimony was based on the original *Ārāḍhanā*. This work will be discussed later in this chapter.

The original *Lokavibhāga*,<sup>22</sup> now lost, was written according to its translator Simhasūri in Śaka 380 corresponding to the twenty-second regnal year of king Simhavarman of Kāñcī. We are further told that its author was Sarvanandi, who was a resident of the village of Pāṭalika, which was situated in the Pāṇḍya kingdom. This shows that there existed a Digambara work on cosmography as early as the fifth century AD. Yativṛṣabha in his *Tiloyapaṇṇati* has repeatedly referred to this work.

I have already mentioned that Yativṛṣabha had written a commentary (*cūṛṇī*) on the *Kāśāyaprābhṛta*. The same saint is the author of the famous work on Jaina cosmography called *Tiloyapaṇṇati*.<sup>23</sup> Vīrasena in his *Dhavalā* frequently invokes him and quotes *gāthās* which are found with minor variations in the current edition of the work.<sup>24</sup> That the author lived after the fifth century AD is also testified to by the fact that he mentions the *Lokavibhāga* several times, and also shows acquaintance with the *Mūlācāra*. It has been argued<sup>25</sup> that the *Lokavibhāga* was known to Jinabhadra Kṣamāśramaṇa, for whom we have a date Śaka 531 corresponding to AD 609. He could not however have flourished much earlier, since he refers to the



duration of the Gupta rule as either 221<sup>26</sup> or 255.<sup>27</sup> It appears that the poet probably lived in the last quarter of the sixth century AD. He is the first writer to refer to the duration of the rule of the Imperial Guptas, and his testimony is strikingly confirmed by the evidence of Gupta inscriptions. It further appears that the earlier figure of 221 for the duration of the Gupta rule is more reasonable than the latter figure of 255.<sup>28</sup> We are also grateful to Yativṛṣabha for giving us an idea about post-Candragupta chronology. Incidentally, he is the earliest author to mention that Candragupta Maurya was a Jaina.<sup>29</sup> Later writers, including the author of the Jaina *Hari-vamśa*, were influenced by Yativṛṣabha. The *Tiloyapaṇṇatī* is divided into nine sections and runs to 8,000 verses. It gives a great deal of information on Jaina doctrine and Purāṇic tradition about Tīrthamkaras. It has been claimed that Yativṛṣabha was at home with the science of mathematics,<sup>30</sup> and he also describes the five hills of Rājagṛha called Pañcaselaṇayara, i.e., Pañcaśailanagara.<sup>31</sup> In addition he mentions a number of places which were regarded as sacred to the Jains. Yativṛṣabha is mentioned as an enemy of the Buddhists in the *Bṛhathakākośa*<sup>32</sup> of Hariṣeṇa, which was written in AD 931.

The well-known *Svāmīkārṭtikeyānupreksā*<sup>33</sup> is a very important and popular work among the Digambara Jains. It explains the 12 *anupreksās* or meditations and has therefore altogether 12 chapters. These *anupreksās* are recommended both for monks and laymen. According to J. C. Jain, this work was written in the early centuries of the Christian era;<sup>34</sup> and he goes on to suggest that the author Svāmī Kumāra should be identified with Kumāranandin of a Mathurā inscription,<sup>35</sup> dated Śaka 87. There is, however, little doubt that Kumāranandin of that inscription was a Śvetāmbara saint and this work is a typical Digambara product. A. N. Upadhye has shown that in no work before thirteenth century AD, has this text been referred to.<sup>36</sup> He further argues that the author was acquainted with the *Gommaṭasāra* of Nemicandra, written in the tenth century AD. Even if we reject this argument, we cannot suggest a much earlier date for this work. Its author was clearly influenced by the views of Kundakunda and Śivārya. Among other important didactic Digambara works of the tenth century I must mention the *Gommaṭasāra* and the works of Devasena. The Prākṛta *Gommaṭasāra*<sup>37</sup> was written by Nemicandra, a close friend of the well-known Cāmuṇḍarāya, who lived in the last quarter of the tenth century AD.

This work was also named after that great minister, whose original name was 'Gommaṭa'. Nemicandra is heavily indebted to earlier writers like Yativṛṣabha and Vīrasena. His work consists of two parts, Jīvakāṇḍa and Karmakāṇḍa. 'It is a kind of natural history of the living beings' and needless to say, is frankly unreadable. Devasena was the author of the works *Ārāḍhanāsāra*<sup>38</sup> and *Darśanasāra*.<sup>39</sup> Fortunately for us, in his *Darśanasāra* he has informed us that he was a resident of Dhārā and lived around AD 933. We are further told that this work was composed in the temple of Pārśvanātha which was situated in that town.<sup>40</sup> Devasena has given us some vital information regarding the origin of sects like Kāṣṭhāsāṃgha, Māthurasāṃgha, Drāviḍasāṃgha, and Yāpanīyasāṃgha.

Let us now turn our attention to the creative works of literature written by Digambara poets and writers. Before doing so however, we must refer to the Jainendra grammar. This work,<sup>41</sup> which is ascribed to Devanandi Pūjyapāda, has altogether five chapters and that is why it is also known as the *Pañcādhyāyī*. Pūjyapāda refers to earlier Jaina savants like Śrīdatta (1.4.34), Yaśobhadra (2.1.99), Bhūtabali (3.4.83), Prabhācandra (4.3.180), Siddhasena (5.1.7), and lastly Samantabhadra (5.4.140). Now, regarding the dating of Pūjyapāda there is now no confusion. Devasena in his *Darśanasāra*<sup>42</sup> has clearly stated that Vajranandin, the disciple of Pūjyapāda, founded the Drāviḍasāṃgha in southern Mathurā (i.e., Madura) in vs 526 which corresponds to AD 468. The preceptor of Vajranandin, Pūjyapāda, should therefore, be assigned to the first half of the fifth century AD. It is interesting, as pointed out by Premi,<sup>43</sup> that Samantabhadra was a contemporary of Pūjyapāda, as he also was acquainted with Pūjyapāda's works. There are a number of early commentaries on Pūjyapāda's Grammar, including one by Abhayanandi and another by Prabhācandra. The latter was a contemporary of Paramāra Bhoja.<sup>44</sup>

No Digambara literary work, written before the seventh century, is now available. The earliest datable work is the *Padmapurāṇa*<sup>45</sup> of Ācārya Raviṣeṇa which was written, according to the testimony of the poet himself, 1203.5 years after Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa*. This suggests a date around AD 678. That poet further informs us that he was a disciple of Lakṣmaṇasena and grand-disciple of Arhatmuni.<sup>46</sup> The latter, in turn, was a disciple of Divākara; Divākara's preceptor was Indra. We can, therefore, assign the earliest *guru* Indra to the last quarter of the sixth century AD.

The *Padmapurāṇa* or *Padmacarita*, as I have already pointed out, is a free and direct Sanskrit translation of Vimala's Prākṛta text. However, nowhere in the text does Raviṣeṇa care to acknowledge his debt to the original poet. He simply states<sup>47</sup> that he followed the work of Anuttaravāgmin who, according to Svayambhū, was identical with Kīrtidhara, yet no work of Kīrtidhara is known. I can understand why Raviṣeṇa has not mentioned Vimala in his work; the former was a diehard Digambara and the latter a Śvetāmbara poet. It appears that before Raviṣeṇa, one Kīrtidhara made an attempt to translate Vimala's Prākṛta *kāvya* into Sanskrit. However, the popularity of Raviṣeṇa's work forced Kīrtidhara's poem out of the literary scene. Although Raviṣeṇa is a mere translator, we have to concede that he was endowed with a genuine poetical fervour. The *Padmapurāṇa* is an exceedingly popular work among the Digambara Jains. That Raviṣeṇa was a learned poet is also evident from various chapters of his work. In chap. 24, in connection with enumeration of Kaikeyī's skill, Raviṣeṇa has displayed his deep knowledge of various branches of learning. Like Vimala, he too, is thoroughly anti-Brahmanical, and he was probably inspired by Bāṇa's style. His descriptions of war-preparation (12.181 ff.) and a love-scene (16.192 ff.) remind us of Bāṇa's style. As Bāṇa lived between AD 560 and 620, and Raviṣeṇa in the last quarter of the seventh century, there is nothing inherently improbable in latter following the former. Raviṣeṇa's easy, graceful style is also responsible for his extreme popularity. Later poets like Udyotanasūri, the author of the *Kuvalayamālā* (Śaka 700) and Jinasena II, the author of the *Harivamśapurāṇa* (Śaka 705) refer to Raviṣeṇa with deference.<sup>48</sup> Since *Padmapurāṇa* is a mere translation of the *Paumacariyam*, it is useless to discuss its contents. I have elsewhere<sup>49</sup> sought to show that Raviṣeṇa had heard about the Muslims.

To the seventh century we can assign another poem written by a Digambara poet, the *Varāṅgacarita*<sup>50</sup> of Jaṭasīmhanandi. As late as 1933 it was believed that this work was composed by Raviṣeṇa. The two crucial verses referring to this work in the *Kuvalayamālā* and *Harivamśapurāṇa* were misunderstood by scholars.<sup>51</sup> However, after the discovery of a number of manuscripts of this poem and the references to its author in various later works, all doubts disappeared regarding its actual authorship. As I have just indicated, the earliest reference to the *Varāṅgacarita* is to be found in the work of Śvetāmbara Udyotanasūri, who wrote in Śaka 700. Five years later,

Jinasena, in his *Harivamśa*, praised this work. In the available manuscripts of this work, however, the name of its author has not been disclosed, but Udyotanasūri has referred to Jaṭiḷa,<sup>52</sup> and later writers like Cāmuṇḍarāya and Dhavala, the author of the Apabhramśa *Harivamśa*,<sup>53</sup> have clearly mentioned him. The name Jaṭāsīmhanandi is first found in the *Cāmuṇḍarāyapurāna*. As A.N. Upadhye rightly conjectures,<sup>54</sup> Cāmuṇḍarāya calls him by that name in order to distinguish him from earlier Sīmhanandis.<sup>55</sup> Still later writers like Nayasena, Pārśvapaṇḍita, Janna, and others show their acquaintance with the *Varāṅgacarita* and its author Jaṭāsīmhanandi.

An epigraph from the holy Kopbal area in Raichur district of Karnataka, as noted in a previous chapter,<sup>56</sup> refers to this poet, who was evidently viewed as a great saint. It was probably inscribed a few centuries after the death of this savant. It, therefore, appears that Jaṭāsīmhanandi became a celebrated figure in both north and south India after his demise.

The poem *Varāṅgacarita* runs to 31 chapters and describes the vicissitudes of the life of prince Varāṅga, the son of Dharmasena of the Bhoja family, who ruled at Uttamapura in the territory of Vinita (Ayodhyā). Some of the adventures of this prince remind us of those of Vasudeva, as described in the Śvetāmbara work *Vasudevahiṇḍī*. However, written in easy, graceful Sanskrit, it is a much more readable work. The poet uniformly calls it *dharmakathā*, which according to Haribhadra's definition is full of religious topics.<sup>57</sup> Varāṅga, the hero, is represented as possessing great religious virtues. The poet, as shown by Upadhye,<sup>58</sup> was influenced by the views of Kundakunda, Umāsvāti, Samantabhadra, Siddhasena, and others. In chapters XXIV–XXV he attacks the views of the different schools in an amateurish way and it appears from this apparent immaturity that he was a comparatively young man when he wrote this poem.

It appears from the poem that Jainism enjoyed rare prosperity during Jaṭiḷa's time.<sup>59</sup> There are references to gorgeous Jaina temples with images of precious stones.<sup>60</sup> Elsewhere, he has referred to the scenes of the Purāṇas which were painted or carved on the walls of the temples.<sup>61</sup> He also refers to the royal gifts of villages to the Jaina temples.<sup>62</sup> A number of *janapadas*, including Aṅga, Vaṅga, Magadha, Kaliṅga, Suhma, Puṇḍra, Kuru, Aśmaka, Ābhīra, Avanti, Kosala, Matsya, Saurāṣṭra, Vindhya-pāla, Mahendra, Sauvīra, Saindhava, Kāśmīra, Oḍra, Vaidarbha, Vaidiśā, Pañcāla, etc. are mentioned in one place in the poem.<sup>63</sup> Elsewhere, Kāmojja, Bāhlika,

Siṃhala, Barbara, Kirāta, Gāndhāra, Pulinda are mentioned as non-Aryan peoples.<sup>64</sup> The poet was equally at home with Hindu Purāṇic stories.<sup>65</sup>

The well-known Dhanañjaya was the author of the *Rāghava-pāṇḍavīya* or *Dvisandhāna*<sup>66</sup> an epic in eighteen cantos. Practically nothing is known about the personal life of the poet except that his father was one Vasudeva, and his mother bore the name Śrīdevī. Probably his *guru* was a certain Daśaratha. It has been suggested that he was probably not a monk but a Digambara layman.<sup>67</sup> This poem by Dhanañjaya has been praised by a number of poets, including the famous Rājaśekhara who lived around AD 900. The poem is based on the two Hindu epics, the *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata*, and unlike most Jaina works, the characters are not represented as embracing the religion of the Jinās. He was inspired, it appears, by the writings of Kālidāsa, Bhāravi, and Māgha. His other works are *Nāmamālā*, *Anekārthanāmamālā*, and *Viṣāpahārastotra*. Even Vīrasena in his *Dhavalā*<sup>68</sup> has quoted a verse from the *Anekārthanāmamālā*. This shows that Dhanañjaya probably lived in the eighth century AD, if not earlier. N.L. Premi has shown<sup>69</sup> that Jināsena I in his *Ādīpurāṇa* has consciously imitated a particular verse from the *Viṣāpahārastotra*, and also drawn our attention to the fact that Somadeva (mid-tenth century) in his famous *Yaśastīlakacampū*, writes a verse in imitation of that very Dhanañjaya poem.<sup>70</sup> This shows that the Jaina poets and philosophers from AD 800, were inspired by the writings of Dhanañjaya.

To the eighth century we can assign at least two poems, written by the Digambara poets. The first *Pārśvābhyudaya*,<sup>71</sup> was written by Jināsena I. Jināsena II, in his well-known *Harivamśa*, which was completed in Śaka 705, refers to this poem of Jināsena I who, as we have already seen, was the famous disciple of the illustrious Vīrasena. It follows therefore that *Pārśvābhyudaya* was written before AD 783.

The poem runs to four cantos, and comprises altogether 364 stanzas, and was written in imitation of the famous *Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa. Like *Meghadūta*, it is written in the Mandākrāntā metre. This is a poetical life-story of Pārśvanātha and encapsulates the entire *Meghadūta* by inserting one or two lines from that poem of Kālidāsa, whilst Jināsena I composed the rest. Needless to say, there is little similarity between the love-sick *yakṣa* of Kālidāsa and the twenty-third Tīrthaṅkara of the Jainas, yet Jināsena I, it appears, has acquitted himself creditably in this difficult and delicate task.

Probably the most remarkable Digambara poem of the second half of the eighth century is the *Harivamśapurāṇa*<sup>72</sup> of Jinasena II, written according to the colophon of the poem in Śaka 705 corresponding to AD 783. In a previous chapter I discussed the information supplied by Jinasena II on the political condition of his time. This poem, unlike many Jaina works, gives very faithful, account of the social, religious, and cultural condition of India of the eighth century.<sup>73</sup> There is detailed list<sup>74</sup> of peoples which can be compared with the similar lists in the Purāṇas and other works. The only reference to the ancient town of Karṇasuvarṇa in Indian literature is to be found in this work.<sup>75</sup> As I have already observed, the poet was influenced by Yativṛṣabha. He was also equally at home with Brahmanical works, including the Vaiṣṇava Purāṇas. As Premi has pointed out,<sup>76</sup> Jinasena II is the only writer to give a continuous list of Jaina teachers from the days of Lohārya (same as Lohācārya), who flourished 683 years after Mahāvīra's demise, to his own time, i.e., AD 783. There are altogether 29 preceptors between Lohārya and Jinasena II, and the average amount to a little over 21, which is quite reasonable. It should however, be remembered that the author belonged to the Punnāṭa Saṃgha, which originated in the ancient Punnāṭa country, which was another name for Karnataka.

The composition of the *Harivamśa* was started at the well-known ancient town of Vardhamāna in Gujarat and was completed at the town of Dostaṭikā (modern Dottāḍi).<sup>77</sup> Vardhamāna is described as a prosperous city, and a similar picture of this town is to be found in Hariṣeṇa's *Bṛhatkathākośa*,<sup>78</sup> which was completed in AD 931, some 150 years after the *Harivamśa*. Among the earlier poets and philosophers, mentioned by Jinasena II, the following deserve notice: Samantabhadra, Siddhasena, Devanandi, Vajrasūri (the same as Vajranandi, the disciple of Devanandi-Pūjyapāda), Mahāsena (the author of the missing *Sulocanākathā*), Raviṣeṇa, Jaṭasīmhanandi, Śānta (probably the same as Śāntiṣeṇa, about whom nothing is known), Viśeṣavādi (also mentioned by Vādirāja),<sup>79</sup> Kumārasena (whose fame was comparable to that of Prabhācandra),<sup>80</sup> Virasena, Jinasena I, and the unknown author of the *Vardhamānapurāṇa*.<sup>81</sup>

Several great Digambara poets and writers of the ninth century enriched Indian literature by their solid contributions. We should first discuss the *Ādipurāṇa*<sup>82</sup> written by Jinasena I, whose *Pārsuvābhyudaya* was written before AD 783, and who completed the *Jayadhavalā* of his *guru* in Śaka 759, corresponding to AD 838. There is little doubt

that Jinasena I had a long life and his earliest poem *Pārsvābhyudaya* was probably written in his early youth. We further learn from his disciple Guṇabhadra that Jinasena I could not complete his *Ādipurāṇa*, and Guṇabhadra wrote the last 1620 *śloka*s of this poem which runs to 12,000 verses. Jinasena I was the author of the first forty-two chapters and the 3 verses of the chapter forty-three. The remaining portion of the latter and the last four chapters were written by Guṇabhadra.

The *Ādipurāṇa* is undoubtedly one of the finest poems written in the early medieval period. It was apparently written after the *Jayadhavalā* commentary, and he was naturally a man of advanced years at the time of its composition. The poem deals with the life of Rṣabha, also known as Ādinātha. The poet calls it both 'Purāṇa' and 'Mahākāvya'. It has been called an encyclopaedia of the Digambara religion.<sup>83</sup> He started this poem in order to write the lives of 63 great men, but was able to only complete the lives of the first Tīrthaṅkara and the first Cakravartin, i.e., Bharata. His knowledge of the writings of the Brāhmaṇas and the various arts is yet to be equalled by any Jaina writer. Being himself a Brāhmaṇa in his early life, he was acquainted with the Smṛti texts. His knowledge regarding the various *janapadas* is also remarkable.<sup>84</sup> In chapter 16 there is a short account of town-planning. A treatise on the duties of warriors and the art of governance is to be found in the forty-second chapter. He has also poetically described the six seasons, moonrise, sunrise, etc.<sup>85</sup> Even the beauty of the female body has not eluded his attention.<sup>86</sup> The various love scenes portrayed by the poet fully justify my contention that the Jaina poets scrupulously followed the footsteps of earlier Hindu poets in their treatment of love, romance, etc. The poet writes in an easy, limpid style and we would be fully justified in calling him the greatest Jaina poet of all times.

Guṇabhadra, the great disciple of a great preceptor, as I have already said, is the author of the last portion of the *Ādipurāṇa* and the whole of the *Uttarapurāṇa*.<sup>87</sup> The two poems are together known as the *Mahāpurāṇa*. The *Uttarapurāṇa* runs to 8,000 verses and is therefore a shorter poem than the poem of Jinasena I. He had great respect for his preceptor.<sup>88</sup> It was formerly supposed that the *Uttarapurāṇa* was completed in Śaka 820, corresponding to AD 898, but Premi has shown<sup>89</sup> that the *prāśasti* of this poem was written by two poets, Guṇabhadra and his disciple Lokasena. The first 27 verses of the *prāśasti* were written by Guṇabhadra in which he has expressed

the hope that educated readers would pay all respect to this *Mahāpurāṇa* and make arrangements for the availability of a sufficient number of copies. From v. 28 to the end the *praśasti* was the work of by Lokasena. We are told by him that the work was consecrated at Baṅkāpura in Śaka 820 when Akālavarṣa, i.e., Rāṣtrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa II was on the throne and Sāmanta Lokāditya was governing the region around that town. Premi suggests<sup>90</sup> that Guṇabhadra was probably not alive at that time and the work was completed much earlier.

Like his *guru*, Guṇabhadra was also a very accomplished poet. In this work he has written about all the Tirthaṅkaras except Ṛṣabha and other great men of Jaina mythology. The story of Rāma, narrated in chaps. 67–8 of this poem, is a deliberate distortion of the story of Vālmiki. Daśaratha here, like the *Daśaratha Jātaka*, is painted as the king of Vārāṇasī. Sītā here is the daughter of Mandodarī, the wife of Rāvaṇa. Rāma's mother is one Subālā, and Lakṣmaṇa is the son of Kaikeyī. The story told in the *Abbhuta Rāmāyaṇa* is similar to that narrated by Guṇabhadra. The author has also made several changes in his treatment of the story of the other Hindu epic, the *Mahābhārata*. Karṇa is here painted as the real son of Pāṇḍu who, we are told, committed intercourse incognito with the virgin Kuntī (23.109 ff.). Karṇa, who was abandoned by his mother, was later rescued by king Āditya (the name is significant) who, afterwards asked his barren wife Rādhā to bring him up (23.112). He further informs us that the system of *prājāpatya* marriage started in ancient India with the marriage of Pāṇḍu and Kuntī (23.115). The examples of such distortions can be easily multiplied, but unlike other Jaina poets, Guṇabhadra has the frankness to ask his readers to consult the original work for details (25.117).<sup>91</sup> The story of Jīvandhara, as told in chap. 75, is quite interesting, and later writers both in Sanskrit and Tamil wrote on it.

Svayambhū, like Vimala and Raviṣeṇa, wrote on the Rāma story. The name of his work is *Paumacariyu*,<sup>92</sup> and is written in the Apabhraṁśa language. In the very opening stanza of the first Sandhi of his work the poet declares that he has taken on the narration of the Rāma story having kept the Ārṣa in view. The colophons of all the *parvans* of Raviṣeṇa's *Padmapurāṇa* begin with it: *ityārṣe śrī raviṣeṇācāryaṅprokte padmapurāṇe*. This makes it clear that Svayambhū's reference pertains to that work. Elsewhere in Svayambhū's work (I.2.9) we are told that he has embarked upon such a vast theme



through the favour of Ācārya Raviṣeṇa.

The work is divided into five Books (called *kāṇḍas*), viz., Vijjhārā, Ujjhā, Sundara, Jujjha, and Uttara. The books are further divided into *sandhis*. Now, the earliest writer to refer to Svayambhū directly is Puṣpadanta, who wrote in AD 959. However, as the editor Bhayani has shown,<sup>93</sup> Svayambhū could not have written before the second half of the ninth century AD, as he has referred<sup>94</sup> to Seuṇadeśa, which was founded by Seuṇacandra I in the first half of the ninth century AD. This country, according to the poet, was washed by the river Bhīmā (Bhīmarahī).<sup>95</sup> It has been suggested that Svayambhū should be identified<sup>96</sup> with Śrīpāla mentioned by Jinesena I in his *Jayadhavalā* and *Ādīpurāṇa*. There is however really no basis for such a surmise since Svayambhū lived after Jinasena I.

