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The famous work on the Nīgāṇṭhīst logic, the Nyāyāvatāra, is traditionally held by the Śvetāmbara church as the work of the illustrious hymnist, dialectician, and epistemologist, Siddhasena Divākara (c. first half of the 5th century A. D.)¹. Several scholars who seriously had considered the works of Siddhasena or had a need to discuss, or an occasion to refer to his age in their writings, took it for granted that the Nyāyāvatāra was his work.

The Nyāyāvatāra is cast in the form of a dvātritiṇḍikā, rendered in the Anuṣṭubh metre; it contains 32 kārikās in Sanskrit. It was first commented upon by Siddharṣi of Nivṛtti-kula (c. A. D. 870-920)². Jincśvara sūri, later looked upon as the patriarch of the Kharatara-gaccha, had selected the opening kārikā of the Nyāyāvatāra for composing his Ślokavārtika (better known as Pramā-laksmaṇa or Pramāna-laksana) with an auto-commentary early in the second quarter of the 11th century A. D.³ Likewise, Śānti sūri, a disciple of Vardhamāna sūri (probably of the Pāṇḍavatīya-gaccha), also chose the same kārikā of the Nyāyāvatāra and composed his vārtikas with an auto-commentary in c. A. D. 1100-1110⁴. And Devabhadra, disciple of ācārya Hemacandra of Harṣapūrīya-gaccha, wrote the tippana on the vārtti of Siddharṣi in early 12th century A. D. All above-noted scholiasts had belonged to the Śvetāmbara sect.

The Nyāyāvatāra, though attributed to Siddhasena Divākara, contains in its fabric no indication as to its authorship, nor does its style in general accord with Siddhasena Divākara's as its comparison with his available 21 (out of the original 32) dvātritiṇḍikās indicates. While the dvātritiṇḍikās uniformly betray the characteristic style of Siddhasena, the Nyāyāvatāra, in terms of cadence, phrasing, modulation, verve, and disposition looks not only different but also seems inferior in several respects. The verses in fact betray variability in quality as well as style. The work, as a whole, lacks the kick, power, and brilliance of Siddhasena's characteristic expression. The Digambara church was aware of a few of the Siddhasena Divakara's dvātritiṇḍikās as well as his other famous work, in Prakrit, the Sanmat-payarana (Skt. Sanmati-prakarana)⁵, but is completely ignorant of the Nyāyāvatāra. In point of fact, no quotations from this work are noticeable in the works of the Digambara commentators and scholiasts, nor was it commented upon by any Digambara writer of the past. As regards quotations, the situation is virtually the same with the Śvetāmbara church as well. The earlier Śvetāmbara writers, who were aware of Siddhasena Divākara's works and had copiously cited from his several, failed to quote from the Nyāyāvatāra. Among them Mallavādi in his svopajña-bhāṣya (auto-commentary) on the kārikās of his Dvādasāra-nayacakra (c. mid 6th century A. D.), Jinaabhādra gaṇi kṣamāśramaṇa in his (incomplete) auto-commentary (c. A. D. 588 or
594) on his Viśeṣ-Āvasyaka-bhāṣya (c. A. D. 585), Siṃhaśūra ksamāśramaṇa in his commentary (c. A. D. 675) on the afore-noted sa-bhasya Dwādasāra-nayacakra, Koṭṭārya vādi gani in his commentary (complementary to Jīnabhadra's, c. A. D. 700-725) on the Viseṣ-Āvasyaka-Bhāṣya, and Gandhahasti Siddhasena in his commentary (c. A. D. 760-770) on the sa-bhasya-Tattvārthādhigama-sūtra of Vācaka Umāsvāti (c. A. D. 375-400) are the more notable. On prima facie grounds, therefore, the authorship as well as the date of the Nyāyāvatāra poses a twin problem that needs fresh investigation.

