Correlation of Jaina Inscriptions with Sthaviravālīs

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 Jainasthaviravālīs has to be correlated and we have to see if we can fix, with the help of these sthaviravālīs, 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 lifetime. Actually, the reading is pratimāvo dve thupe devanirmite¹. In another instance K. D. Bajpai showed that the old reading “Arhat Nandyāvarta” was wrong. The name, as he correctly read it, was Munisuvrata....²”

“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 sthaviravālīs in the Paryuṣaṅa-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)³. 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 Vaishnavites 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 ‘ācāryaratnam Muni Vairadevaḥ of great lustre’ can
be none else than the great ācārya Ārya Vajra, sthavira Ārya Vaira of
the Sthavirāvaliś. I had identified this pontiff as such in an earlier paper⁴,
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 nirvāṇa⁵. (According to Harmann 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 Vairadeva⁶.

S. P. Gupta has published a photograph of the still remaining traces of
the Mauryan high polish of the wall of the rock-cut cave⁷. This certainly
suggests an early date for the Son Bhandar cave, not later than the first
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century A. D. Doubts have been raised by R. N. Mishra and Jyoti Prasad Jain\(^6\) regarding the identification of ṛcārya Vairā with the Śvetāmbara\(^*\) Ṛya Vajra and they suggested that the caves belong to the Digambara sect. There is no ṛcārya Vairā known to any Digambara paṭṭāvalī and even amongst the Śvetāmbaras there is no other Vairā (=Skt. Vajra) who is such an illustrious great pontiff except Ṛya Vajra referred to above. Ṛya Vajra had a disciple called Vajrasena. Vajrasena, according to the medieval Śvetāmbara tradition ordained some monk-disciples at Śūrpāraka (modern Sopārā near Bombay)\(^9\). Out of these four disciples started the four ancient kulas (orders of Jaina monks), namely, Nāgendra, Candra, Vidyādharā and Nivṛtti. Ṛya Vajra, the preceptor of Ṛya Vajrasena, is reported to have visited the Ābhīra country\(^10\), Dakṣiṇāpatha\(^11\) and Śrīmāla, modern Bhīmāla in Mārvād)\(^12\).

I had suggested that the inscription referring to Ṛya 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. Sarasvatī’s views.”\(^13\) Vairī (Vajrī) sākhā, known from some Jaina inscriptions from the Mathurā Stūpa, originated from Ṛya Vajra (Pkt. Vairā) according to the *Sthāvīravālī* of the *Paryuṣanā-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 Barabarī, 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 Barabarī caves are the logical outcome of the Son Bhandara cave(s).”\(^14\) 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\(^15\), 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-śvetambara 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 Vairādeva.”

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 Vairādeva, 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., tīrthāṅkaras) are installed.” (This would mean that he did not have the caves excavated but only had images installed therein).

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 Puñyavijayji. 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 caityavāsī or abbetial 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 paṭṭāvalīs 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. 18.

We may next turn to the other problematic epigraphs. Two inscriptions from Jaina stūpa at Kaṅkāli Tiḷā, Mathurā, especially are interesting as they refer to a Jaina acārya well-known to us from the paṭṭāvalīs 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 Kaṅkāli Tiḷā, Mathura. This is dated in the year 54 (=A. D. 132). 19

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 Goṭṭika, the śūra, the son of śramaṇaka, at the request of the preacher Ārya Divita, (who is) the convert of the gaṇi Ārya Māṅguhaśasti (and) pupil of the preacher Ārya Ghastuhaśasti 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 Sthānikiya 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 (Goṭṭika) and 'Koliya' (Kauṭṭika) instead of 'Koṭṭiya' (Kauṭṭika.)

In the second inscription dated year 54, Lüders' correction, is: read 'Koliya' instead of 'Koṭṭiya' (Kauṭṭika). 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 gañi Ārya Māghahasti, the pupil of vācaka Ārya Hastahasti out of the Koliya (Kauṭṭika) gana, Sthānikiya kula, Vajrī Śākhā, Śrīgrha sambhoga."