The poet supplies us with some interesting information about the economic condition of India of his days. He mentions a number of countries with their special products<sup>97</sup>: betel-leaf of Deulavaḍaya, i. e., Devakulapāṭaka, betel-nut of Cedi, *kañcuā* or *kañcuka* of Citrakūṭa, jewel of Sri Lanka, musk of Nepal, molasses of Rāmapura, arrow of Pratiṣṭhāna, etc. Another list, preserved by Svayambhū,<sup>98</sup> mentions various places along with the beautiful parts of the body for which their women were famous. Since the list is very interesting I reproduce it below:

<i>Places</i>	<i>Parts of the body</i>	<i>Places</i>	<i>Parts of the body</i>
Paunāra	Soles of feet	Paścimadeśa	Shoulders
Cedi	Nails	Dvārakā	Arms
Golla	Fingers	Sindhava	Wrists
Mākandī	Ankles	Kaccha	Neck
Śrīparvata	Knees	Karnataka	Teeth
Nepal	Thighs	Tuṅgaviṣaya	Nose
Karahāṭaka	Waist	Ujjayinī	Eyes
Kāñcī	Hips	Citrakūṭa	Forehead
Gambhīrā	Navel	Kanauj	Ears
Siṅgāriya	Back	Dakṣiṇadeśa	Courteous manners
Elāpura	Breasts		
Madhyadeśa	Chest		

Svayambhū, elsewhere in his poem,<sup>99</sup> has given a list of peoples,<sup>100</sup> which is quite interesting from the point of view of historical geography.

There are indications in Svayambhū's text that he was helped by his son called Tribhuvana-Svayambhū, who was also known as Kavirāja Cakravartī.<sup>101</sup> It appears that the son had put the finishing touches to his father's works. A second work written by Svayambhū and his son is known, the *Ritṭhaṇemicariyu* or *Harivaṃśapurāṇa*. This work<sup>102</sup> runs to 18,000 verses and has altogether 112 *sandhis* and 3 Books (*kāṇḍas*), namely Yādava, Kuru, and Yudha. A third work, written by the father and son called *Pañcamicariyu* remains to be discovered.<sup>103</sup>

Among other Digambara writers of the ninth century we can mention the names of Ugrāditya, Śākaṭāyana, Mahāvīrācārya, and Amoghavarṣa I. Ugrāditya was the author of the *Kalyāṇakāraka*,<sup>104</sup> a medical treatise written in accordance with the testimony of the poet during the reign of Amoghavarṣa I. We are further told that the author belonged to the Deśī *gaṇa*, Pustaka *gaccha*, Pansogavalli *śākhā* of the Mūlasaṃgha of the line of Kundakunda. One Lalitakīrti Ācārya was a colleague of his, and his *guru* was Śrīnandī in whose establishment at Rāmagiri, which was situated in the level plains of Veṅgi in the country of Trīkaliṅga, Ugrāditya wrote his treatise, That monks belonging to the Deśī *gaṇa* resided in this part of India is testified to by a tenth-century inscription found from Udayagiri-Khaṇḍagiri, which has already been discussed.<sup>105</sup> The author further claims that the discourse on the uselessness of a meat diet was delivered in the court of Śrī Nṛpatuṅga Vallabha Mahārājādhirāja, who was none other than Amoghavarṣa I.<sup>106</sup> A few scholars refuse to believe that this work was composed at such an early date;<sup>107</sup> but there is no genuine basis for their suspicion.

The work, written in Sanskrit, is divided into two parts with 25 chapters. It further appears that the author was acquainted with the earlier medical texts, including those written by Hindu and Jaina authorities. It further appears that the author was deeply indebted to the works of medicine, written by Samantabhadra and Pūjyapāda.

Śākaṭāyana, who was also a contemporary of Amoghavarṣa I, was the author of the *Śabdānuśāsana* and its commentary *Amoghavṛtti*,<sup>108</sup> undoubtedly written in the second half of the ninth century. He belonged to the Yāpanīya Saṃgha, as we learn from the commentary on *Nandīsūtra* by Malayagiri.<sup>109</sup>

Mahāvīrācārya was the celebrated author of the *Gaṇitasārasaṃgraha*,<sup>110</sup> which was written, according to the testimony of the writer, during the reign of Amoghavarṣa I, who is described by him as the follower of *Syādvāda*.<sup>111</sup> The author was acquainted with

*Brāhmasphuṭasiddhānta* of Brahmagupta. It has been claimed<sup>112</sup> that he was much advanced in his field and his treatment of geometrical problems deserves special notice. The work was very much popular in south India and a Telugu translation appeared in the eleventh century.<sup>113</sup>

Amoghavarṣa I, who had special love for the Jaina religion, is the author of the *Praśnottararatnamālā*,<sup>114</sup> which also exists in Tibetan translation.<sup>115</sup> The work begins with an adoration to Vardhamāna<sup>116</sup> which shows that it is a Jaina poem. The author displays typical Jaina sentiment in his work, which is natural for a person with Jaina leanings.

The most remarkable Digambara Jaina author in the first half of the tenth century was Hariṣeṇa, the author of the *Bṛhatkathākośa*.<sup>117</sup> Fortunately for us, he not only states the year of its composition, but also refers to the king in whose kingdom, his work was composed. In the *praśasti*<sup>118</sup> he gives the date both in the Śāka and Vikrama years. It was composed in vs 989 or Śāka 853, corresponding to AD 931–2, when Vinayādikapāla was the ruling sovereign. The place of its composition is given as Vardhamāna, where Jinasena II had begun the composition of his *Harivamśa*. Emperor Vinayādikapāla is to be identified with the Pratīhāra Vināyakapāla, who ruled, according to his Asiatic Society plate, in AD 931.<sup>119</sup> Several other inscriptions of this sovereign are known.<sup>120</sup> His kingdom has been compared with that of Indra (*Śakroṣamānake*).<sup>121</sup> Hariṣeṇa's evidence testifies that the Pratīhāra suzerainty was accepted in Gujarat as late as AD 931. The poet, like the author of the *Harivamśa* (AD 783), belonged to the Punnāṭa Saṃgha.

In the *praśasti*<sup>122</sup> the poet gives his spiritual ancestry as follows: There was that Maunibhaṭṭāraka, the full moon in the firmament of the Punnāṭa Saṃgha. His disciple was Śrīhariṣeṇa; the disciple of the latter was Bharatasena, a man of encyclopaedic learning. And our author (who describes himself as devoid of learning and intelligence) was the disciple of this great Bharatasena. He further states that he has written his poem on the basis of the *Ārādhana*,<sup>123</sup> which is undoubtedly Śivārya's original work.

The *Bṛhatkathākośa* is an extremely informative work. The author not only shows his thorough acquaintance with the two epics,<sup>124</sup> but also with the original *Bṛhatkathā*.<sup>125</sup> It is also apparent that the poet was thoroughly at home with the earlier Digambara literature. There is an extremely interesting reference to the famous Sun-temple

(Ādityabhavana) of Mūlasthāna or Multan (98.110), which was destroyed by the Muslims within 60 years of the composition of this poem. The author describes the great Bhadrabāhu as a resident of Devakoṭṭapura, which was situated in Puṇḍravardhana, which was also known as Varendra (96.1; 131.1). the city of Mathurā is described as abounding in Jaina temples (2.1); a similar description of Ujjayinī is also to be found (3.2). He has besides shown his acquaintance with the *Pañcatantra* and one story,<sup>126</sup> including the verse (*aparīkṣitam na kartavyam*, etc.), is taken directly from that work. The religious rivalry between the Jainas and Buddhists are described in story no. 12, where we have references to *Buddharatha* and *Jinaratha* (12.116). A chariot-procession in honour of the Buddha is referred to even by Fa-hien.<sup>127</sup> The Kāyasthas are ridiculed in story nos. 23 and 25. They are denounced in a number of Brahmanical works, including the *Yājñavalkya-smṛti*.<sup>128</sup> Reference to 18 scripts is also found in this poem (22.4), which also has one of the early references to 18 Purāṇas (126.175). There is an interesting story connected with Kārttikeya (no. 136), and like the *Mahābhārata* the town of Rohiṭeka (Rohitaka) is connected with the worship of that deity (136.23). Worship of Durgā was popular at Nāsik (71.8 ff.); Rāmagiri is described as situated at the junction of Kaliṅgaviṣaya and Andhraviṣaya (59.194), and it is apparent that this Rāmagiri is to be identified with its namesake, mentioned in the *Kalyāṇakāraka*. There was great rivalry between Hinduism and Jainism (no. 33). In this connection there is a reference to *Brahmaratha* (33.9). We are also told the origin of Vindhyavāsini by Hariṣeṇa (106.248 ff). The Śvetāmbaras are denounced as holding false doctrine (131.69) and also in this connection that the Śvetāmbaras (*Ardhaphālakāḥ*) originated at Valabhī, which is described as situated in Saurāṣṭra.

The above discussion abundantly shows that this work of Hariṣeṇa is one of the representative Digambara Jaina texts of the early mediæval period, and is certainly one of the more important source-books for the historian of Jainism.

Let us now turn our attention to the two great Digambara literary luminaries of the second half of the tenth century AD. The first was the celebrated Puṣpadanta and the second Somadeva. Puṣpadanta is the author of the following three works: *Tisatthimahāpurīṣaguṇālankāru* (*Triṣaṣṭimahāpurīṣaguṇālankāra*), *Nāyakumāracariyu* (*Nāgakumāracarita*), and *Jasaharacariyu* (*Yaśodharacarita*), all of which were written in Apabhraṃśa.

The first work is also known as the *Mahāpurāṇa*.<sup>129</sup> It is divided into two parts, *Ādīpurāṇa* and *Uttarapurāṇa*. The second part also includes the *Padmapurāṇa* and *Harivamśapurāṇa*. The entire work runs to some 20,000 verses and has altogether 142 *sandhis* (chapters). The work, according to the testimony of the poet, was written under the patronage of Bharata, who was the minister of Kṛṣṇa III, and was completed in Śaka 887 corresponding to AD 965. When he was a resident of Mānyakheṭa. Puṣpadanta was originally a Brāhmaṇa Śaiva, but later became a Digambara ascetic.<sup>130</sup>

Puṣpadanta was undoubtedly the greatest poet of the Apabhraṁśa language. He carries to perfection the possibilities of Apabhraṁśa as a vehicle of poetry. The *Mahāpurāṇa*, which delineates the lives of 63 great men, is undoubtedly one of the finest poems of the tenth century. In numerous places in the poem he demonstrates his great poetic power, and some of the verses praising Bharata, his patron, are written in chaste Sanskrit. We further learn from some of the subjective verses of the work that Puṣpadanta was a man of delicate temperament and health. He had several titles, of which *Abhimāneru*, *Kāvyaratnākara*, *Kāvīkulatilaka*, *Sarasvatīnilaya*, etc. deserve special mention. It has further been conjectured that the poet in his earlier life had some bitter experience and was obliged to leave his original home.<sup>131</sup> He was however, cordially welcomed by the minister Bharata at Mānyakheṭa, where all his creative writings were produced.

The *Nāgakumāracarita*<sup>132</sup> is a short work consisting of nine *sandhis*. It appears that even at the time of its composition Kṛṣṇa III was on the throne of Mānyakheṭa and the city still enjoyed great prosperity. It was composed in the palace of Nanna, the son of Bharata, his earlier patron. The *Yaśodharacarita*<sup>133</sup> is another lovely work consisting of four *sandhis*. The story of Yaśodhara was a favourite theme with the Jaina poets and celebrated literary luminaries like Somadeva, Vādirāja, and others have written on it. This poem too was written at the residence of Nanna, when Mānyakheṭa was virtually a ruined and deserted city. We must remember that according to Dhanapāla's *Pāyilacchī*, Mānyakheṭa was plundered by the Mālava army in vs 1029, corresponding to AD 972. Khoṭṭiga was probably the reigning king when this calamity befell Mānyakheṭa. Even in the *Mahāpurāṇa* there is a verse<sup>134</sup> which refers to the sack of the city by the king of Dhārā. This particular verse was probably composed seven years after the composition of the *Mahāpurāṇa*. We just do not know what

happened to the poet or his new patron after the fall of Mānyakheṭa.<sup>135</sup>

The exact contemporary of Puṣpadanta was Somadeva who, as we have already noticed, in a previous chapter, is mentioned in an inscription of Śaka 888, when Kṛṣṇa III was the sovereign king.<sup>136</sup>

Three works of Somadeva have already been published. They are *Nītivākyāmr̥ta*, *Yaśastilakacampū*, and *Adhyātmatarāṅgiṇī*. The *Nītivākyāmr̥ta*,<sup>137</sup> according to its commentator,<sup>138</sup> was written at the request of Mahendrapāla, king of Kanauj. Raghavan proposed his identification with Mahendrapāla II, who is known from an inscription of vs 1003, corresponding to AD 946.<sup>139</sup> Now we definitely know from the *Yaśastilakacampū* that it was written in Śaka 881 corresponding to AD 949. It follows therefore that the *Nītivākyāmr̥ta* was written before the *Yaśastilakacampū*. However, in the *praśasti* of the *Nītivākyāmr̥ta*, Somadeva is described as the author of the *Yaśodharacarita*. Raghavan and Premi<sup>140</sup> have opined that this *praśasti* was added later. It appears that Somadeva started his career at Kānyakubja and later migrated to the south. I noted in a previous chapter that Somadeva was probably a Jaina monk of Bengal, belonging to the Gauḍasaṅgha who later lived in the Prañihāra kingdom from there he migrated to the Sapādalakṣa country.

The *Nītivākyāmr̥ta* is largely based on the the *Arthasāstra* of Kauṭilya and is written in prose. It is however, surprising that now here in this work has the author has cared to mention that great authority. Some earlier authorities like Śukra, Bhīṣma, Viśālākṣa, etc., who are mentioned by Kauṭilya, are however referred to by Somadeva in this work. The language is attractive, which is not surprising in the case of a genius like Somadeva.

The *Yaśastilakacampū*<sup>141</sup> is one of the finest novels in Sanskrit literature and, in some respects, is similar to the *Kādambarī* of Bāṇa, which is a model for Somadeva. The conversion of the cruel king of the Yaudheyas. Māridatta, who is described as a devotee of the goddess Caṇḍamāri, to Jainism is the theme of the novel. It is basically based on a story of the *Uttaraṣurāṇa*. As we have already observed, the story of Yaśodhara was extremely popular among the early Jaina writers. The author of the *Kuvalayamālā*<sup>142</sup> is the first writer (Śaka 700) to refer to the story of this prince of Ujjayinī written by Pravañjana. Later Haribhadra treated it in the fourth Book of his *Samarāiccakahā*. Hariṣeṇa and Puṣpadanta also wrote on Yaśodhara's adventures. There is however little doubt that Somadeva is the most

successful of those who have written on this subject. The work is also rich in cultural details and the students of social and cultural history of India can use it with profit.<sup>143</sup> The third published work of Somadeva, the *Ādhyātmatarāṅginī*,<sup>144</sup> is also known as the *Yogamārga*, and as the name indicates, it deals with spiritual matters. A commentary on it was written in the first half of the twelfth century by Gaṇadhara-kīrti.

Among other important works which were written by the Digambara writers in the tenth century AD, the following may be mentioned: *Neminiravāṇamahākāvya*<sup>145</sup> by Vāgbhaṭa, *Candraprabhacaritamahākāvya*<sup>146</sup> by Vīranandi, *Vardhamānacarita*<sup>147</sup> by Asaga, *Subhāṣitaratnasandoha*<sup>148</sup> by Amitagati, a contemporary of Muñja, *Jambudīva-panṇati*<sup>149</sup> by Padmanandi, and *Pradyumnacaritakāvya*<sup>150</sup> by Mahāseṇa.

Several works were also written in our period by the Digambara writers in Tamil, Kannaḍa, and other languages. The Tamil *Śivakaśindāmani*,<sup>151</sup> written by Tiruttakadeva, is based on the *Uttarapurāṇa* of Guṇabhadra and was written in the tenth century. It is undoubtedly one of the finest poems written in that language. Several Digambara Jaina writers between AD 850 and 1000 are known to have written in Kannaḍa. The earliest of these was Guṇavarma I who wrote his *Nemināthapurāṇa*<sup>152</sup> in the mid-ninth century AD. The three gems of the Kannaḍa literature of the tenth century were all Digambara Jainas, i.e., Pampa, Ponna, and Ranna. Pampa is the celebrated author of the *Ādipurāṇa*,<sup>153</sup> which is on the first Tīrthaṅkara, Ponna wrote the *Śāntipurāṇa*<sup>154</sup> (story of the sixteenth Tīrthaṅkara) and Ranna's fame rests on his *Ajītapurāṇa*<sup>155</sup> (the life-story of the second Tīrthaṅkara). A patron of Ranna was Cāmuṇḍarāya, the celebrated author of the *Cāmuṇḍarāyapurāṇa*.<sup>156</sup>

#### REFERENCES

1. See the passage quoted in N.L. Premi, *Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihāsa*, p. 147, n. 1. See also *prastāvanā* to I of *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*; for a different view see J.P. Jain, *The Jaina Sources of the History of Ancient India*, pp. 186 ff.
2. *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, ed., H.L. Jain, I, pp. 67-72, published in 16 volumes from Amarāvati, 1939-58.
3. See J.C. Jain, *Prākṛta Sāhitya kā Itihāsa*, p. 275.
4. See *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, 4, p. 60; see also *Prastāvanā*, *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, I, pp. 46-53.
5. See in this connection J.P. Jain, op. cit., p. 188; see also *JBBRAS*, XVII,

- p. 226; see for further details, Premi, op. cit., pp. 143 ff.
6. Ed. with the *cūṛṇī* of Yativṛṣabha by H.L. Jain, Calcutta, 1955.
  7. See *JSBI*, IV, p. 89.
  8. Loc. cit.
  9. *Ibid.*, pp. 91–100.
  10. Ed. in several volumes from Mathurā, 1944–63.
  11. For the relevant verse see Premi, op. cit., p. 140, n. 2.
  12. Ed., Bhāratiya Jñānapīṭha, Varanasi, 1947–58.
  13. Published in two parts in *MDJM* from Bombay (vs 1977 and 1980).
  14. See Ghatge's paper in *IHQ*, 1935; see also J.C. Jain, op. cit., p. 311.
  15. See Jain, op. cit., p. 126; see also *Jaina Antiquary*, XII, pp. 19–23; see in this connection Winternitz, *HIL*, II, p. 577, n. 2.
  16. Ed. with the commentaries of Aparājita and Āśādhara, Sholapur, 1935. An earlier edition was published from Bombay, vs 1989.
  17. See J.C. Jain, op. cit., p. 308.
  18. See *supra*, p. 90.
  19. Ed., Bhāratiya Jñānapīṭha, 1974, p. 14.
  20. See H.L. Jain, *Nagpur University Journal*, no. 9; see also J.P. Jain, op. cit., pp. 130 ff.
  21. See Premi, op. cit., pp. 80 ff.
  22. For the original verse see Premi, op. cit., p. 2, n. 4.
  23. Ed., H.L. Jain and A.N. Upadhye, 2 vols., Sholapur, 1943, 1951.
  24. See Upadhye, Introduction, II, p. 4.
  25. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
  26. IV, 1508.
  27. IV, 1504.
  28. See A.K. Chatterjee, *Ancient Indian Literary and Cultural Tradition*, pp. 100 ff.
  29. IV, 1481.
  30. See J.P. Jain, op. cit., p. 137.
  31. I, 65.
  32. Story no. 156.
  33. Ed. by A.N. Upadhye, 1960, in Rājacandra Jaina Śāstramālā.
  34. See J.C. Jain, op. cit., p. 127.
  35. See Lüders, *List*, no. 71.
  36. *Introd.*, p. 69.
  37. Ed. with the commentaries of Abhayacandra and Keśavavarnin, in 4 vols., Calcutta, 1921. For other editions see, *JSBI*, IV, p. 133, n. 4.
  38. Ed. in *MDJM* series, Bombay, vs 1974.
  39. Ed. by Premi, Bombay, vs 1974.
  40. vv. 49–50 which are quoted by Premi in his *Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihāsa*, p. 175n.
  41. Ed. and publ. with the commentary of Abhayanandi Muni in N.S. Pandit, 31–4.
  42. Quoted by Premi, op. cit., p. 43, n. 1.



43. Ibid., pp. 45 ff.
44. See *JSBI*, V, p. 11.
45. Ed. in *MDJM* series, 29–31, Bombay, vs 1985. A new edition in 3 vols. was published by Bhāratiya Jñānapīṭha, Varanasi, 1958–9.
46. 123.167.
47. 123.166.
48. See Premi's Hindi Preface to *Padmacarita*, I, pp. 1–3.
49. See *AILCT*, pp. 99 ff.
50. Ed., A.N. Upadhye in *MDJM* series 40, Bombay, 1938.
51. See for example Premi's Introduction, *Padmacarita*, pp. 2 ff.
52. The verse quoted by Upadhye in his Introduction to the *Varāṅgacarita*, p. 10.
53. Ibid., pp. 10–11.
54. Ibid., p. 12.
55. The earliest Simhanandi, as I have already noted in a previous chapter, was connected with the western Gaṅgas. Another monk of that name is mentioned in an inscription from Śravaṇa Belgoḷa dated Śaka 622; see *EC*, II, no. 32.
56. See *supra*, pp. 171–72.
57. See *Samarāiccakahā*, p. 2.
58. Introduction, pp. 20 ff.
59. See XII.57ff.; XV.136 ff.
60. XV.139.
61. XXII.61 ff.
62. XXIII.91.
63. XVI.32 f.
64. VIII.3 f.
65. See ch. XXV.
66. Bhāratiya Jñānapīṭha, Varanasi, 1970.
67. See Premi, op. cit., p. 109; see also *JSBI*, VI, p. 526.
68. See *JSBI*, VI, pp. 527 ff.; see also Premi, op. cit., p. 111.
69. Premi op. cit., p. 112, n. 1.
70. Loc. cit.
71. Ed. with English trans., Bombay, 1965.
72. Bhāratiya Jñānapīṭha, Varanasi, 1962. An earlier edition was published from *MDJM*, Bombay, 1930.
73. See my 'Jaina Harivarṇāśa' included in *AILCT*, pp. 89–107.
74. 11.67 ff.
75. 52.90.
76. Premi, op. cit., p. 116.
77. 66.53.
78. Ed. by A.N. Upadhye, *praśasti*, v. 4.
79. See Premi, op. cit., p. 124.
80. Jinasena I has also mentioned Prabhācandra; for the relevant verse see Premi, op. cit., p. 124, n. 2.