Had Siddhasena Divākara been the author, the known earliest commentator of the Nyāyāvatāra, Siddhaseniśa, would surely have so noted. But he is dumb on this point. The earlier of the two vārttikākāras, Jinesvara stiri, ascribes the work to ādyā-sūri at the beginning of his commentary⁶ and to pūrvācārya at the end.⁷ Obviously, to him the author was anonymous or unknown, though doubtless an earlier Nirgrantha logician. It is the subsequent vārttikākāra, Śānti stiri, who uses such phrases as Siddhasenārka sūtritam⁸ and who explains at another place the phrase 'Siddhasenāsya' as sūtra-karttīḥ,⁹ so regards. Next, at one other place, in a verse, he once more projects Siddhasena as the author of the work under reference. It is, thus, from the beginning of the 12th century A. D. that the work began to be looked upon as of Siddhasena, although it was not explicitly clarified by Śānti stiri whether this Siddhasena bore the epithet 'Divākara'. Seemingly, some sort of confounding at interpreting his source may have led Śānti sūri apparently to an erroneous identification (unless he had some other Siddhasena in mind) and the Śvetāmbara church till this day, as well as several scholars of this century, lent (and still lend) an unqualified credence to that ascription. (Alternatively, Siddharṣi's fuller appellation before he attained the pontifical status with the specific suffix 'ṣi' of his monastic order, might have been Siddhasena, which is perhaps why Śānti sūri does not qualify his Siddhasena as 'Divākara'.)

The ascription of the Nyāyāvatāra to Siddhasena Divākara had in the recent past led to erroneous conclusions both on the side of the protagonists of a late date as well as the advocates of an early date for Siddhasena Divākara, the confusion to a large extent is continuing in the writings of the present generation as well. In point of fact, the Nyāyāvatāra has proven a dead and a heavy weight on the issue of the chronological position of Siddhasena Divākara as I shall shortly show.

The opinion on the authorship of the Nyāyāvatāra is in point of fact sharply divided into three major camps: The first unhesitatingly ascribing it to Siddhasena Divākara and hence to the first half of the fifth century A. D. or even earlier, to the first century B. C., depending on the date-perception of the scholars concerned for Vikramādiyā whose contemporary, according to the prabandhas, Siddhasena had been. Among them are Pt. Sukhlal Sanghvi¹¹, Pt. Dalsukh Malwaniya¹², P. N. Dave¹³, and several Śvetāmbara munis. The second camp is represented by S. C. Vidyabhushana¹⁴, H. Jacob¹⁵, P. L. Vaidya¹⁶ (and seemingly also perhaps Satakari Moorjeree)¹⁷ who do ascribe the work to Siddhasena
Divākara but date him either in the sixth \textsuperscript{16} or the seventh century A. D. \textsuperscript{19} The Digamabara scholars, among them the more notable being Pt. Jugal Kishor Mukhtar\textsuperscript{20}, Pt. Kailashchandra Shastri\textsuperscript{21}, and Pt. Darbarilal Kothiy\textsuperscript{22}, attribute it to some other and posterior Siddhasena—without any attempt to identify him—who, according to their estimate, possibly had flourished in the seventh or eighth century A. D.

It is then clear that considerable discussion has ensued on the authorship and date of the \textit{Nāyāyāvatāra} since Vidyabhusana first focused serious attention on it in the early years of the 20th century\textsuperscript{23}. It also reflects a diversity of views containing some useful hints and clues whose potential very largely has been weakly exploited, or not grasped at all. For brevity's sake, I shall forego the detailed account of views and arguments forwarded by scholars concerned and restrict, instead, to the more vital points of their analysis or contention. I must also warn that, this paper does not concern itself with the problem of the date of Siddhasena Divākara; hence no discussion on that issue is deemed relevant in the present context. However, my own researches reject for him the 1st century B. C. date, that being so assumed by P. N. Dave\textsuperscript{24} and by some Švetāmbara munis as a contemporary of Vikramāditya, the legendary founder of the Vikrama Era. There is sufficient external as well as internal evidence to demonstrate that Siddhasena was contemporaneous with a Gupta emperor bearing the cognomen Vikramāditya, and his active period can be convincingly bracketed between c. A. D. 400 and 450\textsuperscript{25}.