On comparing the two inscriptions, it is obvious that the Gañi Ārya Maṅguhastīn, pupil of Vācaka Ghastuhasti (Ārya Hastahasti) of the inscription dated in year 52 is the same as Gañin Ārya Māghahasti, pupil of Vācaka Ārya Hastahasti of the inscription dated Samvat 54. Gaṇa, kula, śākhā, and Saṁbhoga 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-sūtraⁱ⁹. The Nandi-sūtra-sthavirāvali gives the paramparā or succession list of the heads of the Vācaka-varmśa, who succeeded one after the other from Gañachara Sudharmā down to Dūṣagāni (Duṣya gañi). In verse 26 of this Sthavirāvali, we are told that Sthavira Śvāti of Hārīta gotra was succeeded by Ārya Śyāma of Hārīta gotra. The latter is followed by Ārya Sandilla (Śandilya) 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 Kālàkācārya-kathās
and Ōrya Samudra is his grandpupil Ōrya Sāgara śrāmaṇa of the same Kālaka-kathās. Next, in vs. 28, Ōrya Maṅgu is paid respects in the following words:

Bhaṇagam karagam jharagam pabhavagam naṇa-dāmsaṇaṇaṇaṇam
vandāmi Ajja-Maṅguṁ suyasāgarapāragam dhiram | 28 |

The above-cited gāthā shows how great a sthavira the Ōrya 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 pabhavaga=prabhavaka one who had crossed the ocean of canonical learning [śrutasaṅgaṇa-pāraga]).

These inscriptions show that Ōrya Maṅgu belonged to Vera or Vaira, i.e. Vajra or Vajrī sākhā. Origin of this sākhā, according to the Sthaviravālī of the Paryuṣaṇā-kalpa (according to its vistṛta-vacanā), is as under:

"From the two sthaviras of the Vyāghrāpatya line, Susthita (alias Kōtika) and Supratibuddha (alias Kākandaka) branched out the gaṇa named Kōtika which had four sākhās and four kulas. What were the sākhās? They were: First, Uccanāgarī, and then Vidyaḍharī, Vajrī, Madhyamikā—such were the four sākhās of the gaṇa named Kōtika." Ōrya Maṅgu or Ōrya Māghahasti belonged to this Vajrī sākhā. The two inscriptions discussed in the foregoing refer to this Vajrī or Vera or Vaira sākhā derived from Ōrya Vajra who was a pupil of sthavira Ōrya Sīhagiri (Sīmhaśīrī), jātīsmara of the Kauśika gotra, as the Sthaviravālī tells us in sū.11. This sthavira Ōrya Sīhagiri and sthavira Ōrya 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 Sushita (alias Kauṭika) and Supratibuddha (alias Kākandaka) were disciples of Ārya Suhaṣṭi. We know from other sources that Sthavira Ārya Suhaṣṭi was a contemporary of the Mauryan ruler Samprati. Suhaṣṭi is credited to have brought Samprati to the Nirgrantha fold.

In an inscription published by K. D. Baijaī and again discussed by M.A. Dhaky we find reference to Kauṭika-gaṇa, Śāntinika-kula, and the Vajrī sākhā in the inscription which is dated in the year 17 of Kaniṣṭa, which proves that both Ārya Śāntinika, the contemporary of Ārya Sīhagiri and Ārya Vajra, the pupil of Sīhagiri lived before the year 17 of Kaniṣṭa, since Vajrī sākhā is said to have originated from Ārya Vajra. Since Maṅguhastī
or Māghahastī of inscriptions dated in the years 52 and 54 belonged to Vajrī śākhā, it would show that Māŋuhastī or Māghahastī flourished later than Ārya Vajra\(^2\).

Now, if this Māghahastī is the same as Ārya Maṅgu, then Ārya Maṅgu is later than Ārya Vajra. But the Tapāgaccha-paṭṭāvalī, says saptasaṭṭya-dhikacatuḥsatavarṣe 467 Ārya Maṅgu. But the same Tapāgaccha Paṭṭāvalī (composed in V. S. 1696 = A. D. 1639-40) says the following about Vayarasaṃī (Vajrasvāmi):

> तेस्मो वयासामि गुरु।

> व्याख्या - तेस्मो ति श्रीसीवांसिरपृण्टे तन्योदशे: श्रीव्रजस्वामी या वाल्यादपि जातिस्पृश्यन्तिकान्, नस्योपमनिन्दया संयादाक्रुदु, दक्षिणभी बीरदान्ते जिनेन्द्रपूर्वानिधिर्यतं पुराणानि नन्नवचनिन्यन्त्रकाकृत, देवयनिधित्वातो दशार्थिविद्याधिकारिः। अनि दर्शन्ते ज्ञानस्य वाक्यालंबिन्ति वक्षार्थस्वतितितिमूलम्। तत्त्वं स भगवानूण श्रीव्रजशास्त्रिकृतुः। शतभ्रान्ति सम्बन्धमेता वर्णपरिष्कर्ति श्री बीरसुतु चतुष्कृतिकार्यक्षत्रि अनि ५८४ वर्णांंते स्वर्गभाग। श्री व्रजस्वामिनी दशार्थी चतुष्कृतिकार्यक्षत्रिय व्याख्येऽः।

