

# Correlation of Jaina Inscriptions with Sthavirāvalīs

U. P. Shah

While welcoming participants at the Seminar in Ahmedabad on the 'Aspects of Jaina Art and Architecture' (Nov. 18, 1973), I had noted : "It is high time that all Jaina inscriptions from Mathurā are re-read and the old readings checked and revised wherever necessary. It is also necessary to have fresh verdict of the eminent epigraphers apropos the age of the script in each individual case, in the light of the advancement of our knowledge achieved during the past 50 to 70 years. The data from the Jaina *sthavirāvalīs* has to be correlated and we have to see if we can fix, with the help of these *sthavirāvalīs*, the period of at least a few monks appearing in these inscriptions. For it is now becoming certain that there have been mistakes in the old readings.

"The reading "Vodve thupe" for instance was incorrect. Prof. Alsdorf had written to me that Lüders had revised it but could not publish the new reading in his life-time. Actually, the reading is *pratimāvo dve thupe devanirmite*<sup>1</sup>. In another instance K. D. Bajpai showed that the old reading "Arhat Nandyāvarta" was wrong. The name, as he correctly read it, was *Munisuvrata*.....<sup>2</sup>"

"There are inscriptions, for example, which are dated around the year 30, the script in these inscriptions should be the same or very similar. There are inscriptions which are dated around 50, and around 90. The script of these inscriptions in each group must be identical. If this is not so, then the inscriptions are dated in different eras or with the sign for hundred omitted as earlier was suggested by Lohuizen-de-Leeuw."

With such fresh studies, we have to see whether the *sthavirāvalīs* in the *Paryuṣaṇā-kalpa* and the Nandi-sūtra can further help us in identifying

the pontiffs and monks whose names figure in the inscriptions and we must see what the traditional date for them is. Let us first take the instance of an inscription in the Son Bhandar Cave at Rājgir (Fig. 1)<sup>3</sup>. The inscription generally is interpreted as meaning : “Muni Vairadeva, the jewel among the *ācāryas* (and) of great lustre, caused to be made, for obtaining *nirvāṇa*, two auspicious caves which are worthy of ascetics and in which were placed the images of the *arhats* (i. e. *tīrthaṅkaras*).”

There are two Son Bhandar caves at Rājgir, adjoining each other, the second seems to have been appropriated by the Vaishṇavites in the Gupta period. The inscription under reference has been understood to suggest that *Ācārya Vairadeva* had both the caves excavated and images installed therein. A student of Jaina canonical literature and the *paṭṭāvalīs* would immediately see that ‘*ācāryaratnaṃ Muni Vairadevaḥ* of great lustre’ can be none else than the great *ācārya Ārya Vajra*, *sthavira Ārya Vaira* of the *Sthavirāvalīs*. I had identified this pontiff as such in an earlier paper<sup>4</sup>, and the terminal date of Vajra, according to the Jaina traditions, was shown to be around A. D. 57 According to Jaina tradition, *Ārya Vajra* died in the 584th year after Mahāvīra’s *nirvāṇa*<sup>5</sup>. (According to Hermann Yacobi’s corrected date for Mahāvīra’s *nirvāṇa*, it should be A. D. 107).

The inscription, however, is assigned to the third or fourth century A. D. on paleographical grounds. But the cave’s architecture, as shown by S. K. Sarasvati, essentially agrees with the earlier type of Barābar and Nāgārjunī caves and the learned authority had felt that the age of the Son Bhandar cave perhaps belonged to a date not far removed from them. The two Son Bhandar caves are more or less simple; the carved reliefs inside were added later as has been the case with several other early caves in India. The door of the Son Bhandar cave has sloping jambs with a taper of about six inches from the base to the top. The roof is cut into an arch, the arch has a rise of about 4ft. 10 inches and the height of the chamber is a little less than 12ft. It is clear that the caves are not later than the first century A. D. and that when the inscription was carved they were regarded as excavations originally done at the instance of Muni Vairadeva, and were in possession of those who belonged to the line of Muni Vairadeva<sup>6</sup>.

S. P. Gupta has published a photograph of the still remaining traces of the Mauryan high polish of the wall of the rock-cut cave<sup>7</sup>. This certainly suggests an early date for the Son Bhandar cave, not later than the first

century A. D. Doubts have been raised by R. N. Mishra and Jyoti Prasad Jain<sup>8</sup> regarding the identification of *ācārya Vaira* with the Śvetāmbara\* *Ārya Vajra* and they suggested that the caves belong to the Digambara sect. There is no *ācārya Vaira* known to any Digambara *paṭṭāvalī* and even amongst the Śvetāmbaras there is no other Vaira (=Skt. Vajra) who is such an illustrious great pontiff except Ārya Vajra referred to above. Ārya Vajra had a disciple called Vajrasena. Vajrasena, according to the medieval Śvetāmbara tradition ordained some monk-disciples at Śūrpāraka (modern Sopārā near Bombay)<sup>9</sup>. Out of these four disciples started the four ancient *kulas* (orders of Jaina monks), namely, Nāgendra, Candra, Vidyādhara and Nirvṛtti. Ārya Vajra, the preceptor of Ārya Vajrasena, is reported to have visited the Ābhīra country<sup>10</sup>, Dakṣiṇāpatha<sup>11</sup> and Śrīmāla, modern Bhinmāla in Mārvād<sup>12</sup>.

