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I

Preliminary Considerations

From at least the post-Gupta period, the patriarch Ārya Bhadrabāhu (c. B.C. 325–297) has been held in the highest esteem and unswerving reverence by the principal Jaina sects, the designation ‘Jaina’ anciently was known as ‘Nirgrantha.’ The notices on Bhadrabāhu largely hail from the literature of the two surviving major sects of the Nirgrantha-darśana, Śvetāmbara and Digambara. Bhadrabāhu is reckoned and adored by both sects as the last caturdaśapūrvadhara¹ as well as the śrūta-kevali². And yet the glaring fact remains that he very largely has remained an illusive figure. The Jaina writers of our own times possess a strong, even an obsessive, bias for his supposedly inestimable greatness. As a result, they failed to see through the veil of illusion created by some stray but relatively late—some contradictory and confused—literary and inscriptive references to him and likewise could not escape the spell of ethos of the dazzling aura they themselves projected around him. Some of them explicitly believed (and still believe) in all that was attributed to him in the past as an invariable fact, a tangible and truthful reality. The high-pitched reverential attitude adopted for Bhadrabāhu has not only hindered an objective approach toward searching and reconstructing his realistic image, not even a sketchy history based on available evidentiary facts, but also, as its consequence, has disallowed taking dispassionate estimation of him and his supposed contributions. This happening, in essence and so far, has led to preclude examining the very basis on which the edifice of esteem for him was built. Likewise, excepting for one category of literature, the niryuktis, very little effort had been made in the past toward checking the veracity of the claim for what are looked upon as the works authored by him in the Northern Nirgrantha (Śvetāmbara) tradition³.
Arya Bhadrabāhu

The Northern as well as the Southern Nirgrantha Church has preserved only small bits of information on Bhadrabāhu, some seeming reliable, some probable or plausible, some undoubtedly falling in the category of 'doubtful,' and still others that frankly are at variance with the other recorded facts as well as internal evidence present in his supposed works and hence clearly unependable. The present article intends to focus critically on the image of Bhadrabāhu as it emerges through the light cast by the evidence preserved within the relatively earlier and more trustworthy sources, though later writings will not be neglected: This evidence, in point of fact, lead to some hitherto unsuspected angles and consequently to surprising implications and conclusions. Some among the available Northern Nirgrantha sources relatively are earlier than the known Southern: hence these will be noticed here first, followed by the Southern, and next the information gathered from both sources will be compared, evaluated, integrated wherever plausible, and used in the discussions to follow. And finally will be presented the conclusions that may flow therefrom.

II

Northern Nirgrantha literary sources on Bhadrabāhu

The earliest extant source on Bhadrabāhu is the Sthavirāvalī or hagiological list of pontiffs incorporated in the Paryuṣanā-kalpa. In its present shape, it was compiled partly from the preexisting lists and partly completed in V.N.S. 980/993 or A.D. 503 or 516. The Sthavirāvalī, in point of fact, is the result of a five-phase growth and correspondingly contains portions of different periods, the portion forming Phase I begins its statement, after a brief introduction, with the ganadhara-apostle Sudhamā— the direct disciple of Arhat Vardhamāna alias Jina Mahāvīra—and next serially follow the names of four patriarchs as successors, the list terminating with the fifth pontiff Arya Yaśobhadra (c. B.C. 350-325) who, as we learn from the Sthavirāvalī’s Phase 2 portion, was the preceptor/guru of Arya Sambhūtvijaya and of Arya Bhadrabāhu. The Phase I portion, predictably, may have been composed in a still older linguistic form as well as, perhaps, a little more archaic stylistic mould, in Ardhamāgadhī, plausibly at the end of the first Synod convoked in Pāṭaliputra (in or before B.C. 300) for the redaction, the first in recorded history, of the Nirgrantha śrūta/scripture/canon after the end of a long draught* in Mahyadeśa. The Phase 2 of

* Its duration is reported, in some sources to be discussed, of 12 years.
the Sthaviravali embodies a portion which, in point of fact, came from another and, seemingly, somewhat later source. It represents a shorter version (sramkšipta vācanā), as against the much more elaborate Phase 3 portion (vistrta vācanā), commencing as it does from Ārya Yaśobhadra and his two aforenoted disciples and extending further down, through six successive pontiffs, to Ārya Vajra's disciple Ārya Vajrasena and ending with the names of the latter pontiff's four disciples (c. 1st cent. A.D.). But, it is the aforenoted Phase 3 portion, which covers an enlarged version of the second, is very, very important, because it, for the first time, gives detailed denominations along with the succinct indications on the origination of the various gana (cohorts), their sākhās (branches), and their kulas (regional and clanal groups), all of these being the subdivisions formed by the specific bands of mendicants. Arguably, the starting point for these group-proliferations temporally must be located a few decades after Ārya Bhradráhu and whose senior disciple Godāsa, the earliest and hence the very first gana of the Nirgrantha monastic system is reported, as per the northern hagiological tradition, to have emanated. (This may have taken place some time in the latter half of B.C. the third century.) While the list of succession within this Phase 3 (which figures in several manuscripts of the Paryusaṇā-kalpa) terminates with Ārya Phalgumitra (c. early 1st cent. A.D.), some mss. also contain a Phase 4 extension leading up to Ārya Skandila (or Śaṇḍila)—the 17th pontiff in succession from Ārya Phalgumitra—who presided over the Synod convened in Mathurā in c. V. N. 830-840/A.D. 353-363. These four successive sections of the sthaviravali are in prose and were dovetailed to form a single continuous text, largely in Ardhamāgadhī, by casting them into a homogeneous stylistic mould which doubtless reveals a few lately introduced linguistic affectations of the Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit. The last, or Phase 5, which is the latest portion of the Sthaviravali, however, is in versified form and unambiguously is rendered in Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit. It starts from Ārya Phalgumitra and, after mentioning the 16th pontiff in succession, namely Ārya Dharma who was the guru of Ārya Skandila, switches over to Ārya Jambū (apparently the confrère of Ārya Skandila of whom it takes no notice) and next gives the names of six pontiffs in succession, the sixth being Devarddhī ganī who chaired the Valabhi Synod II in A.D. 503, or, according to an alternative tradition, in A.D. 516.
the period when the Maitraka viceroy Dhruvasena I was governing from Valabhi in the Surāśṭra region on behalf of some imperial power, either Gupta or, perhaps, Vākāṭaka\textsuperscript{10}. For our purpose, only the second and the third Phase of the Sthavirāvalī are relevant; for it is these two which give some initial, though very succinct but the earliest and significant information on Bhadrabāhu.

The source of information, contemporaneous (or may be even earlier) in time, in the past, was the Gandhikānuṭyoga of Ārya Śyāma I alias Ārya Kālaka I (c. 1st cent. B.C.–A.D.) which plausibly contained passages in a chapter (gaṇḍikā) that had dealt with Bhadrabāhu, namely the “Bhadrabāhu-gaṇḍikā,” a section noted in a different context in the Samavayāṅga-sūtra (147)\textsuperscript{11}. This latter āgama, the fifth of the 12 arīgas, was updated (or rather recompiled with many additions, as a replacement palpably of an earlier shorter version)* in or soon after A.D. 363 and thus in the latter half of the last century of the Kuśāna rule in Mathurā. Regrettably, the Gandhikānuṭyoga, like all other works of Ārya Śyāma, is for long lost\textsuperscript{12}. It is, however, likely that, for a part of the information on Bhadrabāhu in late Gupta āgamic notices, the ultimate source may have been this work.

The source next in time is the Sthavirāvalī of the Nandisūtra of Deva Vācaka (c. mid 5th cent. A.D.)\textsuperscript{13}; but that work only briefly alludes to Bhadrabāhu and his gotra (familial lineage) and, in point of fact, adds nothing more to what is gleaned from the Phase 2 portion of the afore-noted Sthavirāvalī of the Paryuṣaṇā-kālpā.

After the Nandisūtra, the works which mention Bhadrabāhu, in one or the other context, are the Uttarādiḥyayana-nirṇyukti (c. A.D. 525 and later)\textsuperscript{14}, the Tiṭṭhagāliya i.e. Tiṭṭhavakālika (or Tiṭṭhodgārika)-prakīrti (c. mid 6th cent. A.D.)\textsuperscript{15}, the Vyavahāra-bhāṣya (c. late 6th cent.)\textsuperscript{16}, the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi (c. A.D. 600-650)\textsuperscript{17}, the Uttarādiḥyayana-cūrṇi (c. A.D. 650-700)\textsuperscript{18}, and the Āvaśyaka-vṛtti of Haribhadra sūry (c. mid 8th cent. A.D.)\textsuperscript{19}. Among the medieval sources, the first is the Kahāvalī of Bhadrēśvara sūry (c. late 10th century)\textsuperscript{20}. A fairly dependable medieval source, like the Pariśiṣṭa-parva (c. A.D. 1166) of Ācārya Hemacandra of Pūrṇatalla-gaccha\textsuperscript{21}, apparently

\* Abhayadeva sūry (latter half of the 11th century), in his commentary on the Samavāyāṅga, refers to its shorter version which apparently was available in his time. I forego citing the source since it is a secondary point.
is indebted, mainly indeed, to the aforenoted work for its information on
Bhadrabāhu namely the Kahāvali and, to some extent, to the Tīrthāvakālikā
and the Avaśyaka-cūrṇī, though for a few details, Hemacandra also may
have consulted one or two other concise textual sources, including perhaps
a Southern one.

III

Southern Nirgrantha Sources on Bhadrabāhu

Unlike Northern and, importantly, the Southern sources also include
epigraphical. Among the literary works—what have been looked upon by
Western (particularly German) scholars as secondary, substitute, or surrogate
āgamas, the Arādhana of Śivārya (c. early 6th cent.)²², and the Tiloyapaṇṇatī,
(Trilokaprajñāpti, assigned to c. mid 6th cent. A.D.)²³ are the earliest to have
a bearing, in a small measure though, on Bhadrabāhu. Next comes the Harivamsa-puraṇa of Jinasena of Punnāṭa Saṅgha (A.D. 783)²⁴,
the Dhavalā-ṭīkā of Svāmī Vīrasena of Pañcaśṭupānvyaya (completed A.D.
816)²⁵, as also the Arādhana-Kannada-ṭīkā (popularly known as Vaḍḍa
Arādhane²⁶), now ascertained to be a work of Bhrājiṣṇu [c. A.D. late 9th or
early 10th cent.]²⁷, and the Brhat-kathākoṣa (A.D. 931) of Hariṣeṇa²⁸ (who,
too, like Jinasena, was a monk of the Punnāṭa Saṅgha²⁹). All of these, in
the Southern context, relatively are older and more useful among literary
sources. Incidentally, also the Bhavasaṅgraha of Pt. Vāmadeva (c. 16th cent.),
the Bhadrabāhu-carita of Ratnānandī (c. 16th cent. A.D.)³⁰, the Munivamśābhyudaya of Cidānanda-Kavi (A. D. 1680), and the Ratnāvali-kathākoṣa of Devacandra (A. D. 1838)* which contain overtly sectarian
material and which, from their particular standpoint, orientation in
thinking, liking, and hence the attitude adopted and predilections set, has
been considered authoritative and used by some Digambara Jaina scholars.

As for the the epigraphical domain, it is restricted exclusively to Karnataka
and, the earlier records there, happen to be the inscription no. 1 (c. A. D.600)³¹
as well as no. 24 (c. mid 7th cent. A. D.)³² at the Čikkabeṭṭa or Candragiri,
Śravaṇabelgola, are more ancient and, to a large extent, also crucial. Also
are the two inscriptions from some site in the Srirangapatnam taluq (c. A. D.

* The first, the third, and the fourth work, all very late, were not available to me for
consultation. But, from their content known through others' writings, they all are,
like Ratnānandī's work, highly sectarian.
Moreover, the Śravaṇabelgoḷa inscription no. 251 at the Bhadrabāhu cave on Cikkaṇeṭa and datable to c. 11th cent. A. D., the two epigraphs from Huranta (A.D. 1075, 1077) and one other there datable to the c. 13th cent. A. D. are to some extent relevant to the discussions in the present context. All of these will be discussed in section VI where they have a direct pertinence.

IV

The Deducible Facts from Sources

While focusing on this aspect, the first to be noticed, since more ancient, are the Northern sources. The second Phase of the Sthavirāvali of the Paryuṣanā-kalpa (c. 1st cent. A.D.) notices two disciples of Ārya Yaśobhadra (the fourth patriarch after the apostle Sudharmā), namely Ārya Sambhūtāvijaya and Ārya Bhadrabāhu as earlier stated. It next turns to Ārya Sthulabhadra (the disciple of Ārya Sambhūta) and his seven successors up to Ārya Vajrasena and next mentions the latter’s four disciples. Hereunder I quote from the text (after removing the Mahārāṣṭrī affectations and, as its consequence, restoring the original Ardhamagadhi linguistic form) only that portion which has relevance to Bhadrabāhu:

\[
\text{थेरसं अर्जुनमहधास्ते तुगियानगुरस्ते अतेवासी दुःखे थेर—थेरे अर्जुनसम्भूतोत्पिष्टेषु, थेरे अर्जुनमहधास्ते पार्जनस् गुणे।}
\]

This statement reports that Bhadrabāhu was the disciple of Ārya Yaśobhadra and had belonged (prior to ordination) to the family having the Pracīna-gotra, which, in essence, may imply that he belonged to the “Pracī” or eastern country. The country immediately easterly in relation to Magadha is Varendra with Vanga including ancient Rāḍha (called Lāḍha in Māgadhī), these being the major territories forming ancient (as well as undivided modern) Bengal. (The Nandi-sthavirāvali [c. A.D. 450], as remarked earlier, repeats this information.)