> चतुष्कृतालसुल्मतितितितिमहं विभूम।

> दशार्थिविधि (दे) वनं ब्रजस्वामिमुन्नेत्राश्रम।

> -पवित्रती-समुख्य, part 1, p. 47

But we must remember that, just as Kauṭika or Koṭika gaṇa had a Veri or Vairī or Vajrī śākhā, Vārana gaṇa had a Haṭṭikīya kula (corrected by Lüders as Ārya Halakīya kula) with Vajranāgarī śākhā, mentioned in a Jaina Inscription from Mathurā dated Saṁvat 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 Saṁvat 5 of Devaputra Kaniṣṭha refers to Kauṭika gaṇa, Brahmādāsika kula, and Uchenāgarī śākhā. These are also referred to in Lüders’ Inscriptions nos. 19 and 20 of Saṁvat 5. The Uccaināgarī śākhā emanated from Ārya Śāntiseniā according to the vistrta vācanā of the Paryuṣaṇākalpa Sthavirāvalī. This Śāntinika was contemporary, senior confrère of Śīhagiri (Śimhagiri) 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 Ucchenāgarī (of the city Ucchenagara=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 śrūta 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:

हारियुगो छाई । विदितो हारियं च सामकर्जः ।
वंदे कोसियोन संडियो अज्जामयथरः॥२५॥
तिसुवुद्धायाकिन्तु दीवसमुद्धु गहियेयालं ।
वंदे अज्जसमुद्धु अक्कुभियासमुंगारीं॥२६॥
भरण्ग कर्त्यं ज्ञर्यं पश्चादयं पाणपदस्यांगुणां ।
वंदामि अज्जामयुं सुससागरायारं धीरे॥२८॥

Next come two verses which are not commented upon by the author of the Nandi cūrṇi nor by Haribhadra sūri in his commentary and which are not found in all manuscripts of the Nandisūtra. Editors of the Paṭṭāvali-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 Nandi-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 अज्जामयं, वंदे ततो अ भद्रारं च ।
ततो अ अज्जामयं, तवनियामयुः पदसाकं ॥


Then we have:-

नाणिम्म संसारमिम्म य तत्वविवेद, शिवस्तानुश्वुर्तं ।
अज्जानन्दिलामण्ड, शिवसा वंदे पशुमण्ड ॥२९॥

—णविन्दम्म, (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 Maṅguhastī or Māghahastī as belonging to Vairā śākhā, we have to presume that he was either later than Ārya Vajra or was his junior contemporary or that the Vairā śākhā to which Māghahastī 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 Maṅguhastī or Māghahastī of the two Mathurā inscriptions referred to above as identical.

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.). Samudda was his preceptor and Nandila his disciple (Nan. 28, 29).

In the “Pratikramaṇa adhyayana” of the Āvaśyaka cūrṇi, while referring to the pratikramaṇa of three types of gaurava-virādhanā, the story is given of Ārya Maṅgu, a Jaina monk who was reborn as a Yakṣa in Mathurā on account of egoism: xxx तिसुपि उदाहरण महं अज्ञमंगु आयसः तिच्छयावाभिषुतो अपात्रिक्तो कालं तत्मसं महं गौरवज्ञाकंद्रो उदाहरणं, तस्य जवःयतपातसं अद्वैतव ताहा साधुऽ योनिभासीय ज्ञ्यपठिं अणुपविसितं ज्ञाति निधानेति, एवं अण्डव्यावहरणं को निधानेति, बभयति अर्थं उदाहरणं तं मा तु मी गौरवज्ञाकंद्रो निधानेति, एतः सत्यास्वेही जी मे जातु दुस्कर्दिति। Av. Cū. I. p. 80.