The \textit{Nāyāyāvatāra} is terse and concise work, a mere \textit{dvātraṁśika}. With regard to size, then, it does not favourably compare with the works of the great Buddhist philosophers, logicians, and epistemologists such as Diśnāga and Dharmakirti. However, it does succeed in neatly codifying the main features of the Nirgranthist position on \textit{pramāṇa} (valid knowledge or valid cognition), and, as such, has been hailed as a valuable work of its class and disposition. Since the Nirgranthist perception and definition of \textit{pramāṇa} had in part also to be settled by comparing and contrasting (and hence, by the logic of the process, agreeing with or confuting and refuting) the positions held by the other schools such as the Buddhist, the Vaiśeṣika, the Nyāya, etc., the \textit{Nāyāyāvatāra} largely has served the purpose.

Coming back to the question. Had the \textit{Nāyāyāvatāra} been authored by a luminary like Siddhasena Divākara, it would have betrayed considerable originality as well as sparks of brilliance in thought constructs, structure, phrasing, and overall presentation. While dryness is not a demerit in such works, what intrigues in the case of the \textit{Nāyāyāvatāra} is its rather cool and quiet flow, with only a little colour and glitter seen here and there, this too being present more within the borrowed, and what today may seem to us plagiarized verses, hemistiches, strophes, and overt as well as masked influences of the writings of earlier Nirgranthas as well as Buddhist and other thinkers on this subject. The author doubtless is sufficiently clever in combining it all into an apparently homogeneous, harmonious, articulate, and consistent whole, which does succeed in
presenting the Nirgranthist standpoint and notions on the attributes, qualifications, and nature of pramāṇa, a fact I must stress and repeat here on the authority of Vidyabhusana, Sanghvi, Malwaniya, Mookerjee, and a few other contemporary writers.

The upper limit of the date of the Nyāyāvatāra can be fixed as c. late ninth or early tenth century, which, incidentally, is the general date-bracket of Siddhārṣi’s vivṛtti commentary. The internal state of the Nyāyāvatāra is our dependable guide in fixing its virtual or plausible date and, by its logic, get some indication on its probable authorship. We may begin by comparing the Nyāyāvatāra with the works of Dīnāga, the founder of the systematic school of the Buddhist logic. Malwaniya, in the comparisons he instituted of the Nyāyāvatāra with the works of other ancient and pre-medieval authorities, has included Dīnāga’s famous works such as the Pramāṇasamuccaya, the Nyāyamukha, and the Nyāyapravesa. While he has drawn attention to certain similarities, as also the reflected thinking of (and even oppositions to) Dīnāga’s statements and views in the Nyāyāvatāra, he drew no conclusions arising from the correspondences as well as familiarities noticed. I shall select a few points from Malwaniya’s notings which more directly and forcefully indicate the acquaintance of the author of the Nyāyāvatāra with Dīnāga’s famous works:

1. Dīnāga has qualified the parārtha-anumāṇa with two characteristics, namely the hetu-vacana and the pakṣād-vacana. Both are included in the kārika 13 of the Nyāyāvatāra.

2. The refutation of the kārika 1. 23 of Dīnāga’s Pramāṇasamuccaya is in the kārika 28 of the Nyāyāvatāra.

3. The first foot of the kārika 10 of the Nyāyāvatāra is an adoption, with very slight change, of Dīnāga.

The Nyāyāvatāra thus seems posterior to the works of Dīnāga (c. A. D. 480-540) and hence subsequent to c. A. D. 550. It cannot, therefore, be the work of Siddhasena Divakara.