The literary passage immediately next in sequence is the enlarged version of the hagiographical list—the Phase 3 of the Sthavirāvali of the aforenoted Paryuṣanā-kalpa—which thus runs:

\[
\text{थेरसं अर्जुनमहधास्ते तुगियानगुरस्ते दुःखे थेरे अतेवासी आहारच्छ अभिप्रायता हुस्थ। तं ज्ञाने—थेरे अर्जुनमहधास्ते पार्जनसुले, थेरे अर्जुनसम्भूतोत्पिष्टेषु माधसुले। थेरसं अर्जुनमहधास्ते पार्जनसुले इमे चतुरारे थेरे अतेवासी आहारच्छ अभिप्रायता हुस्थ। तं ज्ञाने—थेरे गोर्यासे १, थेरे अभिप्रायते २, थेरे ज्ञाने ३, थेरे समाजेते ४ कामाश्चुले। थेरे गोर्यासे गौडासाद्वेदी कामाश्चुले हर्याने न।}
\]
This passage gives more details on Bhadrabāhu. Besides repeating the information of the passage in the preceding Phase 2 portion, it further reports that he had four disciples: Godāsa, Agnidatta, Yajṇadatta, and Somadatta, all of whom belonged to the Kāśyapa-gotra. From the chief disciple Godāsa, a cohort of friars called ‘Godāsa-gana’ emerged; and, from this gana, had emanated four specific sākhās or branches of mendicants, namely the Tāmraliptikā, the Koṭivarsīyā, the Pauṇḍravardhanikā, and the Dāsikarvaṭikā. Three of these sākhās evidently took their denominations after the contemporary towns of the following names—Tāmralipti (Tāmluk), Koṭivarsa (Koṭipura?), and Pauṇḍravardhana (Pāṇḍuā), while Dāsikarvaṭa is still unidentified though it may be conjectured that it was a smaller habitational settlement of the servant caste as its name suggests, very likely was located in Bengal and either had disappeared in the past or if it exists, today it may be known by some other appellation. The three identifiable are, of course, ancient towns located in Bengal.

Bhadrabāhu’s connection with Bengal is supported, in fact further confirmed, by notices, though late, inside the Southern sources. The Vadda Arādhane tiṅā of Bhrājiṣṇu reports that Bhadrabāhu was born in Kaṇḍinī in the Pauṇḍravardhana territory and was initiated by acārya Govardhana. And, Hariṣena (of the Punnāṭa Saṅgha) (A.D. 931), slightly differing from Bhrājiṣṇu, mentions that Bhadrabāhu was born in Koṭipura/Koṭinagara situated in the Pauṇḍravardhana territory. He was tought, groomed, and next initiated by the Caturdaśapūrvadha Govardhana muni. Bhadrabāhu thus, and to all seeming, was a native of ancient Bengal, a conclusion to which the historian of eminence, R. C. Majumdar, earlier had reached but, his concerned publications are, at the moment, not available to me. And arguably, Bhadrabahu’s disciple Godāsa and his immediate disciples and in turn their hagiological descendents as well as followers, reported exclusively in the early Northern source, too, had hailed from Bengal as inferrable from the sākhā-denominations that specifically, indeed indubitably, reveal connection with Bengal.

These notices on Bhadrabāhu and his disciples also raise some questions. First, why no gana and their sākhā sub-orders emanated after the other
three disciples of Bhadrabahu. Generally speaking, as inferred from the further
details given in the \textit{Sthaviravali} (Phase 3), in the palpably early stages of
growth of the Northern Nirgrantha Church, the sub-orders of friars did
sometimes originate from the confrères of the chief disciple of a pontiff:
Second, what happened to the sub-orders of the Godasa-gana; for nothing
afterwards has been reported about them in the ecclesiastical or epigraphical
records either, the latter largely are encountered in Marhurā. After the passage
dwelling on Bhadrabahu’s disciples, the \textit{Sthaviravali} takes up Sthūlabhadra,
disciple of Bhadrabahu’s confrère Ārya Sambhūta and, further onwards, gives
particulars of Sthūlabhadra’s descendents, indeed not for once returning
to Bhadrabahu’s line, an omission the significance of which later will be
discussed. The hagiographical position from Arhat Vardhamāna onwards
and especially after Ārya Jambū—the disciple of \textit{gaṇadhara} Sudharmā—and up to Bhadrabahu and his disciples, according to the first three phases
of the \textit{Sthaviravali} of the \textit{Paryuṣaṇā-kalpa}, may be tabulated as follows:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
| Arhat Vardhamāna |  \\
| (Preached c. B.C. 507-477) \textsuperscript{42} |  \\
| \textit{Gaṇadhara} Gautama & \textit{Gaṇadhara} Sudharmā |  \\
| \hspace{1cm} Ārya Jambū |  \\
| \hspace{1cm} Ārya Prabhava |  \\
| \hspace{1cm} Ārya Śayyambhāva (or Svāyambhūva) |  \\
| \hspace{1cm} Ārya Yaśobhadra |  \\
| \textit{Ārya Sambhūta} & \textit{Ārya Bhadrabahu} |  \\
| (c. B.C. 325-297) |  \\
| \textit{Ārya Sthūlabhadra} & \textit{Godāsa} Agnidatta Yajñadatta Somadatta |
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
The next source, which preserves a small piece of information on Bhadrabāhu, is the Uttarādhayayana-niryahti (c. A.D. 525). In this work it is reported that the four disciples of Bhadrabāhu (the niryahti does not specify their names) died in peace in a cave at Vaibhāragiri near Rājagrha, having faced śīta pariṣaha, visitation of severe chill:

राजग्रह-प्रवाहिता सीतापरिषाहा उ भद्रबाहस्।
बेशामलिग मुख सीतपरिषाहा समाहिताय। ॥

उत्तराधययननिरयक्ति २९ ॥

The Uttarādhayayana-niryahti’s verse, in point of fact, clarifies the import of a relevant (and earlier) verse from the Maraṇavibhakti-prakīrṇaka (c. 2nd-3rd cent. A.D.)44, which apparently alludes to this very incident although, like the Uttarādhayayana niryahti, it specifies no names of the friars involved: it does mention Rājagrha, but not the Vaibhāragiri cave there. Moreover, it does not specifically state that these four were the disciples of Bhadrabāhu:

रामभिनिग्रहवलन्तु पद्माभिप्रज्ञवधो मुनिचाय।
सीततिवृत्तय कनेन्न पहेरेत कनेन्न गया सिद्ध। ॥

मराणविभक्तिप्रकीर्णक ४८९ ॥

However, the combined information from the last two sources would lead to infer that, what was intended to be conveyed, is the death of the four disciples of Bhadrabāhu due to the visitation of severe chill (on Vaibhāragiri) in Rājagrha. According to the Uttarādhayayana cūrṇi (c. A.D. 675-700), these four disciples were of the Vanika (merchant) community and belonged to Rājagrha45. But each one of them, according to this source, died at a different locale within Rājagrha46. These four disciples evidently were different, as will be shown, from the earlier four noted, beginning from Godāsa, in the Sthaviravali. We will look into other information in the post-niryahti literature as the discussion progresses.

Turning now to the Southern literary sources, the earliest two works which tabulate the spiritual lineage of Bhadrabāhu, namely the Trilokaprajñapti47 and the Śravanabelgola Inscription No. 148 are about five to three centuries and odd decades posterior to the relevant two earlier portions of the Sthaviravali of the Paryuṣaṇa-kalpa cited in the foregoing discussion. And the two sources next in date, the Harivamśa-purāṇa49 and the Dhavalā-
\text{\textit{\textbf{Arya Bhadrabāhu}}}

\text{tīkā}^{50}, largely follow the preceding two Southern sources, adding no new information. Keeping in view the temporal position of these sources, it is clear that the earliest is not earlier than mid sixth century, the earliest being the \textit{Trilokaprajñāpti} whose sectarial affiliation is, in fact, somewhat dubious since, like the āgamas inherited by the Śvetāmbara sect, it stipulates 12 instead of the 16 \textit{kalpas} for the Kalpavāsī gods, the figure 16 otherwise is firmly held by the Digambara sect.

The Southern (and South affiliated) sources \textit{inter alia} with some minor variations in a few nominal details, present the following pontificial sequence after Arhat Vardhamāna’s disciple and grand disciple, the apostles Sudharmā (Lohārya in Southern version) and Jambū:\textsuperscript{51} :

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ccc}
\textbf{Trilokaprajñāpti} & \textbf{ŚB.Ins.No.1} & \textbf{Harivamśa-purāṇa} & \textbf{Dhavalā-tīkā} \\
(c. mid 6th cent. A.D.) & (c. A.D. 600) & (A.D. 783) & (A.D. 816) \\
Lohārya & Lohārya & Lohārya & Lohārya \\
Jambū & Jambū & Jambū & Jambū \\
Nandi & Viśṇuudeva & Viśnu & Viśṇu \\
Nandimitra & Nandimitra & Nandimitra & Nandimitra \\
Aparājīta & Aparājīta & Nandimitra & Nandimitra \\
Govardhana & Govardhana & Govardhana & Govardhana \\
Bhadrabāhu & Bhadrabāhu & Bhadrabāhu & Bhadrabāhu \\
Viśākha & Viśākha & Viśākha & Viśākhācārya \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

The confrontation of the Northern and the Southern hagiologies of Bhadrabāhu reveal intriguing, even sharp differences between the two. Contrast on at least five points clearly are discernible: First, the Southern \textit{gurvāvalīs} under reference do not prefix the honorific term “Ārya” before the pontiffs’ appellations; second, they take no notice of their \textit{gotras}; third, they are silent on the names of the four disciples of Bhadrabāhu; instead, only one name figures as Bhadrabāhu’s disciple, Viśākha, not found in the northern list; fourth, and as a direct consequence of the third difference, the Godāsa-gaṇa and its four \textit{sākhās} find no mention there; and fifth and the major, which is the sharpest, difference is about the names of the post-
Jambū predecessors of Bhadrabāhu including his own preceptor's name in both sources. In the present state of our knowledge, it is difficult to explain this too obvious a difference, no question of reconciling the two lists\textsuperscript{52}. One of them is inaccurate or both may be unaware of certain realities of the past.

Now, to some other facts/anecdotes recorded in Southern sources. The Ārādhanā of Śivārya (c. early 6th cent. A.D.), a Yāpanīya work (or plausibly of its likely parent sect, the Botika-Ksapanaka of north India, founded by the schismatic pontiff Ārya Śivabhūti in the second century A.D.) only records a single fact: It states that Bhadrabāhu passed away by resorting to avamodarya, reduction in the quantity of the food intake. It does not, though, specify the place where he breathed his last. Nor does it note his ‘predecessors,’ or ‘successors’ names either. The Kathākosa of Hariśeṇa (A.D. 931), however, mentions that, after the prediction he made of the 12 years’ draught in Ujjayāni, Bhadrabāhu passed away in Bhādrapadadeśa (unidentified, but may be contiguous to the Pārīyātra region adjacent to the Mālava country) by anaśana or rite of suspension of aliment\textsuperscript{53}. The earlier noted Kannada work, the Āradhanā-tīkā, however, despite several legendary and imaginary elements appearing in its long-winding narration, does state that Bhadrabāhu passed away by avamodarya but that event occurred in Śravaṇabelgola. (The details and implications of these differing statements are reserved for discussion in Section VI.)

V

Works attributed to Bhadrabāhu

From at least the time of the opening verse of the Daśāśrutaskandhaniryukti and the Pañcakalpa-niryukti (both c. A.D. 525) and, following it in time, of the Pañcakalpabhāṣya of Saṅghadāsa gaṇī (c. A.D. 550) as well as the Daśāśrutaskhandhaṃcariṇī (c. mid 7th cent. A.D.), the authorship of the three chedasūtras—the Daśāśrutaskanda (also called the Acāradasā), the Kalpa, and the Vyavahāra of the Northern or Ardhamāgadhi canon—is attributed to Arya Bhadrabāhu\textsuperscript{54} Bhadrabāhu, in the post-Gupta Śvetāmbara (as well as the medieval and possibly pre-medieval Digambara) tradition, is believed to be the last patriarch to have possessed, as had been noticed in the foregoing pages, the complete knowledge of scriptural works (śrutakevalī). Likewise, he is looked upon as the last to have possessed the knowledge of the 14 Pūrva-texts\textsuperscript{55}; hence he also had been called
the *antima caturādaśa-pūrvadhara* in the post-Gupta, pre-medieval, and medieval exegetical and the late biographical literature of the northern tradition. The current Śvetāmbara Jaina tradition, and even the critical Western scholarship, hardly had doubted the pious assumption regarding Bhadrabāhu’s authorship of the *Kalpa* and the *Vyavahāra* (along with the *Daśāsruta*), and hence no attempt was made to check the accuracy/veracity of the belief and hence of the tradition by verifying the premises on which it may have been founded.

The *Kalpa* and the *Vyavahāra* are formularies embodying the monastic codes containing the basic rules of conduct, the first text enjoining what is admissible and what is not for the Nirgranthas mendicants and nuns; the second, in its primary intentions, lays down the rules of atonement embracing large areas of conduct as well as what must be done in cases of the transgression of the disciplinary rules, surprisingly with fair amount of detail for the age they were formulated, together with some other material. (As the matter stands, these two texts, along with the *Daśāsrutaskanda*, till now have not been subjected to detailed textual, linguistic, analytical, and stylistic study.)

The style and, no less the content, of the first two works under reference—both being in the *sūtra* or prose form—should be able to reveal whether the monastic situations/conditions envisaged therein can be consistent with, or can really go back to the times as ancient as those of Ārya Bhadrabāhu (c. B.C. 325-297). And, predictably, the study of the terminology and expressions, language and phrase-structure together with the formal habits and cadence, can cast light on their true temporal status and sectarian affiliation. These factors can be considered here but only very briefly.