The *Niśtha cūrṇi* calls him a bahuśruta, well-versed in canon, and having a large group of disciples: लोभे इमं उदाहरणं “तुद्धरणं” अहवा “अज्ञमंगु”- मधुरा मंगु आयसः बहुशु मम स्मृति: समाप्ति: व।

सातादि-लोभ-गिरिते, मनुष्यो जीवांहि गीद्धमो॥ ३२०॥
Correlation of Jaina Inscriptions with Sthaviravallis

अञ्जनमणि आयरिया बहुस्तुया अञ्जणामणि बहुस्थितिपरिवर्ता उज्ज्वलविहारिणी ते विहरता महुर्त्यं परगिन्

ते ‘तेरियाम’ति तदाउल सम्भवितविषयं पुष्टता, खीर-दर्श-धर-गुल्लितिपुड़ि दिष्टे दिष्टे परज्ञितेण

परिवर्तीति। से आयरिये लोपेण सत्तास्थपतिपिघड़े ण विहारिते। ग्नितियो जाते। से साधू

विहरित। से वि अग्नात्रूप पक्षीके विहारियपुरयणं चंतरी ग्नितमण जक्खे जाते। ××××× दाहुि

पुष्टिके भणिति-सोह्य अञ्जनमणि इंहुस्थितिपादागृह मंत्रिण ग्निदमणे जक्खे जाते, तं मा कोइ तुभे एवं

लोधिये कोहे इ। ३२००

Also see ibid., p. 125.

The Digambara author Svāmī Virasena (A. D. 817), in his commentary, the Dhaivala on the Saṅkhāṇḍagama of Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali, and ācārya Jinasena (A. D. 837) who finished his guru Virasena’s incomplete commentary, the Jayadhavalal, on the ancient Kaṣāya-pāhuḍa-sutta and Yati-Vṛṣabhā’s cūrṇī on the Kaṣāya-Pāhuḍa, repeatedly cite Mahāvācaka Ārya Nāgahasti kṣamāśramaṇa, Mahāvācaka Ārya Maṅkṣu kṣamāśramaṇa, and Mahāvācaka Ārya Nandi kṣamāśramaṇa27. Prof. Hiralal Jain, the editor of the Saṅkhāṇḍagama, identifies Mahāvācaka Nāgahasti and Mahāvācaka Maṅkṣu with Ārya Nāgahasti and Ārya Maṅgu of the Sthaviravalli of the Vācakas of the Śvetāmbara tradition given in the Nandi sūtra of Deva vācaka (c. A. D. 450)28.

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 nīrūṇa as 477 B. C. following Jacob. 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 Śaka 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 Kaniska or Huviska. But those which do not refer to the Saṅvatsara (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 sthaviravālīs 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 Vira. nirvāna) or B. C. 7 to A. D. 177 acc. of Jacobi’s calculations²⁹.

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 (dvē) images (pratimāvo) installed in the devanirmita stūpa. Similarly, in the Vasantagaḍi Jaina bronze inscription of Saṅvat 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 engraved is actually ‘Munisucrata’, a scribal error for ‘Munisuvrata’.


5. For more information about Vaira, see, M. J. Mehta, and K. R. Chandra, Prakrit Proper Names, vol.II., pp. 660-661, and the “Pariśṭaparva” of Hemacandra’s Triṣaṣṭīśalākāpurusacarita. According to the Vicāraśreṇi of Merutuṅgacārya (Añcałagacchiya : late 14th cent. A. D.) and the Duḥṣamākāla-samāṇasarāṅghatthava, of Dharmaghoṣa sūri (c. 3rd quarter of the 13th cent. A. D.), the date of Arya Vajra is

∗ Now, of course, that date has to be reconsidered.—Editors
calculated as \textit{Virāt} 548-584, i.e., A. D., 21-57; vide Muni Nathmalji, \textit{"Jaina Darśana Manana aur Mīmāṁsā}, (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, \textit{Jaina Sāhitya no Samkṣipta Itihāsa} (Gujarātī), Bombay 1933, pp. 31, 37, 124.


9. See the \textit{Brhat-Kalpa-Bhāṣya}, pp. 917-921. Also cf. the \textit{Paṭṭāvali-samuccaya}, Ed. Darśanavijaya, “Guruparvakrama” of Guṇaratnasūri, p. 26, and Śrī Tapāgaccha-


15. There are many more inscriptions in the cave, including one or two in Shilak characters. To my knowledge, none of these other inscriptions so far have been published.


17. The inscription is read as under by A. Ghosh:

\begin{quote}
\textbf{निर्ज्ञालभाष्य \ तपस्विययः}
\textbf{श्रुवे \ गुहेिहक्षत्रितमापलितहे ह।}
\textbf{आचार्यरण मुनिशैलेवी}
\textbf{विमुनक्षेपकारयत् कहलेजः ह।}
\end{quote}

The Normal prose order is:

\textbf{आचार्यरण कहलेजः मुनिशैलेवी निर्ज्ञालभाष्य विमुनक्षेप(च) \ तपस्विययः श्रुवे \ गुहेिहक्षत्रितमापलितहे गुहेिकारयत् ह।}