81. The relevant verses regarding all these predecessors of Jinasena II are quoted in Premi's work, pp. 124 ff.
82. In 3 vols., Bhāratiya Jñānapīṭha, Varanasi, 1951-4.
83. See Winternitz, *HIL*, II, p. 498; also *JSBI*, VI, p. 57.
84. The list quoted in my *AILCT*, p. 106.
85. 9.11; 12.17; 26.148 et seq.
86. See 6.69; 70.75.
87. Ed., Bhāratiya Jñānapīṭha, Varanasi, 1954; an earlier edition was published from Indore in vs 1975.
88. See Premi, op. cit., pp. 138-9.
89. *Ibid.*, pp. 141 ff.
90. *Loc. cit.*
91. For further details, see my paper entitled 'The Bhārata Tradition in Jaina Literature, *JAJH*, VII, pp. 159 ff.
92. Ed., H. Bhayani in 3 vols., Varanasi, 1953-4.
93. See his Introduction to III of this work, p. 41.
94. 69.63.
95. *Loc. cit.*
96. See J.P. Jain, op. cit., pp. 201 ff.
97. II, p. 192.
98. II, pp. 224-5
99. 82.6.1-6.
100. The list is quoted in the present Author's *AILCT*, p. 194.
101. See Premi, op. cit., p. 198.
102. *Ibid.*, p. 201.
103. *Ibid.*, p. 203.
104. Published from Sholapur, 1940.
105. See *supra*, p. 156.
106. The relevant line is quoted in J.P. Jain, p. 206, n: 1.
107. See *JSBI*, V, p. 231; see also Premi, op. cit., p. 49n.
108. See, for further details, *IA*, 43, pp. 44, 205-12, 275-9; *ABORI*, I, pp. 7-12; Premi, op. cit., pp. 155 ff.
109. Quoted in Premi's work, p. 157, n. 1.
110. Published with an English translation by M. Rangacharya, Madras, 1912.
111. See Premi, op. cit., p. 151, n. 6.
112. See *JSBI*, V, p. 161.
113. *Ibid.*, p. 162.
114. Edited by K.P. Pathak, Bombay.
115. See Bhandarkar, *Early History of the Deccan*, p. 95; Premi, op. cit., p. 151.
116. The *śloka* quoted in Premi's work, p. 151, n. 1.
117. Ed., A.N. Upadhye, Bombay, 1943.
118. *Praśasti*, vv. 11-12.
119. See *IA*, 15, pp. 138-41; see also H.C. Ray, *DHNI*, I, pp. 584-5.
120. See G.C. Choudhary, *PHNI*, pp. 43 ff.

121. *Praśasti*, v. 13.
122. vv. 3–7.
123. v. 8.
124. Cf. the story nos. 43, 58, 83, 84, 89, 96, and 122.
125. Cf. nos. 143 and 153.
126. No. 102.2.
127. Legge's trans., p. 15.
128. I.336: '*piḍyamānāḥ prajā rakṣet kāyasthaisca ciśeṣataḥ*.'
129. Ed. by P.L. Vaidya in 3 vols., Bombay, 1937–41.
130. For further details, see Premi, op. cit., 225 ff.
131. *Ibid.*, pp. 231ff.
132. Critically edited by H.L. Jain, Karanja, 1933.
133. Ed., P.L. Vaidya, Karanja, 1931.
134. See Premi, op. cit., p. 250.
135. The evidence of the recently discovered *Dharmaparīkṣā* written by Pandit Hariṣeṇa in AD 987, attests that within a few years of the composition of the *Mahāpurāṇa* he became famous; see Premi, op. cit., p. 247.
136. See *supra*, p. 177.
137. Ed. in *MDJM*, vs 1979; an earlier edition was published by Nirnaysagar Press.
138. Quoted in Premi's work, pp. 180 ff.
139. *EI*, 14, p. 176; see also Raghavan in *Jaina Siddhānta Bhāskara*, X, pt. II.
140. See Premi, op. cit., p. 182.
141. Ed. in Mahāvīra Jaina Granthamālā series, in 2 vols., Varanasi; an earlier edition was published by Nirnaysagar Press, Bombay, 1901–3.
142. *SJGM*, p. 3.
143. For fuller treatment, see K.K. Handiqui, *Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture*, Sholapur, 1945; see also G.C. Jaina, *Yaśastilaka kā Sāmskr̥tika Adhyayan*, Varanasi, 1967.
144. The text of this work is included in *MDJM*, XIII, entitled *Tattvānuśāsanādisaṃgrahaḥ*, Bombay, vs 1975.
145. Nirnaysagar Press, Bombay, 1936.
146. Sholapur, 1970 (Jīvarāja Granthamālā).
147. Ed. in 1931 (Sholapur).
148. Nirnaysagar Press, Bombay, 1909.
149. See Premi, op. cit., pp. 256 ff.
150. *MDJM*, Bombay, vs 1973.
151. See Sastri, *The Coḷas*, pp. 666 ff.
152. See *The Age of Imperial Kanauj*, pp. 223 ff.
153. *Loc. cit.*
154. *Loc. cit.*
155. *Loc. cit.*
156. See Premi, op. cit., pp. 266 ff.

## CHAPTER XIV

### Jaina Thinkers

The earliest Jaina philosopher was Umāsvāti (called Umāsvāmin by the Digambaras), who was the celebrated author of the *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra*,<sup>1</sup> one of the most original works of philosophy written by any thinker of ancient India. Much controversy surrounds the years when he lived. Satish Chandra Vidyabhusan assigns him to the first century AD,<sup>2</sup> and, frankly speaking, there is nothing in the body of the text that goes against this date. The author also wrote a commentary,<sup>3</sup> according to the Śvetāmbaras, although the Digambaras deny the authenticity of this *bhāṣya*.<sup>4</sup> There is however irrefutable proof that this commentary was known to the Śvetāmbara monks even in the early seventh century AD, if not earlier.<sup>5</sup> Both Siddhasenagaṇi (c. AD 600) and Haribhadra (mid-eighth century) knew this *bhāṣya*. According to the *praśasti* at the end of it Umāsvāti was a monk belonging to the Uccanāgarī *sākhā*, which according to the *Therāvālī* was a branch of the Koḍiya (Koliya) *gaṇa* and was quite popular in the Mathurā region, as we have already noted in a previous chapter. This *sākhā* originated, according to the testimony of the text in the third century BC. The reference to the *sākhā* of Umāsvāti goes far to destroy the Digambara claim that he was a thinker of that sect. In all probability, he wrote before the birth of the Digambara sect. We further learn from the same *bhāṣya* that he was a resident of Kusumapura or Pāṭaliputra at the time of its composition. He was a Brāhmaṇa of the Kaubhīṣaṇi *gotra*, and his father's name was Svāti and mother was called Vātsī. His preceptor in respect of initiation was Ghoṣanandi Kṣamāśramaṇa and grand-preceptor Vācakamukhya Śivaśrī. His teacher in respect of education, according to the *praśasti*, was Vācakācārya Mūla and grand-preceptor Mahāvācaka Muṇḍapāda.

According to the Digambara *Paṭṭāvalīs*,<sup>6</sup> Umāsvāmin was the sixth Digambara monk of the Sarasvatī *gaccha*; according to another Digambara tradition he succeeded Kundakunda in AD 44<sup>7</sup> but there is absolutely no doubt that not a single Digambara work or epigraph

that makes him a successor of Kundakunda, is earlier than AD 1000.<sup>8</sup> Indeed, it can be asserted with confidence that Umāsvāti was the earlier philosopher and Kundakunda, a southerner, could not have lived before the third century AD. There is however nothing to show that Kundakunda was acquainted with the works of Umāsvāti.

The *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra* has 357 verses and has altogether ten chapters, and this is why it is also known as the *Daśādhyāyī*. Writers belonging to both the Śvetāmbara and Digambara sects have written learned commentaries on this text. It is believed that the earliest commentary on this work of Umāsvāti was written by Samantabhadra<sup>9</sup> in 84,000 verses, and was known as the *Gandhahastimahābhāṣya*; it has further been contended that the earliest section of this work is the well-known *Āptamīmāṃsā* or *Devāgamastotra*.<sup>10</sup> But as Jugalkishore Mukhtar<sup>11</sup> has shown, there is no proof that the *Gandhahastī* was a commentary on that philosophical treatise of Umāsvāti, and till now no such work has come to light. We should therefore look upon the *Sarvārthasiddhi* of Pūjyapāda as its earliest available commentary. Several other celebrated savants also wrote commentaries of this treatise of Umāsvāti, which will be discussed later.

It is difficult to make a correct assessment of the influence exercised by Umāsvāti on the Jaina thinkers of later times, but it appears that not a single thinker, with the possible exception of Kundakunda and Samantabhadra, was immune from the all-pervading influence of this Brāhmaṇa savant. In the *Vividhatīrthakalpa*<sup>12</sup> Jinaprabha refers to Umāsvāti as a writer of 500 texts and a resident of Pāṭaliputra.

After Umāsvāti, the most celebrated Jaina philosopher was Kundakunda, who is probably the most controversial figure among the early Jaina savants. Before we discuss his exact time, we have to refer to the works which are assigned to him, and all these are very significantly written in Prakṛta.

The *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgamaṭīkā* is assigned to Kundakunda by Indranandi in his *Śrutāvātāra*. This commentary was known as the *Parikarma* and is repeatedly mentioned by Virasena in his *Dhavalā*.<sup>13</sup> However, according to another authority, this particular commentary was written by Kundakīrti, a disciple of Kundakunda. The work is now lost and Upadhye has doubts regarding Kundakunda's authorship of it.<sup>14</sup>

The eight *pāhuḍas*<sup>15</sup> which are ascribed to Kundakunda according to Upadhye<sup>16</sup> are quite in tune with the phraseology of the *Pravacanasāra*, one of the representative works of that philosopher. The *Damaṣaṇapāhuḍa* has 36 verses, *Cāritta* 44, *Bodha* 62, *Bhāva*

163, Sutta 27, Mokkha 106, Liṅga 72 and Śīla has 40 verses. In the Bhāvapāhuḍa, it is interesting that Śivabhūti is mentioned (v. 53) and this Śivabhūti appears to be identical with the person who is represented in the Śvetāmbara texts as the founder of the Digambara sect. At the end of the *Bodhapāhuḍa* we are told that it is work of the disciple of Bhadrabāhu. We cannot however identify this Bhadrabāhu with the celebrated contemporary of Candragupta Maurya.

The *Rayanasāra*<sup>17</sup> is also ascribed to Kundakunda, and has 162 verses. As Prof. Upadhye points out,<sup>18</sup> a few of the verses of this work are written in Apabhraṁśa, which probably shows that it is not a genuine work of Kundakunda. The *Bārasa-Aṅuvekkhā*<sup>19</sup> has 91 verses. As the name suggests, it deals with twelve reflections which should be cultivated for the stoppage of *karmic* influx. It was a fascinating subject with the Jaina authors of both the sects.<sup>20</sup> Some of the *gāthās* are common with the eighth chapter of the *Mūlācāra*. It has further been pointed out<sup>21</sup> that Pūjyapāda in his *Sarvārthasiddhi*<sup>22</sup> quotes five *gāthās* from this text of Kundakunda, which are found in the same order in the present text of that work. The *Niyamasāra*<sup>23</sup> appears to be a genuine work of Kundakunda and has altogether 187 verses. It has a commentary by Padmaprabha, who lived around AD 1000. This same commmentator has quoted the verses of Amṛtacandra, who wrote commentaries on three *pāhuḍas* of Kundakunda.<sup>24</sup> There is a discussion on the three jewels, namely Right Faith, Right Knowledge, and Right Conduct in this work. The *Pañcāstikāyasāra*<sup>25</sup> is preserved in two recensions, one by Amṛtacandra which has 173 verses, and the other by Jayasena which has 181 verses. As Upadhye<sup>26</sup> points out, this work a mere compilation as its original name, *Pañcatthiyasamgaha*, suggests.

The finest and most popular work of Kundakunda appears to be the *Samayasāra*,<sup>27</sup> which has 415 verses, according to the earlier commentator Amṛtacandra (c. tenth century), and 439 *gāthās* according to Jayasena, who lived in the second half of the twelfth century AD. The Sāṃkhya doctrine is criticised in *gāthās* 117, 122, and 340; there is also reference to *Do-kiryāvāda* which was first preached by Ārya Gaṅga 228 years after Mahāvīra. The *Pravacanasāra*,<sup>28</sup> a very important text of the Digambara Jains, has 275 *gāthās* according to Amṛtacandra, and 311 according to Jayasena.

Kundakunda has almost become a legendary figure, and hundreds of stories are told about him by the Digambara Jains. Various

dates have been suggested for him and Upadhye, a very competent scholar, would place him in the first century AD.<sup>29</sup> It however appears that Upadhye has mainly relied on the evidence of the Mercara plates of Śaka 388 which are definitely spurious;<sup>30</sup> even if we accept it to be a genuine copy of an older record, we cannot assign the earliest of the six monks, mentioned here before AD 325 (taking 25 years for each generation), who is delineated as belonging to the *anvaya* of Kundakunda. It is significant that in no genuine record of the early Gaṅgas, is Kundakunda mentioned by name. Indeed, the *anvaya* of Kundakunda appears only in the records of south India, which were inscribed after AD 900. This however does not prove that Kundakunda never existed in reality. As we have already pointed out, Pūjyapāda definitely quotes a few verses from the *Bārasa-Anuvekkhā*; and the date of Pūjyapāda is fortunately now known. Devasena in his *Darśanasāra*<sup>31</sup> informs us that the Drāviḍa Saṁgha was founded by Vajranandi, the disciple of Pūjyapāda in vs 526 corresponding to AD 468. We therefore have to assign Pūjyapāda, the teacher of Vajranandi, in the first half of the fifth century AD. Also, since Pūjyapāda knows Samantabhadrā,<sup>32</sup> who probably lived after Kundakunda, we have to assign the latter in the early fourth century AD, which is the date suggested for him even by the writer of the Mercara plates. The present village of Koṇḍakunde,<sup>33</sup> situated in the Anantapur district of A.P., may probably represent the original home of this Digambara savant.

Samantabhadrā, like Kundakunda, is regarded as a great Digambara savant and one of the most powerful exponents of the doctrine of *Syādvāda*. Like Kundakunda, however, his personal life is shrouded in obscurity. According to the colophons of a few manuscripts, he was the son of the king of Urāgapura (Tiruchirapalli), which is said to be included in the Phaṇimaṇḍala.<sup>34</sup> A few other manuscripts call him Śāntivarman,<sup>35</sup> and it is tempting to identify him with his namesake of the Kadamba dynasty. Such speculations do not however lead us anywhere, and all we know about his personal achievements are to be found for the first time in the eleventh-century *Kathākośa*<sup>36</sup> of Prabhācandra, who was a contemporary of Jayasīma of Dhārā. In this work Samantabhadrā is represented as calling himself the naked ascetic from Kāñcī. He is further shown as the preceptor of Śivakoṭi,<sup>37</sup> the author of the *Ārādhana*. That work delineates him as visiting places like Puṇḍravardhana, Daśapura, Vārāṇasī, Pāṭaliputra, Kāñcī, Mālava, Sindhu, Ṭakka (Punjab) and

Karnataka. It appears that Samantabhadra was an itinerant *sādhu* and was universally respected for his vast learning and mesmeric personality.

Regarding the date of Samantabhadra, it is at least certain that he flourished before Pūjyapāda. Formerly scholars like Vidyabhusan or Winternitz were not aware of the evidence supplied by the *Darśanasāra* (AD 933) on Pūjyapāda's date and their chronology was therefore based on surmise. Now, happily we know the approximate date for Pūjyapāda who emphatically mentions Samahtabhadra in his *Jainendra*.<sup>38</sup> The traditional Digambara chronology places him two generations before Devanandi Pūjyapāda,<sup>39</sup> and therefore we will be justified in placing Samantabhadra in the last quarter of the fourth century AD.<sup>40</sup>

Among the works of Samantabhadra, the most important and significant is the *Āptamīmāṃsā*,<sup>41</sup> which as we have already said, is also known as the *Devāgama*. This poem has 114 verses, each of which has a beauty in its own right. The work is replete with discussions on logical principles besides a review of the contemporary schools of philosophy, including the *Advaitavāda*. As noted by Vidyabhusan,<sup>42</sup> it has been cited by the Hindu philosopher Vācaspati Mīśra in explaining Śaṅkara's criticism of the *Syādvāda*. The earliest commentator of this great philosophical poem of Samantabhadra was Akalaṅka (eighth century), followed by Vidyānanda and others. Several commentaries on this work also exist in Kannaḍa, Tamil, and other Indian languages,<sup>43</sup> which show that it was looked upon as one of the most precious poems on philosophy by the later Jaina thinkers. The second work of Samantabhadra is *Yuktyanuśāsana*,<sup>44</sup> a poem of 64 verses which has a Sanskrit commentary by Vidyānanda. It appears from the commentary<sup>45</sup> that the work was composed after the *Āptamīmāṃsā*. Like that poem, it too is full of useful discussions. The *Svayambhūstotra*<sup>46</sup> is a poem of 143 verses and contains *ślokas* in praise of various Tīrthaṅkaras. The highest number of verses (20) are reserved for Arhanātha and the second highest (10) for Neminātha. Mahāvīra has 8 and the others 5 each. The only commentary on it is by Prabhācandra. The fourth work of Samantabhadra is *Jinastutiśataka*<sup>47</sup> which has 116 verses and has a commentary by Narasiṃha Bhaṭṭa. It is a truly theistic poem and therefore very appealing. Nothing is known regarding the date of the commentator.

The *Ratnakaraṇḍakaśrāvākācāra*,<sup>48</sup> which is also known as the *Upāsakādhyāyana*, as the name indicates, is a manual of morals for



Jaina layman. There is little doubt that it is one of the most popular Jaina texts and a copy or two of the work are to be found virtually in every Digambara *bhāṇḍāra*. The only available Sanskrit commentary on it is by Prabhācandra, about whose exact date there is some doubt as we have a formidable number of Jaina scholars<sup>49</sup> bearing that name. The work has been highly praised by Vādirāja in his *Pārśvanāthacarita*,<sup>50</sup> which was completed in Śaka 947 corresponding to AD 1025. The commentator Prabhācandra is also full of praise for this work.<sup>51</sup> Authors like Cāmuṇḍarāya and Padmaprabha have also freely used it.<sup>52</sup>

Samantabhadra was looked upon as a model by later Jaina savants, including the great Jinasena I.<sup>53</sup> That scholar represents him as a supreme poet, capable of destroying the dense darkness of ignorance by the lightning of his wisdom. Thinkers of later times also are full of praise for Samantabhadra and his works,<sup>54</sup> number of which are now unfortunately lost.

Siddhasena Divākara is identified by some<sup>55</sup> with Kṣapaṇaka, traditionally regarded as one of the nine gems of the court of Vikramāditya. That he flourished in the Gupta period is indirectly shown by the fact that he is mentioned by Pūjyapāda (early fifth century) in his *Jainendra*.<sup>56</sup> He is claimed by both the Śvetāmbaras and Digambaras. According to a tradition, current with both the sects, Siddhasena Divākara performed a miracle during Vikramāditya's time in the celebrated Mahākāla temple of Ujjayinī. He is the author of the two well-known books, *Nyāyāvatāra*<sup>57</sup> and *Sammatitarkasūtra*,<sup>58</sup> both of which deal with logic. The *Nyāyāvatāra* explains the doctrine of *pramāṇa* (source of valid knowledge) and *Naya* (the method of comprehending things from particular standpoint).<sup>59</sup> Siddhasena also wrote a commentary on the famous work of Umāsvāti.<sup>60</sup> This work has been quoted by Siddhasena II who lived around about AD 600.<sup>61</sup> In the seventh century *cūṛṇī* text *Āvaśyakacūṛṇī* of Jinadāsa, Siddhasena Divākara is mentioned.<sup>62</sup> Haribhadra (eighth century) was also thoroughly acquainted with the philosophy of Siddhasena Divākara. According to the Śvetāmbaras, Siddhasena Divākara was originally a Digambara thinker from Karnataka and was later defeated and converted by the celebrated Vṛddhavadin.<sup>63</sup> It has also been demonstrated that he lived before Jinabhadraṇi.<sup>64</sup>

Pūjyapāda, who was also known as Devanandi, as we have already noticed, definitely lived in the first half of the fifth century. I have

already referred to his grammar called *Jainendra*. His *Sarvārthasiddhi*<sup>65</sup> is undoubtedly the greatest, and one of the earliest, commentaries on the *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra*. That he was an accomplished logician is evident from this commentary which has been highly praised by later writers. There are a few stories dealing with his wife which are practically of no value to the serious historians.

Akalaṅka is undoubtedly one of the greatest names in the history of Indian logic. However, like majority of ancient authors, he gives practically no information regarding his personal life. Only in his *Tattvārtharājavārttika* does he inform us that he was the son of the king Laghu Havva.<sup>66</sup> Regarding the identity of this king, nothing is known. However, in the *Kathākośa* of Prabhācandra we are told that he was the son of the minister of king Śubhatuṅga of Mānyakheṭa.<sup>67</sup> A number of writers, beginning from Vādirāja and Prabhācandra, refer to Akalaṅka's debating skill and his victory over the Buddhists. The earliest source that refers to this event is a tenth-century inscription of the reign of Būtuga II which has already been mentioned.<sup>68</sup> Later Jaina writers and authors of epigraphs have referred to this feat of Akalaṅka with evident pride. However, regarding the name of the king, in whose reign this feat was accomplished, there is some confusion. As I have already noted, the patron of Akalaṅka, according to the *Kathākośa* of Prabhācandra was Śubhatuṅga, but the *Akalaṅkacarita*<sup>69</sup> mentions one Sāhastuṅga in whose reign Akalaṅka defeated the Buddhists. Prabhācandra further informs us that the debate took place in the court of Himaśītala, who was evidently a contemporary of Śubhatuṅga. The evidence of the *Akalaṅkacarita* is confirmed by the Śravaṇa Belgoḷa inscription no. 67 which refers to Akalaṅka's patron as Sāhasatuṅga, who is generally identified with Dantidurga (mid-eighth century).<sup>70</sup> This date for Akalaṅka conflicts with the traditional date, vs 700 given to him by later Jaina writers.<sup>71</sup> It however appears that Akalaṅka was actually a contemporary of Dantidurga, and lived in the mid-eighth century AD. This should be regarded as the latest date for Akalaṅka since he was known to both Haribhadra and Jinadāsa I. The suggestion that he was known also to Jinadāsa (seventh century) appears gratuitous.<sup>72</sup> It has also been suggested that Himaśītala of the Akalaṅka tradition should be identified with the king of Kaliṅga who was a contemporary of Yuan Chwang,<sup>73</sup> but this too is a mere surmise. Since Akalaṅka knew even the Buddhist and Brahmanical scholars who lived even in the seventh century, we will be justified

in placing him in the eighth century AD.