**Terminology, Style, and Content**

1) Unlike the most ancient among the extant āgamas, namely the *Ācārāṅga* (Book I, c. B.C. 450-300), and next the *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* (Book I, earliest parts c. B.C. 300-100), and the *Uttarādhyayana* (early chapters c. 3rd cent. B.C. to 1st cent. B.C.–A.D.), and unlike also the early Pāli Buddhist works, the term acela for the nude friar is almost completely absent in the *Kalpa* as well as in the *Vyavahāra*. The two works, instead, mention the *Jina-kalpa* and the *Sthavira-kalpa* states (sthitis) for the Nirgrantha
recluses\textsuperscript{59}. (The \textit{Vyavahāra} also mentions \textit{pāṇipratigrahadhārī} [bowl-less mendicants] and \textit{Pratigrahadhārī} [in essence monks using a begging-bowl]). These terms, on the other hand and, significantly, are absent in the āgamas of the pre-Christian Era. What is more, there is here noticeable a scholastic approach and classificatory tendencies about the \textit{kalpa-sthitis} which do not seem compatible to, or correspond with the much simpler and straightforward (but very stern) ideals held, and the precise rules laid down for the \textit{acela} or nude friars and, by contradistinction, for the \textit{sacela} friars (in that early age having minimal allowable possession for them) in the undoubted oldest strata of the earlier āgamas such as the \textit{Ācārāṅga} Book I. Even the style and phraseology of these specific \textit{kalpa-sthiti} passages in the \textit{Kalpa} widely differ from those of the rest of the text. These passages apparently had been introduced at some point in time from somewhat later and different, yet relatively ancient, source. These formidable facts raise the first solid suspicion on the supposedly high antiquity of the \textit{Kalpa} and the \textit{Vyavahāra} and their authorship ascribed to Bhadrabāhu.

2) Both of these works reflect a highly developed state of organization of the Nirgrantha clergy, as also a well-established as well as much proliferated monastic church. On the testimony of the third phase of the \textit{Sthaviravāli} (c. A. D. 100) of the \textit{Paryuṣaṇā-kalpa}, the first \textit{gaṇas} or organized bands of friars and mendicants (\textit{nigghanthas, bhikkhus}) and nuns (\textit{nigghanthīs, bhikkūṇīs}) progressively began to be instituted some 50 years or so posterior to Bhadrabāhu\textsuperscript{*} and had diversified further, indeed considerably so into śākhās and kulās by, and even before, the first two centuries of the Christian Era. The \textit{gaṇas}, in the next stage, also were further divided into \textit{saṁbhoga}-groups\textsuperscript{60}. The \textit{Vyavahāra} refers to this latter term which, however, nowhere appears in the earlier canonical literature including even the \textit{Ācārāṅga} Book II (c. Ist cent. B.C.-A. D.): It does figure though in

\textsuperscript{*} A late Sāravāhana inscription in one of the Junnar caves in Maharashtra refers to “\textit{Siddh-gaṇe Aparājīte}.” [Cf. S. Nagraju, \textit{Buddhist Architecture of Western India}, (C. 250 B.C.- A.D. 300), Delhi 1981, “Appendix : List of Brāhmi Inscriptions from the Rock-cut monuments of Western India,” p. 331, Ins. no. 10.] If the Aparājīta noted here is the grand preceptor of Bhadrabāhu, then the convention for the \textit{gaṇa} formation may have started a few decades earlier. The whole problem needs further investigation. (This \textit{gaṇa} has not been noticed even from an early literary source. It is noted late in the Southern work, the \textit{Śrutasrūvatāra} [c. 10th cent.].)
the Mathura inscriptions; but the earliest of those which have this term are of the middle Kušāṇa period, generally datable to c. 3rd cent. A. D. or slightly earlier 61. And the terms *ganāvacchedaka* (administrator of the *ganā*) and his female counterpart, the *ganāvacchedikā* (next to mother superior), figuring in the *Vyavahāra-sūtra*, appear neither in the earlier canonical texts nor anywhere in the inscriptions. These monastic positions/titles had been instituted and apparently, therefore, the terms denoting them had been coined and had come into currency, arguably some centuries posterior to Bhadrabāhu’s time 62.

3) The *Kalpa* permits the friars to have cloth (*vattha, vastra*), also a piece of cloth for foot-cleaning (*pādapiṇḍhanaka*), and a blanket (*kambala*), the possessions which enter somewhat later into (and even may have been interpolated into) the corpus of monastic rules embodied in the somewhat younger portions of the *Ācārāṅga* I, but are more regularly referred to thereafter. The *Vyavahāra-sūtra*, moreover, is much too lenient in allowing several objects as friar’s possession: these include a leather-piece, a leather-bag, a cloth-curtain, a stick, and even an umbrella 63. A rule such as this could be an anathema to the followers of the doctrine of the total non-possession (or exceptionally and indeed exceedingly restricted possession) for recluses belonging to the Church of Arhat Vardhamāna, to which the patriarch Ārya Bhadrabāhu traditionally had belonged. Here, in point of fact, is discerned a clear-cut introduction of the elements consistent more with the practices of the followers of the Church of Arhat Pārśva (and hence of the Pārśvāpatyas) rather than those of the Church of Arhat Vardhamāna 64. Friars who kept such accessory objects (*upakaraṇas*) later will be classed as “Pāśaṭhā” or wayward and degraded or, alternatively, perhaps more accurately, implied to be (or may be interpreted simply as) those who had not joined the reformed and sternly ascetical Church of Arhat Vardhamāna but had stayed within the more lenient Church of Arhat Pārśva (hence Pārśvastha). The position in the *Vyavahāra*, for such sections of the text, either indicates a period considerably later than that of Ārya Bhadrabāhu or else, if it really is early, reflects a very different monastic ideology and practices. It unquestionably stands farther from the extremely austere and strict monasticism of Arhat Vardhamāna. *Vyavahāra’s* moderate discipline comes closer to not only what is attributed to the Church of Arhat Pārśva but also, to a fair degree, to the Order of Buddha. In point of fact,
in terms of the doctrinal principles and consequent monastic rules, such a situation was to manifest in the future times in western India, indeed some centuries posterior to even the period of Ārya Raksīta (c. 1st cent. A. D.) who had permitted only one additional pātra or bowl66 beside the usual (single) begging bowl and who advocated and practised strict nudity, allowing no other possession including loin cloth (kaṭi-bandhana, kaṭi-paṭṭaka, cola-paṭṭaka) for a friar66, the kaṭi-bandhana, interestingly, is noted in the Kalpa and in the relatively later portion of the Ācārāṅga I. (If the Kalpa indeed was authored by Bhadrabāhu, then this point will have a bearing on Bhadrabāhu’s doctrinal leanings and creedral connections.)

4) The Kalpa loudly talks about a “shelter-building” (uvassaya, upāśraya) which temporarily may be occupied by friars and nuns and also enters into considerable detail relating to its surroundings as well as its internal disposition67. Places such as these as temporary resorts for recluses virtually is an impossible reality in the early phase of the Church of Vardhamāna: because, the earlier āgamic injunction refers exclusively to cemetery (susāna i.e. smaśāna), ruined and desolate dwelling-houses (sunnāgāra, śūnyāgāra), and tree-bases (rūkhamūla, vrksamūla) as places appropriate for recluses to take shelter by or into68. The Kalpa, of course, is aware at least of vrksamūla and also adds there ‘bamboo-clump base’ which it permits to the nirgranthas but forbids to the nirgranthīs, nuns69. However, the older spirit and the forms of very rigorous ascetic practices are somewhat wanting in this (as well as, even more so, in the Vyavahāra) text.

The Kalpa, though forbidding the nuns to stay at the travellers’ lodge (āgamanagriha), permits the mendicants to do so70. The latter clause is again inconsistent with the most ancient friars’ discipline if we take into account the earlier notions of the Nirgrantha monastic constraints as laid down in, or understandably followed within, the Church of Arhat Vardhamāna. Indeed, this and several other such points encourage toward reassessing the nature of monastic discipline of Bhadrabāhu’s time.

5) The style of the Kalpa, though sounding fairly ancient where the sūtras generally begin as ‘No kappati’ (not permissible), or ‘Kappati’ (permissible), is seldom encountered in other disciplinary āgamas like the Ācārāṅga Book II, the Nīṣītha, etc71. It is, perhaps, likely that such a style of phrasing may have been peculiar more to the books of monastic codes,
now lost\textsuperscript{72}, of the Church of Arhat Pārśva rather than of Arhat Vardhamāna and adopted for the composition of the Kalpa. Bhadrabāhu, it must be remembered, knew by heart the Pūrva texts of the Church of Arhat Pārśva as per the tradition.

Looking now at the mode of expression of the Vyavahāra, it is, in point of fact, and visibly, different from that of the Kalpa, although Bhadrabāhu is claimed to be the author of both the works. It also largely differs from the style of the āgamas of the first three phases\textsuperscript{73}. Moreover, the Vyavahāra, both in style and content, is heterogeneous in character, with chapters possibly of differing dates, details, and perceptions\textsuperscript{74}.

The text of the Kalpa as well as that of the Vyavahāra conceivably may have been modified at a few places and augmented or added to, or subtracted at some points of time in the past\textsuperscript{75}, a possibility which cannot be ruled out. Since both works also were included in the sacred treatizes of the Yāpanīya Sect, it may be concluded that they already were known and recognized as an authoritative part of the canon before the 2nd cent. A.D. in the Northern Nirgrantha Church\textsuperscript{76}. Supposing it can be established that the earliest portions of the two texts are indeed datable to the Maurya period, it would then raise some serious questions: 1) Was Bhadrabāhu their author? 2) If he were, did he lean toward the monastic discipline of the Church of Pārśva or, alternatively, did he sanction generous concessions for accommodating the mendicants and nuns of the Church of Pārśva who, assumably, may have been progressively joining the Church of Arhat Vardhamāna? Since, as is believed in the tradition, he had mastered the 14 Pūrvas—arguably the āgamic books of the Pārśva's sect—there is a possibility that he was fully conversant with the Pārśvian monastic disciplinary code and, as a result, may have been influenced by it. If this surmise is accurate, it may, in turn, compel us to revise our views on Bhadrabāhu. The present discussion perhaps opens a door to what seemingly is an entirely unsuspected and uncharted area of investigation\textsuperscript{77}. Of course, it will all depend on the definitive evidence, besides the presently known post-Gupta tradition, that the Kalpa and (the parts of) the Vyavahāra were authored by Bhadrabāhu.

The third work, namely the Daśāśrutaskandha olim Acāradasā, both from the standpoint of style and content, is far more heterogeneous in composition and in content: and, for the style of a few of its chapters,
it positively looks away from Bhadrabāhu's times. These chapters, in fact, are younger in age. It, therefore, raises even graver doubts about the veracity of its long believed attribution to Bhadrabāhu. It likewise presents a somewhat more complex situation\textsuperscript{78}, needing a separate investigation involving elaborate and an in-depth discussion.

Before closing this section, it may be noted that the Southern tradition does not attribute the composition of any work to Bhadrabāhu. It only believes that he was responsible for introducing and propagating the Nirgrantha religion in Southern India\textsuperscript{79}. And later, in the eighth century, Padmanandi of the anvaya Kōṇḍakunda, known from the 13th or at most the 12th century as 'Kundakundācārya' in the Digambara sections in north India, is said to have regarded Bhadrabāhu as his 'gamika-guru' or a teacher by virtue of his being, as he may have believed, in the Bhadrabāhu's sectorial tradition\textsuperscript{80}.

VI

Śruta-Kevali Bhadrabāhu, Candragupta, Śravaṇabelgola, and Southern Jaina Traditions

Fairly considerable literature has grown in English and in German, not to say in Hindi and in Kannada which revolve around the Southern Nirgrantha traditions that associate Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta on one hand and on the other hand associate the two to the famous tīrtha site of Śravaṇabelgola inside ancient Gaṅgavāḍi, located in Southern Karnataka. The trends of discussions and conclusions drawn therein reveal a picture in which some scholars agreeing, others rejecting, a few sitting on fence, while some sensing not enough strength in available evidence yet willing to concede credibility to the tradition. When all is said and done, some among the noteworthy writings which dwell on this subject at some length, impress the reader as either one-sided since they refuse to use, even allude to, sources which go against their cherished intentions (or declare them as late although they are not), often indeed uncritical or insufficiently critical or wanting in an objective as well as common sense approach. Perhaps the only, rather very partial, exceptions are the much too succinct statements within the discussion by the editorial team of the Epigraphia Carnatica Volume II (Mysore 1973) and a brief observation by A. M. Ghatage\textsuperscript{81}.

The earliest, and indeed crucial, evidence in the Southern context is the Śravaṇabelgola Sanskrit inscription No.1 (c. 600 A. D.), which more or
less had been the starting point of discussion in several serious writings. It refers to a prediction in Ujjayāni by Bhadrābhū, an expert on the eightfold omenology (aṣṭāṅga-nimitta)—he is not called there either śrutakevalī or caturdāśa-pūrvadhāra—of the visitation of a 12-year famine (dvādaśa samvatsara-kāla-vaiṣamya, implied to be in north India) whereupon the entire Nirgranthā community (samasta-saṁgha) from north India (Uttarāpatha) migrated to south India (Dakṣināpatha). At some point, when this congregation (saṁgha) was passing through southwestern Kārṇaṭa (the specific area later to be called Gaṅga-vādi), a pontiff by name Prabhācandra, sensing his end approaching, separated himself from the congregation and clambered the hill Kaṭavapra (Cikkabeṭṭa or Candragiri Hill in Śravāṇabelgola) along with one disciple (name not specified) with the objective of passing away in peace (saṁādhi) by the rite of suspension of aliment unto death (sanyāsārā-dhitavān). And in course of time, some 700 other friars in succession followed (the same path, of dying by the rite of sallaekhanā), the inscription in question reports as its end note.