I had suggested that the inscription referring to Ārya Vajra may be posthumous and A. Ghosh, the editor of the *Jaina Art And Architecture* remarked on this suggestion that “the identification suggested by him is therefore highly probable. About the date of the caves he drew attention to S. K. Sarasvati’s views.”<sup>13</sup> Vairi (Vajrī) śākhā, known from some Jaina inscriptions from the Mathurā Stūpa, originated from Ārya Vajra (Pkt. *Vaira*) according to the *Sthavirāvalī* of the *Paryuṣaṇa-kalpa*.

S. P. Gupta, in his *Roots of Indian Art*, pp. 198 ff., has discussed the architecture of the Son Bhandar cave and compared it with that of the Barabara, Sudāmā, and Daśaratha caves. He concludes : “....look at the Son Bhandar cave from any angle, the picture that emerges remains the same : it is one of the most important missing links between the early Mauryan caves and the pre-historic caves. The Barabara caves are the logical outcome of the Son Bhandara cave(s).”<sup>14</sup> He further writes : “The fact that the Son Bhandar cave has generally been dated to the fourth century A. D. on palaeographic grounds appears to shake the very foundation of the pyramid of our arguments. The inscription on the outer wall of this cave<sup>15</sup>, in fourth century Brahmi characters, states that the cave was cut by the Jaina muni Vairadeva who installed some Jaina images in it. The reading

---

★ Recent researches on our side show that he was a pre-śvetāmbara pontiff of the main stream northern Nirgrantha sect. - *Editors*

of this inscription, however, has been debated as it admits an alternate meaning according to which the term used for 'cutting' may equally apply to the cutting or fashioning of the images. In that case, the cave was earlier than the date of the images and the inscription put together. Saraswati has argued in favour of the dichotomy that exists between the actual date of the excavation of the cave and its real use by the Jaina muni Vairadeva."<sup>16</sup>

I had corresponded with late A. Ghosh when he was editing the volumes of the Jaina Art and Architecture. He referred to my views and remarked that the identification suggested by me was highly probable. It seems he thought over the whole inscription again when he gave the reading of the inscription to S. P. Gupta with the normal prose order of the verse of the inscription and a new special prose order (published in *The Roots of Indian Art*, p. 202). According to this new prose order the translation reads : "Muni Vairadeva, the jewel among the *ācāryas* (and) of great lustre, caused to be made the two auspicious caves which are worthy of ascetics as those in which the images of Arhats (i. e., *tīrthaṅkaras*) are installed." (This would mean that he did not have the caves excavated but only had images installed therein)<sup>17</sup>.

This inscription has an additional importance for the history of the Jaina Church. It speaks of caves in which images are installed and which were fit for residence by Jaina monks practising austerities. This practice technically is *caitya-vāsa*. Usually, the Jaina friars do not stay in Jaina shrines. Vajra-svāmī or Ārya Vajra, a great knower of the Jaina canon and a jewel amongst the *ācāryas*, was an innovator and reformer. I had discussed this inscription with the late Muni Puṇyavijayji. He had informed me that, according to the Śvetāmbara Jaina traditional beliefs, Vajra-svāmī (Ārya Vajra) started certain practices which are characteristic of the *caityavāsī* monks. Later, there was degradation amongst the *caityavāsī* monks but, in the beginning, the *caityavāsa* or abbatial practice, attributed to Ārya Vajra in the Jaina tradition and supported by this very important old inscription, was not degraded in terms of monastic rigour, staunchness, and discipline. Ārya Vajra, in point of fact, was held in high esteem as much in his own times as was in later centuries.

I believe that this inscription had to be carved on the wall in c. fourth century A. D. when one of the two caves, the eastern one, fell into the hands

of the followers of the Vaiṣṇava sect. This was done by the Jainas of the school of Ārya Vajra who still had retained possession of the western one of the two caves. The original Jina image or images of the time of Ārya Vajra now do not exist.

The followers of the Digambara sect are reluctant to accept the above-noted interpretation for the fear of Śvetāmbaras being acknowledged as owners of this and other sites at Rājgir. But this inscription about Ārya Vajra (who is known to the early *paṭṭāvalis* inherited by the Śvetāmbaras) refers to the times when the Śvetāmbara-Digambara schism did not originate nor had the difference about Śvetāmbara and Digambara images in worship come.<sup>18</sup>.

We may next turn to the other problematic epigraphs. Two inscriptions from Jaina *stūpa* at Kaṅkāli Tīlā, Mathurā, especially are interesting as they refer to a Jaina *ācārya* well-known to us from the *paṭṭāvalis* and other Jaina texts. The first dated in the year 52 (=A. D. 130)\*, on the pedestal of a broken image, was published by Bühler in "Further Inscriptions From Mathura", inscription no. 18, *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. II (reprinted ed.), pp. 203-204. The second edited by Bühler in *EI.*, Vol. I., pp. 391, no. 21, as inscribed on the pedestal of a headless image of Sarasvatī (fig. 2) from Kankāli Tīlā, Mathura. This is dated in the year 54 (=A. D. 132).<sup>+</sup>

Lüders discussed them again in the *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XXXIII. pp.104f. Transcripts of Bühler's readings, placed side by side, are also reproduced there (fig.—).

Bühler translated the first inscription as under :-

"Success ! The year fifty-two, 52, the first month of winter, the twenty-fifth day, 25, - at that moment (was dedicated) the gift of the worker in metal Gotṭika, the sūra, the son of śramaṇaka, at the request of the preacher Ārya Divita, (who is) the convert of the gaṇi Ārya Maṅguhasti (and) pupil of the preacher Ārya Ghastuhasti out of the Koṭiya gaṇa, the Vera (Vajra)

---

★ The new date for the beginning of the Kuṣāṇa Era, as recently calculated by Harry Falk is A.D. 137. Hence the date of this inscription would be A. D. 189.—*Editors*.