Apart from his *Tattvārtharājavārtika*,<sup>74</sup> which is a commentary on the famous book of Umāsvāti, Akalaṅka is the reputed author of the *Aṣṭaśatī*,<sup>75</sup> a valuable work of Jaina philosophy in 800 verses dealing principally with logic, and is a commentary on the *Āptamīmāṃsā* of Samantabhadra. Another well-known work on logic by him is the *Nyāyaviniścaya*.<sup>76</sup> His other works are *Laghyastrayīprakaraṇa* and *Svarūpasambodhana*.<sup>77</sup> A treatise on expiatory rites called *Prāyaścittagrantha*<sup>78</sup> is also ascribed to him, but Akalaṅka's authorship of this work is extremely doubtful.<sup>79</sup> It has 90 *ślokas* and is called *Śrāvakācāra*.<sup>80</sup> The *Pramāṇasamgraha*<sup>81</sup> contains 87 *kārikās* and is also a work of logic. Another work called *Siddhiviniścaya* is also ascribed to Akalaṅka.<sup>82</sup>

Haribhadra, the great Śvetāmbara savant, was undoubtedly one of the greatest thinkers of the eighth century. He was not only a successful literary artist, but also, as Udyotana asserts, an authority on logic. Udyotana claims that he was taught logic by Haribhadra, and this information practically settles the date of Haribhadra. The *Kuvalayamālā*, from which this information has been obtained, was completed in Śaka 700. The earliest writer who quotes from Haribhadra is the Buddhist Śāntarākṣita, who in his *Tattvasamgraha* (eighth century) ascribes the verse to an Ācārya Sūri, who is no other than Haribhadra.<sup>83</sup>

Haribhadra, as we have already said in a previous chapter, wrote in both Sanskrit and Prākṛta. Being himself a Brāhmaṇa by birth, he was very well-acquainted with the Brahmanical works of philosophy. His well-known commentary on Diñnāga's *Nyāyapraveśā*<sup>84</sup> shows that he was equally at home with Buddhist logic. Indeed, because of Haribhadra's commentary this great work of the celebrated Diñnāga has survived in Sanskrit. His other works are only available in translation. Another well-known work of Haribhadra is the *Anekāntajayapatākā*.<sup>85</sup> It has altogether four chapters in which he refutes the doctrines of the Buddhist and Brahmanical schools. Since he refers to Mallavādin in this work, it appears that it is one of his latest works.<sup>86</sup> The *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya*,<sup>87</sup> a summary of the six philosophical systems in 87 verses, is the first work dealing with the six philosophical systems, Bauddha, Nyāya, Sāṃkhya, Jaina, Vaiśeṣika, and Jaimini, with a brief section on Cārvāka's philosophy. Haribhadra emphatically says that Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika cannot be separated from one another, although he treats them separately. There is no dis-

cussion on the Yoga and Vedānta systems. Haribhadra, unlike many orthodox Jaina philosophers, have discussed other systems with some degree of impartiality. In another work called *Lokatattvanirṇaya*,<sup>88</sup> a work written in chaste Sanskrit, he shows his scholarship and depth of feeling. The works like *Yogabindu*,<sup>89</sup> *Yoga-dṛṣṭisamuccaya*,<sup>90</sup> and *Dharmabindu*<sup>91</sup> are written primarily for the Jainas. The *Yogabindu* has 526 verses; the *Yogadṛṣṭisamuccaya* shows his depth as philosopher. The *Dharmabindu* has 8 chapters and has a commentary by Muniçandra. This work is a manual of morals and asceticism. The author deals with the duties of both the layman and monk. In the last few verses of this work he describes the bliss of the perfect soul in *nirvāṇa*. As Winternitz remarks, 'the title "Drop of the Religion" is an expression of modesty. As the drop of water is to the ocean, so is this work to the religion of the Jinās'.<sup>92</sup> Another text dealing with doctrinal matters is the *Śāstravārtāsamuccaya*.<sup>93</sup> Here too he was referred to the views of Buddhist logicians. The *Lalitavistara*,<sup>94</sup> is said to have been composed for Siddharṣi,<sup>95</sup> the author of the *Upamitibhavaprapaṅcākaṭhā*, which is impossible. Siddharṣi, as we have already seen in a previous chapter, lived long after Haribhadra. Another interesting work by Haribhadra is the *Upadeśapada*,<sup>96</sup> which is written in Prākṛta and has a commentary by Muniçandra.

Another Jaina logician of the eighth century was Mallavādin who wrote a commentary called *Dharmottaraṭippaṇaka*<sup>97</sup> on the *Nyāyabindu* of Buddhist Dharmakīrti. This Mallavādin appears to be identical with his namesake mentioned in the Surat plates of Karka (AD 821),<sup>98</sup> and described as the grand-preceptor of Aparājita, the donee of the grant. If this is accepted, we have to assign Mallavādin to the first half of the eighth century and it is therefore not surprising that he is mentioned by Haribhadra, as noted above. It should also be remembered that the Śvetāmbara tradition makes him a nephew of the last Śīlāditya of Valabhī (second half of the eighth century).

Vidyānanda, who lived in the ninth century, was a well-known logician of the early medieval period. According to a later writer<sup>99</sup> he was a resident of Pāṭaliputra and was also known as Pātrakeṣari. In the colophons of several of his works a number of western Gaṅga kings ruling in the latter part of the eighth century and the first half of the ninth are mentioned.<sup>100</sup> This shows that he lived around AD 800. Besides, in his *Aṣṭasāhasī*<sup>101</sup> he admits that he was greatly helped by the advice of Kumārasena, who may be identical with the saint of the same name, mentioned in the *Harivamśa*<sup>102</sup> of Jināsena II (AD

783). We should also remember that Vidyānanda-Pātrakeśari is also mentioned by Jinasena I in his *Ādīpurāṇa*.<sup>103</sup>

The principal work of Vidyānanda is the *Āptamīmāṃsālamkṛti*,<sup>104</sup> also called *Aṣṭaśatībhāṣya* and *Aṣṭasaḥasrī*. It contains an elaborate exposition of various logical principles. In the opening and closing lines of this text he makes an indirect reference to Samantabhadra and Akalaṅka, respectively. In chapter X he openly says that he followed the *Aṣṭaśatī* of Akalaṅka in explaining the *Āptamīmāṃsā*. Another important work of Vidyānanda is the *Āptaparīkṣā*,<sup>105</sup> which consists of 124 verses and is generally based on the *Āptaparīkṣā*. The *Pramāṇaparīkṣā*<sup>106</sup> is a work in Sanskrit prose and is definitely a contribution to Jaina logic. The *Śloka-vārttika*<sup>107</sup> is a commentary on Umāsvatī's famous work. Vidyānanda shows his thorough acquaintance with almost all the Buddhist and Brahmanical logicians. His other works include *Satyasāsanaparīkṣā*<sup>108</sup> and *Vidyānanda-mahodaya*.<sup>109</sup> In the former, Vidyānanda has undertaken an examination of Indian philosophical systems.

Māṅikyanandi is the author of the *Parīkṣāmukhasūtra*<sup>110</sup> which has 207 *sūtras* and is based on Akalaṅka's *Nyāyaviniścaya*. It has a commentary by Prabhācandra called *Prameyakamala-mārtaṇḍa*.<sup>111</sup> Vidyānanda, Māṅikyanandi, and Prabhācandra are pronounced by K.B. Pathak<sup>112</sup> to be contemporaries. In the printed edition of the *Prameya-kalamārtaṇḍa*, we are however told that Prabhācandra, the disciple of Padmanandi Siddhānta, composed it during the reign of Bhoja of Dhārā.<sup>113</sup> But this is quite puzzling as Jinasena I in his *Ādīpurāṇa* mentions *Candrodaya* as the work of Prabhācandra and actually in his *Nyāyakumundacandrodaya* Prabhācandra claims that he too is the author of the *Prameyakamalamārtaṇḍa*.<sup>114</sup> It therefore appears, and this is suggested by Mukhtar,<sup>115</sup> that the printed edition has referred to a commentator bearing the same name. Let us further remember that in Jaina literature there are no less than 20 Prabhācandras.<sup>116</sup> The *Prameyakamalamārtaṇḍa* refers to a number of Buddhist logicians, including Dharmakīrti, Diñnāga, and others. Amṛtacandra, who lived around AD 900 is the author of the *Tattvārthasāra*<sup>117</sup> and *Ātmakhyātī*.<sup>118</sup> The *Tattvārthasāra* has 618 verses and is divided into nine chapters. The seven *padārthas* are discussed in it. *Ātmakhyātī* is the title of the author's commentary on *Samayasāra* of Kundakunda.

Two great Śvetāmbara logicians lived in the last quarter of the tenth century. One was Pradyumnasūri of Rājagaccha, who was elev-

enth in descent from Māṅkīyacandra. As the author of the *Pārśvanāthacaritra* (AD 1219), we have to place him in the third quarter of the tenth century. In the *Pārśvanāthacaritra* we are told that Pradyumna defeated the Digambaras in debate at Venkapaṭṭa.<sup>119</sup> His disciple Abhayadeva, who flourished around AD 1000, is the author of the *vytti*<sup>120</sup> on *Sammatimahātarka* of Siddhasena Divākara. Another work of his is *Vādamahārṇava*,<sup>121</sup> which is not currently available but which is repeatedly mentioned by the writers of the Rājagaccha. 'He is described as the lion that roared at ease in the wild forest of books on logic. That the rivers of various conflicting opinions might not sweep the path of the good, Abhayadeva wrote his *Vādamahārṇava*.'<sup>122</sup>

The above discussion shows that a great number of Jaina thinkers of both the sects wrote philosophical and logical texts and enriched the ancient Indian philosophical literature by their solid contributions. Even in the later medieval period Jaina metaphysicians and logicians continued to write thought-provoking texts, which will be discussed in the vol. II.

#### REFERENCES

1. Ed., J.L. Jaini, Arrah, 1920; for other edns., see Winternitz, *HIL*, II, p. 578, n. 3.
2. *A History of Indian Logic*, Calcutta, p. 168.
3. This *Bhāṣya* is included in the edition published by the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, 1903-5.
4. See in this connection J.P. Jain, *The Jaina Sources of the History of Ancient India*, p. 135.
5. As noted by Sukhlal Sanghavi (English trans. of his Hindi work on *Tattvārthasūtra*), p. 21; even Jacobi, *ZDMG*, 60, pp. 287 ff., accepts the authenticity of this *bhāṣya*; see also p. 34 of Sukhlal's work.
6. See Hoernle in *IA*, XX, 1891, p. 391.
7. See J.P. Jain, op. cit., p. 136.
8. As noted by Sukhlal op. cit., p. 114, the earliest epigraph referring to Umāsvāti as belonging to the *anvaya* of Kundakunda is no. 47 dated Śaka 1047 from Śravaṇa Belgoḷa. Premi also does not believe that Umāsvāti has anything to do with Kundakunda (see Sukhlal, pp. 111 ff.) Elsewhere Premi has sought to show that Umāsvāti was probably a monk belonging to the Yāpaniya Saṃgha (see *Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihāsa*, pp. 533 ff., which is clearly untenable).
9. See Vidyabhusan, op. cit., p. 182.
10. See Winternitz, op. cit., p. 581.

11. See his 'Svāmī Samantabhadra' in Hindi included in his edition of the *Ratnakaraṇḍakaśrāvakaścāra* (*MDJM*, no. 24, pp. 212ff).
12. p. 69.
13. See *JSBI*, IV, p. 60.
14. See his Introduction to *Pravacanasāra*, Bombay, 1935, p. xviii.
15. These *Pāhuḍas* were ed. by P.L. Soni in *MDJM*, no. 17, vs 1977. Of these with the exception of *Liniga* and *Silapāhuḍas*, all the others have commentaries by Srutasāgara.
16. Upadhye, op. cit., p. xxxvii.
17. This text is included in the *MDJM*, no. 17, which includes the *Pāhuḍas*.
18. See his Introduction to *Pravacanasāra*, p. xxxix.
19. Included in the *MDJM*, no. 17.
20. See Upadhye, op. cit., p. xxxixn.
21. *Ibid.*, p. xxi.
22. Kolhapur edn., pp. 90 f.
23. Ed., Jaina Grantha Ratnākara Kāryālaya, Bombay, 1916.
24. See J.C. Jain, *Prākṛta Sāhitya kā Itihāsa*, p. 300.
25. Ed. in *SBJ*, III by A. Chakravarti, Arrah, 1920; for other editions see Upadhye, op. cit., p. xlii, n. 4.
26. Upadhye, op. cit., p. xlv.
27. Ed., J.L. Jaini in *SBJ*, VIII, Lucknow, 1930; for other editions see Upadhye, op. cit., p. xlv, n. 1.
28. Ed., A. Upadhye, Bombay, 1935.
29. *Ibid.*, pp. xix, xxii.
30. See *Epigraphia Carnatica* (rev. edn.), 1972, I, Introd., pp. x ff.
31. p. 24.
32. Cf. *Jainendra*, V.4.140.
33. For details see Desai, *Jainism in South India*, pp. 152 ff.
34. See the life of Samantabhadra in Hindi by Jugalkishore Mukhtar included in his edition of the *Ratnakaraṇḍakaśrāvakaścāra*, p. 4.
35. *Ibid.*, pp. 5 ff.
36. Ed. in *Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha*, Varanasi, 1974, p. 13.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
38. V.4.140.
39. See Jain, op. cit., p. 145.
40. On the date of Samantabhadra, see K.B. Pathak in *ABORI*, XI, 1930, pp. 149 ff.; Pandit Jugalkishore Mukhtar in the same journal, XV, pp. 67 ff. refutes Pathak's view.
41. Jaina Grantha Ratnākara and Sanātana Jaina Granthamālā Edn., 1905; for further details see Mukhtar, op. cit., pp. 197 ff.
42. Vidyabhusan, op. cit., pp. 182 ff.
43. See Mukhtar, op. cit., pp. 201 ff.
44. Text edited with Vidyānanda's commentary in *MDJM*, no. 15.
45. See Mukhtar, op. cit., p. 202.

46. Ibid., pp. 203 ff.
47. Ibid., pp. 204 ff.
48. Ed., Jugalkishore Mukhtar, *MDJM*, no. 24, Bombay, vs 1982. The commentary by Prabhācandra is also included in this edn.
49. See Mukhtar, op. cit., *Prastāvanā*, pp. 53 ff.
50. For the relevant verses from the *Pārśvanāthacarita*, see Mukhtar, op. cit., p. 11.
51. See Mukhtar's edn., p. 100; see also his 'Life of Samantabhadra' in the same work, p. 205.
52. Mukhtar, op. cit., *Prastāvanā*, pp. 10–11.
53. See Mukhtar, 'Life of Samantabhadra', pp. 19, 21.
54. Ibid., pp. 19 ff.
55. See Vidyabhusan, op. cit., pp. 173 ff.; see also J.P. Jain, op. cit., p. 150.
56. V.1.7.
57. Ed. with English trans. by S.C. Vidyabhusan, Calcutta, 1909.
58. Ed. in Yaśovijaya Jaina Granthamālā, no. 13; another edn., Poona, 1926.
59. For further discussion, Vidyabhusan, op. cit., pp. 174 ff.
60. The commentary *Tattvānusāriṇī Tattvārthaṭīkā* was printed in Ahmedabad.
61. See Vidyabhusan, op. cit., p. 182; see also Winternitz, op. cit., p. 580, n. 1.
62. I, p. 380.
63. For details see *Prabandhakośa*, pp. 15 ff.; see also *Vividhatīrthakalpa*, p. 88.
64. See Mukhtar quoted in Premi, *Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihāsa*, p. 42.
65. Ed., Kolhapur, 1904; see also Jacobi, *ZDMG*, 60, p. 290.
66. See J.P. Jain, op. cit., p. 172, n. 1.
67. See Hiralal, *Catalogue*, Introd., p. 26.
68. See *supra*, pp. 165–66.
69. See *EC*, II, Introd., pp. 48 ff.; see Fleet, *Dynasties*, pp. 32–3; J.P. Jain, op. cit., p. 177–78.
70. See *supra*, pp. 177–78.
71. See in this connection 'Life of Samantabhadra' by Mukhtar, p. 125.
72. See in this connection, J.P. Jain, op. cit., p. 177.
73. See the same scholar in *JUPHS*, III (N.S.), pt. II, pp. 108–25.
74. Ed. in Sanātana Jaina Granthamālā, Varanasi, 1915.
75. This commentary is published with *Āptamīmāṃsā* in Sanātana Jaina Granthamālā, no. 10, Varanasi, 1914.
76. *Īnaratnakośa*, p. 221.
77. These two works edited in *MDJM*, no. 1. *Laghīyastrayīprakaraṇa* is a work containing 78 *kārikās*, divisible into 3 chapters on *pramāṇa*, *naya* and *āgama* which give it the name *Laghīyastrayī*. This work is also edited in Singhi Jaina Series, no. 12, Ahmedabad, 1939. According to



- some others *Svārūpasambodhana* was written by Mahāseṇa, pupil of Nayasena; for details see, *Jinaratnakośa*, p. 458.
78. Ed. in *MDJM*, no. 18, Bombay, vs 1978.
  79. See Introduction by Hiralal to his Catalogue, p. xxvi.
  80. See *Jinaratnakośa*, p. 279.
  81. Singhi Jaina Granthamālā, Ahmedabad, 1939.
  82. See *Jinaratnakośa*, p. 441.
  83. See *GOS*, 30, Introd., p. lxxv.
  84. Ed. in *GOS*, by A.B. Dhruva, Baroda, 1930. In this edition of the *Nyāyapraveśa* both the commentaries of Haribhadra and Candrasūri have been included.
  85. Published in Yaśovijayaji Jaina Granthamālā, no. 40, vs 2436–9.
  86. See J.P. Jain, op. cit., p. 191, n. 4.
  87. This text has several edns., the earliest published with Guṇaratna's commentary in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, Calcutta, 1905; for other edns. see, *Jinaratnakośa*, p. 402.
  88. This text, which has 145 verses was published from Bhavnagar, vs 1958; an Italian translation was published by L. Suali in Florence, 1905.
  89. Ed., L. Suali, Bhavnagar, 1911.
  90. Ed., L. Suali, Bombay, 1913.
  91. Ed., L. Suali, Calcutta, 1912; for other edns., see *Jinaratnakośa*, p. 191.
  92. See *HIL*, II, p. 584, n. 3.
  93. Bombay, 1913.
  94. Published with the *Caityavandanāsūtra* from Bombay, 1915.
  95. See *Jinaratnakośa*, p. 125.
  96. Ed., Palitana, 1909; also Baroda, vs 2449.
  97. Ed., Stcherbatsky, St. Petersburg, 1909. For details see, Vidyabhusan, op. cit., pp. 194 ff.; also *Vienna Oriental Journal*, IV, p. 67.
  98. See *supra*, pp. 141–42.
  99. Brahmanemidatta in his *Kathākośa* quoted by Vidyabhusan, op. cit., p. 188.
  100. See J.P. Jain in *Anekānta*, X, pp. 274–88; see also *The Jaina Sources of the History of Ancient India*, pp. 199–200.
  101. Colophon, v. 3 quoted in J.P. Jain, op. cit., p. 199, n. 3.
  102. I, 38.
  103. Quoted by K.B. Pathak in *JBBRAS*, 1892, p. 222.
  104. Ed. along with the *Āptamīmāṃsā* by N.R. Gandhi, Bombay, 1915.
  105. Ed., Varanasi, 1913.
  106. Varanasi, 1914.
  107. Ed. along with the original text of Umāsvāti by M.L. Sastri, 1918.
  108. See *Jinaratnakośa*, p. 412.
  109. *Ibid.*, p. 355.
  110. Bombay, 1927; see also *Jinaratnakośa*, pp. 238–9.
  111. Published along with the Bombay edn. of the *Parīkṣāmukhasūtra*; an-

- other edn., Varanasi, 1928.
112. See *JBRAS*, 1892, pp. 227, 229.
113. The relevant lines are quoted by Mukhtar in his Hindi Introd. to Samantabhadra's *Ratnakaraṇḍakaśrāvākācāra*, p. 59. See also Winternitz, op. cit., II, p. 282 and fn. 6.
114. See Winternitz, loc. cit.
115. Mukhtar, op. cit., p. 60.
116. Ibid., pp. 57 ff.
117. Bombay, 1905.
118. See *Jīnaratnakośa*, p. 26.
119. See Vidyabhusan, op. cit., p. 196, n. 2.
120. Ahmedabad, vs 1980–4 with the original text of Divākara.
121. See *Jīnaratnakośa*, p. 348.
122. See Vidyabhusan, op. cit., pp. 196 ff.

## APPENDIX A

### Ājīvikism and Gośāla

In the third chapter of this work I briefly discussed the career of the Ājīvika philosopher Mokkhaliputta Gośāla. In this Appendix I will attempt to provide a connected account of the origin of the Ājīvika religion and also of the principal events of the life of Gośāla who, like Lord Mahāvīra, was not the founder of his sect. In this connection I shall endeavour to correlate the evidences supplied by the Pāli and Jaina texts on Ajīvikism and Gośāla.

It is apparent from the Pāli texts that Ājīvikism was a living religion during the days of Buddha. The first Ājīvika whom the Buddha met in his career was Upaka.<sup>1</sup> The story of this meeting is told in the *Ariyapariyesana Sutta* of the *Majjhima Nikāya*<sup>2</sup> and appears to be one of the oldest parts of the Pāli canon. We are told here that Buddha met this Ājīvika teacher immediately after his enlightenment, apparently near Gayā. Buddha was in his thirty-sixth year and, according to our calculations, this event took place in the third quarter (or in the beginning of the fourth) of the sixth century BC. It is interesting that the Ājīvika Upaka was in no mood to accept Buddha's claim that he was a Jina and quite coldly left him. This story is also repeated in a few other places in the Pāli canon.<sup>3</sup> Later Pāli commentators have given the romantic story of his marriage with one Cāpā and even affirm that he was converted to Buddhism in the later part of his life.<sup>4</sup> There is little doubt that the later stories were invented in order to show Buddha's greatness; in the original canon there is no indication that Upaka ever changed his faith.

I have already said that Buddha was a senior contemporary of Mahāvīra<sup>5</sup> and therefore Upaka should also be regarded as a senior contemporary of Gośāla, who according to the *Bhagavatī* declared himself a Jina in the sixth year of Lord Mahāvīra's wanderings, or in other words, in Mahāvīra's thirty-sixth year. This suggests that the monks belonging to the Ājīvika religion wandered in northern India before Gośāla, a conclusion which is strongly supported by the facts told about them elsewhere in the Pāli and Ardhamāgadhī texts.

The Pāli texts repeatedly refer to the Ājīvikas, but never represent Gośāla as the founder of the sect. Several teachers like Nanda Vaccha,<sup>6</sup> Kisa Saṅkicca,<sup>7</sup> and Paṇḍuputta<sup>8</sup> are mentioned in the Pāli canon and it appears that at least the first two, namely Nanda Vaccha, and Kisa Saṅkicca, were looked upon as important personalities in the days of the Buddha. Pūraṇa Kassapa, who was one of the six great rivals of the Buddha, had great deference for these two teachers and also Gośāla,<sup>9</sup> as he includes them in the sixth or the purest type (*paraṃa-sukhābhijātas*) of men. Elsewhere Buddha<sup>10</sup> declares that although the Ājīvikas had *existed for a long time*,<sup>11</sup> they only produced three distinguished teachers, Nanda Vaccha, Kisa Saṅkicca, and Mokkhali Gośāla. This is definite testimony that Ājīvikism is older than Buddhism and Gośāla was only one of the 'distinguished teachers' of this religious sect.

The *Bhagavatsūtra*, which is universally regarded as one of the oldest Jaina canonical texts, also directly confirm the evidence of the Pāli canon regarding the antiquity of the Ājīvika religion. When challenged by Mahāvīra in Śrāvastī he declares that he is actually the eighth Ājīvika teacher and the first seven were the following: Udāi Kuṇḍiyāyaṇa, Eṇejja, Mallarāma, Maṇḍiya, Roha, Bhāradvāja, and lastly Ajjuna Goyamaputta.<sup>12</sup> Basham, who has made a special study of the Ājīvika religion, remarks<sup>13</sup> in this connection that the immediate predecessor of Gośāla, Ajjuna Goyamaputta, is distinguished by a *gotra* name or patronymic as Udāi Kuṇḍiyāyaṇa, in whose body the migrant soul of Gośāla was originally born. He further notes that other five names have not been given any patronymics. From this he concludes that the first and the seventh were 'real' persons, and not figures of the imagination. This is indeed very strange logic! There is really no need for the Jaina writer of the *Bhagavati* to give the *gotra* names of all the predecessors of Gośāla in a passage that was apparently written in haste and with the avowed intention of discrediting the Ājīvika religion. The list of the seven predecessors of Gośāla should either be accepted in entirety or be summarily dismissed. Since the list occurs in a work written by staunch enemies of the Ājīvika religion, we have to accept it as genuine. Besides, the Jaina writer has also given, as noted by B.M. Barua,<sup>14</sup> the geographical centres of activities of all the seven predecessors of Gośāla, including the period of their missionary life. The earliest teacher, Udāi Kuṇḍiyāyaṇa, was associated with the city of Rājagṛha and had preached for 22 years. This suggests that Udāi Kuṇḍiyāyaṇa

was probably the founder of Ājīvikism and the celebrated Rājagṛha, the earlier capital of Magadha, was the first centre of this new religion. Since the Ājīvikas went about naked, it is natural for them to have chosen a hilly place like Rājagṛha where they could easily get natural shelters. The next teacher was Eṇeja, who was associated with the town of Uddanḍapura (identification uncertain, but should be in eastern India) and had preached for 21 years. The third teacher of this sect was one Mallarāma, who spent his life at Campā and taught the principles of the Ājīvika religion for 20 years. The fourth prophet was Maṇḍiya, who was associated with the famous city of Vārāṇasī in which the celebrated Pārśvanātha was born. His missionary life covered a total period of 19 years. The fifth teacher of this sect was Roha who preached at the town of Ālabhiyā (Ālavī of the Pāli texts), which was not far from Śrāvastī,<sup>15</sup> and taught for 18 years. Then came one Bhāradvāja, who belonged to the city of Śrāvastī and preached for 17 years. His successor was Ajjuna Goyamaputta, apparently of the same city, whose missionary life covered a period of 16 years.