Further weight to this surmise is lent by the wording of the first phrase of the opening verse of the Nyāyāvatāra (Pramāṇam svaparābhāst) which shows correspondence with the wording of the strophe of the verse 63 of the Bṛhadsvayambhū-stotra of Samantabhadra (c. A. D. 600) to which Malwaniya has hinted: (‘samagrata’sti svapara-vibhāsakam, yathā pramaṇam buddhi-lakṣaṇam). Also, Mukhtar has demonstrated that the influence of Pātrakesari alias Pātrasvāmi, a Digambara epistemologist of note of the second (or first) half of the seventh century A. D., is discernible on the definition of the anumāṇa-pramāṇa (cognition by inference) figuring in the Nyāyāvatāra; moreover, the first foot of the kārika 22 concerning the hetu-lakṣaṇa
character of probans) reflects sense-agreement, even partial verbal concordance with the verses from Pātrasvāmi's (Pātrakesari's) Trilakṣaṇakadarthana cited by the Buddhist scholiast Sāntarakṣita in his Tattvasaṅgraha (c. 2nd quarter of the 8th century A.D.). Moreover, Sanghvi, but more definitely Kailashchandra Shastri, has shown that the qualification bādha-vivarjīta (incontrovertible) (emphasized as obligatory) for the pramāṇa in the opening kārika of the Nyāyāvatāra has been adopted from Kumārila Bhaṭṭa (c. A.D. 575-625); indeed that specific qualification is earlier nowhere noticeable in the Nirgranthi or Buddhist or Brahmanical works either. What is more, the kārikā 9 of the Nyāyāvatāra is the wholesale appropriation of the verse 9 of the Ratnakarandaka ascribed to Yogīndra by Vādirāja of Drāviḍa Saṅgha in Karṇārdesā (A.D. 1025) and to Samantabhadra by Prabhācandra (c. A.D. 1050), probably of the Mūla Saṅgha, in Mālavadesa. The opinion of the Digambara scholars, as a result, is sharply divided into two camps on the authorship of the Ratnakarandaka. My own view is that the style of the Ratnakarandaka, though, seemingly not later than the seventh century A.D., does not correspond with that of Samantabhadra. (The work is also in part dogmatic as well as sectarian.) In any case, all aforementioned points considered, it clearly emerges that the author of the Nyāyāvatāra is posterior to the first half of the seventh century A.D. This is further confirmed by the use of the term abhrānta (inerrant) and the truths consequently emerging therefrom in the kārikās 5-7 of the Nyāyāvatāra. For abhrānta, in lieu of the earlier term avyabhicāri as one of the qualifying attributes as well as requisite attributes of the pratyakṣa-pramāṇa, was popularised (even perhaps revived, if Aśaṅga and Maitreyanātha, c. 4th century A.D., had employed it) by Dharmakīrti. The influence of the imposing figure of Dharmakīrti in the field of epistemology was all-pervasive since the days he wrote his famous Pramāṇavārttika, the Nyāyabindu, and other cognate works. The author of the Nyāyāvatāra does not in reality refute, but sides with Dharmakīrti as demonstrated by Mookerjee in his brilliant analysis. Looking at the fact that the author of the Nyāyāvatāra is posterior to Diṇṇāga, Samantabhadra, Kumārila, Yogīndra, and Pātrakesari, little wonder if he were also familiar with Dharmakīrti's notions which he indirectly accepts in his own layout. Malwaniya had further shown that, even when there is no close verbal agreement between the Nyāyāvatāra and the corresponding works of the great Digambara dialectician Akalāṅkādeva (active c. A.D. 725-760), there is often a fairly close sense-correspondence at several places. In that event the author of the Nyāyāvatāra has to be placed after the first half of the eighth century.