+ The figure is also read at '94, - in which case, following Falk's determination, the date of the image would be A. D. 231. The style of the image perfectly accords with this date.—*Editors*.

śākhā, the Sthānikīya kula, and the Śrīgrha sambhoga. May it be for the welfare and happiness of all creatures !”

Ārya Maṅguhasti was the pupil of Ārya Ghastuhasti and Bühler's insertion of (and) after Ārya Maṅguhasti is not justified, since the general usage for mentioning the teacher or father of a person in inscriptions etc. is such. The insertion of the word 'and' would show that Ārya Divita was a pupil of Ārya Ghastuhasti.

According to the correction by Lüders in *J.R.A.S.*, 1911, pp. 1084, 1086, read, 'the Golika' instead of the member of the committee (Gottika) and 'Koliya' (Kautika) instead of 'Kottiya' (Kauṭtika.)

In the second inscription dated year 54, Lüders' correction, is : read 'Koliya' instead of 'Kottiya' (Kauṭtika). This second inscription, on the pedestal of the image of Sarasvatī, may be translated as under :-

“Success ! The fourth month of winter, the 10 day, on that date (specified as above), the gift of the worker in metal(iron—loha), Gova, the son of Siha, at the request of vācaka Ārya Deva (who is) convert of gaṇi Ārya Māghahasti, the pupil of vācaka Ārya Hastahasti out of the Koliya (Kauṭika) gaṇa, Sthānikīya kula, Vajrī Śākhā, Śrīgrha sambhoga.”

On comparing the two inscriptions, it is obvious that the Gaṇi Ārya Maṅguhastin, pupil of Vācaka Ghastuhasti (Ārya Hastahasti) of the inscription dated in year 52 is the same as Gaṇin Ārya Māghahasti, pupil of Vācaka Ārya Hastahasti of the inscription dated Samvat 54. *Gaṇa*, *kula*, *śākhā*, and *Sambhoga* in both the cases being identical, there can be no doubt in regarding Ārya Maṅguhasti as the same person as Ārya Māghahasti. And Ārya Maṅguhasti is the same as the Sthavira Ārya Maṅgu of the *Sthavirāvalī* of the *Nandi-sūtra*<sup>19</sup>. The *Nandi-sūtra-sthavirāvalī* gives the *paramparā* or succession list of the heads of the Vācaka-vaṃśa, who succeeded one after the other from Gaṇadhara Sudharmā down to Dūsagaṇi (Duṣya gaṇi). In verse 26 of this *Sthavirāvalī*, we are told that Sthavira Svāti of Hārīta gotra was succeeded by Ārya Śyāma of Hārīta gotra. The latter is followed by Ārya Saṇḍilla (Śaṇḍilya) of Kauśika gotra, succeeded by Ārya Jitadhara and Ārya Samudra whose word was regarded as authority in islands and beyond the three oceans (vss. 26, 27). As I have elsewhere shown, Ārya Śyāma is Ārya Kālaka of the *Kālakācārya-kathās*

and Ārya Samudra is his grandpupil Ārya Sāgara śramaṇa of the same *Kālaka-kathās*<sup>20</sup>. Next, in vs. 28, Ārya Maṅgu is paid respects in the following words :-

Bhaṇagaṃ karagaṃ jharaṇaṃ pabhavagaṃ nāṇa-damṣaṇagaṇāṇaṃ |  
vandāmi Ajja-Maṅguṃ suyaśāgarapāragaṃ dhiraṃ ||28||

The above-cited *gāthā* shows how great a *sthavira* the Ārya Maṅgu was. He was a pontiff of great virtues of *jñāna* and *darśana*, a great personality who could impress upon others (and who had superhuman powers, the *pabhāvaga*=*prabhāvaka* one who had crossed the ocean of canonical learning [*śrutasaṅgāra-pāraga*]).

These inscriptions show that Ārya Maṅgu belonged to Vera or Vaira, i.e. Vajra or Vajrī śākhā. Origin of this *śākhā*, according to the *Sthavirāvalī* of the *Paryuṣaṇa-kalpa* (according to its *viśṛta-vācanā*), is as under :

“From the two *sthaviras* of the Vyāghrāpatya line, Susthita (*alias* Koṭika) and Supratibuddha (*alias* Kākandaka) branched out the *gaṇa* named Koṭika which had four *śākhās* and four *kulas*. What were the *śākhās* ? They were : First, Uccanāgarī, and then Vidyādhārī, Vajrī, Madhyamikā—such were the four *śākhās* of the *gaṇa* named Koṭika.” Ārya Maṅgu or Ārya Māghahasti belonged to this Vajrī śākhā. The two inscriptions discussed in the foregoing refer to this Vajrī or Verā or Vairā śākhā derived from Ārya Vajra who was a pupil of *sthavira* Ārya Sīhagiri (Sīmhagiri), *jātismara* of the Kauśika gotra, as the *Sthavirāvalī* tells us in sū.11. This *sthavira* Ārya Sīhagiri and *sthavira* Ārya Śānti-sainika (= śāntisena ?) were the two disciples of *sthavira* Āryadatta who was a disciple of *sthavira* Ārya Indradatta who himself was a disciple of *sthavira* Ārya Supratibuddha *alias* Kākandaka. Both Susthita (*alias* Kauṭika) and Supratibuddha (*alias* Kākandika) were disciples of Ārya Suhasti. We know from other sources that *sthavira* Ārya Suhasti was a contemporary of the Mauryan ruler Samprati. Suhasti is credited to have brought Samprati to the Nirgrantha fold.