A discerning reader of this passage will not fail to notice two special features regarding the list of the seven predecessors of Gośāla. The first, of course, is the progressive diminution by one year of the period of each reanimation and the second, which is more significant, is the gradual westward migration of this religion. In the course of 133 years the Ājīvika religion gradually spread from Rājagṛha to Śrāvastī, a distance of nearly 300 miles. The progressive diminution of exactly one year seems somewhat artificial, but this cannot be the basis of the entire rejection of the complete list. The *Bhagavatī* passage indicates that the religion of the Ājīvikas was founded in the beginning of the seventh century BC, probably 100 years after Pārśvanātha. Thus, from point of chronology, Ājīvikism stands midway between Jainism and Buddhism.

Barua is of the view that the Ājīvikas even existed in the post-Vedic period,<sup>16</sup> which can, however, be rejected offhand. In no Vedic text is there even the remotest mention of the Ājīvika religion. It is also interesting that, like Buddhism and Jainism, the Ājīvika religion has been totally ignored in the two Indian epics, even in their latest sections. There is also no basis for V.S. Agrawala's surmise<sup>17</sup> that Ājīvikism was known to Pāṇini.

Basham is of the opinion that Pūraṇa Kassapa, one of the six great rivals of the Buddha, was an Ājīvika teacher.<sup>18</sup> In support of his

surmise he quotes from the Tamil poem *Nilakeṣi*. It is true that according to the malicious account,<sup>19</sup> left by Buddhaghōṣa, Pūraṇa went about naked. But in the *Sāmaññaphala Sutta*<sup>20</sup> of the *Dīgha Nikāya*, a clear distinction has been made between the doctrine of Gośāla and that of Kassapa. that Buddhaghōṣa was thoroughly biased is proved by the fact that he represents Pūraṇa as a slave, which is clearly wrong, as Kassapa is a Brāhmaṇa *gotra*. It is however, quite likely that Gośāla and Pūraṇa had some respect for one another as the latter is presented in the *Anguttara Nikāya* as praising the three important Ājīvika teachers, a point which has already been noted.

Let us now attempt to take a close and hard look at the personality and career of Gośāla, probably the most controversial and enigmatic figure in the history of Indian philosophy. We should never forget that the texts, which deal with him, were all written by arch-enemies of the Ājīvikas, namely the Jainas and Buddhists. Yet the life of this Ājīvika teacher, as painted in the *Bhagavatī*, the fifth Aṅga text of the Jainas, is the only available source regarding his career. The references to him and the Ājīvikas in the Pāli *Tripīṭaka* often help us, but they are only incidental notices. The *Bhagavatī*<sup>21</sup> represents Gośāla as the son of one Maṅkhali by his spouse Bhadrā. This work further tells us that this Maṅkhali was a *maṅkha* which means a royal bard.<sup>22</sup> It appears from the *Bhagavatī* that Maṅkhali, the father of Gośāla, was a poor, wandering poet or bard who earned his livelihood by singing old, heroic ballads and exhibiting pictures (*cittaphalaga*) connected with his songs. The boy Gośāla was born in the cowshed (*gośāla*) of a rich Brāhmaṇa called Gobahula, who was a resident of a village called Śaravana. That Makkhali was born in a cowshed is also attested to by Buddhaghōṣa<sup>23</sup> in his *Sumāṅgalavilāsini* and *Papañcasūdanī*. The latter also paints him as a servant of a rich man, and tells a ridiculous story to explain his name *makkhali*; however, the Jainas do not confirm this story and, as I have already pointed out, a similar story is told by Buddhaghōṣa, that diehard Buddhist, regarding Pūraṇa Kassapa.

It appears from the *Bhagavatī* that Gośāla, after attaining manhood, accepted the professional life of his father. It further appears that from the very beginning of his career he developed some sort of repugnance against worldly life. When he met Mahāvīra at Nālandā near Rājagṛha for the first time, he was already a recluse. According to the writer of the *Bhagavatī*,<sup>24</sup> Mahāvīra initially turned down Gośāla's request to make him his disciple. But later, in the second

year of his wanderings, accepted his second request at a place called Kollāga near Nālandā. The two naked ascetics spent six years together and a detailed description of their wanderings has been given by Jinadāsa Mahattara,<sup>25</sup> who lived in the seventh century and, needless to say, his account is largely based on imagination.

The *Bhagavatī* informs us that as a result of doctrinal difference Gośāla left Mahāvīra after six years and declared himself a Jina at Śrāvastī. Mahāvīra had however to wait another six years before attaining the stage of perfection. Now, it is known to all students of religious history that no religious leader (ancient or modern) in India has any respect for his opponent. The Buddha looked upon Mahāvīra with contempt.<sup>26</sup> This is attested to by Buddha's utterances regarding Mahāvīra after his death. We cannot therefore expect the canonical writer of the *Bhagavatī* to accept Gośāla's claim of Jina-hood before Mahāvīra. Had any Ājīvika canonical text survived, we would have come across a similar refutation of Mahāvīra's claim of attaining *kevalajñāna*. In the absence of such a text, the historian has no other alternative but to accept the fact that Gośāla became a Jina at a time when Mahāvīra was a mere learner. Further, nowhere in the Pāli canon is Gośāla represented as a pupil of Nāthaputta. It appears that the two teachers were good friends in their early career and because of serious doctrinal difference they not only parted company, but also developed a mutual deadly hatred. I agree with Basham<sup>27</sup> when he declares that the *Bhagavatī* account is pervaded by deadly sectarian prejudice.

Gośāla was apparently in his late thirties when he established his own headquarters in Śrāvastī at the residence of the wealthy female potter Hālāhalā. He was recognized, as is evident from the *Bhagavatī*,<sup>28</sup> as the head of the Ājīvika Saṃgha, which was established, as I have already said, quite a number of years earlier in that city by Bhāradvāja, the sixth Ājīvika teacher. Gośāla, it appears, not only succeeded in enlarging his circle of disciples in that city, but also converted quite a number of important personalities from elsewhere to his doctrine. One such person, according to the *Cullavagga*<sup>29</sup> was a highly official (*mahāmatta*). The *Vinaya Piṭaka*<sup>30</sup> elsewhere refers to a blood relation of king Bimbisāra as embracing the Ājīvika religion and becoming a recluse of that *saṃgha*. These two examples definitely prove the popularity of the Ājīvika religion among the aristocracy of those days. Probably such conversions of high officials to the religion of the Ājīvikas was not taken kindly by Buddha, and

this explains his outbursts against Gośāla and his teachings. One such outburst is recorded in the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*<sup>31</sup> where Buddha calls the doctrine of Gośāla the 'meanest doctrine' and he is branded as a *moghaṇurīṣa*, which means a 'stupid fellow'. It is interesting that Gośāla alone is the recipient of this epithet in the Pāli canon, but he not only succeeded in soon popularizing his religion in different parts of Madhyadeśa and eastern India but was also able to produce a number of remarkable Ājīvika teachers before his death.

The account of Gośāla's final meeting with Mahāvīra, as recorded in the *Bhagavatī*, deserves close scrutiny. We are told that this meeting took place in the twenty-fourth year of Gośāla's ascetic life, and 16 years before Mahāvīra's death. The venue of this fateful meeting was the Koṣṭhaka shrine of the city of Śrāvastī.<sup>32</sup> Here we find Mahāvīra at first ridiculing Gośāla's claim that he was in possession of perfect knowledge. Gośāla simply denies that he was ever a disciple of Mahāvīra, and asserts, as we have already noted, that he is the eighth prophet of the Ājīvika religion. One of Mahāvīra's disciples called Sunakṣatra, who sought to argue on behalf of his *guru* was consumed by Gośāla's *tejoleśyā* (anger). Lord Mahāvīra too became a victim of Gośāla's spiritual power and the meeting ended abruptly. We are told that the debate was inconclusive and Mahāvīra, as is apparent from a passage in the text, did not succeed in his attempt to destroy the Ājīvika organization of Śrāvastī. However, the *Bhagavatī* represents Gośāla as dying shortly after the meeting in Śrāvastī. There is little doubt that the account of Gośāla's death is highly exaggerated, and it is probable that his untimely demise promoted the Jain canonical writer to devise this story.

That the account of his death is not based on fact will be clear from the contradictory and historical statements in the account itself. We have already noted that, according to this account, Gośāla died 16 years before the *nirvāṇa* of Mahāvīra, yet in another passage we are told that the death of Gośāla coincided with the Mahā-śilākaṇṭaka war,<sup>33</sup> which, as we know from another passage of the *Bhagavatī*,<sup>34</sup> was fought between Ajātaśatru, on the one hand, and nine Mallas and nine Licchavis, on the other. Now, we definitely know that Ajātaśatru became king 8 years before the Buddha's death, and less than 8 years before Mahāvīra's demise. Therefore, Gośāla, who according to the *Bhagavatī* died 16 years before Mahāvīra, was not alive when Kūṇika Ajātaśatru ascended the Magadhan throne, and the passage which affirms that his death coincided with that



famous war must be dismissed as a piece of poetic fancy. The same remark applies to another list of eight finalities, which coincided with Gośāla's death, namely the last sprinkling-scent elephant (*gandhahastī*) which, according to the *Nirayavalikā*, was the cause of dispute between Ceṭaka and Ajātaśatru.

From the *Naṅguṭṭha Jātaka*<sup>35</sup> we learn that there was a group of Ājīvika ascetics living near Jetavana in Śrāvastī who were in the habit of performing difficult penances. That the Ājīvikas were respected for their austere life is clear from a number of passages in the Pāli canon. In an identical passage, preserved in the *Majjhima*<sup>36</sup> and *Saṃyutta*,<sup>37</sup> Gośāla is praised by a *deva* for his perfect self-control. He is further delineated there as a speaker of truth and doer of no evil. Elsewhere in a Vinaya passage<sup>38</sup> we find the Ājīvikas condemning Buddhist monks for carrying parasols. These pieces of evidence strongly suggest that the Ājīvikas were respected for their strict and austere living.

It is surprising that the Ājīvikas, who could lead such an austere life, should hold fatalistic views regarding life and nature. Their teaching, as represented in the *Sāmaññaphalasutta*, deny action (*kirīya*), endeavour (*virīya*), and the result of action (*kamma*). According to Gośāla, all beings attain perfection through *samsārasuddhi*. We can understand why Buddha could not tolerate the Ājīvikas, who were against all his ideas and ideals. 'Like a fish-trap set at river-mouth, Makkhali was born into the world to be a man-trap for the distress and destruction of men',<sup>39</sup> Buddha declared. But in spite of such warnings, a number of respectable people of the Buddha's own time chose this religion in preference to the teachings of the Buddha and Mahāvīra.

In several places in the Jaina canon we find references to Ājīvika devotees and the Ājīvika doctrines. In the *Upāsakadaśā*<sup>40</sup> we have one Saddālaputta, who was a devotee of Gośāla. Another lay devotee called Ayamūpula is mentioned in the *Bhagavatī*.<sup>41</sup>

References in the later literature and epigraphs fully prove that Ājīvikisms survived up to the late mediaeval period. The inscriptions of Aśoka and his successor testify that the Ājīvikas were held in esteem in the Mauryan period. In the seventh Pillar Edict<sup>42</sup> they are mentioned after the Bauddhas and Brāhmaṇas, but before the Nirgranthas. In the Barabar Hill cave (Gayā district, Bihar) inscriptions have been discovered according to which Aśoka made a gift of several caves to the Ājīvikas in his twelfth and nineteenth regnal

years. Aśoka's grandson Daśaratha was certainly a patron of the Ājīvika religion, for we have three brief inscriptions<sup>43</sup> of this emperor in the Nāgārjuni Hill (Gayā district, Bihar) according to which he made gifts of cave-dwellings to the Ājīvikas.

In the *Arthasāstra* (III.20) of Kauṭilya and in the *Mahābhāṣya* (III.96) of Patañjali the Ājīvikas are mentioned. In the latter work Patañjali, the author, shows his acquaintance with the principal doctrine of the Ājīvikas. Patañjali distinctly says that the Ājīvikas deny the freedom of the will. The *Mahāvamśa* (X.102) informs us that the Ājīvikas could be seen in Sri Lanka during the reign of Pāṇḍukābhaya, who ruled in the fourth century BC which proves that after the death of Gośāla, Ājīvikism penetrated into southern India including Sri Lanka. This is testified to by the references to the Ājīvikas in the Tamil Sangam literature. In a fifth-century inscription<sup>44</sup> found from Nellore district (A.P.) of the reign of Simhavarman Pallava there is a reference to the Ājīvikas which shows that monks of this sect flourished in this part of India at that time. Varāhamihira (early sixth century) and his commentator Utpala (tenth century) know the Ājīvikas.<sup>45</sup> On a basis of a wrong statement by Utpala, D.R. Bhandarkar<sup>46</sup> came to the conclusion that, in the later days, the Ājīvikas were identical with Vaiṣṇavas. Basham<sup>47</sup> has however shown that this theory is purely speculative. The Ājīvikas were also known to Kumāradāsa,<sup>48</sup> as is evident from his *Jānakīharana*, which was probably composed during the closing years of the seventh century.<sup>49</sup> There are also references to them in several South Indian inscriptions of a much later period, but by AD 1200, they vanished completely from history.<sup>50</sup>

#### REFERENCES

1. For details see Malalasekera, *DPPN*, I, pp. 385 ff.
2. *Majjhima*, I, pp. 160–75; see also Malalasekera, op. cit., I, pp. 179–80.
3. See *Jātaka*, I.81; *Mahāvagga*, trans., I.B. Horner, p. 11.
4. See Malalasekera, op. cit., I, p. 662; the *Therīcāpā* is mentioned in the *Therīgāthā* (see Nālandā edn., *Khuddaka Nikāya*, II, pp. 441–3), but there the name of Upaka is conspicuously absent.
5. See *supra*, p. 29, n. 3.
6. See Malalasekera, op. cit., II, p. 14.
7. *Ibid.*, I, p. 609.
8. *Ibid.*, II, p. 123.
9. See *Āṅguttara*, III (trans.), p. 273.

10. See *Majjhima, Sandakasutta* (no. 76); see also Malalasekera, op. cit., II, p. 14; see also Hindi translation published by Mahābodhi Sabhā, p. 307.
11. Emphasis mine.
12. *Bhagavatī* (Sailana edn.), V, pp. 2425–6.
13. *History and Doctrines of the Ājīvikas*, London, 1951, p. 32.
14. See *JDL*, II, p. 5.
15. See Malalasekera, op. cit., I, p. 295.
16. See *ABORI*, 8, pp. 183–4.
17. See the Hindi translation of his work entitled *Pāṇinikālīna Bhāratavaṛṣa*, p. 370.
18. Basham, op. cit., pp. 80 ff.
19. See *Sumāṅgalavilāsini*, I, p. 142.
20. *Dīgha*, no. 2.
21. V, p. 2373.
22. See M. Monier-Williams, *SED*, p. 772.
23. See *Sumāṅgalavilāsini*, I, pp. 143 ff.; *Pañcasūdanī*, I, p. 422; see also Malalasekera, op. cit., II, p. 400.
24. V, p. 2381.
25. See *Āvaśyakacūmī*, I, pp. 271, 282–4, 287–99.
26. See *Majjhima*, II, pp. 243 ff.; *Dīgha*, pp. 117, 210.
27. Basham, op. cit., p. 66.
28. V, p. 2369.
29. Nālandā edn., p. 260.
30. See Nālandā edn., *Pācittiya*, p. 106.
31. See Nālandā edn. of *Āṅguttara*, I, p. 267.
32. V, p. 2418.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 2444.
34. *Ibid.*, III, pp. 1190 ff.
35. No. 144.
36. See Malalasekera, op. cit., I, p. 238, n. 1.
37. *Loc. cit.*
38. *Loc. cit.*
39. Nālandā edn., *Āṅguttara*, I, p. 267.
40. Ed., N.A. Gore, Poona, 1953, pp. 114 ff.
41. V, p. 2449.
42. See Bühler, *EI*, II, pp. 245 ff.; see also Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, pp. 62 ff.
43. See *IA*, 20, p. 364; Lüders, *List*, nos. 954–6; see also Sircar, op. cit., pp. 77 ff.
44. *EI*, XXIV, pp. 296 ff.
45. See Basham, op. cit., pp. 168 ff.
46. See *IA*, 41, pp. 286–90.
47. Basham, op. cit., pp. 173 ff.

48. *Ibid.*, pp. 165 ff.
49. See Winternitz, *HIL*, III, pt. I, p. 81.
50. Basham believes that the Nagnātakas who defiled Deva-temples during the reign of Harṣa of Kashmir (last quarter of the eleventh century), were probably the Ājivikas; see *op. cit.*, pp. 205 ff.; but this surmise appears to be entirely wrong.

## APPENDIX B

### Early Jainism and *Yakṣa*-Worship

The early Vedic texts show some acquaintance with 'supernatural beings' or 'springs' called *yakṣas*, but in comparison to *yakṣas* they are mentioned less frequently. Unlike *yakṣas* and *piśācas*, the *yakṣas* are depicted in the early and later Vedic literature as less dangerous and malignant, although they too, sometimes are conceived as pure evil spirits. It is of great interest that Kubera, the leader of the *yakṣas* of later literature, is delineated as the king (*rājan*) of *yakṣas* and other evil-doers in such an ancient text as the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*.<sup>1</sup> He is further called by his other name Vaiśravaṇa in that text. A still earlier reference to him will be found in the *Atharvaveda*,<sup>2</sup> but there he is not connected with either the *yakṣas* or *rākṣasas*. There are separate references<sup>3</sup> to the *yakṣas* and Kubera in later Vedic literature, but Kubera as the king of the *yakṣas* appears only in the post-Vedic literature. The term *yakṣa* also appears in the *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa*<sup>4</sup> as the name of an unexplained being. But exactly at what time Kubera lost his position as the king of *yakṣas*, it is not possible to say in the present state of our knowledge, but there is little doubt that he came to be associated with them long before Mahāvīra and the Buddha.

From the epics we learn a great deal about *yakṣas* and some of their prominent leaders. In both the *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata* the *yakṣas*, unlike other supernatural beings, appear as demi-gods. The interesting story told about the struggle of the *yakṣas* led by Kubera, and *rākṣasas* led by his younger brother Rāvaṇa in the Uttarakāṇḍa<sup>5</sup> of the *Rāmāyaṇa* shows that by the time that portion of the epic was composed, the *yakṣas* were looked upon as somewhat benevolent beings. We should particularly note the epithet *mahātman* applied to Maṇibhadra and Kubera in that Book of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.<sup>6</sup> The famous *yakṣa*-Yudhiṣṭhira story told in the *Mahābhārata*,<sup>7</sup> also testifies that the poet of that part of the great epic had real deference for *yakṣas*. Another point to be noted in this connection that Kubera or Vaiśravaṇa, the lord of the *yakṣas* in the

epics, is conceived not only as an honourable member of the Brahmanical pantheon but also as one of the four *lokapālas*. We are told in the Uttarakāṇḍa<sup>8</sup> that formerly there were three *lokapālas* and that Kubera or Vaiśravaṇa was installed as the fourth *lokapāla* by Brahman after the former satisfied the latter by his penances. There is no doubt that Kubera was either a *rakṣa* or *yakṣa* before he was accepted in that Indian pantheon, and his elevation supports my contention that in the period of the composition of the epics, *yakṣas* had their regular devotees among the local population, and this will be confirmed by my discussion.

In the literature of both the Jainas and Buddhists the *yakṣas* play a very important role, but the early Jaina canonical writers, even more than their Buddhist counterparts, show a very intimate acquaintance not only with the *yakṣas*, but also disclose the names of innumerable *yakṣa* shrines of the Āryāvarta and Uttarāpatha. Anyone who is even superficially acquainted with the Aṅgas and Upāṅgas knows that one such *yakṣa* shrine is mentioned almost in every *sūtra* of these texts. There was hardly a city or town which had not a *yakṣa āyatana* or *caitya*. I list below the names of some important shrines (a majority of which were dedicated to *yakṣas*) in the Jaina texts.

<i>Name of the city</i>	<i>Name of the Shrine</i>
Vardhamānapura	Maṇibhadra
Kayaṃgalā Campā	Chattapalāśa Pūrṇabhadra and Aṅgamandira
Vāṇiyagāma (a suburb of Vaiśālī)	Suhamma
Vaiśālī	Bahuputtīyā and Koṃḍiyāyaṇa
Mithilā	Maṇibhadra
Ālabhiyā	Samkhavaṇa and Pattakālaga
Vārāṇasī	Koṭṭhaga and Ambasālavana
Kauśāmbī	Caṃdotaraṇa
Śrāvastī	Koṭṭhaga
Mathurā	Sudarśana
Hastināpura	Sahasāmbavana
Dvārāvastī	Surapriya

This list is by no means exhaustive, and it is not difficult to mention at least another hundred such shrines situated in various parts

of northern and eastern India.