And now we may look at the viśṛtti of Siddhars. As noted in the beginning, Siddhars does not ascribe the Nyāyāvatāra to Siddhasena Divākara or to a different Siddhasena or for that matter to any other author. Nor does he mention it as a composition of a pūrvācārya, vydhācārya, or some cirantaṇācārya. Also, in his verse by verse exposition, he nowhere uses qualifying phrases such as the sāstrakāra, sūtrakāra, kārikākāra, ācārya, etc., which may have denoted a second, an earlier revered personage, as the kārikās' author. And had the original author been Siddhasena Divākara, the five
centuries intervening between him and Siddhārṣi would probably have given rise to the pāṭhāntaras or variant readings in the text. Siddhārṣi, however, nowhere records or notices such alternative readings. Also, neither in the inaugural nor in the concluding verse does he pay obeisance to the author of the kārikā which indeed is very, very unusual. Had Siddhasena Divākara been the author, Siddhārṣi surely would have known that fact and paid him homage in glowing terms. His silence, together with the other concomitant facts just noted, lead to a singular inference: Siddhārṣi himself is the author of the Nyāyāvatāra: which is why there are no variant readings recorded; which is why he does not have to resort even to proxial ways of referring to the author as sāstrakāra etc.; which is also why he avoids salutation to the author. Since Siddhārṣi flourished in the times as late as ninth and early tenth century A. D., just at the threshold of the medieval age, he had the opportunity to have before him the works of all earlier masters mentioned in the foregoing discussion. Siddhārṣi for certain is not startlingly original; he could not have been in that age since much ground in the field of Indian epistemology and logic by different schools had already been covered before him. But, to be fair to Siddhārṣi, he did make an adroit use of the enormous data gathered on the question of pramāṇa that was before him, and that indeed was with exemplary precision, clarity, consistency, incision, and concision.

A formidable objection, however, to the above-postulated identification as well as the period-determination can be raised on the grounds of the ascription of a verse, which appears as the kārikā 2 of the Nyāyāvatāra, to Mahāmati (= Siddhasena Divākara) by Yākiniśīnu Haribhadra sūri (active c. A. D. 745-785) in his Aṣṭaka. And the kārikā 4 figures as a part of the Saḍḍarśana-samuccaya of the same Haribhadra sūri. Since Haribhadra sūri ascribed the particular verse (kārikā 2) to Siddhasena Divākara, it must be so. However, this kārikā could be orginally from some dvārtinīśīkā, one of the last 11 of Siddhasena Divākara, perhaps the Pramāṇa-dvārtinīśīkā, from which Gandhahasti Siddhasena quotes in his sa-bhiṣya-Tattvārthādhiyoga-sūtra-vṛtti. The kārikā 4 in the Saḍḍarśana-samuccaya may likewise have been taken from one of the unavailable dvārtinīśīkas of Divākara. Alternatively, if that verse is Haribhadra’s own, Siddhārṣi must have borrowed it from the Saḍḍarśana. In any case, Haribhadra and Siddhārṣi could have common sources from which they apparently may have drawn.

It may be argued that there were other Siddhasena-s who had flourished between Divākara and Siddhārṣi: Why not, then, one of them could be the author of the Nyāyāvatāra? Granted, there were at least three other early Siddhasena-s, none of them, however, could be the author of this work. For instance, a single verse from some Vācaka Siddhasena (c. 475-525), cited by Vādi-Vetāla Sānti sūri of the Thārāpadragaccha in his Sukhobodhā-vṛtti (c. A. D. 1020-1030) on the Uttarādhikāyana-sūtra, differs in terms of style as well as content from Divākara’s as well as Siddhārṣi’s. The writings of Siddhasena kṣamāśramaṇa (c. A. D. 575-625), a disciple most probably of the illustrious Jīnabhadra gaṇi kṣamāśramaṇa, are in Prakrit and relate to monastic
discipline. The third Siddhasena is Gandhahasti (c. A.D. 690-770), earlier referred to in this paper. He was both an āgamika as well as a dārsanika pundit as is clear from his voluminous vṛtti on the sa-bhāṣya Tatvarthadīhigama-sūtra. He could have composed the Nyāyāvatāra. But then he is anterior to Siddharṣi by only 150 years. Siddharṣi, in his age, certainly would have known that important fact and hence could have recorded it, indeed reverentially, in his vṛtti. This negative but none the less significant evidence precludes the possibility of his being the author of the Nyāyāvatāra. We must then revert to the original conclusion that Siddharṣi himself was the author; for he satisfies the conditions even when the position rests on arguments on the indirect evidence that emerge out of reductio ad absurdum.