The said inscription does not bring Bhadrābhū to this Hill; his rôle was confined to making the prophesy of the oncoming draught that was to last for 12 years. Indeed, the central focus of the inscription is “Prabhācandra,” not Bhadrābhū. What is more, the inscription is silent on Candragupta, a significant omission. There is likewise not the slightest indication there to warrant equating Prabhācandra with Bhadrābhū and, the unnamed accompanying disciple, with Candragupta; nor, on the other hand, is there even the vaguest hint that would allow identifying Prabhācandra with Candragupta. Indeed, no source clarifies that the Maurya emperor Candragupta, after his supposed ordination as a Nirgranthā friar, was rechristened Prabhācandra. Such an identification has been conjectured by some writers of our times, but without any clear or firm evidence to base upon. In any case, the inscription, like the Ārādhana of Śivārya, is silent on what happened to Bhadrābhū or where he proceeded after the prediction he is said to have made in Ujjayāni.

Now, to explain away the silences, an inference has been drawn from this inscription that two Bhadrābhūs (as stated here in annotation 82) are implied, the first one is he who figures in the pontifical sequence from Lohārya downwards, that is the one who was the disciple of Govardhana and the preceptor of Viśākha as also the preceptor of Candragupta: It was he who,
in the tradition, was the śrūtakēvali and the caturdaśa-pūrvadhara: the second Bhadrabāhu who, in due course flourished in that monastic tradition, was the aṣṭāṅga-naimitika (expert on eightfold omenology). It was he who predicted the visitation of the 12 years’ famine in Ujjayāni. But neither of the two Bhadrabāhus is, even implicitly, said there to have visited Śravaṇabelagola. It was Prabhācandra who passed away on the Kaṭavapra Hill there according to that earliest inscription from Śravaṇabelagola.

The commemorative record under reference, moreover, is not contemporaneous with the passing away of Prabhācandra. It arguably was engraved centuries after the period of the supposed happening of the event which, implicitly though, is much later than c. B.C. 300 (Bhadrabāhu’s time) and predictably even a few years after the second Bhadrabāhu conjectured, by some scholars, from the data contained in the inscription. And between the date of Prabhācandra’s passing away and the date of this inscription of c. A.D. 600, significantly, no commemorative inscriptive record is found on this Hill even when it clearly refers to the passing away of some 700 other friars after Prabhācandra on this Hill. The inscription seemingly records the essence of a “legend” or “belief,” current in the late sixth century, of the death by self-mortification earlier on this Hill, of a pontiff named “Prabhācandra,” a nomen which has no parallel in the period between the Mauryan and the very early centuries of the Gaṅga (or for that matter contemporaneous Kadamba) period in Karṇāṭa, or for that matter in the inscriptive or literary records of the earlier periods—be they Nirgrantha, Buddhism, or Brahmanical—in north India. Typologically, the name does not accord with the fashions in vogue for personal appellations before the sixth, or at most the fifth century A.D. Prabhācandra, doubtless, will be a very popular nomen for the monks in pre-medieval and, even more so, in the medieval Digambara Jaina Church. In literature, the earliest reference noticeable for this appellation is by Pūjyapāda Devanandi (active c. A.D. 635–685) in his Jainendra-śabdaśāstra, referring as he does to a peculiar grammatical formation in Sanskrit by Prabhācandra and the next is in the encomium of the Jayadhavalā-tīkā (begun by Viṣṇesena, completed by his great disciple Jinasena (c. A.D. 837) in which Jinasena eulogizes the (poetic) qualities of the Candrodaya-kāvya of Prabhācandra, the reference in the latter two cases might pertain to one and same poet—Prabhācandra—though not to the Candragirī-Prabhācandra who is purported
to belong to earlier times. After these two relatively early Prabhācandras—one figuring in the 600 A.D. inscription, the other appearing in the two literary allusions, one being post-Gupta (early Calukya) and the other pre-medieval (early Rāṣṭrakūta)—several other Prabhācandras successively came in different gaṇas and gačchas till the late medieval times as inferred from the Digambara insessional and literary / hagiological and allied notices. This early ‘Prabhācandra’ of Śravaṇabelgola, then, generates an enigma which will need future efforts and concrete, indeed more definitive, evidence to resolve it. One thing is certain. He cannot be connected either with Bhadrabāhu or with Candragupta.

Within 50 years of this earliest inscription on Candragiri mentioning Prabhācandra, scores of other inscriptions are encountered from whose report it is clear that the pontiffs and mendicants, monks and nuns, vied with one another ritualistically to give up their life on this sanctified Hill. Could the legend of the first Prabhācandra—a figure unknown in the annals—passing away here have inspired this phenomenal (and from the standpoint of Jainism a sacred and elevating) activity of self-mortification on this Hill? Arguably not. A more powerful stimulus was needed for this development. Plausibly, between c. A.D. 550-650, a new and a parallel legend was being worked out, at some Jaina centre in Karnata, of Śrutakevali Bhadrabāhu and his supposed disciple, the Maurya emperor Candragupta, laying down their life by the sacred rite of sallekhana on this Hill. Some anecdotes or bits of partially valid historical facts must have existed for the formulation of such a legend.

The beginning of a part of this belief, somewhat vaguely though, may be sensed in a statement occurring in the Tiloyapaṇṇatti (Trilokaprajñapti, c. A.D. 550 with sizeable later additions) that, among the crowned kings, Candragupta was the last to be initiated to the Order: There is, though, no clarification in this notice whether the ‘Maurya’ Candragupta is implied and who his preceptor was. It is only the epigraphical records, in date posterior to the Tiloyapaṇṇatti, to be noticed now, which implicitly or explicitly connect the two.

The most crucial on this issue is the Śravaṇabelgola inscription 17-18 (32) in Kannada, dateable to c. mid seventh century. It states: “When the Faith that had much prospered in the time of the pair of the chief among the sages—Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta—who shed lustre on it, later grew dimmed, (then) the coral-lipped Śāntisena, the chief among the ascetics,
rejuvenated it: And on the hill at Velgola, having given up food etc., attained the (state of) cessation of birth (i.e. attained salvation): "60

This inscription for certain connects Bhadrabahu with Candragupta, arguably as the teacher and the disciple, though it does not explicitly associate the two with Sravanabelagola. However, the act of including this phrase in the draft of the inscription would be meaningless if the composer of the text had not intended to convey the connection of the two with this sacred Hill. From this standpoint, it may be regarded as the earliest pointer, even somewhat obliquely, toward that direction.

Next of note are some inscriptions, all of them of medieval period and not valuable as weighty evidence in the historical construct for times very ancient. An inscription of c. A.D. 1110 (71[166]) in the Bhadrabahu cave, records that some Jinacandra bowed to the feet [carved imprints] of Bhadrabahu svami: And, below the footprints carved on the summit of the Cikkabeta hill, is a 13th century record purporting to the effect that they are those of Bhadrabahu svami. What is more, in the two records from Srirangapattana taluk, of c. A.D. 900 [E.C. Vol. III, Sr. 147, 148], it is stated that Jambu (Katavapa or Cikkabeta Hill) is blessed with the (carved) imprints of the feet of Bhadrabahu and Candragupta. Moreover, an inscription of A.D. 1163 (Nos.40 [54], new no. 71) refers to srutakevali Bhadrabahu and his disciple Candragupta. Likewise, a record of A.D. 1129 (Nos.5 [67], new no.77) refers to the celebrated pair. And on a pillar in the Siddharabasadi environs on the Dodjabeta (Vindhyagiri, Sravanabelagola) are two late records, the first of A.D. 1398 (No.105, [254]) mentioning srutakevali Bhadrabahu and the second of A.D. 1432 which mentions srutakevali Bhadrabahu and his disciple Candragupta91. It thus remains established that, at the dawn of the medieval period, the Bhadrabahu-Candragupta pair and their association with Sravanabelgola was a firmly established fact in the Digambara Jaina lore and later was persistently recalled as inferred from the above-cited inscriptions. And the footprints of Bhadrabahu were carved on Cikkabuta or Candragiri before A.D. 900.
Turning next to the Southern literary sources having a bearing on Bhadrabāhu, the earliest, as was pointed out, is the Ārādhana of Śivārya (c. 6th cent.), a Yāpanīya (or Boṭika-Kṣapanaka) and not Digambara work. It, however, refers to only a single point related to Bhadrabāhu, namely his death due to reduced food intake [92]:

ॐोंदित्रि योते भद्रबाू हसकिलिन्तदी ।
योते विनिस्मृति पदविणियो उत्तमं तरणं ॥

—आराधना १५.३९

The next source is the Ārādhanā-ṭīkā, also known as the Vaddā-Ārādhane (c. 9th or early 10th cent.), the commentary in Kannada by Bhrājiṣṭhu [93], on the above-cited Śivārya’s Ārādhana. Unlike the inscriptions, it delineates Bhadrabāhu’s life-sketch wherein a small part seems somewhat genuine, but the rest has a look and flavour of fiction as well as smell of fabrication and coloured by sectarian bias, the latter part omitted here in discussion since irrelevant in the present context.

‘In the town of Kaṇḍinī within the Puṇḍravardhana county,’ says Bhrājiṣṭhu, ‘ruled a chief called Padmaratha with his consort Padmaśri. To his high priest Somaśarmā and wife Somaśri was born Bhadrabāhu.’

The names, except for Bhadrabāhu and the localities noted there, obviously are fictitious. The commentary next enters into a lengthy mythical account concerning catarūdaśapūrṇi Govardhana (ultimately the one who initiated Bhadrabāhu) and immediately next the one relating to Bhadrabāhu. This portion we may leave out for good. What is contextually significant is of course the notice that Bhadrabāhu not only learnt the Anāga texts (the 11 Nirgrantha canonical works) but, significantly, also the Pūrva-texts from his preceptor Govardhana.

The Commentator then dwells not upon the Maurya emperor Candragupta but his grand son Aśoka reigning in Pātaliputra. Next he turns to another phase of the anecdote, the queen Candrānanā, consort of Aśoka’s son Kuṇāla, the prince who was blinded by an official due to a wrong reading (tempered version?) of the emperor’s communication. She gave birth to a son who was named Sampratī-Candragupta by Aśoka. Following this account, starts a lengthy mythical narrative concerning the previous embodiment of that prince, which being totally useless as history, has to be ignored. The grown up Sampratī-Candragupta is placed by the Commentator in
Ujjeni (Ujjayanī) which is next visited by Bhadrabāhu, along with a large group of friars. There he sojourned in some park. Interestingly, Bhadrabāhu is qualified by the commentator as ‘Caturḍāśa-pūrvadhara’ and not ‘aṣṭāṅga-naimitika’ in contrast to the Śravaṇabelgola inscription of c. A.D. 600. King Samprati-Candragupta visits Bhadrabāhu and embraces the vows of the (Nirgrantha) lay-follower. One day, Bhadrabāhu, during his alms-begging tour, entered a house where a child in a swing said: “Revered Sir, go away, go away!” He took these words as omnic of the onset of a draught: on asking for how many years, the child, by gesture, indicated the figure 12. Whereupon Bhadrabāhu assembled the disciples and announced the visitation soon of 12 years famine and proposed to migrate to South. The same night the King dreamt 16 strange and prognosticative dreams, their interpretation by Bhadrabāhu leading to the same conclusion, of the oncoming eventuality of the prolonged draught. (The lengthy narrative relating to this imaginary event is omitted here.) The King, now knowing about the impending calamity, joined the Order of the Mendicants. Bhadrabāhu next sent a message to the mendicants in Madhyadeśa to migrate to South. And he, with his new disciple Samprati-Candragupta and eight thousand friars moved toward the Southern country. On the way, when they reached Kaṭavappu (Kaṭavapra, Candragiri in Śravaṇabelgola), he sensed that his end is near. Whereupon he sent the saṅgha under the leadership of his other (arguably senior) disciple Viśākha to the Tamil country. He next clambered the hillock Kaṭavapra with Samprati-Candragupta, undertook the rite of avamodarya and sanyasta, eventually passed away and, was born as god in the Brahmakalpa heaven with the life span of ten sāgaropamas⁴. Samprati-Candragupta stayed on at Kaṭavapra, and, as for aims, he was eating what a sylvan deity of that area offered. After 12 years, when the news reached that the drought in Madhyadeśa had ended, Viśākhācārya returned from south to Kaṭavapra advised Samparti-Candragupta not to accept food from a deity, and proceeded toward north. Samprati-Candragupta who, staying as he did for all those years close to the (commemorative) shrine of Bhadrabāhu on the hillock, eventually passed away and (he, too,) was born in the Brahmakalpa with the life span of ten sāgaropamas.

Forgetting the imaginary elements which are innate to the Indian narrative class of writings in ancient and medieval India—Jaina being
famous for its super-inflated megalomania and super-astronomical pampalomania—the problems that this kathā generates are, even at the first look, these:

1) In the established history of India, Sampratī was junior to Bhadrābhāhu by four generations, he being the great grandson of emperor Candragupta’s son Bindusāra. Moreover, he never was known as Candragupta. So, this notice in the commentary is very visibly anachronistic besides betraying gross historical confusion. (Sampratī, of course, had ruled from Ujjayāni, but his preceptor was Ārya Subasti who in turn was Ārya Stūlabhadra’s disciple, as gleaned from the post-Gupta Śvetāmbara sources. And that hagiographical notice perfectly synchronizes with the known dates of the Maurya imperial chronology.