The Pāli Buddhist texts disclose the names of a good number of so-called *yakkha-cetiya*s, most of which were situated in various parts of Eastern India. In the *Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya*, quite a number of shrines situated in the celebrated city of Vaiśālī or Vesālī are mentioned. They are: Sāranda, (Cāpāla, Udena, Gotamaka, Bahuputta, and Sattamba. From another Book of the *Dīgha Nikāya*, *Pātika Suttanta*, we further learn that Udena was situated to the east, Gotamaka to the south, Sattamba to the west and Bahuputta to the north of this city. We have already seen that the shrine of Bahuputta is mentioned in the *Bhagavatī*,<sup>9</sup> the celebrated fifth Aṅga of the Jainas from which we further learn that it was once visited by Mahāvīra. Indeed, this is the only shrine that is mentioned both in the Jaina and Buddhist texts. Another Bahuputta shrine was situated on the road between Rājagṛha and Nālandā, according to the *Saṃyutta Nikāya*.<sup>10</sup> In this shrine the Buddha exchanged robes with Mahākassapa. We have also seen that a few *yakṣa* shrines of Ālabhiyā are mentioned in the Jaina texts. It is just possible that one of these *yakṣa* shrines is repeatedly mentioned in the Pāli texts<sup>11</sup> as connected with the activities of the Buddha and few of his disciples. The Pāli texts also disclose the names of a few other shrines of eastern India, namely Supatittha of Rājagṛha,<sup>12</sup> Ānanda of Bhoganagara (in the Vajji territory),<sup>13</sup> Makuṭabandhana of the Mallas,<sup>14</sup> and Ajakalāpa of Pātali or Pāvā.<sup>15</sup>

It is, however, extremely doubtful whether all the *ceiyas* and *cetiya*s or *āyatana*s of the Jaina and Buddhist texts were dedicated to the *yakṣas*. Let us first take up the case of the famous Bahuputta shrine situated in the northern part of Vaiśālī which, as we have already noted, was the only shrine of ancient India to be mentioned clearly in both the Ardhamāgadhī and Pāli canons. There is reason to believe that this shrine was named after the goddess Bahuputtiyā, whose story is told so evocatively and humourously in the Upāṅga text entitled *Nirayavalikā*. We learn from the fourth *adhyayana* of that Jaina text that the goddess (and not a female *yakṣa*) Bahuputtiyā was intimately connected with the welfare of children. We cannot, however, be sure on this count since another Bahuputtiyā is mentioned in the *Bhagavatī*,<sup>16</sup> *Sthānāṅga*,<sup>17</sup> and *Nāyādhammakahā*<sup>18</sup> as the wife of *yakṣa* Pūrṇabhadra. The well-known Gotamaka shrine of the same city was in all probability not a *yakṣa* temple. I invite, in this connection, attention to a few *śloka*s of the Sabhāparvan<sup>19</sup> of the *Mahābhārata*

where we come across the name of one Gautamauka temple of Rājagṛha which, according to these verses, was named after the ṛṣi Gautama. The Sanskrit word *gautamauka* is exactly the same as the Pāli *gotamaka*. Since the temple of Gautamauka at Rājagṛha was dedicated to ṛṣi Gautama, it is reasonable to infer that the shrine of the same name situated at Vaiśālī was also named after that Vedic ṛṣi. It is also interesting that a sect called Gotama-Goyama is mentioned both in the *Anuyogadvāra*,<sup>20</sup> a Jaina canonical text, and the *Aṅguttara*,<sup>21</sup> a Pāli work. According to Hemacandra,<sup>22</sup> the commentator of *Anuyogadvāra*, the mendicants belonging to that school earned their livelihood by exhibiting young bulls, both painted and decorated, and performing tricks. The worship of ancient ṛṣis was not an uncommon thing in ancient India. We have the well-known instance of Agastya worship. A shrine called Kāmamahāvana is mentioned in several Jaina texts including the *Antagaḍadasāo*<sup>23</sup> and *Bhagavati*,<sup>24</sup> as situated at Vārāṇasī. It can by no stretch of imagination be called a *yakṣa* shrine. It was quite definitely dedicated to the Hindu god of love, Kāmadeva, who was one of the most popular gods of ancient India and whose festivals were regularly held in almost all important cities of India in spring, the Aṅgamandira<sup>25</sup> shrine of Campā, associated with the activities of the Ājīvika philosopher Makkhaliputta Gośāla, was also probably a Brahmanical temple. This is the only *ceiya* of Jaina literature whose name has the significant ending *mandira*, probably meaning a *devakula*. We should further note that the deities and even noble persons were often called *yakṣas* in ancient India. In the *Majjhima Nikāya*<sup>26</sup> and the *Petavatthu*,<sup>27</sup> Indra is called a *yakṣa*. The famous city of gods Alakanandā is mentioned in the *Dīgha*<sup>28</sup> as the city of *yakṣas*. Even the Buddha is called a *yakṣa* in the *Majjhima Nikāya*.<sup>29</sup> That very interesting Buddhist Sanskrit text the *Mahāmāyūrī*, recently edited and translated by D.C. Sircar,<sup>30</sup> has a comprehensive list of the so-called *yakṣa* shrines in which virtually all the well-known Hindu gods are called *yakṣas*. For example, Viṣṇu of Dvārakā in v. 19, Śiva of Śivapura in v. 47, and Kārttikeya of Rohitaka in v. 35. We have already noted that the epics, the *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata*, have nothing but deference for the *yakṣas*, who were superior in character and demeanour to the *rākṣasas* and *piśācas*. Even a person like Yudhiṣṭhira is delineated in the *Mahābhārata*<sup>31</sup> as worshipping Yakṣa Maṇibhadra whose shrine according to the Jaina texts,<sup>32</sup> was situated both at Mithilā and Vardhamānapura of Bengal. This particular *yakṣa* is mentioned else-



where in the *Mahābhārata* as the presiding deity of travellers and traders<sup>33</sup> and a Buddhist canonical text<sup>34</sup> alludes to a shrine of the same *yakṣa* at Gayā. Another Buddhist text<sup>35</sup> refers to the sects who apparently worshipped Maṇibhadra and Pūrṇabhadra, both of whom are honourably mentioned in the Jaina texts.

The list given above regarding some of the *yakṣa-cetiyas* shows that most of these shrines were situated in eastern India. There is no doubt that *yakṣa*-worship was basically anti-Vedic in character, and it was only when the fusion of Aryans with non-Aryans was complete, that they were looked upon with veneration. It is also true that a few members of the Brahmanical pantheon like Śiva, Gaṇapati, Skanda, and Durgā were originally local deities, worshipped by non-Aryans, or to put it more correctly, un-Aryans. Both Jainism and Buddhism, which were basically anti-Vedic, naturally befriended popular and indigenous religious systems, which had a greater appeal for the masses. Pārśva, who may be called the real founder of Jainism, probably used to visit the well-known *yakṣa* shrines of Vārāṇasī. His visit to the famous Pūrṇabhadra shrine of Campā is recorded in the *Nāyādharmakahāṇo*,<sup>36</sup> the sixth Aṅga text. Regarding his illustrious successor, Lord Mahāvīra, we can say with certainty that the *yakṣa* shrines of eastern India were his most favoured resorts. In this connection the following words of the Master found in the *Bhagavatī* may be reproduced here: 'I pass my nights in *devakulas*, *sabhās*, *ṣavās*, *ārāmas*, and *ujjāṇas*.' Most of the *cetiyas* of the Jaina texts were situated in *ujjāṇas*, meaning gardens. He also used frequently to visit shrines like Guṇaśīla of Rājagṛha Pūrṇabhadra of Campā, Koṣṭhaka of Śrāvastī, etc. Quite a number of his lectures were delivered, according to the *Bhagavatī*, in the Guṇaśīla shrine of Rājagṛha. A very vivid and useful description of the famous *yakṣa* shrine of Pūrṇabhadra, situated to the north-east direction of Campā is given in the well-known Upāṅga text the *Aupapātika*.<sup>37</sup> The description there leaves no room for doubt that this particular shrine was one of the most prominent cultural and religious centres of that celebrated city, represented as the metropolis of Kūṇika-Ajātaśatru, the son of Śreṇika-Bimbisāra.

Although the *Bhagavatī* refers to Mahāvīra's visit to *devakulas*, very few *devakulas* are actually mentioned either in the Jaina or Buddhist canonical texts. I have already referred to the temple of the god of Love situated at Vārāṇasī. There is little doubt that all the three teachers, Pārśva, Mahāvīra and the Buddha, scrupulously and care-

fully avoided temples dedicated to Brahmanical gods. But the *cetiya-cetiyas*, dedicated to *yakṣas*, were favoured by them. In this connection I can recall the following words spoken by the Buddha to his followers in the *Āṅguttara Nikāya*,<sup>38</sup> 'Vajjian shrines should be revered.' By Vajjian he means the famous shrines of Vaiśālī and possibly also of Bhoganagara which was also situated in the Vajjī country. It thus appears that both Mahāvīra and the Buddha had some genuine deference for *yakṣa* shrines, particularly those of eastern India. Unlike Buddha, who spent the major part of his ascetic life in the luxurious Jetavānavihāra of Śrāvastī and the squirrels' feeding place of Rājagṛha, Mahāvīra, who wandered about absolutely naked, spent the major portion of his life in deserted caves and dilapidated shrines. Here I would like to draw attention to the fact that Mahāvīra became a *kevalin* near a dilapidated shrine (*cetiya*).<sup>39</sup>

It is clear from the *Vipākaśruta*<sup>40</sup> and *Aupapātika*<sup>41</sup> that *yakṣas* were worshipped like gods, with leaves, flowers, incense and sandal, etc., and as with the gods they were worshipped for progeny, success, etc.<sup>42</sup> These shrines invariably had an image<sup>43</sup> of the *yakṣa* to whom it was dedicated. There is also reason to believe that image-worship was originally a non-Aryan custom and probably began with the worship of *yakṣa* images. Image-worship was also an integral part of Jaina religion from the earliest times. Even in the most ancient texts of the Jainas we have references to images and shrines dedicated to various Tīrthamkaras. If the evidence of the Hāthīgumphā inscription is to be believed, a Nanda king of the fourth century BC, took away a Jina image from Kalinga.<sup>44</sup> It is also possible that early Jaina sculptors got inspiration from that *yakṣa* images installed in various shrines. There is even reason to believe that the association of every Tīrthamkara with a particular tree was due to the influence of *yakṣa* worship which was often connected with *rukṣa* or tree-worship. We should remember that the original Sanskrit word *cetiya* also meant a sacred tree.<sup>45</sup> Further, the commentary of the *Dhammapada* describes the Udena and Gotamaka shrines as *rukkhacetiya*s. This is not surprising since most of the *yakṣa* shrines, according to the Jaina canonical texts, were situated amidst large gardens (*ujjāna*).<sup>46</sup>

The intimate connection of both Jainism and Buddhism with *yakṣa*-worship is also testified to by the fact that Vaiśravaṇa Kubera, the lord of *yakṣas*, is probably the most prominent of the Hindu gods to be worshipped by the Jainas and Buddhists alike, shown by the references to him in their canonical texts. He was popular even

outside India.<sup>17</sup> As Jainism found favour with the traders from quite early times, it is natural that the god of wealth, Kubera, who was the supreme lord of the *yakṣas*, should be popular among the devotees of Pārśva and Mahāvīra.

It is clear from the above discussion that early Jainism had a close and intimate connection with *yakṣa*-worship and gradually incorporated and absorbed some of its salient features. The Jainas, it should be noted, had a very favourable attitude towards the so-called malignant spirits, this is shown by Vimala's treatment of some *rākṣasa* characters of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in his celebrated *Paumacariyam*. Characters like Rāvaṇa, Kumbhakarṇa, and others are represented in this poem as vegetarian *vidyādharas* believing firmly in non-violence. Vimalasūri, who lived in the first century AD (530 years after the *nirvāṇa* of Mahāvīra) even takes the author of the *Rāmāyaṇa* to task for delineating the *rākṣasas* as cruel beings.<sup>18</sup> As firm believers in non-violence, the early Jaina writers refused to believe that even supernatural beings or spirits could indulge in violence, and it was therefore entirely natural that *yakṣas* should get an honourable place in the early Jaina canonical literature.

#### REFERENCES

1. XIII.4.3.10.
2. VIII.10.28.
3. *Mānava GS*, 11.14; *Śān. GS*, 1.1.7; *Hiranya GS*, II, 1.3.7; see also *SBE*, 29, p. 219.
4. II, 203, 272.
5. Chs. 14 ff.
6. VII.15.15, 29.
7. III, chs. 312 ff.
8. 3.11 ff.
9. Para 617.
10. II, p. 149.
11. *Suttavibhaṅga*, I, p. 246; II, pp. 71, 194; 223; *Aṅguttara*, IV, p. 147; *Saṅguttara*, I, pp. 234, 275 et seq.
12. *Mahāvagga*, p. 45.
13. *Aṅguttara*, II, p. 174.
14. *Mahāparinibbāna* of the *Dīgha*.
15. *Udāna*, p. 6.
16. Para 406.
17. Para 273.
18. Para 153.

19. 21.5–8.
20. Para 20.
21. III, p. 200.
22. *Anuyogadvāravṛtti*, p. 25.
23. Para 15.
24. Para 550; see also *Nāyā*, 151.
25. *Bhag*, 550.
26. I, p. 252.
27. II, 9.65 ff.
28. II, p. 170.
29. I, p. 386.
30. *JAIH*, V, pp. 262–328.
31. *VIV*, 65.7.
32. *Jambudvīpāprajñapti*, 1.178; *Sūryaprajñapti*, 1–2; see also *Bhag*, 362.
33. III, 64.13; 65.22.
34. *Samyutta*, I, p. 266.
35. *Mahāniddesa*, pp. 89, 92; see also *Milindapañha*, p. 191.
36. Para 152.
37. Para 2.
38. IV, p. 10.
39. See *Kalpasūtra*, 120 (*SBE*, 22, p. 263); see also *Ācārāṅga*, 11.15.25.
40. See *Vipāka*, Kota, 1935, p. 248.
41. Para 2.
42. *Vipāka*, p. 244.
43. See *Ant.*, p. 86 (ed., L.D. Barnett); *vipāka*, p. 86.
44. See Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, p. 217.
45. Cf. *Mahābhārata*, I, 150.33:  
*eko vṛkṣo hi yo grāme bhavet pamaṅghalānvitah  
 caityo bhavati nirjñātirarcanīyaḥ supūjitaḥ.*
46. See especially *Aupapātika* (3) which describes a large garden just outside the Pūrṇabhadra *caitya* of Campā.
47. See Watters, *Yuan Chwang*, I, p. 108; See also *Mahāvamśa*, X, 89.
48. See the paper on Vimalasūri's *Paumacariyam* included in my *Ancient Indian Literary and Cultural Tradition*, pp. 177–95.

## Bibliography

- Ayyangar, R., and Seshagiri, B., *Studies in South Indian Jainism*, Madras, 1922.
- Barua, B.M., *History of Pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy*, reprinted, Delhi, 1998.
- , 'The Ājīvikas', *JDL*, 2, pp. 1–80; see also his paper in *ABORI*, 8.
- Basham, A.L., *History and Doctrines of the Ājīvikas*, London, 1951.
- Bhagavatī*, Āgamodaya Samiti, Bombay, 1918–21.
- Bhandarkar, D.R., *IA*, 41, pp. 286–90.
- Bloomfield, M., *The Life and Stories of the Jain Saviour Pārśvanātha*, Baltimore, 1919.
- Chatterjee, A.K., *The Cult of Skanda Kārtikeya in Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1970.
- , *Ancient Indian Literary and Cultural Traditions*, Calcutta, 1974.
- Choudhary, G.C., *Political History of Northern India from Jain Sources*, Amritsar, 1963.
- Desai, P.B., *Jainism in South India and Some Jain Epigraphs*, Sholapur, 1957.
- Dey, N.L., *The Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Medieval India*, reprinted, New Delhi, 1983.
- Doshi, Becharadas, *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, vol. 1, Varanasi, 1989.
- Fergusson, J., *Tree and Serpent Worship*, London, 1873.
- Ghosh, A., ed., *Jaina Art and Architecture*, 3 vols., New Delhi, 1974.
- Gopani, A.S., *Bhārātīya Vidyā*, 2, pp. 201–10; 3, pp. 47–59.
- Guérnot, A., *Répertoire d' Epigraphie Jain*, Paris, 1908.
- Handiqui, K.K., *Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture*, Sholapur, 1968.
- Jacobi, Hermann, *Jaina Sutras*, 2 vols., *SBE*, 22, 45, reprinted, Delhi, 1997.
- Jain, Jagdish Chandra, *Life in Ancient India as Depicted in Jain Canons*, Bombay, 1947; reprinted, New Delhi, 1984.
- , *Prākṛta Sāhitya kā Itihāsa*, Varanasi, 1961.
- Jain, J.P., *The Jaina Sources of the History of Ancient India*, Delhi, 1964.
- Jaina, C.L., *Jaina Bibliography*, 2 vols., Calcutta, 1945. At the end some recent Jain inscriptions, discovered from Mathurā have been

- edited in *JUPHS* and *Epigraphia Indica*, they have also been cited in *Jaina Śilālekha Saṃgraha*.
- Kalapasūtra*, ed., H. Jacobi, Leipzig, 1879; trans. by the same scholar, *SBE*, 22, Oxford, 1898.
- Majumdar, R.C., *The History and Culture of the Indian People*, vol. III, *The Classical Age*, Bombay, 1988; vol. IV, *The Age of Imperial Unity*, Bombay, 1990.
- Malalasekera, G.P., *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*, 2 vols., New Delhi, 1995.
- Mehta, Mohanlal, *Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, vol. 3, Varanasi, 1989.
- , and Chandra, K.R., *Dictionary of Prakrit Proper Names*, 2 pts., Ahmedabad, 1970–72.
- Nāyādhammakahāo*, Āgamodaya Samiti, Bombay, 1919.
- Ojha, G.H., *Bhāratīya Prācīna Lipimālā* (The Palaeography of India), reprinted, New Delhi, 1993.
- Rapson, E.J., *The Cambridge History of India*, vol. I, *Ancient India*, Cambridge, 1935, ch. VI.
- Raychaudhary, H.C., *Political History of Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1953.
- Ray, H.C., *Dyanastic History of Northern India*, 2 vols., reprinted, New Delhi, 1973.
- Saletore, B.A., *Medieval Jainism*, Bombay, 1938.
- Samavāyāṅga*, ed. together with the *ṛtti* by Abhayadeva, Āgamodaya Samiti, Bombay, 1918.
- Schubring, W., *The Doctrine of the Jains*, trans. from German, Delhi, 1962.
- Shah, C.J., *Jainism in North India*, Bombay, 1932.
- Sircar, D.C., *Select Inscriptions bearing on Indian History and Civilization*, vol. I, from the sixth century BC to sixth century AD, Calcutta, 1965.
- Sthānāṅga*, Āgamodaya Samiti, Bombay, 1918–20.
- Suttāgame* (Collection of eleven Aṅga texts), ed., Puppha Bhikkhu, Gurgaon.
- Velankar, H.D., *Jinaratnakośa*, Poona, 1944.
- Watters, Thomas, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, 2 vols. (bound in 1), New Delhi, 1996.
- Winternitz, Maurice, *History of Indian Literature*, 2 vols., reprinted, New Delhi, 1991.

## Index

- Abhayadeva 206–7, 212, 215–17, 230–31; *Vādamahārṇava* 292  
*Abhidhānaçintāmaṇi* 56  
Abhinandana, the fourth Tīrthamkara 4; Vajranābha and Ajitā, chief disciples of 4; *priyaka*, tree associated with 4  
Abhira 148  
*Ācārāṅganiryukti* 227  
*Ācārāṅgasūtra* 13, 17, 19–23, 60, 69, 74, 89, 201–3, 205, 209, 223  
*Ācārāṅgaṭīkā* 251  
*Abhuta Rāmāyaṇa* 270  
Agastya, *ṛṣi* 21  
Agastyasimha 94; *Daśavaikālikacūṛṇī* 94  
Agnibhūti 26  
Agrawala, V.S. 52, 58, 299  
Ahicchatra (Adhicchatra), ancient capital of North Pañcāla 50, 59, 79–83, 94, 148  
Aihole stone inscription 156  
Aihole 159; Meguti temple at 159  
*Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* 3  
Aivaramalai stone inscription 191  
Ajātaśatru 11, 25, 209, 220, 302–3  
Ajitanātha, the second Tīrthamkara 4; Sihasena and Phaggu, first disciples of 4; *saptaṭarna*, tree associated with 4  
Ājivika, school 27; religion 81, 209, 297–99, 302, 304  
Ājivikas 27–28, 111–12, 128, 186, 205, 211, 215, 218, 298–99  
Ājivikism 27, 211, 297, 299, 303–4  
Ajjanandi 192  
Ajjanandi, Jaina saint 114  
Ajmer Museum 136  
Akalaṅka 146, 166; *Pramāṇasaṃgraha* 146; *Tattvārtharājavārttika* 288–89; *Aṣṭaśatī* 289, 291; *Siddhivinīścaya* 289; *Nyāyavinīścaya* 291  
*Akalaṅkacarita* 288  
Akālavaraṣa Kannardeva. *See* Kṛṣṇa III  
Akota 96  
Ala-ud-din 81  
Alexandria 105  
Allahabad *praśasti* 90  
Alsdorf 246  
Altekar 180  
Ambapālī 46  
Amitagati 145; Subhāṣitaratna-sandoha 145  
Amoghavarṣa I 142, 146, 178–80, 260, 272; known as Dhavala and Atiśaya Dhavala 181; *Praśnottararatnamālā* 180, 273  
Ammā II (Vijayāditya) 173–74; undated Masulipatnam grant of 174  
Amoghavarṣa III 177  
Amṛtacandra 291; *Pañcāstikāyāsāra* (173 verses) 284; *Tattvārthasāra* 291; *Ātmakhyāti* 291  
Aṇahilapātaka 207, 230  
Aṇahillapura 140–41, 149  
Ānanda (of Vāṇiggāma), a rich and pious Jaina votary 26  
Ananta, the fourteenth Tīrthamkara 6; Yaśa and Padmā, disciples of 6; *aśvattha*, tree associated with 6  
Anāthapiṇḍika 26  
Aṅga texts, known eleven 201

- Āṅgavijjā* 225–26, 246  
*Āṅguttara* 24, 40, 47, 204, 206, 300, 302, 310, 312  
*Antagaḍadasāo* (*Antakṛtadaśā*) 47, 216, 310  
 Anurādhapura, Nigaṅṭha ascetic temples at 104; Nirgrantha monastery of 107  
*Anuttaropapātikadaśā* 216  
 Aparājita 290  
 Aranātha, Jaina Tīrthamkara 7; Kumbha and Rakkhiyā, chief disciples of 7  
 Ārdraka 205  
 Arhadāsī 56  
 Arikeśārī II 175–77  
 Arikeśārī III 177  
 Ariṣṭanemi (Neminātha), the twenty-second Tīrthamkara 7, 51, 82, 84–86, 94, 213, 216; Varadatta and Yakkīni, chief disciples of 8; *vetasa*, tree associated with 8; as a kinsman of Vāsudeva 75  
 Arivan (Ādinātha) 110  
*Arthaśāstra* (of Kauṭilya) 202, 207, 225, 247, 261, 276, 304  
 Āryanandin 170  
 Āryarakṣita 89  
 Āryavarman (Harivarman) 118, 126  
 Āryāvarta 44  
 Āśāḍhasena 80  
 Āsamitta, the fourth Niṅhava 83  
 Aśoka 37, 70, 71, 76, 202, 304; inscriptions of 36; the thirteenth Rock Edict of 70, 72; the seventh Pillar Edict of 303  
 Aṣṭāhnikā festival 109, 120, 124–25  
*Aśvaghōṣa* 57, 202, 254  
 Aśvasena 11  
 Audambara (tribe) 35  
*Aupapātikasūtra* 25, 83, 110, 218, 224, 311–12; eight types of Brāhmaṇa *parivṛājakas* mentioned in 218; eight types of Kṣatriya *parivṛā-*  
*jakas* mentioned in 218  
 Avantīputta 41  
*Avanūsundarikathā* 122  
*Avarakamkā* 214  
*Āvaśyakabhāṣya* 14, 17  
*Āvaśyakaniryukti* 1, 26, 55, 63, 69, 85–86, 91, 93, 227  
 Avinīta 117, 120–22  
 Ayodhyā 1, 3–4, 40, 42  
 Bādāmi (fort) 127  
 Bagchi, P.C. 14  
 Bahasatimitra/Bṛhaspatimitra 80  
 Bāhubali 85, 169  
 Bahuputta. *See* Bahuputtiyā  
 Bahuputtiyā, goddess 21; Bahuputta shrine, dedicated to 21  
 Baladina, Ārya 52  
 Balatrata, Ārya 52, 59  
 Bālin 245, 247  
 Balisaha, disciple of Mahāgiri 34; *śākhā* originated from: Kauśāmbikā 34–35  
 Bāna 98, 255, 265; *Kādambarī* 98, 255, 276  
 Banerji, R.D. 50, 54, 56–57, 74–75, 80  
 Bankura 134  
*Bārasa-Aṅgavekkhā* 284–85  
 Barua, B.M. 74, 298–99  
 Basham, A.L. 299, 301, 304  
 Basu, R.D. 80  
 Bay of Bengal 104  
 Beg, Ghulam Rasul 82  
 Bhadrabāhu 34, 48, 60, 117, 200–201, 223–24, 226, 274, 284; *Uttarādhyayananiiryukti* 221, 227; *Piṇḍa* 225; *Oghaniryukti* 225  
 Bhadrayaśas, disciple of Suhasūn 35; *śākhās* originated from: Bhadriryikā and Kākandikā 35  
 Bhāgavata, the cult of 42, 59  
*Bhāgavatapurāna* (Vaiṣṇava work) 2–5, 74, 98, 225