In an inscription published by K. D. Bajpai<sup>21</sup> and again discussed by M.A. Dhaky<sup>22</sup> we find reference to Kauṭika-gaṇa, Śāntinika-kula, and the Vajrī śākhā in the inscription which is dated in the year 17 of Kaniṣka, which proves that both Ārya Śāntinika, the contemporary of Ārya Sīhagiri and Ārya Vajra, the pupil of Sīhagiri lived before the year 17 of Kaniṣka, since Vajrī śākhā is said to have originated from Ārya Vajra. Since Maṅguhasti

or Māghahasti of inscriptions dated in the years 52 and 54 belonged to Vajrī śākhā, it would show that Maṅguhasti or Māghahasti flourished later than Ārya Vajra<sup>23</sup>.

Now, if this Māghahasti is the same as Ārya Maṅgu, then Ārya Maṅgu is later than Ārya Vajra. But the *Tapāgaccha-paṭṭāvalī*, says *saptaśaṣṭya-dhikacatuḥśatavarṣe* 467 Ārya Maṅguḥ. But the same *Tapāgaccha Paṭṭāvalī* (composed in V. S. 1696 = A. D. 1639-40) says the following about Vayarasāmi (Vajrasvāmi) :

तेरसमो वयरसामि गुरू ।

व्याख्या - तेरसमो ति श्रीसीहगिरिपट्टे त्रयोदशः श्रीवज्रस्वामी यां बाल्यादपि जातिस्मृतिभाक्, नभोगमनविद्यया संघरक्षाकृत्, दक्षिणस्यां बौद्धराज्ये जिनेन्द्रपूजानिमित्तं पुष्पाद्यानयनेन प्रवचनप्रभावनाकृत्, देवाभिवंदितो दशपूर्वविदामपश्चिमो वज्रशाखोत्पत्तिमूलम् । तथा स भगवान् षण्णवत्यधिकचतुःशत ४९६ वर्षान्ते जातः सन् अष्टौ ८ वर्षाणि गृहे, चतुश्चत्वारिंशत् ४४ वर्षाणि व्रते षट्त्रिंशत् ३६ वर्षाणि युगप्र०, सर्वानुराशीति वर्षाणि परिपाल्य श्री वीरात् चतुरशीत्यधिकपंचशत ५८४ वर्षान्ते स्वर्गभाक् । श्री वज्रस्वामिनो दशपूर्व-चतुर्थसंहनसंस्थानानां व्युच्छेदः ।

चतुष्कुलसमुत्पत्तिपितामहमहं विभुम् ।

दशपूर्वविधि (दं) वन्दे वज्रस्वामिमुनीश्वरम् ॥

-पट्टावली-समुच्चय, part 1, p. 47

But we must remember that, just as Kautika or Koṭika gaṇa had a Veri or Vairī or Vajrī śākhā, Vāraṇa gaṇa had a Haṭṭikīya kula (corrected by Lüders as Ārya Halakīya kula) with Vajranāgarī śākhā, mentioned in a Jaina Inscription from Mathurā dated Saṃvat 4, *vide* Lüders' Inscr. no. 16. Thus Veri or Vairī and Vajranāgarī are two different śākhās. (See also inscription on 1.234, Lucknow Museum.)

Lüders' Ins. no. 18, dated in the Saṃvat 5 of Devaputra Kaṇiṣka refers to Kautika gaṇa, Brahmadāsika kula, and Uchenāgarī śākhā. These are also referred to in Lüders' Inscriptions nos. 19 and 20 of Saṃvat 5. The Uccaināgarī śākhā emanated from Ārya Śāntiseṇiā according to the *viśṛta vācanā* of the *Paryuṣaṇākālpa Sthavirāvalī*. This Śāntinika was contemporary, senior confrère of Sīhagiri (Simhagiri) the teacher of Ārya Vajra. It is interesting to note that, in the inscription discussed by Bajpai and Dhaky, earlier referred, a mendicant of the Śāntinika kula became a member of Vajrī śākhā and not of the Uccenāgarī śākhā said to have been started under Ārya Śāntinika.



On the analogy of the name Uccenāgarī (of the city Uccenagara=modern Bulandas'ahara)+ shall we suppose that there was a place called Vajranagara from which was derived the Vajranāgarī śākhā ?

Ārya Maṅgu was a famous and revered pontiff having considerable/ proficiency in śruta or the Jaina Canon and was a *prabhāvaka ācārya*. The *Himavanta Sthavirāvalī* (supposed to be spurious) says that Ārya Maṅgu was a pupil of Ārya Samudra. In this context we must note the order of *gāthās* of the *Nandisūtra Sthavirāvalī* :

हारियगुत्तं साइं च, वंदिमो हारियं च सामज्जं ।  
 वन्दे कोसियगोत्तं संडिल्लं अज्जजीयधरं ॥२६॥  
 तिसमुद्दखायकिंति दीवसमुद्देसु गहियपेयालं ।  
 वन्दे अज्जसमुद्दं अक्खुभियसमुद्दगंभीरं ॥२७॥  
 भणगं करगं झरगं पभावगं णाणदंसणगुणाणं ।  
 वंदामि अज्जमंगुं सुयसागरपागं धीरं ॥२८॥