2) It is clear that, the legend of Prabhācandra and his unnamed disciple as noted in the Śravaṇabelagola inscription of c. A.D. 600, is transferred here to, or superimposed on Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta duo. This new legend of the association of those two celebrities with Śravaṇabelagola apparently had come into currency in Karnataka by, or before, circa the mid seventh century and Bhṛājiśnu used it to fit it in his narrative context. The two inscriptions from Seringapattam taluq which are more or less contemporaneous with Bhṛājiśnu’s commentary, likewise cannot be reckoned as good evidence for Bhadrabāhu-Candragupta connections with Śravaṇabelagola. The whole episode smells of improbability and hangs on a slender thread of an untenable notice. A solid and an unambiguous as well as fairly early evidence of Bhadrabāhu’s migration with Candragupta to Śravaṇabelgola is wanting. No reliance can be placed on later writings which come in conflict with what is said and implied in the relatively earlier sources. The earliest inscription referring to Bhadrabāhu does talk about migration to South, but in that event neither Bhadrabāhu, nor Candragupta, or both were involved; and the earliest available literary source—Bhṛājiśnu’s Kannada commentary (c. 9th -10th cent.), too, does not illuminate the history because of the confusions it creates.

3) The commentator had given no thought on the logistics of as many as eight thousand friars travelling together, the problems about feeding them under the strict Nirgranthist rules of bhikṣā, besides providing them camping facilities, which virtually would be unmanageable in those times. In the pre-Mauryan and Mauryan periods, megalithic culture had prevailed
in Karnataka. But the nearest megalithic habitations were some miles away from Śravaṇabelagola. There is, indeed, no evidence that Śravanabelagola, with its starkly stony terrain, was inhabited even long centuries after the Maurya times.

There are conflicting notices as to the region where the famine was to visit as per the prediction; was it just Madhyadeśa (central and eastern Uttar Pradesh) or was it the entire northern India. In the former case, there was no need to migrate to Southern India. Also, a continuous draught lasting for as many as 12 years would create a havoc in the ecology of the concerned territories. Most rivers progressively would have dried up. The Jaina writers (of both sects) gave no thought on what, under such circumstances, would have happened to the Brahmanists, the Buddhists, the Ājivakas and other people who all together must have constituted the far larger part of population than the Nirgranthas in north India. Such an eventuality also would have destroyed the larger part of flora and fauna, besides human population of north India. And the Buddhist annals surely would have taken note of it.

The South-oriented source, next in time, seemingly is the “Bhadrabāhu-kathānaka” inside the Bhṛhat-kathākośa of Hariśena (A.D. 931)⁶. It largely agrees with the Vadda-ārādane in several details. It mentions the capital town Koṭipura (in Bengal, which, as the author reports, was called in his times Davakoṭṭa), the names given of the ruling king and his consort and those of Bhadrabāhu’s parents there are the same as mentioned in the Ārādhana-ṭikā. When Bhadrabāhu was young, the caturadaśapūrvī Govardhana muni, who was on his way to Ujjayantagiri* for paying obeisance to Jina Nemi, visited Koṭinagara (=Koṭipura). Bhadrabāhu apparently was initiated on that occasion by Govardhana muni who imparted the knowledge of the scripture (śruta) to him. After some years, Bhadrabāhu, alongwith the caturvīda-saṁgha, visited Ujjayanī-purī (Ujjain), located on the river Kṣiprā, in Avanti-viśaya. There ruled king Candragupta with his consort Suprabhā. He was (already) a (Nirgrantha) śrāvaka possessing true faith (samyag-darśana). While sojourning in Ujjayanī, once on his begging tour, in one mansion, Bharabāhu saw a child

* This Tīrtha, however, was not founded till we come to the initial centuries of the Common Era.
resting in a swing. The child made him a gesture to leave, which he took as
an omenic sign and predicted the onset soon of a 12 years' famine,
whereupon the Saṅgha proceeded to Dakṣināpatha while he himself retired
to (some unspecified place within) the Bhādrapradadeśa where he passed
away in peace. Before that, Candragupta joined the Order of Mendicants
and was called 'Candragupti munī'. The narrative's details up to the
prediction part essentially are the same as in the Arādhana-ṭīkā; but
Hariṇeśa does not send Bhadrābhū to Śravaṇabelagola, a point on which
he, in fact, sharply differs from, or rather contradicts, Bhrājiśnu. Also,
the king's name he specifies is just 'Candragupta,' not 'Sampratī-
Candragupta'; what is more, the Maurya emperor Candragupta had ruled
from Pātaliputra, not from Ujjayāni, though that visaya apparently was
included in his empire (and a century or so afterwards, his fifth descendant
Samprati will govern it). And Hariṇeśa does not mention the 16 dreams
dreamt by Candragupta that confirmed the visitation of 12 years' famine
and, further more, the other undesirable consequences that will follow
therefrom. Lastly, he does not state what happened to Candragupti munī,
whether he accompanied Bhadrābhū, or remained in Ujjayāni, or went
along with the Congregation to the Southern country.

Among the Northern narrative sources on Bhadrābhū, usually, why
totally neglected by the scholars using Southern sources, four happen to be
more important. The earliest is the Tirthāvakālika prakīrṇaka (c. A.D. 550).
Its author first lays down the details of Bhadrābhū's hagiology, which, of
course, follows that of the Paryuṣanākalpa-Sṭhavirāvalī as well as of
the Nandisūtra. Next, in its exposition, it brings in Bhadrābhū in connection
with a single, and an important, episode described through 63 verses in
Prakrit. As the work goes on to say, after the end of the prolonged drought
(its duration unspecified) in Madhyadeśa (eastern U.P.), the (Bhikṣū-)
saṅgha assembled in Pātaliputra (in Magadha) to reconstitute the āgamas
since many learned pontiffs had lost the memory of several texts due to
their abandoning regular recitational practice—some knowledgeable friars
even may have passed away—during those trying years. The munīs, who
participated in the proceedings of the Synod, are reported to have
reconstituted the 11 aṅga-texts but, as the work reports, none of them
remembered the 12th one, the Dṛṣṭivāda, in which were included the Pūrva-
texts—in all probability the works of the Church of Arhat Pārśva—which
arguably contained Pārśva’s pravacana or teachings. The only pontiff who is said to have possessed the knowledge of the Pūrva-texts was Bhadrabāhu who was not present at the Synod. (It is not clarified where he then was and why was he not present despite his eminence.) A messenger from the Council was sent to him, respectfully addressing him as the ‘Jina of their times’ and requesting him to pass the knowledge of those texts to the Council, to which he declined, expressing as he did disconcern and detachment. That angered the (leaders of the) Saṅgha who next sent a categorical/unequivocal notice warning him that he, as he himself is aware of the rule, in that event, will be excommunicated. Thereupon Bhadrabāhu yielded, agreeing to impart instruction to some bright young mendicants. Whereupon Sthūlabhadra⁹⁷, alongwith 500 friars—the figure of course is very highly inflated, a characteristic tendency noticeable in Jaina writings of this class—was sent. While other mendicants eventually deserted since the tempo of teaching was very slow, Sthūlabhadra alone persisted and he persevered in learning from Bhadrabāhu. He progressively learnt the ten Pūrva-texts. In the meantime his seven sisters (who had embraced the Order of the Nuns) came to visit him⁹⁸. Bhadrabāhu informed them that Sthūlabhadra then was meditating behind the Śiva temple. In order to impress them with the supernatural powers he had acquired, Sthūlabhadra assumed the form of a lion which frightened the nuns who ran back to Bhadrabāhu telling him that the lion seems to have devoured Sthūlabhadra. Bhadrabāhu assured them that the lion is Sthūlabhadra himself. This incident of misuse, by Sthūlabhadra, of the extraordinary powers made Bhadrabāhu unhappy. He, consequently, refused to impart further instruction to Sthūlabhadra whose repentance-full appealings softened him and he passed the texts of the remaining four Pūrvas but withheld the exposition of their meaning. Ignoring the miraculous element which predictably emanated from the belief that the Pūrvas included a text that embodied the secrets of magical powers (Vijjāpāhuda/Vidyāprabhṛta ?)—the belief reflecting profound reverence of later ages toward the assumed mystical character of, and awe in which the long lost Pūrva-texts were held by, the later writers—the central fact remains that Sthūlabhadra had been deputed to Bhadrabāhu by the Pāṭaliputra Synod to learn the Drsṭīvāda that included the Pūrva texts. The Bhadrabāhu-Sthūlabhadra connection may be inferred through an earlier reference,
in Umāsvāti’s *Praśamaratī-prakaraṇa* (c. A.D. 350), which tacitly hints to the myth of Sthūlabhadra’s vanity due to his acquiring magical powers through the sacred literature and, as its consequence, he generated in his psyche (a sub-variety of) kaśāya-passion called śruta-mada/vanity due to possessing (the rare) knowledge of the canon, the knowledge which otherwise was meant for eliminating vanity of all kinds:

माष्ठुर्योपास्यां श्रुतपर्यंप्रप्रयुप्यां चैव।
श्रृत्वाति विस्मयकरं विकरणं स्थूलभ्रमणे। ॥
सम्प्रकृष्टमुलबे चरणकरसाधारं श्रृत्वात् ज्ञानम्।
लघ्वा सर्वभद्रं लेनैव मद् कर्षं कामं। ॥
—प्रशांतिप्रकरण ९५-९६

The medieval commentator of the *Praśamaratī-prakaraṇa*, namely Hariśhadra sūri (A.D. 1129)\(^{100}\), thus explains the content of those verses relating to Sthūlabhadra and tacitly hints to the episode due to which (the quantitative) degradation/disappearance of the scripture or canon (śruta-viccheda) began:

‘अतिविस्मयकरश्विकरण’ वैक्रियसिंहरुपर्निर्माणं स्थूलभ्रमणहर्षं जिम्मिआर्थिनिः दर्शनाय, आगमाभियोगनिः लघ्वविकरणं श्रुतसम्मदायविच्छेदं...\(^{101}\)

The next source, the *Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi* (c. A.D. 600-650), follows the *Tīrthāvakālika* in time as well as in content, but specifies two additional details (not noted in the *Tīrthāvakālika*), the first being that the drought had lasted for 12 years (as is also stated in the Southern sources) and, second, Bhadrabāhu had moved to Nepāla during that distressful period\(^{102}\).

The third source, the *Kathāvali* of Bhadreśvara sūri (c. late 10th cent.), repeats what the *Tīrthāvakālika* as well as the *Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi* record, differing only on a few minor details, or adding small particulars not mentioned by the former two sources. Like the cūrṇi, it states that Bhadrabāhu with Sthūlabhadra eventually had moved to Pātaliputra\(^{103}\), apparently after the major part of instruction to Sthūlabhadra on the *Pūrva-texts* was over while in Nepāla.

The fourth source in sequence is the *Pariśīṭa-parva* of Hemacandra\(^{104}\). It clarifies a couple of points left partially unilluminated by the former three works. Plausibly, on the basis of what is noted in the *Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi*, it records that, at the time of the Pātaliputra Synod for the redaction of
the canon, Bhadrabāhu was in Nepāla where, as stated also in the cūrṇi, Hemacandra adds, he had undertaken the yogic mahāprāṇa-sādhanā. As its prelude, Hemacandra also talks about the 12 years’ drought whereupon the pontiff Sushitha dispersed the Samigha to different congenial locales and, at that time, emperor Candragupta attained Samādhisāraṇa, peaceful end/death by ritually undergoing starvation. The work earlier talks at great length about Cāṇakya and how he helped Candragupta in vanquishing Nanda and in seizing his empire. Then there is a brief report on Candragupta’s son and successor Bindusāra, followed by that on Asoka, his son Kuṇāla, and the circumstances under which Kuṇāla was blinded; also, he mentions Kuṇāla’s consort (by name Śravacchā) and their begetting the son Samprati who eventually was given a share in Asoka’s empire. (He very plausibly ruled from Ujjayani as his capital.) The account thus far and in part is endorsed by the earlier sources except that (Ārya) Sushitha, in point of fact, was to appear on the historical scene a couple of centuries later. But more serious confusion appears when Hemacandra starts talking about a “second 12 years drought” and Bhadrabāhu next meeting Samprati, an impossible reality, unless he is some other Bhadrabāhu, about whom nothing is known from any other source. It was Ārya Suhasti, disciple of Śrīlābhadra, who was contemporary as also the preceptor of Samprati. And this latter notice seems plausible since it synchronizers with the historical chronology of the Mauryan dynasts.

VII

Conclusions

After assessing the total evidence from the available earlier writings and related pre-medieval and medieval epigraphs from Karnataka on Ārya Bhadrabāhu, the following facts, by way of recapitulation, together with a few additional, brief, clarificatory, and further elucidatory observations now may be put forward. Along with a few speculative thoughts also will be included. The picture delineated even by the collective information from all of the presently available sources, however, is far from complete. There are several gaps, lingering doubts, unresolved enigmas and obvious improbabilities ranged against the apparent plausibilities. The conflicting positions are present at several crucial points, paths, and turnings. As a result, the determinations in all such cases, wherever made, or plausibilities in happenings, wherever suggested, are at best tentative.
1) Ārya Bhadrabāhu doubtless had flourished during the régime of the first Maurya monarch Candragupta who had vanquished the Nanda and inherited his empire early in the last quarter of B.C. the fourth century, the general consensus for the absolute date of that event veers around B.C. 322\textsuperscript{106}.

2) Bhadrabāhu belonged to Prācīna-gotra and thus to Bengal as earlier perceived by U.P. Shah; and, R.C. Majumdar (who otherwise had not seen the Southern and South affiliated literary sources) likewise had arrived at the same conclusion—on the basis of the appellations of the sākhās or monastic branches emanated from his senior disciple Godāsa—that Bhadrabāhu was a native of Bengal. The Southern literary sources unequivocally endorse that inference, adding that he was born and (in his earlier years) had lived in a town within Bengal—be it Kauṇḍinī or Koṭipura—and was initiated in Puṇḍravardhana.