The new suggested prose order is:

\textbf{आचार्यरण कहलेजः मुनिशैलेवी निर्ज्ञालभाष्य विमुनक्षेप(च) \ श्रुवे \ गुहेिहक्षत्रितमापलितहे॥ कारयत् ह।}
---

18. For some canonical references to Ārya Vajra, see Prakrit Proper Names, Vol.II., pp. 660-661.


23. The other alternative is that the Vairiśākhā originated earlier than Ārya Vajra.

24. Incidentally, I would want to point out that ‘hasti’ seems to have been a suffix added to different personal/pontifical 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 Maṇguhasti suggests that monks with hasti-ending names belong to the same line. Ghastuhasti is an old Prākrit form for Hastahasti and Ghastu may be a scribal error for Ghasta. Now, we have in the Paryuṣaṇa-kalpa sthaviravālī a few verses in the end after the prose Sthaviravālī ending with Phalgumitra, the disciple of Ārya Pusyamitra; 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 :

梵दामि फ़गुमित्र च गोयमं ध्यानगिरि च वासिणो ।
कोच्च सिवभूभ्यु पिप, कोशिय दोभजहस्त्रेय यं॥१॥
तं वदिन्द्राण सिस्ता, चिन्त हवाडी काष्ठवर्गे गोते ।
नक्षे काष्ठवर्गों, रक्षे पिप काष्ठव वदें॥२॥
It is of course obvious that these gāthās are added sometime after the second Valabhi council that met under the leadership of Devardhī gani ksamāśramana. Possibly, the gāthās refer in brief to the lineage to which belonged Devardhī gani ksamaśramana.

25. Aṅkādābhāvānihī tāvibhāvabhāvadānaṁ abhimūlaṁ gāto, xxvaṁbhāvānahūṁ uṣṇaṁ aśvaṁ bṛndaś, abhimūlaṁ gāto jāna padhāsa udvāj, aṅkā dvaṭāyaṁvāktiṁ uṣṇāpanīvāvātipi y, sāvane mūlāgurũ, chitakamādhi uṣāgurũ, abhaya janaṁ bhūvīṁ vājirin, mūlāvāyaṁ gāto uṣāvāyaṁ gāto gāto

26. The Nandisūtra edited by Muni Punyavijaya reads Ajjanandila and not Ajja Nandila in the Nandi sthavirāvalī. The correct name probably was Ārya Anandila, since the editors of the critical edition by Muni Punyavijaya, Dalshukh Malvania, and Amritlala Bhojak, give only one v.l., aṭṭaṇandila 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 Anandita? — Editors)

27. See Hiralal Jain, the Śatkhandaṅgama Vol. I, “Intro.” pp. 49-50, the Dhavalā, 39149; the Jayadhavalā, 30 1239; the Dhavalā, 30 1429, 1458; the Jayadhavalā, 30 172. Also Hindi “Intro.,” to Śatkhandaṅgama, Vol. II.p. 36.

* We think that this hagiological list follows the sequential order. —Editors.
Virasenasvāmi, in his maṅgalācarana to the Jayadhavalī-ṭīkā, writes :-

जेणिह कसाय-पाहुढमणिणययुमुण्डलं अणंतथ्यं।
गाहाहै विवारवं ते गुणहरणवचमं मद्यं ॥६॥

गुणाधर्मयण विषोगय गाहाण्डोसङ्गारिवं सम्बो।
जेणिहससमकुणा सो तपागहलधी वरदेख ॥७॥

जो अज्ञात्मुण्डसी संतेवासी वि पागहद्विस्तर
सो विशिष्टावलध्य जडङ्गदसहे ने वं देख ॥८॥

—कसायप्राप्तव, भाग ९, p. 4

Guṇadhara composed the Kaśayaprabhṛta in gāthās. Ārya Maṅkhu fully grasped the meaning of the gāthā's uttered by Guṇadhara. Yātivṛṣabha was the author of the Vṛttisūtra (curṇisūtra). Yātivṛṣabha, according to Vīrasena, was the disciple of Ārya Maṅgu and also disciple (antevāsti) of Nāgahasti.

28. See an. 26 where Av. 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 Maṅkṣu of the Dhavalī and the Jayadhavalī, etc.

29. According to the avacūri on दु:षगकलात्रीश्रमणसंधस्तीत्र अवमघे, वर्गस्वामी was ācārya (head) for 36 years including wh. 584 years A. M. elapsed so क्र = 548 to 584 A. M. 21 to 57 A. D. or 71 to 127 A. D. (Jacobi).