Next come two verses which are not commented upon by the author of the *Nandī cūrṇi* nor by Haribhadra sūri in his commentary and which are not found in all manuscripts of the *Nandisūtra*. Editors of the *Paṭṭāvalī-Samuccaya*, part 1, give them as extra verses found in some mss. only and do not give them continuous numbers. Even in the critical edition of the *Nandī-sūtra* published by the Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya these were not accepted as verses of the original text and are treated as doubtful. They are :

वंदामि अज्जधम्मं, वंदे तत्तो अ भद्दगुत्तं च ।  
 तत्तो अ अज्जवयरं, तवनियमगुणेहिं वयरसमं ॥  
 वंदामि अज्जरक्खिअ-खमणे रक्खिअचरितं सव्वस्से ।  
 रयणकरंडगभूओ, अणुओगो रक्खिओ जेहिं ॥

—पट्टावली समुच्चय, I. p. 13.

Then we have :-

नाणम्मि दंसणम्मि य तवविणए णिच्चकालमुज्जुत्तं ।  
 अज्जानंदिलखमणं, शिरसा वंदे पसन्नमणं ॥२९॥

—णंदिसुत्त, (Bombay ed p. 6)

+ Ucchera in M.P. according to Sagarmal Jain.—*Editors*.

The *Tapāgaccha-Paṭṭāvalī* says that Ārya Samudra and Ārya Maṅgu belonged to another lineage and thus it does not help us much in deciding whether Ārya Maṅgu was later than Ārya Vajra or was his Junior contemporary. When the Mathurā inscriptions speak of Ārya Maṅguhasti or Māghahasti as belonging to Vairi śākhā, we have to presume that he was either later than Ārya Vajra or was his junior contemporary or that the Vairi śākhā to which Māghahasti belonged had started before Ārya Vajra if the dates of Ārya Maṅgu (467 years after Mahāvīra) and of Ārya Vajra (years 496 to 584 after Mahāvīra) given by the *Tapāgaccha Paṭṭāvalī* in the 17th century are to be believed. It is difficult, however, to rely on the dates it gives composed as it was in as late a period as the 17th century. But it is certain that, as shown by the *Nandi-sthavirāvalī*, Ārya Maṅgu succeeded Ārya Samudra as 'Vācaka-mukhya', the *Nandi-sthavirāvalī* concerns itself with the Vācakas. Ārya Maṅgu's active association with Mathurā is supported by several texts. Hence it is reasonable to regard Ārya Maṅgu of literary works and Ārya Maṅguhasti or Māghahasti of the two Mathurā inscriptions referred to above as identical<sup>24</sup>.

In the *Prakrit Proper Names* (Ed. Pt. Dalsukh Malvania), part II, p. 537, we have the following entry about Maṅgu :- A learned preceptor (Nan. V. 29). Owing to his greed for food he became a Jakkha after his death at Mathurā (Nis. Bh. 3200. Nis. Cū. II. pp. 125-26; III. p. 142. Av. Cū. II. p. 80. NanM. p. 50. GacV. p. 31.). He had a different opinion regarding dravyācārya (Av. Cū. I. p. 585. Brhm. p. 144. Vyabh. 6. 239 ff.)<sup>25</sup>. Samudda was his preceptor and Nandila<sup>26</sup> his disciple (Nan. 28, 29).

In the "Pratikramaṇa adhyayana" of the *Āvaśyaka cūrṇi*, while referring to the *pratikramaṇa* of three types of *gaurava-virādhana*, the story is given of Ārya Maṅgu, a Jain monk who was reborn as a Yakṣa in Mathurā on account of egoism : ××× तिसुवि उदाहरणं महुसाए अज्जमंगू आयसिओ तिब्बगारवाभिभूतो अपडिक्कंतो कालं कातुं महुसाए णिद्धवणजक्खो उववण्णो, ताहे जक्खवायतणस्स अदूरेण साहुणो बोबेंताणं जक्खपडिमं अणुपविसितुं जीहं निल्लालेति, एवं अण्णदावि कते साधूहिं पुच्छितो भणति-अहं सो पावकम्मो अज्जमंगू जोहादोसेण एत्थ उववण्णो तं मा तुब्भे गारवपहिबद्धा विद्धधसा होहिह, एतेहिं गारवेहिं जो मे जाव दुक्कडंति । Av. Cū. I. p. 80.

The *Nisītha cūrṇi* calls him a *bahuśruta*, well-versed in canon, and having a large group of disciples : लोभे इमं उदाहरणं - "लुद्धणंदी" अहवा "अज्जमंगू"-

मधुरा मंगू आगम बहुसुय वेरग सङ्कपूया-य ।

सातादि-लोभ-णितिए, मरणे जीहाइ णिद्धमणे ॥३२००॥

अज्जमंगू आयरिया बहुस्सुया अज्झागमा बहुसिस्सपरिवारा उज्जयविहारिणो ते विहरंता महुरं णगरीं गता । ते “वेरगिय”ति काउं सङ्केहिं वत्थातिएहिं पूइता, खीर-दधि-घय-गुलातिएहिं दिणे दिणे पज्जतिएण पतिलाभयंति । सो आयरियो लोभेण सातासोकखपडिबद्धो ण विहरति । णितिगो जातो । सेसा साधू विहरिता । सो वि अणालोइय पडिक्कंतो विहारियसामण्णो वंतरो णिद्धमणा जक्खो जातो । ×××× साहहिं पुच्छितो भणाति-सोहं अज्जमंगू इड्डिरसपमादगरुओ मरिऊण णिद्धमणे जक्खो जातो, तं मा कोइ तुब्भे एवं लोभदोसं करेज्ज ॥ ३२००

—*Niṣūtha cūrṇi* (Agra, 1958), Vol-II Sū.43, भाष्य-गा.३२००, pp. 152-153. Also see *ibid.*, p. 125.