3) According to the second as also the third phase growth of the Sthāvirāvalī of the Paryuṣaṇā-kalpa (c. A.D. 100), Bhadrabāhu was the disciple of Ārya Yaśobhadra, the fifth pontiff in the hagiological descent from Arhat Vardhamāna. According to the Southern and South-affiliated Jaina literary sources (earliest of which dates from circa the mid 6th century onwards) as well as the Śravaṇabelagola inscription of c. A.D. 600, however, his preceptor’s name was Govardhana who, too, might have been a Bengāli. As an after thought, a reconciliation between these two totally divergent notices, the Southern being four to five centuries younger in date than the Northern, may be suggested by assuming that Govardhana may have been the ṛddhi-guru—not the dīkṣā-guru—who probably had taught the 14 Pūrva-texts to Bhadrabāhu. And the Southern sources, for that matter, in the hagiological sequence, connect Bhadrabāhu with Govardhana.

4) Bhadrabāhu, according to the earlier noted Sthāvirāvalī, had four disciples, namely Godāsa, Agnidatta, Yaṭṭhadatta, and Somadatta. They all, as their appellations unambiguously suggest, were brahmīns. The Uttarādhyayana-niryuktī reports the death of four disciples of Bhadrabāhu (who earlier were initiated in Rājagrha), on Vaibhāragiri near Rājagrha due to śīta parīṣaha, suffering by severe chill. In the gloss given by the Uttarādhyayana-cūrṇī, regarding the death of the four disciples in question, they are said to have died at different locales within Rājagrha’s environs, of
course due to the same cause, though it likewise does not identify them. This statement, as regards the four disciples of Bhadrabāhu who died by suffering from intense cold, is broadly confirmed by a notice in the Prakūṭa class of āgamic work, the Maranāsamādhi, a pre-medieval compilatory work, which absorbed the versified content of eight earlier texts, largely of pre-Gupta (Mitra-Śaka-Kuśāna) date, within it. Now, the cūrṇī calls these latter four disciples as of vanīka or mercantile community. Clearly, then, these four unnamed disciples were different from the former four named and, as their names suggest, of brahmin extraction.

5) Bhadrabāhu’s senior disciple Godāsa as well as the latter’s disciples, too, must have hailed from Bengal, as indicated by the appellations of the sākhās or branches of mendicants that afterwards had emanated from them, namely the Tāmraliptikā, the Koṭivarsīyā, the Paundravardhanikā, and the Dāsikharvatikā. Of these, at least the first three definitely were named after the then existing ancient towns in Bengal.

6) The authorship of the three āgama-category of works, namely the Daśāsrutaskandha, the Kalpa, the Vyavahāra, as also of the Nirvuktis traditionally is attributed to Bhadrabāhu in the Śvetāmbara sect. Of these, the first three texts, afterwards classified under the Chedasūtra category that dwells on the rules for ācāra or monastic discipline, the Kalpa alone and, plausibly, for its larger part (which seems ancient and largely uniform in style), may have been his work. The Nirvuktis seemingly are as late as early sixth century A.D., of course partly based on older material. (The Logassasutta included within the Āvaśyaka compendium is a hymn to the 24 Jinas and ascribed to Bhadrabāhu by Silācārya in his Ācārāṅga-vṛtti [latter half of the 9th cent. A.D.]. However, as I elsewhere have suggested, it could have been the inaugural hymn of the Prathamānuyoga of Ārya Śyāma 1 (c.1st cent. B.C.-A.D.), which was the earliest work to notice the 24 tīrthaṅkaras, giving as it also did their biographical (in most cases of course overtly fictitious) sketches.) The Śvetāmbaras also attribute the famous magical and very popular hymn, the Uvasaggahara-thōttā [Upasargahara-stotra], composed in the Mahārāṣṭrī Prākṣa, to Bhadrabāhu. (In the Digambara sect, it is believed to be a composition by Mānataṅgācārya, c. late 6th-early 7th cent. A.D., an equally erroneous and hence untenable ascription.) That work, as is obvious by its language, style, content, and spirit seems a composition by
some medieval Śvetāmbara abbatiai (caityavāsī) monk practicing sorcery and plausibly belonged to the late ninth or early tenth century A.D. as the of the hymn suggest.

7) It is likely that the emperor Candragupta, in the last year of his regnal period, may have been admitted by Bhadrabāhu to the Order of Mendicants. The combined information obtained from the Tiloyapaṇṇati (c. mid 6th cent.) and several inscriptions from Śravaṇabelagola dating from circa the mid seventh century onwards, provide such an indication. The 12th century Śvetāmbara writer Hemacandra, on the basis of some source before him, records that Candragupta attained Samādhimaṇḍana⁷, death by the rite of suspension of aliment which, too, would hint towards a possibility that he had embraced Nirgranthism. There is thus some degree of probability on this score even when the concerned sources are not sufficiently ancient. Some hazy but a genuine memory of the past event seems to have been preserved in that tradition⁸. Bhadrabāhu doubtless was contemporary of Candragupta but not of Sampratī who, in point of fact, was the son of Candragupta’s great grand son Kuṇāla*. Both Bhājīśu, the author of the Kanṭha-tīkā on the Ārādhana and Hemacandra, the author of the Pariśīṭaparva, are confused on this point. Sampratī’s association with Ujjayanī as his capital (by virtue of his becoming the ruler of the western half of Aśoka’s empire) does seem a historical reality or at least a plausibility.

8) As for Bhadrabāhu’s visit to Śravaṇabelagola along with his mendicant disciple Candragupta and the passing away of both of them there, it is not so recorded in the earliest inscription from Śravaṇabelagola (c. A.D. 600). The inscription does mention Bhadrabāhu in connection with the prediction he made in Ujjayanī of the 12 years’ drought, but does not mention Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta or bring them to Śravaṇabelagola, although this eventuality of historic importance and of considerable significance could hardly have been missed by the author of the draft of the inscription. Instead, it mentions Prabhācandra to have died there⁹. And no direct or indirect allusion to the effect of Bhadrabāhu’s and Candragupta’s association with Śravaṇabelagola is available in Northern Indian Jaina sources. Somewhere in Karnata, this belief was taking shape apparently in the late sixth century and was firmly established by mid seventh

★ The dynastic order is Candragupta, Bindusāra, Aśoka, Kuṇāla, and Sampratī.
century as earlier had been suggested here on the basis of an inscription, on the holy hill Kaṭavapra, concerning Śāntisena, of c. mid seventh century. Bhrājiśnu, in the Ārādhana-tīkā (c. late 9th or early 10th Cent.), positively associates Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta with the Śravaṇabelgola hill. On this point, Hariṣēna’s Brhadkathākosa (A.D. 931) comes in conflict with the Bhrājiśnu’s tīkā. For it reports that Bhadrabāhu, after the prediction he made, retired from Ujjain to (some site in) Bhādrapadadeśa where he died by resorting to avamodaryya or progressively decreased intake of food, the latter fact, without mentioning the locale sinvolved, was noted earlier and originally in Śivārya’s Ārādhana (c. early 6th cent.). The Brhadkathākosa throws no light on Bhadrabāhu’s disciple Candragupta as to what he did and where he was after he embraced the Order. Bhrājiśnu, however, avers that he was with Bhadrabāhu when the latter passed away in Śravaṇabelgola by anaśana rite: and the sage Candragupta, who stayed over there, died sometime after the 12 years’ draught. The Northern sources say nothing on how and where Bhadrabāhu died.

9) The most intriguing point is the presence of Bhadrabāhu simultaneously at two places and, on the opposite score, also in two times as deduced from two completely contradictory reports: (1) during and after the draught, he was in Nepāla; and (2) just before the onset of draught, he was in Śravaṇabelgola and his passing away there very soon after! The Northern records, available from c. mid sixth century onwards are unanimous that, when the Pāṭaliputra Synod was convoked after the draught for the redaction of the āgamas in c. B.C. 300 (or a few years before that date), Bhadrabāhu was in Nepāla and Sthūlabhadra—disciple of Bhadrabāhu’s confrère Ārya Sāmbhūta (and son of Śakaṭāra, minister of Nanda)—was sent by the Pāṭaliputra Council to Bhadrabāhu for learning the 14 Pūrva-texts from him. The Southern literary sources, all of which are late, on the other hand, claim that Bhadrabāhu was in Ujjayani, had predicted the onset of 12 years draught, and either before or just at the beginning of the 12 years famine, proceeded either to Bhādrapadadeśa where he passed away by reduction in food-intake, or to Śravaṇabelgola where he went along with his royal disciple Candragupta, passed away by anaśana rite, and had sent the Sāṅgha with his disciple Viśakhācārya to Southern India (Tamilnadu). The Southern sources, moreover, show no knowledge about the Pāṭaliputra Synod which assembled after the long draught and that
Bhadrabāhu was still alive and then was in Nepāla. It is difficult to reconcile the two totally differing and absolutely conflicting notices, their content standing poles apart. If these two represent not only very different traditions but also may refer to two separate Bhadrabāhus, which, somewhat remotely, may be a plausibility, then the first Bhadrabāhu belonged to the Mauryan period and the second was of a later date who may have migrated to Śrāvanabelgola. However, the concerned biographical anecdotes of the two Bhadrabāhus (if the second really existed) were confounded in the past and the today’s messy confusion arises therefrom. It generates a formidable conundrum which, in the present state of evidence cannot be resolved.

10) The complete absence in north India of inscriptions mentioning the gaṇas and the sākhās that had originated from Bhadrabāhu’s lineage is a pointer to the fact that Bhadrabāhu’s disciples and hagiological descendents were not in north India (Bengal and perhaps Orissa to be precise) and, by implication/deduction, had migrated to the Southern territories and settled there. Some, plausibly during the years of the draught, had gone as far as Simhala-dvīpa, while several apparently had settled in the Pāṇḍyan country in lowermost Tamilnadu where the earliest grotto inscriptions (c. B.C. 2nd—1st cent A.D.) indicating the passing away, apparently of the Nirgrantha recluses—assumably by the rite of sailekhanā—have been inferred.

11) Bhadrabahu of the Mauryan period, even if he really may have gone to Śrāvanabelgola, he may have done so a few years subsequent to the Pāṭaliputra Synod and after Sthūlabhadra’s learning the Pūrva texts from him. There is no reason to brush aside the Northern sources on the point of Bhadrabāhu-Sthūlabhadra association. That particular tradition is, as recorded in the Northern literarily notices, positively anterior by about three centuries to the mid-seventh century Southern epigraphical reference that at best is suggestive only obliquely of the Bhadrabāhu-Candragupta connection with Śrāvanabelgola, while another epigraphical source at the same site, which is half a century anterior to the former, explicitly refers to Prabhacandra and his (unnamed) disciple and not at all to Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta: but the earliest literary source, the commentary of Bhrājiśnū (c. 9th-10th cent.) talks about Bhadrabāhu and Samprati-Candragupta (the ruler of Ujjayani) visiting Śrāvanabelgola and not the Maurya emperor Candragupta (who ruled from Pāṭaliputra), who was
Samprati’s great grand-father’s father. (Bhrājiṣṇu doubtless is confused on this point.)

12) A question, indeed of sterling importance, also arises why Bhadrabāhu, despite his eminence and senescence, was not present at the Pāṭaliputra Synod. It seems that, today’s Bengal-Bihar divide seemingly had existed even in early Mauryan times. Bhadrabāhu apparently was alienated, the preponderance (and consequent predominance) of the mendicants from Magadha and from other territories, some of which now forming the State of Uttar Pradesh, at the Pāṭaliputra Synod and contrariwise, not according due importance to the Bengālī Bhadrabāhu, perhaps not even inviting him for the Redaction Conference, may have hurt him and consequently he may have remained aloof by staying in Nepāla and thereby completely ignoring the Synod113. (The ‘diktat’ or command of the Synod to pass, what then had become very rare, the knowledge of the Purva texts, may have served to sprinkle salt on the wound.) That the tempo of teaching was very slow, proves that Bhadrabāhu was an unwilling horse and only reluctantly had imparted the instruction to Sthūlabhadra.

And the legendary anecdote of Sthūlabhadra’s vanity bordering on deliquency was created, plausibly in pre-Gupta times or earlier (since the legend already was known to Umāsvātī) to cover up the fact that Bhadrabāhu had withheld the last four Purva texts while the teaching had entered into the final phase. And there is no clarity on the point whether the Pāṭaliputra Council had continued their sessions indefinitely and had waited till the return of Sthūlabhadra. The medieval sources briefly note that both Bhadrabāhu and Sthūlabhadra had reached Pāṭaliputra after the major part of teaching was over.

13) Since Bhadrabāhu either had not visited Karnatakā at all, or, if he did, he may have stayed at Śrāvenabelagla for a very brief period before he passed away: How, in that event, indeed in that extremely short period and under the avamodarya (or anaśana) vow as he is said to be, did he propagate the Nirgrantha religion in Southern India is a moot point. The more likelihood is that it was his hagiological descendents as well as some other contemporaneous Nirgrantha mendicants, who had migrated during the drought period to Tamilnadu and settled there, possibly were
responsible for the propagation of Nirgrantha-darśana in South, particularly and at first in the Tamil country and some time after in Andhradesa. There may have been more than one group of mendicants that migrated from the northern (essentially eastern) to southern India, indeed progressively so in different ancient centuries.