- Bhagavatī* (*Vyākhyāprajñapti*) 12, 18–22, 25–28, 32–35, 42, 47, 56, 60, 73, 81, 83–84, 209 *passim*, 298–301 *passim*  
*Bhagavatī-ārādhana* 90  
 Bhandarkar, D.R. 134, 304  
 ‘Bharadhavasa’ (Bhāratavarṣa) 74  
 Bhārata (war) 209  
 Bharata 245  
 Bharatpur 137  
 Bhāravī 157  
 Bhāsa 46, 247; *Cārudatta* 46, 247;  
*Pratijñāyagandharāyaṇa* 229  
 Bhīma 175  
 Bhinnamāla (Bhīnmāl) 97, 135, 139–40  
 Bhogivarman 162  
 Bhoja I 136, 146  
 Bhojakas 72  
 Bhṛgukaccha (Broach) 87, 96, 140;  
 Mūlavasati and Śakunikā *vihāras*  
 of 87, 139–40, 253  
 Bhūtabali 259–60; *Mahābandha* 261  
 Bimbisāra (Bhambhasāra) 25  
 Bindusāra 70  
*Bodhapāhuḍa* 284  
 Bombay Museum 97  
 Brahmagupta 273; *Brāhmasphuṭa-*  
*siddhānta* 273  
 Brahman 112  
*Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* 3, 98  
 Brāhmī, inscriptions 113–14; char-  
 acters 115; script 208  
 Bṛhaspatidatta 35  
*Bṛhatkalpa* 36, 224, 227  
*Bṛhatṭippanikā* 251  
 British Museum 174  
 Buddha (Gautama Buddha) 20–21,  
 24, 26–27, 33, 41, 69, 71  
 Buddhaghōṣa 225, 230; *Sumaṅgala-*  
*vilāsini* 300; *Pañcasūdanī* 300  
 Buddhi 54  
 Bühler 43–48, 50–51, 54, 56–58, 64,  
 92  
 Būtuga II/Nanniya Gaṅga 165–67,  
 184, 288  
 Cāhamāna 151  
 Cakreśvari 176  
 Cālukya/s 127–28, 145, 160, 169,  
 173, 175, 178; Western 156;  
 Bādāmi 171; Veṅgī 172; Eastern  
 172, 175; dynasty 174–75, 177,  
 184  
 Cāpa/s (dynasty) 135, 140–41  
*Cambridge History of India* 11, 29  
 Campā 207, 209–11, 214–15, 218,  
 220, 299; Devadattā, famous pros-  
 titute of 213–14; temple of  
 Vāsupūjya at 247; Aṅgamandira  
 shrine of 310; Pūrṇabhadra  
 shrine at 218, 224, 311  
 Cāmuṇḍarāja 142  
 Cāmuṇḍarāya 168, 181, 263, 287;  
*Cāmuṇḍarāyapurāṇa* 168, 181,  
 266  
 Caṇḍa 26  
 Candanā, a Jaina nun 26, 210  
 Candanāpurī (Candanpuri) 145–46;  
 Amoghavasati, Jaina monastery  
 situated at 145–46  
 Candella 143, 151  
 Candrabhāgā (Chenab) 94  
 Candragupta 48, 70, 90, 117; as a  
 Jaina devotee 37; as an orthodox  
 Hindu 37  
 Candragupta I 94  
 Candragupta II 94  
 Candranandin, Ācārya 120  
 Candraprabha, the eighth Tīr-  
 thaṅkara 5, 90, 96; Diṇṇa and  
 Sumanā, chief disciples of 5;  
*nāgavṛkṣa*, tree associated with 5  
*Candrajñapti* 220  
*Cāraṇa-bhāvanā* 109  
 Cāraṇārs, a class of Jaina ascetics  
 108–10, 114–15, 191  
 Cārudatta 204, 217

- Cārvāka, philosophy of 248  
 Caulukya (dynasty) 142  
 caves of: Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri hills 76–77, 150; Pabhosa 80; Dank and Bawa Pyara 86–87; Śon Bhāṇḍāra 93; Āṇḍar-Maḍam 188; Aivarmalai hill 191; Candragumphā (of Girnar hills) 86, 259; Barabar Hill 73, 303; Nāgārjuni Hill 304  
 Cedi, family 70, 77; king 70, 72, 75  
 Cera 108, 112, 177  
 Ceṭaka, Kṣatriya chief of Vaiśālī 19, 220, 303  
*Ceṭakakathā* 229  
 Chakravarti 107  
 Chausa 97  
 Chedasūtras, known six 223  
 Citrakūṭa 138, 230, 248  
 Cola, empire 188; period 188, inscription 189, 248  
 Cola/s 108, 110, 112, 116–17, 185  
 Cuddapah 119  
*Cullavagga* 301  
 Cunningham 82–83, 85, 94  
 Dadhikarṇa, the temple of 56  
 Dadhivāhana 69–70  
 Daśapura 87, 91  
 Daśaratha 243, 245  
 Daśārṇa 222  
*Daśāśrutaskandha* 224, 226  
*Daśavaikālika* 221, 223, 226–27  
 Datta, Ārya 51–52  
 Demetrius 73  
 Deva, Ārya 55  
 Devadatta 25, 28, 57  
 Devānandā, Brāhmaṇa lady 17, 47, 209–10; Mahāvīra's real mother 18  
 Devagupta, Mahākavi 94, 224  
*devanīrmita stūpa* 43, 54, 63–64, 228  
 Devasena 116, 122, 144; *Darśanasāra* 116, 144, 264, 285; *Ārādhanaśāra* 88, 264  
*Dhammapada* 221–22, 312  
 Dhanañjaya 267; *Anekārthanāmā-mālā* 267; *Nāmamālā* 267; *Rāghavapāṇḍaviya (Dvisandhāna)* 267; *Viśāpahārastotra* 267  
 Dhanapāla 144; *Pāiyalacchī* 144; *Tilakamañjarī* 255; *Rṣabhapañcā-sikā* 255  
 Dhaṅga 143  
 Dhaṅga (Dhanya) 213  
 Dhanvantari 217  
 Dharasena, Jaina saint 86; Samādhi-maraṇa of 86  
 Dharasena II 96  
 Dharavalā, the gift of 56  
 Dharmaghoṣa, Jaina ascetic 213  
 Dharmaghoṣā, an *āṃtevāsini* of Jayasena 47  
 Dharmānātha, the fifteenth Tirthaṅkara 6; Ariṣṭa and Śiva, chief disciples of 6; *dadhīparṇa*, tree associated with 6  
 Dharmakīrti 291  
*Dharmaparikṣā* 145  
 Dharmapuri 170, 187; known Tagaḍūru in ancient times 187; Mallikārjuna temple at 170  
 Dharmavṛddhi 54  
 Dharwar 178–79, 182–84  
 Dhruvasena (of Ānandanagara) 95  
 Dhruvasena I 17, 95  
 Digambara/s 3, 21, 37, 64, 81–82, 86–88 passim; school 93; important works (of writers) in the tenth century AD 277  
*Dīgha Nikāya* 13–14, 20, 25, 112, 207, 210, 212, 218, 300, 309  
*digvijaya* (of Arjuna) 86  
 Dikshitar 108  
 Diṅnāga 289, 291; *Nyāyapraveśa* 289  
*Dīpavamsā* 104, 106  
 Dvārakā (Bāravaī) 40, 213  
 Divākara 128

- Draupadī (Dovai) 214, 216  
 Draviḍa 185, 204  
 Durgā 111, 208, 311  
 Durvinita 122
- Elācārya, Jaina savant 138, 165–66, 259  
 Ellora 86; Jaina images from 97  
 Erāvati/Acirāvati (Rapti) 206
- Fa-hien 81, 84, 274  
 Fleet 45, 52, 124, 127, 157, 159, 165, 174  
 four ages (Kṛta, Kali, Tretā, and Dvāpara) 203  
 Führer 56, 80, 82
- Gajabāhu (Kayavāgu) 105–6  
 Gandhahastin, earlier commentator of the *Ācārāṅga* 201  
 Gandhāras (Gadara) 44  
 Gaṇeśa 215  
 Gaṅgā 35, 206, 250  
 Gaṅga, family 118–19, 140; empire 118, 160, 163; kingdom 118–19; copperplates 119; inscriptions 119, 164, 168; records 121; ruler 122, 160, 168, 172  
 Gaṅgas 123–24, 163, 178; Western 117, 119, 187  
 Gautama, *ṛṣi* 21. Gotamaka shrine, dedicated to 21  
 Geiger 104  
*Ghaṭa Jātaka* 216  
 Giri, the Nigaṅṭha 104  
 Girinagara. *See* Girnar  
 Girnar 85, 86, 140, 142, 259  
*Gītā* (*Bhagavadgītā*) 220, 247, 250  
 Godāsa, disciple of Bhadrabāhu 34, 52; *śākhās* originating from: Tāmraliptikā 34, Koṭivarṣiyā 34, Puṇḍravardhaniyā 34  
 Gośāla (Maṅkhaliputta Gośāla) 22, 24, 27–28, 33, 35, 81, 205, 211, 297–98, 300–303, 310  
 Goṣṭhamāhila 87; Avaddhiya doctrine, founded by 87  
 Gotamaka. *See* Gautama  
 Gotiputra 43–45  
 Govinda III 163, 178  
 Govinda IV 182–83  
*Govindaniryukti* 228  
 Guhanandin 92–93  
 Guhila 151  
 Guṇabhadra 180, 270; *Uttarapurāṇa* 180–81, 269, 276  
 Guṇādhyā 241; *Bṛhathkathā* 91, 241, 246–47  
 Guṇaśīla (shrine) 208  
 Gundāvana 41  
 Gunji Rock inscription (of Kumāravīradatta) 3  
 Guntur 173, 175  
 Gupta period 82, 89–91, 93, 97–98, 123, 134, 147, 211, 246; Jina images of 94  
 Gupta inscription 263
- Hanumat 243  
 Hargovind Das, Pandit 109; *Prakrit Dictionary* 109  
 Haribhadra 138, 200, 219, 223–24, 230, 247–48, 254, 266, 282, 288–89; *Dhūrtākhyāna* 228, 249; *Pañcāśaka* 248; *Samarāiccakahā* 248–49, 254, 276; *Anekāntajayapatākā* 289; *Upadeśapada* 290  
 Hari Gupta 94  
 Hariṇgameśi 18, 47; identified with Kārttikeya 209  
 Hariṣeṇa 34, 37, 64, 81, 139, 150, 159, 276; *Bṛhathkathākośa* 34, 37, 64, 81, 93, 95, 97, 139, 147, 150, 159, 262–63, 268, 273  
*Harivamśapurāṇa* 246–47  
 Harivarman 136  
 Harṣa 157  
 Harṣa Siyaka 144; Harsola grant of

- 144  
 Hastikuṇḍī (Hathuṇḍi) 136  
 Hastimalla 118; Udayendiram plates of 190  
 Hastināpura 6–7, 24, 35, 207, 210, 222  
 Hastipāla 28  
 Hastisīmha 76  
 Hāthīgumphā inscription 70, 75–76, 312  
 Hemacandra 218, 243, 252  
 Huviṣka 52, 54–56
- Ichāvādi 165; fragmentary stone inscription of Būtuga II at 165  
 Ikṣumatī, the river, identified with Saṅkissa 83  
 Ikṣvākus 24  
 Ilango, Ceral 106–8; *Śilappadikāram*, the Sangam epic 105–10, 112, 115; Śiva, Viṣṇu, Murugan, and Durgā referred in 108  
 Indo-Greek ruler 73  
 Indra III (Nityavarṣa) 182; Dānavulapāḍu pillar inscription of the reign of 182; Hatti Mattur stone inscription of the reign of 182  
 Indrabhūti (Imḍabhuti) 12, 26–28, 205, 208, 215, 222  
 Indranandi 184; *Jvālāmālinīkalpa* 184; *Śrutāvātāra* 260, 283  
 Indranandin, Ācārya 82, 94  
 Indrarakṣita 84
- Jacobi 19  
*Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa* 307  
 Jain, J.C. 250, 263  
 Jaisalmer *bhāṇḍāra* 95  
 Jamālī, Mahāvira's son-in-law 21, 28, 35; first Niṣhava 28, 81  
*Jambūdvīpaprajñapti* 220  
 Jarāsandha 40  
 Jaṭāsīmhanandin 172, 262; *Varāṅga-carita* 86, 172, 262, 265–66
- Jaṭāyu 243  
 Jayabhūti 50–51  
*Jayadhavalā* 260, 268–69, 271  
 Jayaghoṣa 222  
 Jayasena 47; *Pañcāstikāyasāra* (181 verses) 284  
 Jayasīmha 252–53; *Dharmopadeśa-mālā* 252  
 Jayasīmha II 172  
 Jayaswal 73–75  
 Jeṣṭhasti 58  
 Jetavana *vihāra* 81  
 Jhansi 147; Deogarh temples at 147  
 Jinabhadraṅgi 54, 95–96, 246, 287; *Viśeṣāvāsyakabhāṣya* 95, 223, 227–28, 241; *Jitakalpasūtra* 224; *Jitakalpabhāṣya* 227  
 Jinadāsagaṅgi Mahattara 37, 200–201, 223–25, 246, 252; *Niśīthaviśeṣa-cūṛṇī* 37, 229, 249; *Āvāsyakacūṛṇī* 1, 19, 89, 200, 229, 287; *Nandī-cūṛṇī* 229; *Anuyogadvāracūṛṇī* 225, 229, 241, 261, 310; *Daśavaikālika-cūṛṇī* 229; *Uttarādhyayanacūṛṇī* 229; *Sūtrakṛtāṅgacūṛṇī* 229–30  
 Jina-Kāñci 117  
 Jinaprabha 64, 80–82, 85, 135, 138–39, 147, 255; *Vividhatīrthakalpa* 64, 80, 82, 85, 96, 135, 138–39, 147, 159, 255, 283  
 Jinasena I 93, 96, 287–88; *Ādīpurāṇa* 93, 267–69, 271, 291; *Pārśvābhya-daya* 180, 267–69  
 Jinasena II 135, 139; *Harivamśapurāṇa* 56, 96, 135, 180, 250, 265, 267–68, 273  
 Jinavallabha 175–76  
*Jivājivābhigama* 219  
*Jivakacintāmaṇi* 192  
 Jivantasvāmin, temple of 91  
 Jotiya, the Nigaṅtha 104  
 Junagarh 86  
 Jvālāmālinī (Uriamma) 146

- Kadamba, kingdom 122; dominion 127; kings 127; dynasty 285  
 Kadambas 123, 126, 128, 160–61  
 Kaikeyī 247  
 Kākavarṇa (Kālāsoka) 70  
 Kakkuka 136; Ghaṭiyālā inscription of 136  
 Kakubha 92  
 Kākusthavarman 123–25; Halsi grant of 123–24  
 Kalacuri/s 96, 151  
 Kālāñjara 222  
 Kalhaṇa 149; *Rājataranṅiṇi* 149  
 Kali Age 4  
 Kālīdāsa 157; *Meghadūta* 267  
 Kālīṅga 45, 69–72, 76–77, 222, 312; Jina of 74–75  
*Kalpāsūtra* 1–3, 12, 14, 17–19, 21–23, 27, 29, 34, 47, 69, 85–86, 95, 203, 209, 219, 224, 226  
 Kāmadeva 310  
 Kāmardhi, disciples of Suhastin 35; *śākhā* originated from: Śrāvastikā 35  
*Kāmasāstra* 71  
 Kambayya (Stambha) 178; Manne plates of 178  
 Kāmboja 222; horses of 219  
 Kāmiddhī 51  
 Kāmpilya/Kampil, the capital of southern Pañcāla 83, 148, 207, 218, 222  
 Kaṁsa 40  
 Kanahasaha 55  
 Kanakasabhai 107  
 Kāncī 116, 125, 186, 228, 262, 285; Kāmakaṭṭam Śiva temple of 186  
 Kaṇḍarāyaṇa, Brāhmaṇa 41  
 Kaṇhavenṇa (Kṛṣṇā) 71  
 Kaṇṣka 47–49, 58; era of 80, 92  
 Kaṅkāli Ṭilā 43, 46–48, 55, 76  
 Kapilavastu 24  
 Kāpiśī, identified with Opian 85, 133, 219  
 Karaṇḍu/Karakaṇḍa/Karakaṇḍaka (Karaṇḍu-Karakaṇḍu), a Pacceka Buddha 69–70, 222  
 Karāta 70  
 Karkuhastha 56  
 Kārttikeya 47  
 Kāśī 5, 11, 13, 20, 29, 32, 92–93, 148, 209  
 Kaṭaccuris 96  
*Kathāsaritsāgara* 249  
*Kathāvattu* 104  
 Kauravas 24  
 Kauśāmbī 32, 34–36, 42–43, 79–81, 148, 207, 210, 224  
 Kāverī 105, 110, 189  
 Kāveripattīnam 108, 110; Nirgrantha temple at 108  
 Keśin 12, 14, 222  
 Ketas. *See* Simhapura *kevala-jñāna* 29, 86  
 Khajuraho 143; inscription of the reign of Dhaṅga 143; Jinanātha temple at 143  
 Khāravala 45, 70–74, 76–77, 94, 98; military stature of 72  
 Kielhorn 180  
 Kirāta 70  
 Kīrtivarman I 127, 156  
 Kīrtivarman II 159  
 Kolar 120; Nonamaṅgala grant of 120; Perur Evāṇi Adigal Arhat temple of 120  
 Kolhapur 146; Altemi copperplates (grants) discovered at 127, 146  
 Koṅkaṇivarman (Mādhava I) 118–19  
 Konnur stone inscription 179  
 Konow 93  
 Kopaṇa/Kopbal, second Jaina holy place of Karnataka 171–72, 183, 266; identified with Kung-kan-napu-lo of Yuan Chwang 171  
 Kosala 29, 42–43, 81, 206, 209  
 Koṭivarṣa, capital of Lāḍha 34

- Kṛṣṇa 19, 40, 75, 213, 215, 247;  
Rukmiṇī and Jāmbavatī, wives of  
216
- Kṛṣṇa II 169, 181, 270; Saundatti  
inscription of the reign of 181;  
Mulgund inscription of the reign  
of 181
- Kṛṣṇa III 166–67, 177, 183–84, 189,  
276; Karhad plates of 184; Karjol  
inscription of 184
- Kṛṣṇavarman I 126
- Kṣema 57
- Kumāradāsa 304; *Jānakīharaṇa* 304
- Kumāragupta 90–91
- Kumāramitā 50–53
- Kumārputras. *See* Indrabhūti
- Kumārīparvata. *See* caves of
- Kumbhakarṇa 242, 245, 313
- Kumbhaṇḍa, the Nigaṇṭha *sādhu*  
104
- Kuṇāla (king) 37
- Kuṇāla (N. Kosala) 36
- Kuṇavāyil, the temple of 108
- Kundakunda 88, 128, 260–61, 283,  
285; *Bhāvapāhuda* 88; *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍā-*  
*gamaṭikā* 283; *Rayasāra* 284;  
*Niyamasāra* 284; *Samayasāra* 284
- Kunthu, Jaina Tirthamkara 7; Sva-  
yambhu and Amjuyā, disciples  
of 7
- Kural*, a Jaina poem 106–7
- Kuṣāṇa, period 3, 47, 56, 58–59, 79,  
80, 82; inscription 58, 82–83
- Kuṣāṇas 55
- Kuśadhvaja Janaka 83
- Lādha 34, 69
- Lakṣmaṇa 243, 245, 247, 270
- Lalitavistara* 207, 290
- Laṅkā 242, 245
- Lāṭa (Lāṭadeśa) 251, 253
- Lohācārya 261; *Ārādhanā* 261–62
- Lokavibhāga* 262
- Lüders 44, 46–48, 50–53, 59, 76–  
77, 82
- Luke 214
- Machilipatnam (Masulipatnam) 174
- Mādhava II (also known as Mādhava  
III) 118, 120; Penukoṇḍa plates  
of 118–20
- Madhurasūtra* 41
- Madura 110, 113–15, 171, 192;  
Nirgrantha temple of 110; Jaina  
relics of 113
- Maduraikkanchi* 113
- Magadha 40, 76, 299
- Māghahasti. *See* Maṅguhasti
- Mitra, R.L. 58
- Mahābhārata* 3, 8, 14, 21, 40, 44, 70,  
72, 75, 83, 86, 202–3, 213–15,  
217, 261, 267, 270, 274, 307, 309–  
11; Nami (Videhan monarch)  
identified with Nimi (of Brahma-  
nical and Buddhist) in 204
- Mahāgiri 89, 91
- Mahākaccāna 41
- Mahāmeghavāhana 70, 77
- Mahānīśīthasūtra* 54, 64
- Mahāpadma Nanda 72, 75
- Mahāpurāṇa*. *See* Guṇabhadra
- Māharakkhita/Māgharakṣita 43, 84
- Mahāsena 138; *Pradyumnacarita-*  
*kāvya* 138
- Mahāvagga* 27
- Mahāvamsā* 104, 106–7, 304
- Mahāvastu* 207
- Mahāvijaya 73
- Mahāvīra, the last (twenty-fourth)  
Tirthamkara 17–29, 32–35, 40–  
42, 47, 58, 60, 64, 69, 73–74, 79,  
81, 83–84 passim
- Mahāvīrācārya 180; *Gaṇitasārasam-*  
*graha* 180, 272
- Mahendravarman I 185; *Mattavilāsa-*  
*prahasana* 185
- Mahī 206
- Mahmūd (of Ghazni) 138