The Digambara author Svāmī Virasena (A. D. 817), in his commentary, the *Dhavalā* on the *Saṭkhaṇḍāgama* of Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali, and ācārya Jinasena (A. D. 837) who finished his guru Virasena's incomplete commentary, the *Jayadhavalā*, on the ancient *Kaṣāya-pāhuḍa-sutta* and Yati-Vṛṣabha's *cūrṇi* on the *Kaṣāya-Pāhuḍa*, repeatedly cite Mahāvācaka Ārya Nāgahasti *kṣamāśramaṇa*, Mahāvācaka Ārya Maṅkṣu *kṣamāśramaṇa*, and Mahāvācaka Ārya Nandi *kṣamāśramaṇa*<sup>27</sup>. Prof. Hiralal Jain, the editor of the *Saṭkhaṇḍāgama*, identifies Mahāvācaka Nāgahasti and Mahāvācaka Maṅkṣu with Ārya Nāgahasti and Ārya Maṅgu of the *Sthavirāvalī* of the Vācakas of the Śvetāmbara tradition given in the *Nandi sūtra* of Deva vācaka (c. A. D. 450)<sup>28</sup>.

We have shown above that, according to the archaeological evidence of the two inscriptions from Mathurā, Ārya Māghahasti (identified with Ārya Maṅgu as earlier shown) is later than Ārya Vajra since Maṅgu belonged to Vajrī-śākhā. This goes against the dates given in the Commentary on the *Tapāgaccha-paṭṭāvalī*. Under the circumstances, we have to reject the late literary evidence of the Commentary on the *Tapāgaccha paṭṭāvalī*. But, if we can fix up the date of Ārya Maṅgu, we can fix up the age of the above-noted inscriptions. At present these inscriptions are regarded as dated in 52 and 54 = A. D. 130 and 132 This would show that the era of A. D. 78 is used in these inscriptions.

Dhaky takes the date of Mahāvīra's *nirvāna* as 477 B. C. following Jacobi. Thus Ārya Vajra's date would be A. D. 177 and Ārya Maṅgu would be a junior contemporary of Ārya Vajra or letter a little later than Ārya Vajra. Dhaky, following A. K. Narain, takes the initial year of the Kuṣāṇa era as A. D. 105 and A. D. 78 as the initial year of the Śāka era. If the dates in the two inscriptions discussed here are in the Kuṣāṇa era, then they are

dated= A. D. 155 and A. D. 157 according to Dhaky's calculation of the Kuṣāṇa era.\*

We have to remember that there are two types of inscriptions from Mathurā. One type which refers to the year of Kaniṣka or Huviṣka. But those which do not refer to the *Samvatsara* (Era) of any king—must we regard them as dated in the Kuṣāṇa era ?

The analysis done above is an idle exercise to arrive at a solution of the problem of the era or eras used in the Jaina Inscriptions from Mathurā. If identification of the *ācāryas* named in these inscriptions and finding out of their age from the *sthavīrāvalīs* could help us, it would be a great forward step. For the present we can say that Ārya Maṅgu cannot be earlier than Ārya Vajra. Vajra's date would be either between B. C. 57 and A. D. 57 (acc. to traditional date of Vīra. nirvāṇa) or B. C. 7 to A. D. 177 acc. of Jacobi's calculations<sup>29</sup>.

#### Annotations :

1. This was a case of splitting the words, written in a line in inscriptions and manuscripts, in a correct way. The inscription referred to two (*dve*) images (*pratimāvo*) installed in the *devanirmīta stūpa*. Similarly, in the Vasantagaḍh Jaina bronze inscription of Samvat 744 (A. D. 688), it is said that the śilpin Śivanāga cast two images of the Jinas. The other (identical) image is not inscribed.
2. See my observation in *Aspects of Jaina Art and Architecture*, Eds. U. P. Shah and M. A. Dhaky, Ahmedabad 1975, p. xii. In the inscription, the name ingraved is actually 'Munisucrata', a scribal error for 'Munisuvrata'.
3. However, cf. Archaeological Survey of India, *Annual Report*, 1905-1906, p. 98, 166.
4. "Muni Vairadeva of Son Bhandar cave inscription," *JBRs.*, December 1953, pp.410-412.
5. For more information about Vaira, see, M. J. Mehta, and K. R. Chandra, *Prakrit Proper Names*, vol.II., pp. 660-661, and the "*Parīṣiṣṭaparva*" of Hemacandra's *Triṣaṣṭiśālākāpuruṣacarita*. According to the *Vicāraśreṇī* of Merutuṅgācārya (Añcala-gacchīya : late 14th cent. A. D.) and the *Duḥṣamākāla-samaṇasaṃghatthava*, of Dharmaghoṣa sūri (c. 3rd quarter of the 13th cent. A. D.), the date of Ārya Vajra is

---

★ Now, of course, that date has to be reconsidered.—**Editors**

calculated as Virāt 548-584, i.e., A. D., 21-57; vide Muni Nathmalji, “*Jaina Darśana Manana aur Mīmāṃsā*, (Hindi), App.I.p.63. This of course would be the date of Ārya Vajra as ācārya or as head of the group of monks.