Bhrājīṣṭhu, as well as Hariṣeṇa, talk about the events in north India during the famine as well as what happened after Viśākhācārya returned to north India in post-famine time. They are, of course, not only poorly informed but are overtly sectarian and the South affiliated sources posterior to these two earliest ones only repeat what the above-noted two authors said and the further additions of details they made only betray their very strong sectarian bias with increased hate and venom. (I intend to deal with that part of the storey, of what happened during the draught years and in post-Bhadrabāhu times in north India, as perceived by medieval and post-medieval Digambara writers, in a future paper.) In Karnataka, the Nirgranthas eventually may have moved from western Andhradesa as well as from north western Tamilnadu and settled there only in the late third and early fourth century of the Common Era as indicated by the earliest charters from the lower Gaṅgavāḍi and the Kadamba country that predate the known Śravaṇabelgola inscriptions. The principalities of the Gaṅgas and the Kadambas by then already had been founded. No earlier Jaina vestiges including epigraphs, or literary notices either, between c. B.C. 300 and A.D. 300 so far are known from Karnataka.

★ There, of course, are reported a few grotto inscriptions of c. the 2nd or 3rd century A.D. mentioning the death (by sailekhanā rites) of the (Nirgrantha) mendicants in lower southern Gaṅgavāḍi.
Annotations:

1. The 14 Purva texts were believed to be the older and fundamental āgamas. To all seeming, they were of the sect of Arhat Pārśva and some of them plausibly had covered the early phase of Nirgrantha scholasticism. These texts' cosmography and probably much of the basic Nirgrantha doctrines (including the theory of eight karmas) and the dogmatics, besides disciplinary rules and allied matters, predictably had permeated through—of course by then in a developed form—in some of the available earlier āgamas, particularly their later chapters, and the younger āgamas, of the Śaka and Kuśāna periods, as well as the āgamic works, all of the Northern tradition of Arhat Vardhamāna's Church. To a fair degree, this applies also to the much younger surrogate canon of the Southern tradition. As for the Niruktis, these largely are composed in the Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit, are cast in the Āryā meter, and adopt the nikṣepa method of examination in determining the word's meaning intended in the given context. The German Jainologists ascribe these to c. 80 A. D. Muni Punyavijaya, however, regarded them still younger in date, composed as they must have been soon after the Valabhi Synod II (A. D. 503/516), and hence this date could be circa A. D. 525. Afterwards, however, he changed his view and ascribed them to the early centuries of the Common Era. However, I seem to think that his earlier determination is valid. The Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit does not appear even in the Sātavāhana inscriptions before c. 200 A. D. and the first available work in Mahārāṣṭrī, the Tarāṅgavaikāhā of Pādalipta sūri I also dates around A. D. 200-225. The Niruktis do contain some older, but largely relatively later material.

2. Literally 'omniscient by virtue of the complete knowledge of the sacred scripture.'

3. Since the Yāpaniya sect (mainly located in Karanataka) recognized the āgamas including the 'Kalpa (Bṛhad-Kalpasūtra)' and the 'Vyavahāra,' both of which the Śvetāmbara sect attributes to Bhadrabāhu, it is likely that, that sect, too, attributed these to Bhadrabāhu. (This, of course, is my feeling. There is, at the moment, no direct evidence to that effect.)

These two different dates are given in some manuscripts of the Paryuṣāṇakalpa at the end of the "Jinacaritra" (which is the second of the three sections of the Paryuṣāṇa-kalpa.) In some, the date given is V.N. 980; in a few others, according to another tradition, V.N. 993. The first date apparently originates as per the Mathura Synod's tradition; the other plausibly was due to the Valabhi Synod I tradition as earlier was suggested and, as I recall, by Muni Kalyāṇavijaya in one of his works. (It was, perhaps, his Viranīrvāṇa Saṅvat aur Jaina
Kālaganaṇā, Hindi. At the moment it is not handy.) For the date of the nirvāṇa of Jina Mahāvīra, I have followed Jacobi’s determination, namely B.C. 477. According to the tradition recorded in Dharmasāgara’s auto commentary on his Paṭṭāvalī (late 16th-early 17th cent.), the Paryuṣanā-kalpa was first recited in the assembly of Dhruvasena (1) of the Maitraka dynasty at Ānandapura (Vaṭṭanagar) in north Gujarat. Hence Jacobi’s determination appears valid; for the Maitraka prince named Dhruvasena (1) did flourish in early sixth century A.D. Seemingly, Dharmasāgara had before him some old traditional record. For no one before him mentions the name of this king, which was known only through the copper plate charters of the Maitraka donor rulers that were discovered, deciphered, and studied in the last century.

5. These dates are suggested here on the basis of a reasonable guess, based on computations and synchronisms, the details regarding which I shall not dwell upon here. For these are being discussed in a separate paper, “The Paryuṣanā-kalpa sthavirāvalī—eka Adhyayana” (Gujarāṭī), still incomplete, to be published in future.

6. Ārya Phalgumitra apparently was contemporary of Ārya Rakṣita, the latter pontiff reported in later literature as the one who classified the śruta/canon into four anuyoga-categories, namely the Dharmakathānuyoga, the Caranakarananuyoga, the Guṇitānuyoga, and the Dravyānuyoga. Since the term anuyoga is synonymous also with vācanā or redaction, a hitherto unreported synod may be suspected in this notice. It may also be added that the available āgamas are not categorically arranged into four anuyogas or classes stipulated in the above-noted later tradition. Hence, the term anuyoga, in the above-noted context, may be understood more accurately as vācanā rather than categories of canonical literature. Phalgumitra, for certain, figures in the main line of succession and Rakṣita, who otherwise may have played a key rôle at the Synod, apparently had belonged to a collateral branch (avāntara śākhā): Hence the name of Ārya Rakṣita (who otherwise was of considerable eminence) does not, but his much less famous contemporary Ārya Phalgumitra’s does figure at the point where the Third Phase of the Sthavirāvalī terminates. Seemingly, each one of the Sthavirāvalī’s five Phases ended soon after a redaction of the āgamas took place. Thus, each time it had to be extended after the happening of a redaction. If a redaction of the āgamas did happen in Phalgumitra’s time, the place where the elders met for that purpose is not recorded in the available literature. (No redaction had been undertaken after the Valabhi Synod II in c. A.D. 503/516.)
7. Medieval sources specify this date: The computed date for Ārya Skandila / Śaṇḍila also accords with this date: the date thus seems probable. I reserve detailed discussion on this date for a future paper.

8. For this Phase 5, in fact for the whole of the Sthavarāvalī, I have consulted the Paṭṭāvali-samuccaya, Ed. Muni Darśanavijaya, Śrī Cārina-Śmāra- 
granthmālā, Vīramagām 1933, pp. 1-11.

9. These two different dates are recorded, as specified in annotation 4, at the end of the "Jinacaritra" section in some later manuscripts of the Puryuṣanākalpa. Muni Puṇyavijaya's edition does not give the second or alternative date, namely V.N.993/ A.D. 516 : (Cf. his Kalpasūtra, Ahmedabad 1952, pp. 59-60, sūtra 200). Valabhi Synod II was convened for collating and reconciling the differences and divergencies in the versions fixed at the Mathurā Synod (c. A.D. 363) chaired by Ārya Skandila (or Śaṇḍila) and the contemporaneous Valabhi Synod I presided over by Ārya Nāgārjuna of the Nāgendra-śākhā. This fact is reported in the Kahāvali of Bhadreśvara sūri (c. late 10th century A.D.: unpublished) and, if I correctly remember, in one of the commentaries by Malayagiri (c. 3rd quarter of the 12th cent. A.D.).

10. As I recall, the noted epigrapher and historian H. P. Shastri favours Gupta as the more probable sovereign power under which the Maitrakas ruled before they became independent rulers.

11. Cf. the Thānaṅgasuttam and Samavāyāṅgasuttam, Ed. Muni Jambūvijaya, Jaina- 
śāhrasātā Series No.3, Bombay 1985, p. 450.

12. Ārya Śyāma is credited in the two seventh century cūrṇi commentaries on the Brhatkālpa-sūtra to have composed the Prathamānuyoga (embodying lives of the 24 tirthaṅkaras), the Gaṅgikānuyoga (treating the lives of the Cākraparīta, Vāsudevas, and some other early great men), the Lokānuyoga (dealing, as its title suggests, with cosmology/cosmography), and some Saṁgrahaṅḍs or collections of topical verses, some of which may have been inserted in the corpus of the āgamas of the Śaka and Kusāna periods and some of them apparently were utilized in the formulation of the texts of some of the Prakīrṇaka āgamic works. All of the works of Ārya Śyāma, however, are lost, but were available for consultation to the compiler of the Samavāyāṅga-sūtra (c. A. D. 353/363). The cūrṇis interpret the heading 'Lokānuyoga' in a way different from mine. However, as the title suggests, it must pertain to cosmology/cosmography. (For details and discussion on Ārya Śyāma and his contributions, see Puṇyavijayaji's article, "Prathamānuyogaśāstra ane Tenā Praṇetā Sthavīra Ārya Kālaka," (Gujarāṭi),
Jñānāṇījali, Vadodara 1960, pp. 122-129. (This article originally was published in Ācārya Śrī Vijayavaaśīlābhasūri Smāraka Grantha, Bombay 1956, pp. 49-56.

13. As I elsewhere have shown, the date of Deva vācaka is c. mid fifth century A.D. and not c. A.D. 400: (Cf. “Bhadrāryācārya ane Dattilācārya” Gujarāti, Svādhyāya, Vol.14, Vadodara V.S.2037/A. D. 1981. This article has been incorporated in the author’s Nirgrantha Aitihāsika Lekha-Samuccaya, pt. 1, Ahmedabad 2002, pp. 103-113.)

The hagiological table of Deva vācaka and of Devarddhi gani is as follows:

```
                                    kṣamāśramaṇa
                                  __________________________
                                |                                    |
                                |                                   |
      Dusya gani kṣamāśramaṇa       |             Bhadrāryācārya
      __________________________   |_____________________
      |                             |
Deva vācaka                        | Sthiragupta kṣamāśramaṇa
      (Nandisūtra: c. A.D. 450)  |                    |
      __________________________   |_____________________
      |                             |
Devaarddhi kṣamāśramaṇa (chaired | Kumāradharmagani
      Valabhi Synod II: c. A.D. 503 or 516
```


15. Muni Kalyāṇavijaya and, following his view, Pt. Malvaniya dated this work to the fifth century of Vikrama Era (c. A.D. 345-445). (See Kalyāṇavijaya, Vira nirvāṇa Saṃvat aur Jaina Kālaṇaṇa, (Hindi), Jalor S.1987/A.D. 1931, p.30, and D. Malvaniya, “Study of Tīṭhogaḷīya,” Bhāratīya Purātattva (Muni Jīnavijaya Felicitation Volume), Jaipur 1971, pp.129-138.) I would, on the basis of style and content, prefer the date c. A.D. 550 for this work: It must be available to the author of the Vyavahāra-bhāṣya (c. late 6th cent.) which, as noted by Malvaniya, mentions this text: ( Malvaniya, p.137). It is, however, not noted in the list of the Prakīrmaka works in the Nandisūtra (c. A.D. 450). This significant omission almost confirms the date I here have suggested.

16. It apparently is the latest among the earliest āgamic bhāṣyas.

17. It is one of the two earliest extant cūrṇis, the first being the Daśavaikālika-cūrṇi of Agastyaśinīha (c. A.D. 575). The time bracket A.D. 600-650 for the Āvaśyakacūrṇi was suggested, if I have remembered correctly, by Leumann. I have tested the validity of that date: It certainly is probable.
18. This cūraṇi, like that on the Ācārāṇga and the one on the Sūtrakṛtāṇga, is younger among that class of āgamic exegetical literature.

19. Haribhadra (active c. A.D. 740-784), as guessed by earlier writers, apparently had begun his literary career by writing vyttis in Sanskrit on the āgamas like the Nandi, the Anuyogadvāra, and the Āvaśyaka in c. A.D. 750.

20. The Kāhāvali of Bhadreśvara sūri is as yet unpublished. Prof. Harivallabha Bhayani had assigned the task of its editing to Dr. Ramanik Shah. I am grateful to Dr. Shah for giving me the gist of the “Bhadrabāhu-kathā” incorporated in that medieval work. As for its date, see my paper, “Kāhāvali-kartr Bhadreśvara sūrino Samaya,” (Gujarāti), Sambodhi Vol.12, Ahmedabad 1982-83. It has been included in the Nirgrantha Aitihāsika Lekha-Samuccaya, pt.1, Ahmedabad 2002, pp.103-113. (There, the word was ‘kartr’ in the original rubric which here is replaced by ‘karṭā’.)

21. Sīhavirāvalīcarita or Pariśiṣṭaparvan, (Ed.) Hermann Jacobi, sec. ed., Calcutta 1932, pp.242-248; and ŚrīPariśiṣṭaparva (Gujarāti), translator Rājaśekhara sūri, Ahmedabad 1994, pp.182-186. The particulars on the content of the Pariśiṣṭaparva will be cited in this article at a relevant point in the discussion.

22. Bhagavati Arādhana, pt.2. (Ed.) Pt. Kailāścandāra Siddhāntaśastrī, Solapur 1978, p.707. The work has been identified as of the Yapanīya sect by Pt. Nathooram Premi, A. N. Upadhye, and even Pt. Kailashchandra Shastri agreed with this attribution. I forego citing references to their writings since not directly relevant to the present discussion.


25. Šaṭkhaṇḍāgama, pt.1, (Eds.) Hiraḷal Jain and A.N. Upadhye, Śrīmanta Sētha Sitābrāy Lakṣmīcandra Jaina Sāhityoddhāraka Siddhānta Granthamālā 1, Sholapur 1973, pp.66-67; cf. there the Dhaivala-tīkā, the portion that concerns with the hagiology of early pontiffs.