- Majjhima Nikāya* 24–25, 297, 303, 310  
 Malakuṭa (Mo-lo-ku-ta) 185  
 Malaprabhā (river) 179  
 Mālava 148, 251  
 Malayagiri 219, 224, 272  
 Mallavādin 290; *Dharmottaraṭīp-panāka* 290  
 Malli, Jaina Tīrthamkara 7, 110, 214; Indra and Bandhumatī, chief disciples of 7; *āsoka*, tree associated with 7  
 Maṅguhasti (Maṅgu), Ārya 55, 88, 97, 227  
 Mammaṭa 136–37  
 Mañcapurīgumphā records 76  
 Mandasor 143  
 Maṅgaleśa (Maṅgalarāja) 156  
 Māṅikyanandi 291; *Parikṣāmukha-sūtra* 291  
 Mankani inscription 96  
 Maṅkhu, Ārya 88, 260  
*Manusmṛti* 217  
 Mārasimha 118, 163–64, 172, 185  
 Mārasimha III 164, 167–68; Kudlur plates of 164–66  
 Marshall 85  
 Mathurā 3, 32–33, 40–48, 50, 64, 79, 81, 87, 147, 207, 227–28, 253 passim  
 Mathurā inscription 4, 6–8, 45, 50, 88, 109, 227; Maṅgu mentioned in 55, 84  
 Mathurā Lion Capital inscriptions 45  
*Mattavilāsaprahasana* 111  
 Matthew 214  
 Mauryan, period 41, 79, 84, 145, 303; rulers 70; dynasty 37  
 Meghavāhana 70, 77  
 Melapātī (Melapādi) 184  
 Mercara treasury 121  
*Merumandiram*, Tamil Jaina work 106  
 Merutuṅga 139, 141; *Prabandhacintā-maṇi* 139–41, 144  
*Milindapañha* 219  
 Mithilā 7, 207, 222  
 Moggarapāni, *yakṣa* 43  
 Mohenjo-daro 98  
 Mora Well inscriptions 45  
 Moriyaputta 26  
 Mrgeśavarman 123–24, 126, Kālavānga village, a gift of: divided in three equal portions 124  
*Mūlācāra* 227, 284  
 Mūlarāja I 142  
 Muṣkara/Mokkara 160  
 Nāgārjuna 92, 95  
 Nagarkoyil 115  
*nāgas* 56  
 Nāgasarikā (Nausari) 142  
 Nāgasena 54  
 Nālandā 22, 24, 32, 149, 205, 301, 309  
 Naminātha, Jaina Tīrthamkara 7, 140; Śubha and Amalā, chief disciples of 7; *bakula*, tree associated with 7  
*Nirayavalikā* 13–14, 19, 25, 209, 220, 303, 309  
 Nanda/s 41, 70, 72, 75, 77, 200  
 Nandibala 56  
*Nandīcūrnī* 92  
 Nandiṣeṇa 255; *Ajitaśāntistava* 255  
*Nandīsūtra* 2, 55, 88, 207, 216, 224, 227, 261, 272  
 Nandiśvara, the time of. *See* Aṣṭāhnika festival  
 Nandivardhana 22  
 Nandivarman II (Kumāramārtaṇḍan) 186–87, 189  
 Nandiviśāla 53  
*Naṅguṭṭha Jātaka* 206, 303  
 Narasimharājapura 162  
 Narasimhavarman II 186  
 Naravāhana II 174–75  
 Nāsik 145–46, 179, 182

- Nāthaputta (Nirgrantha Nāthaputta) 24, 27, 33  
*Nāyādharmakahāo* (*Jñātr̥dharmakathā*) 7, 13–14, 40, 42, 84–86, 212–13, 215, 309, 311  
 Nemicandra 241; *Taraṅgalolā* 241; *Gommaṣāsāra* 119, 263  
*Nemināthacarīyu* 141, 248  
 Nerur grant 156  
*Nīlakeṣī*, Tamil Jaina work 106–7  
 Nirgrantha, doctrine 20; religion 25–26, 32–33, 38, 69, 77, 80, 82, 84; ascetics 26, 77, 111, 124, 162, 214; *muni* 108; temple of 108; *sādhus* 114  
*Niśītha*, first Chedasūtra 223  
 Nītimārga II 165  
 Ogha, Ārya 51  
 Ojha, G.H. 36, 138  
 Okhārikā 57–58  
 Pādalipta 98; *Taraṅgavatī* 98, 241  
 Padmanābha 118–19  
 Padmaprabha (Suprabha), the sixth Tīrthamkara 5, 80; Suvrata and Rati, disciples of 5; *chatrābha*, tree associated with 5  
 Paharpur 92; inscription of 93, 134  
 Pāla, Ārya 51  
 Pāla period 134, 149  
 Palāśikā (Halsi) 125, 127; Jinendra temple of 123, 126  
 Pallava, inscription 117; period 187  
 Pallava/s 105, 115–17, 120, 124, 185  
 Pampa 175, 176; *Vikramārjunavijaya* (*Pampabhārata*) 175–76; *Ādi-purāna* 175–76  
*Pañcakalṣamahābhāṣya* 224  
 Pañcāla region 80  
*Pañcānacandamūrti* 85  
 Pañcāśaka 248; *Samarāiccakahā* 248–49, 254, 276; *Anekāntajayapatākā* 289; *Upadeśapada* 290  
*Pañcatantra* 274  
 Pāṇḍavas 214–15  
 Pāṇḍipura (Ādūr) 127  
 Pāṇḍukābhaya 104  
 Pāṇḍya/s 108, 110, 112, 177, 191  
 Pāṇini 83, 215, 218  
*Paṇṇāpaṇṇā* 34  
 Paramāras 144  
 Parameśvaravarman I 186; Nalanampadu stone inscription of the reign of 186  
 Parāntaka I 189–90  
 Pārśvanātha (Pārśva), the penultimate Jaina Tīrthamkara 11, 14, 25–26, 32–33, 40–42, 56, 58, 60, 82–84, 87–88, 90, 96, 105 passim; Puppacūlā, principle lady disciple of 13–14; worshipped as Dharaṇīnda 82  
 Paśupati 202  
 Pāṭalipura 115–16  
 Pāṭaliputra (Kusumapura) 92, 200, 204, 211, 241, 282–83, 290  
 Patañjali 41, 83; *Mahābhāṣya* 304  
 Patna Museum 97  
 Pattani worship 106  
 Pāvā 28–29, 211  
*Periplus* 97, 206, 225  
 Persepolis inscriptions, of Darius 44; of Xerxes 44  
 Poṭhayas/Proṣṭhas 44  
*Prabandhacintāmaṇi* 140, 255  
*Prabandhakośa* 241  
 Prabhācandra 128, 286–87; *Kathākośa* 261, 285, 288  
 Prabhani plates 177  
 Prabhāsa 206  
*Prabhāvahacarita* 141, 144, 241, 248, 254–55  
 Prabhūtavarṣa. *See* Govind III  
*Prabodhacandrodaya* 107, 254  
 Pradyota 26  
*Pradyumnacaritakāvya* 144  
 Prasenajit (Pasenadi) 26, 81, 219



- Praśnavyākaraṇa* 216  
 Pratihāra 136, 253  
*Pravacanasāra* 283–84  
 pre-Kuṣāṇa, inscription 46–48;  
     record 47; period 46  
 Premi, N.L. 264, 267–68  
 Prince of Wales Museum 97  
 Ptolemy 74, 108, 206  
 Pudukkottai, Jaina sites of 115  
 Pūjyapāda 122, 128, 158, 264, 272,  
     285, 287; *Śabdāvatāra* 122; *Sarvā-*  
     *rthasiddhi* 283–84, 288  
 Pulakeśin I 127, 157  
 Pulakeśin II 156–57  
 Puṇdra 70  
 Puṇḍravardhana 34, 133–34, 274  
 Pūraṇa Kassapa, one of the six great  
     rivals of Buddha 298–99, 300  
*Purāṇanaprabandhasamgraha* 139,  
     141  
 Purulia 134  
 Puṣpadanta 90, 260, 275–76; *Tisatti-*  
     *mahāpūrīṣaguṇālaṅkāru* (*Triṣaṣṭi-*  
     *mahāpuruṣaguṇālaṅkāra*) 274;  
     *Nāyakumāracarīyu* (*Nāgaku-*  
     *māracarita*) 274–75; *Jasahara-*  
     *cariyu* (*Yeśodharacarita*) 274–75  
 Puṣpadanta/Suvidhi, the ninth  
     Tīrthamkara 5; Varāha and  
     Vāruṇī, disciples of 5; *mali/mallī*,  
     tree associated with 5  
 Puṣyamitra (monk) 47–48  
 Puṣyamitra Śuṅga 74  
  
 Rahavīrapura (Rathavīrapura) 87  
 Rājagrha 22, 32, 43, 46, 79–80, 93,  
     133, 207, 213–14, 216, 223, 298–  
     99, 309, 312; Gautamauka tem-  
     ple of 310; Guṇaśīla shrine of 311  
 Rājamalla I 164  
 Rājamalla II 164–65  
 Rājamalla III 165  
 Rājamalla IV 168  
*Rājapraśnīya*, the second Upāṅga  
     text 206, 218  
 Rājarāja I 187, 190  
 Rājarsi Vasu 76  
 Rājaśekhara 74; *Prabandhakośa* 248  
 Rājasimha II 191  
 Rājasūya 73  
 Rajgir 73; inscription of 94  
*rākṣasas* 72, 242, 307, 310, 313  
 Raktapura 158–59  
 Rāma 242–43, 245, 270  
*Rāmāyaṇa* 2–3, 20, 83, 225, 242–43,  
     245, 247, 261, 267, 307, 310, 313  
 Ranna 183; *Ajitatīrthakarapurāṇa-*  
     *tilakam* 183  
 Rāstrakūta/s 121, 137, 142, 144, 146,  
     163, 166, 168–70, 177–78, 180  
     passim  
 Raṭhikas 72  
*Ratnakaraṇḍakaśrāvakācāra* (*Upā-*  
     *sakādhyayana*) 286  
 Raṭtas 168–70  
 Rāvaṇa 242–43, 245, 247, 270, 313  
 Ravigupta 94  
 Ravikīrti 156–57  
 Raviṣeṇa 159, 270; *Padmapurāṇa*  
     (*Padmacarita*) 264–65, 270  
 Ravivarman 123–26; undated Hāsi  
     grant of 125–26  
*Rāyapāsenīya* 14  
 Raychaudhuri 37  
 Rice 168  
*Riṭṭhanemicariyu* 272  
 Rohaṇa, Ārya, disciple of Suhastin  
     35, 50, 86; *sākhā* originated from:  
     Audambarikā/ Udumbarikā 35,  
     86  
 Rohiṇī 214  
 Rome 105  
 Rṣabhanātha (Ādinātha), regarded  
     as the first Tīrthamkara 1–3, 56–  
     58, 81, 87, 134, 136, 141, 175–  
     76; Rṣabhasena and Bāmbhī, first  
     disciples of 1; regarded as an  
     *avatāra* of Viṣṇu 2; *nyagrodha*, tree

- associated with 1; temple of 135  
 Ṛṣigupta, disciple of Suhastin 35;  
*śākhā* originated from: Saurāṣ-  
 trika 35, 84  
 Rudradāsa 53
- Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya* 289  
 Sahni, D.R. 57  
 Śaiva 53  
 Śakas 44  
 Śakaṭāyana 272; *Śabdānuśāsana* 272;  
*Amoghavṛtti* 272  
 Śāketa. *See* Ayodhyā  
 Śākyamuni 35  
 Salt Range 85, 133  
 Śāmā, Ārya 58  
 Samaṇa. *See* Mahāvira  
 Samantabhadra 128, 264, 283, 285,  
 287, 291; *Gandhahastimahābhāṣya*  
 283; *Āptamīmāṃsā* (*Devāgama*)  
 286, 289, 291; *Yuktyanuśāsana*  
 286; *Svayambhūstotra* 286; *Jinastu-  
 tiśataka* 286  
 Samataṭa 133  
*Samavāyāṅga* 1, 14, 207, 246  
 Sambhava 54  
 Sambhavanātha, the third Tīr-  
 thamkara 4, 81; Cāru and Sāmā,  
 prominent disciples of 4; tem-  
 ple of 81  
 Samprati (Sampai) 37–38  
 Samudragupta 90  
*Samyutta* 24, 303, 309  
 Sangam, poetry 105; period 105;  
 texts 105–6, 113–14  
 Saṅgamikā 50  
 Saṅghadāsagaṇi, the Śvetāmbara  
 commentator 63, 246; *Bṛhatkalpa-  
 bhāṣya* 54, 88, 147, 224, 228;  
*Niśīthabhāṣya* 228; *Vyavahāra-  
 bhāṣya* 54, 64, 97, 140, 228  
 Śaṅkaragaṇḍa II 183–84  
 Śāntinātha, Jaina Tīrthamkara 6, 51,  
 87, 97, 137, 139, 147; Cakkāha  
 and Suī, chief disciples of 6;  
*nandī*, tree associated with 6  
 Śāntisūri 3; *Uttarādhyayanavṛtti* 3  
 Śāntivarman 125, 285  
 Sarasvati 56  
 Sarayū 206  
 Sarvanandin 116; *Lokavibhāga* 116,  
 118  
*Ṣaṣṭitantra* 214  
 Sastri, K.A.N. 191  
 Śātakarṇi 71, 227  
 Śātakarṇi I (of Śātavāhana dynasty)  
 71  
 Śātānika 69  
*Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 307  
 Śātavāhana period 98, 246  
*Satruṅjayamāhātmya* 256  
 Sāttanār, Sittalai 108; *Maṇimekalai*,  
 the Sangam epic 106–8, 111  
 Saundatti 169–70; Aṅkeśvara tem-  
 ple at 169  
 Sauvira 222  
 Senguttuvan, the Cera king 106–8  
 Setubandha 229  
 Siddharṣi 254  
 Siddhasena 287, 292; *Nyāyavatāra*  
 287; *Saṃmatitarkasūtra* 287  
 Siha, Ārya 51  
 Sihanādika 46  
 Śilāditya 95–96  
 Śilāṅka 82, 201, 252; *Ācāraṅgavṛtti*  
 82; *Caupāṇṇamahāpurīṣacariyam*  
 251–52; *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣa-  
 caritra* 252  
 Śimhala 177  
 Śimhanandi 118–19  
 Śimhapura (Sihapura) 6, 79, 85–86,  
 133  
 Śimhavarman I 116, 118, 120  
 Śimhavarman II 117  
 Śimhaviṣṇu, a devotee of Viṣṇu 116–  
 17, 121–22  
 Sindhu-Sauvira 84, 210  
 Sira Pahari 91

- Sircar, D.C. 36, 73–74, 80; *Mahamayūri* (ed. and trans.) 310
- Sirkap 85
- Śiśupāla 204
- Śiśupālavadhā 250, 254
- Śītalānātha, the tenth Tīrthamkara 5; Ānanda and Sulasā, disciples of 5; *pilāṅka*, tree associated with 5
- Śiva 112, 188, 311
- Śivabhūti 87–89; Bodiya (Digambara) sect founded by 87
- Śivadeva 59
- Śivamāra I 118, 160–61
- Śivamāra II 161–64
- Śivārya 262
- Śivasena 59
- Skanda (also known as Naigameya/Naigameśa) 18
- Skandagupta 92
- Skandavarman 120
- Smith 37
- Somadeva 150–51, 177, 184; *Yaśastilakacampū* 150–51, 177, 184, 267, 276; *Yaśodharacarita* 177; *Syādvādopaniṣad* 177; *Nitīvākyāmṛta* 177, 276; *Adhyātmataraṅgiṇī* 276–77
- Śravaṇa Belgola 117, 163–64, 167–68, 171–72, 178, 181, 185, 288; *nirvāṇa* of *ācārya* Ariṣṭanemi on Katvapra hill at 164; image of Gommateśvara at 168
- Śrāvastī 12–13, 23, 25, 27–28, 42, 79–81, 148, 207–8, 219 298–99, 301–2, 311; Jetavanavihāra of 312
- Śreyāmsa, the eleventh Tīrthamkara 6, 86; Gothubha and Dhāriṇī, chief disciples of 6
- Śrīpuruṣa 161–62; copperplate inscription of 161
- Śrīvijaya 182
- Stein 85
- Sthānāṅga* 87, 109, 205–7, 216, 219, 246, 309
- Sthira 58
- Sthūlabhadra 34, 200
- Subandhu 98; *Vāśavadattā* 98
- Sudarśanā 22
- Sudharman 26
- Śūdraka 46, 247; *Mṛcchakatika* 46, 204, 217, 246
- Suhastin 35, 38, 48–51, 84, 89. *See also* Rohaṇa, Bhadrayaśas, Kāmardhi, and Ṛṣigupta
- Suhatthi 91
- Sukhavipāla 217
- Sumati, the fifth Tīrthamkara 4; Camara and Kāsavī, chief disciples of 4; *priyaṅgu*, tree associated with 4
- Śuṅga period 43
- Supārśva, the seventh Tīrthamkara 5; Vidarbha and Somā, chief disciples of 5; *śirīṣa*, tree associated with 5
- Śūra 55
- Śūraparaka 97
- Sūryaprajñapti* 220
- Sūtrakṛtāṅga* 13, 32, 203–5, 226
- Sūtrakṛtāṅgavivaraṇas* 230
- Suvarṇavarṣa, Karkarāja 141–42; Surat plates of 141–42
- Suvrata, the twentieth Jaina Tīrthamkara 7, 41, 43; Kumbha and Puṣpavati, chief disciples of 7; *campaka*, tree associated with 7; temple of 79–80
- Śvāmīkārttikēyānuprekṣā* 263
- Svayambhū 270–72; *Paumacariyu* 270
- Śvetāmbaras 3, 17, 36, 41, 64, 81–82, 85–86, 88 *passim*
- Śyāma, Ārya 219; *Prajñāpanā* 219, list of 25½ *janapadas* mentioned in 219
- Tagara/Ter/Terāpura 97
- Takṣaśīla 79, 85
- Tamil Sangam. *See* Sangam

- Tāmralipta 208  
 Tāranātha 55  
*Tilakamañjarī* 144  
*Tolkāppiyam* 106  
 Toramāṇa 94  
 Trigarta 44  
 Trigartas, a tribe 86  
*Tripīṭaka* 13, 300  
 Triśalā 18–20, 209  
  
 Udayana 26, 35, 217  
 Udayana (of Kauśāmbī) 19, 69, 227  
 Udayana (of Sindhu-Sauvīra) 33, 80  
 Uddālaka 11  
 Udayagiri 90  
 Udyotanasūri 94, 134–35, 138, 230, 241, 251, 266, 289; *Kuvalayamālā* 94, 96–97, 134–35, 248–50, 254, 265, 276, 289  
 Ugrāditya 180; *Kalyāṇakāraka* 180, 272, 274  
 Ujjayinī 46, 90, 216, 220, 228, 253, 274, 276  
 Ujjimta/Ujjamta. *See* Girnar  
 Umāsvāti (Umāsvāmin) 282–83, 289; *Tattvārthādhipigamasūtra* 254, 282–83, 288  
 Ūncanagar, the fort of 49  
 Upadhye, A.N. 266, 283–85  
 Upaka, first naked Ājīvika monk 27  
*Upamitabhavaprapañcākathā* 253  
 Upāṅga texts, known twelve 217  
 Uparicharu Vasu 70, 75; ‘Cakadhara’ epithet given to 75  
*Upāsakadaśā* 26–27, 215, 303  
 Uppina Betgiri, very important Jaina record of AD 964 183  
 Uraiyur, Kandarapalli temple of Nirgranthas at 109  
 Utpala 304  
*Uttarādhyayanāniryukti* 87  
*Uttarādhyayanasūtra* 12, 26, 83, 88, 205, 221, 223  
*Uttarādhyayanaṭīkā* 230  
 Vadanagara 95  
 Vādirāja 287–88; *Pārśvanāthacarita* 287  
 Vaibhāra hill 94  
 Vairadeva 93  
 Vaiśālī 13, 20–22, 26, 32, 47, 80, 210, 212, 215, 221, 309–10, 312; Bahuputta shrine at 212, 309  
 Vaiṣṇavas 42, 53, 55, 95, 304; tradition of 84; literature 207, 221  
 Vajranandin 116, 122  
 Vajrasena 97  
 Vākātaka inscription 72  
 Valabhī 92, 95–96, 139, 256, 274; council of 17, 95; shrine of Candraprabhā at 139  
 Vālmiki 242, 247, 270  
 Vanarāja 140–41  
 Vaṅga 70  
 Vañji (capital of Cera king) 107–8; Nirgrantha shrine of 110  
 Varaguṇa I (Neduñjadayana) 191  
 Varaguṇa II 191  
 Varāhamihira 98, 202, 304; *Bṛhat-samhitā* 98  
 Vārāṇasī 5, 11, 14, 80, 161, 207, 211, 222, 270, 299, 311  
 Vardhamāna. *See* Mahāvira  
*Vardhamānapurāṇa* 268  
 Vasantasenā 46, 246  
 Vasantgaḍh 134  
 Vāsiṣka 52  
 Vāsudeva. *See* Kṛṣṇa  
*Vasudevacarita* 229  
*Vasudevahiṇḍī* 91, 98, 228, 246–47, 266  
 Vāsudeva, Mahārāja 57  
 Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa 70, 84, 207  
 Vasulā, Ārya 57  
 Vāsupūjya, the twelfth Tīrthamkara 6; Suhamma and Dharaṇī, chief disciples of 6; *pātala*, tree associated with 6  
 Vatsa 43

- Vātsyāyana 204  
 Vaṭṭagāmaṇi 107  
 Vaṭṭakera 261; *Mūlācāra* 261–62  
 Vāyubhūti 26  
*Vāyupurāṇa* 213  
 Vidarbha 72  
 Vidiśā 90; image of Jīvantasvāmin at 91  
*Vidudhānanda* 252  
 Vidyabhusan, S.C. 282  
*vidyādharas* 72, 242, 245, 313  
 Vidyānanda 291; *Āptamīmāṃsā-lamkṛti* 291  
 Vijaya (a majority of thieves and robbers) 213; as a person 217  
 Vijayakīrti 120  
 Vikramāditya 44  
 Vikramāditya II 158–59  
 Vimala, the thirteenth Tīrthamkara 6, 83, 98, 187; Mandara and Dharaṇidharā, chief disciples of 6; *jambu*, tree associated with 6  
 Vimalasūri 41, 43, 242–43, 245, 247, 265, 270, 313; *Paumacariyam* 41–43, 59, 63, 72, 75, 88, 108, 241, 252, 265, 313; also known as *Rāghavacaritam* and Jaina *Rāmāyaṇa* 241  
 Vinayanandin, compared with Indrabhūti 128  
*Vinaya Pīṭaka* 301  
*Vipākāśruta* 35, 40, 42, 216, 312  
 Viradeva, Ācārya 120  
 Vira Nārāyaṇa era 36  
 Virasena 93, 261, 264; *Dhavalā* 93, 259–60, 262  
 Viśākhadatta 37, 90; *Devīcandraguṭṭa* 90  
 Viṣṇu 111, 119, 179–80, 188, 221–22  
*Viṣṇupurāṇa* 246  
 Viṣṇuvardhana 128, 172; Musinikoṇḍa grant of 128, 172  
 Viṣṇuvardhana III 173  
 Viṣṇuvarman 125  
 Vogel 52, 81  
 Vṛddhahasti 54  
 Vṛjji 48  
 Vṛndāvana 41  
 Vṛṣṇis 40, 45, 213, 216  
 Vyāghramuka, the earliest Cāpa king 140  
*Vyavahāraniryukti* 227  
*Vyavahārasūtra* 109  
 Winternitz 286, 290  
 Yādavas 84  
*Yājñavalkyasmṛti* 274  
*yakṣas* 21, 40, 42, 217, 267, 310, 312; images of 43; Kubera, the king of 307–8, 313  
 Yamunā 206, 250  
 Yaśā 54  
 Yativṛṣabha 117, 263–64, 268; *Tiloyapannati* 117, 261–63; *Cūrṇīsūtra* 260  
 Yuan Chwang 80, 84–86, 96, 133–34, 185, 288



Asim Kumar Chatterjee was Senior Reader in the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture, Calcutta University. He also acted as Head of the Department from 1989-91. He has published several books and research articles which are published in learned journals. At present he is writing a book on "Gautama Buddha".

ISBN 81-215-0930-0 (for the set)  
Jacket by Ratnam Sengupta