Also cf. M. D. Desai, *Jaina Sāhitya no Samkṣipta Itihāsa* (Gujarātī), Bombay 1933, pp. 31, 37, 124,

6. Also see, A. Ghosh (Ed.), *Jaina Art and Architecture*, vol. II. Delhi 1974, pp. 88-89, 118-119 and plates 51, 52.
7. Gupta, S. P., *The Roots of Indian Art*, Delhi 1980, p. 201, pe.99, b.c.
8. A. Ghosh (Ed.), *JAA*. Vol. I., pp.119-120 and *infra*.
9. See the *Brhat-Kalpa-Bhāṣya*, pp. 917-921. Also cf. the *Paṭṭāvalī-samuccaya*, Ed. Darśanavijaya, “Guruparvakrama” of Guṇaratnasūri, p. 26, and *Śrī Tapāgaccha-Paṭṭāvalī*, pp. 47-48, and the *Kalpa-sūtra sthavirāvalī*, p. 8.
10. *Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi*, pp.396-397.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 404.
12. *Āvaśyaka-ṭīkā*, p. 390.
13. A. Ghosh, *JAA*. vol. I., p. 89, note 7.
14. Gupta, *The Roots.*, pp. 199-200.
15. There are many more inscriptions in the cave, including one or two in Shell characters. To my knowledge, none of these other inscriptions so far have been published.
16. Gupta, pp. 201-202. S. K. Saraswati, in *The Age of Imperial Unity*, pp. 502 f.
17. The inscription is read as under by A. Ghosh :

निर्वाणलाभाय तपस्वियोग्ये  
शुभे गुहेऽर्हत्प्रतिमाप्रतिष्ठे ।  
आचार्यरत्नं मुनिवैरदेवो  
विमुक्तयेऽकारयत् ऊढतेजाः ॥

The Normal prose order is :

आचार्यरत्न ऊढतेजा मुनिवैरदेवो निर्वाणलाभाय विमुक्तये(च) तपस्वियोग्ये शुभे ऽर्हत्प्रतिमाप्रतिष्ठे गुहेऽकारयत् ।

The new suggested prose order is :

आचार्यरत्न ऊढतेजा मुनिवैरदेवो निर्वाणलाभाय विमुक्तये(च) शुभे गुहेऽर्हत्प्रतिमाप्रतिष्ठेऽऽकारयत् ।—

*The Roots of Indian Art*, p. 202.

Lüders' *List of Brāhmī Inscriptions*, no. 959; Cunnigham, *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. I. p. 25; Bloch, A. S. 9., A. R. for 1905-06, p. 98, note 1.

18. For some canonical references to Ārya Vajra, see *Prakrit Proper Names*, Vol.II., pp. 660-661.
19. The *Sthavirāvalī* is given in *sūtra* 6 of the critically edited *Nandi-sūtra*, pp. 68, vss 23-24, Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyalaya, Bombay 1968, Edsn. Muni Puṇyavijaya, Pt. Malavaniya, and Pt. A. M. Bhojaka.
20. "Suvarṇabhūmi meṃ Kālakācārya" (Hindī) published in *Śrī Vijaya Vallabha-sūri Smāraka Grantha*, Bombay 1956. Also see, U. P. Shah, "Kālakācārya—A Revolutionary Jaina Monk," *Bhāratī* (Journal, B.H.U.) forthcoming issue as *R.C. Majumdar Commemoration Volume*; and "Jaina Anuśrutis About Kālaka" *Journal of Indian Museums*, 1959.
21. K. D., Bajpai, "Three New Kushana Inscriptions from Mathurā," *Jaina Antiquary*, Vol.XVI. no.1. pp. 13-16.
22. M. A., Dhaky, "A Propos of the Śāntinika Kula of Kauṭika Gaṇa," *Bhāratī*, New Series no.2, (Vārānasi) 984, pp. 149-151.
23. The other alternative is that the Vairīśākhā originated earlier than Ārya Vajra. For Ārya Vajra, see, *Āgamic Index of Prakrit Proper Names*, Ed. Dalsukh Malvania, Ahmedabad 1972, part-II. pp. 660-661.
24. Incidentally, I would want to point out that 'hasti' seems to have been a suffix added to different personal/pontiffical names, e.g. Nāga-hasti, Su-hasti, and others. Whether all monks with hasti ending names belong to one line or not is to be investigated. But the name Ghastuhasti as the teacher of Ārya Maṅguhasti suggests that monks with hasti-ending names belong to the same line. Ghastuhasti is an old Prākṛta form for Hastahasti and Ghastu may be a scribal error for Ghasta. Now, we have in the *Paryuṣaṇā-kalpa sthavirāvalī* a few verses in the end after the prose *Sthavirāvalī* ending with Phalgumitra, the disciple of Ārya Puṣyamitra; also the disciple of Ārya Ratha who was a disciple of Ārya Vajrasena, in turn the disciple of Ārya Vajra. Amongst these nine verses, we have two names : Sthavira Hasta as well as Sthavira Ārya Hasti. But we do not know for certain that the monks mentioned in these nine verses are in order of teacher and the taught or are just names of some chiefs of the line of Phalgumitra. The verses are as under :