27. Its editor Kharabadi ascribes the work to Śivakoṭi and dates it to the tenth century. But Hampa Nagarajaiah has shown, on the basis of a reference in the Punyāśrava-
kāthākọśa (c. 11th cent. A.D.) that the author was one Bhrājiṣṇu and because the work uses old Kannada, it may be dated to the ninth century: (Cf. his article, the “Arādhanā Kārṇāṭa-tikā,” Jain Journal, Vol. XXXII, No. 4, April 1999, pp. 166-170.)


29. Ibid., cf. there the Harīśeṇa’s praśasti, pp. 355-356.


31. In view of its importance, the text of this inscription is here fully quoted:

सिद्धअङ्गस्य सिद्धम् स्वतिः
तिलम्बणति स्रीसद्धम् तत्त्व-विधायिना।
ब्रह्मवेदान्त समाहा-सिद्ध-सोख्यामुतातन्त्राः।
लोकालोक-इत्यादियम्यस्तु स्वादु चरिणु वा।
सिद्धिनिर्विन्नाति-साधिः स्वाध्वरेषु यथा केवला ॥३॥
जगत्विचित्त्व-महात्म्य-पूजादिशायमीयम्।
तीर्थकृत्नाम-पूज्याचं-महाहृदयांमुरुपुष्याः।
तद्वत्र श्री-विशालयत् (तालाम) जयवच जगात्खजन्।
तस्य शासनम् यजां प्रवाहि-पत्र-शासनम् ॥४॥

अथ खेलु सकत-जगद्य-करणोदित-नितितथ्य-पुनास्तदीप्त-पतमजन-शासन-सरससंग्रहित्त्रत्स्य-भव्यत्व-कमल-विस्म-वितितिस्य-गुण-कीरण-सहं-महोक्ति दक्षवीर-सकितरि
परिवर्तुः भगवतसर्पर-णायम-गणर-साधार्च्यव-लोहार्य-जन्मु-विषुवेदाराजित-गोविर्भ-भद्रवादु-विशाराख-प्रोश्थिल-कृतिकार्य-जयान।
सिद्धार्थिधृतिष्यणुसादिलास्य-गुरु-परमपत्रेणकामा-भयान्ति-महापुरुषस्वतिः-समवयोहितान्त्र्य-भद्रवादु-वायुमना।
उक्जयुन्या-महस्त्रुण्या-महाप्रदेशिन्स-तत्रकृत्त-कैक्यत-दृश्यिता निमित्तने हदाद-संक्वतार-वाल-वैस्म्यमुलकाथा कथिते स्वर्गस्कु\(\) उत्तारभाषिकाण्मध्यप्रथित्: कगेश्वर जनपदमने-ग्राम-सत-सद्भं मुदित-जन-धन-कनक-सस्य-गो-महिषा-जावी-कुल-समाकीर्षणमात्रवा अत: आचार्य: प्रभाचन्त्रो नामाविनति-ललाम-भूते: शास्त्रिकथमियम्य-नामकोपलसिते विविध-तात्त्व-कुसूम-दलाविति-विचर्ना-सबल-बिपुल सजल-जलद-विबह-नौलोपन-तले वह-दीपी-व्यवध-ताप्य-व्यत-मुंगकुशपतिपते-पक-कंधरी-भवागुप-गहरादोगवति समुद्रज्ञ-श्रव्ये सिद्धिकोण सिद्धि सिद्धि योगभाषणात्मकां समयु-जिन-शासनभिमिति।


32. For the details, see the above-cited work and the “Introduction” by the compiler.

34. These have been completely ignored by all of the writers on Bhadrabāhu who exclusively used southern sources. (The Digambara writers, understandably, recognize only Digambara-mānya sources.)

35. Some three decades ago, U.P. Shah, in the course of a personal discussion, had conveyed to me his thinking about interpreting this word. I here have followed it.

36. The concerned verse is as follows:

जसमद्र तुणिव बंदे संधूर्यं चेव मातं।
भद्रबाहुं य पाण्यं शुलमभद्रं च गोयम।

—नवलीसूत्र १६.२४.


37. After all, kharvaṭa means a relatively smaller settlement. And when it is prefixed by the term ‘Dāsī,’ it was an humble place, indeed of lesser consequence.


40. The great historian R.C. Majumdar, apparently on the basis of the sākhā names of the Godāsa-gana, had reached the conclusion that Bhadrabāhu hailed from Bengal. As it happened, his relevant published works currently are not handy.

41. Tāmraliptikā, Koṭivarṣīyā, and Pundravardhanikā emanate from Tāmralipti, Koṭivarṣa, and Pundravardhana, as earlier inferred here; and all of these towns are located in Bengal under their modern derivative appellations.

42. Recent researches tend to bring down the date of Gautama Buddha by about a century, toward c. B.C. 400-383, with a few years plus or minus. If this date finally holds, then Arhat Vardhamāna’s date must also slide down and stabilize at c. B.C. 415-400 since, according to the Pāli sources, he predeceased Buddha. This date does not seem incompatible with the computable time-brackets for the successors of Vardhamāna. The traditionally held B.C. 527 as the date of Vardhamāna’s nirvāṇa, of course, is totally unrealistic on several counts, just as it upsets several firmly established historical dates, synchronisms, and time-brackets, an issue that cannot be dealt with in this article.

43. While citing the actual past instances of friars who had suffered from one or the other type of the 22 pariṣahas or visiting sufferings noted in the āgamas, for
the visitation of the śīta-parīṣaha or suffering due to severe cold, it cites this episode as a typical instance. See the Uttarādhyayana-niyukti 2. 91 inside the Niruyktaśāṅgraha, p. 373.


45. See the Uttarādhyayana-cūrṇi, Rishabhadeo Keshrimal, Ratlam 1933, pp. 56-57.

46. Ibid.


48. Quoted here in the annotation 31 along with the particulars on its published source.


51. The nomens such as Nandi, Nandimitra et cetera were to come into vogue in times posterior to Mauryan in Indian cultural history.

52. However, I intend to throw a small suggestion in the concluding remarks of the paper.


54. वंदनम् महब्बाहु पाइणध चरिम सप्तस्वात्मनाणि।
सुतस्स तांगमिः सदासु कामे य ज्ञानहरे॥
—विङ्क्तेश्वरकण्ठनिर्युक्तक १.१.

55. Already noted in the relevant foregoing pages.

56. However, Schubring has pointed out the anomalous situation in the Doctrine of the Jaina, sec. ed. 2000, Delhi, pp. 109-112.

57. This statement is based on the information I got from late Pt. Malvaniya. I have yet to verify it with the Pāli texts.

58. This is rather strange, because the mendicants, in that early age, preferred the nude state.

59. See particularly the last portion of the Kalpa, namely the sixth uddeśa, its end part and its commentaries. For the Kalpa and the Vyavahāra, I have used Muni Kanhayālāl’s edition, Rajkot 1969.
60. As inferred from a few Mathurā inscriptions.
61. The precise date will depend on the date of beginning of the Kuśāṇa Era.
62. That surmise seems reasonable in the present state of available evidence.
63. See the Vyavahāra-sūtra, eighth uddeśa.
64. The study of the oldest portions of the Ācārāṅga Book I leads one to such a conclusion.
65. The tradition is recorded in the pre-medieval Śvetāmbara literature.
67. See the Kalpa, third Uddesa.
68. See the Uttarādhyayana sūtra, modelled upon the severe ascetical style of Arhat Vardhamāna himself as narrated in the Uvadhāna sūtra of Ācārāṅga I.
69. Kalpa, second Uddesa.
70. Ibid.
71. A few sūtras taken from such works later were incorporated in the Sthānāṅga.
72. Such as possibly the lost Kalpākalpa.
73. These fall within the pre-Mauryan to the Kuśāṇa times.
74. See the details of content and style of each chapter and the strata within them.
75. This seems plausible in view of the presence of uncomformities and heterogeneity noticeable in the character of the content.
76. Quotations from the version of the Kalpa possessed by the Yāpaniya sect figuring in Aparājita sūri’s commentary (c. late 8th cent. A. D.) on the Ārādhana of Śivārya would lead to such an inference. The Boṭrika-Kṣapaṇaka sect was founded by the schismatic Ārya Śivabhūti who separated from the main stream Nirgrantha Church somedate in the second century A. D. The Yāpaniya sect apparently was the off–shoot of the Boṭrika settled in northern Karnatuka.
77. The discussion needs a very detailed analysis of the texts in question, which, of course, cannot be attempted in this paper.
78. Same remarks hold here, too, as they do in the context of the annotation 77.
79. This is the view largely held by the pundits of the Digambara sect and by those who follow them.
80. "वारसांगविवाणां चूँकरपुव्वत्वाताविवित्तयाणं।
सूर्यङ्गानि महत्वाकृ गमियगुरुभयंक्रेन जयादो।"
—बोध्यापाहुँ ६.२।

(श्रीमाध्यालिसामोह: Ed. Pt. Pannalal Soni, Māṇikyacandra-Digambara-Jaina-

81. Unfortunately, the original article by A. M. Ghatage is not handy. If my memory
does not play me false, it had appeared in one of the issues of the Jaina Gazette.

82. Hence some scholars have concluded that he was a later and hence different
Bhadrabāhu, about whose date the opinions widely differed.

83. See here the entire text of the inscription cited under annotation 31.

84. However, we must remember that, at least three temples were built on that hill
top to the north of this earliest inscription engraved on the surface of the ground-
rock there. Could these have covered and hence concealed beneath them some
still earlier inscriptions?

85. At least I so far have not come across the examples of the personal names ending
with 'candra' in the earlier context.

86. चन्द्रेण: कृष्णं प्रभासचन्द्रस्य
—जैनेन्द्रस्वामस्वास्त्र ४-३-१८०

For discussion, see Nathoooram Premi, Jaina Sāhitya aur ātihāsa (Hindi),

87. For elucidation, see Premi, "Vīrasena, Jinasena aur Guṇabhadra," Jaina Sāhitya,,
p., 137

88. Provided, of course, the belief/tradition recorded there is sufficiently accurate.

89. मउडधेशसु चिर्मो जिगिनिक्ष्ण धर्मिद चम्युत्तो च।
ततो मउडधृतम हुयज्जित्व पैव गण्धिि ॥
—निरोवपणणाति ४-५४८।

90. I have based this passage on the information noted in the Introduction by
Pt. Vijayamurti—his compilation earlier referred to here—as also the Introduction
by the editors of the Epigraphia Carnatica, Vol. I , (sec. ed.), Mysore, and
the observations thereof.

91. I have based this passage also on the information noted in the Introduction by
Pt. Vijayamurti in the Introduction by the editors of the Epigraphia Carnatica,
Vol. I, Mysore and the observations thereof.

93. For particulars on the source, see here annotations 26 and 27.


95. It also comes into conflict with the traditions preserved in the sixth century and subsequent works of the Śvetāmbara Church.


97. According to the *Sthāvirāvali* of the Paryuṣanā-kalpa, he was the disciple of Ārya Sambutavijaya. From his medieval biographical sources, he is known to be the son of Sagadāla (Śakatāra), minister of Nanda, and had seven sisters. Apparently, he must be the youngest child of Śakatāra and must be in his prime of life when sent to Bhadrabāhu by the Saṅgha. His future disciple, Ārya Suhasti, was to be the preceptor of Maurya Samprati, grandson of Aśoka, arguably in the pontiff's advanced age.

98. This account is given, among the older sources, in the *Tīrthāvākalika* and the *Kahāvali*.


100. He is a medieval author, a namesake of the famous Haribhadra sūri of the eighth century.

101. *Praśamaratl*, p. 65. I suspect that the “Bhadrabāhu-gaṇḍikā” (probably a chapter of the lost Gaṇḍikāraṇyoga of Ārya Śyāma, c. 1st cent. B. C. – A. D.) may have contained this myth and this may have been the source of the tradition before Umāsvāti.

102. ŚrimadĀvaśyakasūtram (Uttarabhāgah), Ratlam 1929, p. 187.

103. According to the cūrni, the episode of the visit of the sisters of Sthūlabhadra took place at the devakulikā when Bhadrabāhu and he were camping at, or close by, Pātaliputra.

104. For particulars, see annotation 21..

105. For details, see the *Sthāvirāvali*.

106. This is the view of the Indian historians, a few of whom, as I recall, also suggested B. C. 325 for that event. The Greek sources state it to be B. C. 312.


108. The *Pariśiṣṭaparva* of Hemacanda (between c. A. D. 1160-1170) so states.

109. Further confusion is added by the interpreters of the Śravaṇabelgola inscription of c. A. D. 600.
110. Some scholars think that it was the Tarai area of Nepāla.

111. In fact more number of Bhadrabāhu-s are implied: 1) The first, of the Mauryan one, contemporary of Candragupta; 2) The second of the period of Maurya Samprati; 3) The third, a contemporary of the Digambara Guptigupta who was Candragupta; 4) The fourth a contemporary of Varāhamihira who was the author of the Niryukta-s; and the fifth was a Śvetāmbara monk who composed the Jīnasahasranāma-stotra. See, however, Schubring’s obervation based on Leumann’s statement: ‘IEUMANN, however, points out that, in this list that already existed in the eighth century, “the second Bh. is but a chronic repetition...’ (The Doctrine., p. 53.)


113. This, to me, seems a plausibility. Schubring, on a related point, thus notes: “The inner reasons are explained by IEUMANN, Übersicht p. 26f.” (The Doctrine., p. 47, infra.) What these ‘inner reasons’ in their perception were, cannot be guessed until we have the translation in English of the Leumann’s famous and oft-referred to work.


115. Implicitly from Bengal and Orissa. It is easier to enter Āndhradeśa by land route; and to the Tamil country, by sea route, particularly to the Pandyan country via some port such as Nāgapattīnām.

116. These date from c. A. D. 300 in Gaṅgavāḍi and from c. A. D. 464 or so in Kadambavāḍi. (I here forgo stating the related details.)