वंदामि ऋग्गुमिस्तं च गोयमं धृणगिरिं च वासिष्ठं ।  
 कोच्छं सिवभूदं पिय, कोसिय दोज्जंतकण्हे य ॥१॥  
 तं वंदिरुण सिरसा, चित्तं वंदामि कास्सवं गोतं ।  
 नक्खं कासवगोतं, रक्खं पिय कासवं वंदे ॥२॥

वंदामि अज्जनागं च गोयमं च जेहिलं च वासिडुं ।  
 विण्हुं माढरगोत्तं, कालगमवि गोयमं वंदे ॥३॥  
 गोयमगोत्तकुमारं, सप्पलयं तह य भद्दयं वंदे ।  
 थेरं च अज्जवुडुं, गोयमगुत्तं नमंसामि ॥४॥  
 तं वंदिऊण सिरसा थिरचित्तचरित्तनाणसंपन्नं ।  
 थेरं च संघवालिय कासवगोत्तं पणिवयामि ॥५॥  
 वंदामि अज्जहत्थि च कासवं खंतिसागरं धीरं ।  
 गिह्वाण पढममासे, कालगयं चेव सुद्धस्स ॥६॥  
 वंदामि अज्जधम्मं च सुव्वयं सीललद्धिसंपन्नं ।  
 जस्स निक्खमणे देवो छत्तं वरमुत्तमं वहइ ॥७॥  
 हत्थं कासवगोत्तं धम्मं सिक्खसाहगं पडिवयामि ।  
 सीहं कासवगोत्तं धम्मं पिय कासवं वंदे ॥८॥  
 सुत्तत्थ रयणभरिए, खमदमभद्दवगुणेहि संपन्ने ।  
 देवड्ढिखमासमणे कासवगोत्ते पणिवयामि ॥९॥★

It is of course obvious that these *gāthās* are added sometime after the second Valabhī council that met under the leadership of Devarddhi gaṇi kṣamāśramaṇa. Possibly, the *gāthās* refer in brief to the lineage to which belonged Devarddhi gaṇi kṣamaśramaṇa.

25. अहवादव्वायरिओ तिविहो-एगभविओबद्धाउओ अभिमुहणामगोतो, xxणिबद्धाउओ उजेण आउयं बद्धं, अभिमुहणामगोतो जेण पदेसा उच्छूढा, अहया मूलगुणिव्वत्तिओ उत्तरगुणिव्वत्तिओ य, सरीरं मूलगुणो, चित्तकम्मादि उत्तरगुणो, अहवा जाणओ भविओ वतिरित्तो, मंगुवायगाणं समुहवायगाणं नागहत्थिवायगाणं जथासंखं आदेसो—- *ĀvCū.I.p.* 585.

26. The *Nandisūtra* edited by Muni Puṇyavijaya reads Ajjāṇandila and not Ajja Nandila in the *Nandi sthavirāvali*. The correct name probably was Ārya Ānandila, since the editors of the critical edition by Muni Puṇyavijaya, Dalshukh Malvania, and Amritlaia Bhojak, give only one v.l., अज्जानंदिल and do not read Ajja Nandila from any ms. referred to by them. One does not know when the name Ārya Nandila came in currency. (could the Ārya Nandi of the *Dhavalā-tikā* be Ārya Nandila or Ārya Ānandita ? —*Editors* )

27. See Hiralal Jain, the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* Vol. I, "Intro.," pp. 49-50, the *Dhavalā*, अ० १४४०; the *Jayadhavalā*, अ० १२३९; the *Dhavalā*, अ० १४२९, १४५८; the *Jayadhavalā*, अ० ९७३. Also Hindi "Intro.," to *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, Vol.II.p. 36.

★ We think that this hagiological list follows the sequential order. —*Editors*.

Vīrasenasvāmī, in his *maṅgalācaraṇa* to the *Jayadhavalā-ṭikā*, writes :-

जेणिह कसाय-पाहुडमणेयणयमुज्जलं अणंतत्थं ।  
 गाहाहिं विवरियं तं गुणहरभडारयं वंदे ॥६॥  
 गुणहरवयण विणिग्गय गाहाणत्थोवहारिओ सव्वो ।  
 जेणज्जमंखुणा सो सणागहत्थी वरंदेऊ ॥७॥  
 जो अज्जमंगुसीसो अंतवासी वि णागहत्थिस्स  
 सो वित्तिसुत्तकत्ता जइवसहो मे वरं देऊ ॥८॥

—कसायप्राहुड, भा० १, p. 4

Guṇadhara composed the *Kaṣāyaprabhṛta* in *gāthās*. Ārya Maṅkhu fully grasped the meaning of the *gāthā*'s uttered by Guṇadhara. Yativṛṣabha was the author of the *Vṛttisūtra* (*cūrṇisūtra*). Yativṛṣabha, according to Vīrasena, was the disciple of Ārya Maṅgu and also disciple (*antevāsī*) of Nāgahasti.

28. See an. 26 where *Āv. Cūr.* p. 585 refers to Ārya Maṅgu, Ārya Samudra, and Ārya Nāgahasti as Vācaka. It is, then, certain that Ārya Maṅgu of the Śvetāmbara texts is identical with Ārya Maṅkhu of the *Dhavalā* and the *Jayadhavalā*, etc.
29. According to the *avacurī* on दुःषमाकाल श्रीश्रमणसंघस्तोत्र of धर्मघोष, वज्रस्वामी was *ācārya* (head) for 36 years including wh. 584 years A. M. elapsed so वज्र = 548 to 584 A. M. 21 to 57 A. D. or 71 to 127 A. D. (Jacobi).