Sanghvi and Doshi as well as Dave thought that Simhaśura (c. A.D. 675) refers to the Nyāyāvatāra along with the Sammati (and hence the Nyāyāvatāra is implied to be the work of Siddhasena Divākara.) However, what Simhaśura refers to in that context is the Nayavatāra, not the Nyāyāvatāra: It seems that Divākara had authored the work on nayās or standpoints of viewing at an object or idea; and the concept of nayā is different from that of pramāṇa. I have elsewhere suggested that the two citations in prose figuring in Simhaśura's commentary as of Siddhasena's could have come from this lost work, the Nyāyāvatāra:


ii. "Tathācācārya Siddhasena āha-yatra hyartho vācaṁ yablācaratī nābhidhānaṁ tat' iti:

Once more, though not sufficiently strong, indication comes from the so-called Vardhamāna Śakra-stava ascribed, though wrongly, to Siddhasena Divākara in the Śvetāmbara Church. It reflects some of the tendencies paralleled in the composition of the Nyāyāvatāra. The work is cast into the Daṇḍaka mode for its 11 stanzas; the ending, the 12th, is a verse in the Vasantatilaka metre. The eighth Daṇḍaka mentions 'Siddhasena' which perhaps was instrumental in the dubious supposition that the hymn was composed by Siddhasena Divākara. The 12th verse, however, significantly mentions 'Siddharṣi' which apparently was employed with the objective of double entendre and hence the author in reality could be Siddharṣi whose other name arguably may have been Siddhasena. This may perhaps explain why Śānti sūrī had ascribed the Nyāyāvatāra to Siddhasena.

In recent years, I had chances to discuss the problems of the date and authorship of the Nyāyāvatāra with Pt. Malwaniya. Independently of my findings, he, too, had arrived at the same conclusion as laid bare in this paper. For all these years he had been upholding and defending the Nyāyāvatāra as the work of Siddhasena Divākara, and had vigorously argued in favour of that stand in his stimulating Introduction to the Nyāyāvatāra-vārtika.
vṛtti. Now no longer. He is currently preparing a case necessitating a modified view on the date and authorship with his characteristic and profound epistemological insights to which I cannot pretend. We must await to read his brilliant erudition on the problems under discussion which can give a final seal to, and vindicate what has been argued in this article.

Notes and References:

1. Opinions differ on his date. I am here using my own determination.

2. Two editions of the Nyāyāvatāra with this commentary are available. The details of these publications are as follows:
   ii) *Ed.* Pt. Bhagwandas Harakhchand, *Nyāyāvatārāṇah*, Ahmedabad 1917. The *Ṭīppana* of Devabhadra is included in this edition. The text alone has been published along with Divākara’s other works in JDPS, Bhavnagar 1909.


5. No manuscripts of this work are available in Digambara libraries. However, a reference to a commentary on this work by Sumati, supposed to be a Digambara scholiast of c. late 8th century A. D., is known. And citations from this work also figure in several pre-medieval and medieval commentaries of the Digambara authors.


7. This figures in the opening verse of the commentary: (Malwaniya, p. 11).


14. In 1908, he considered him to be the contemporary of Varahamihira (c. early 6th century A. D.) on the authority of the Jyotirvindabharana. In 1909, he made him contemporary with (the Aulikara monarch) Yasodharma of Malava (c. early 6th century A. D.) whom he identified with Vikramaditya. But 12 years afterwards, in his A History of Indian Logic (Ancient, Medieval and Modern Schools), Calcutta 1921, he had felt that he was contemporary of Jinabhadra gañi kṣamāśramana (ob. A.D. 588 or 594) since Jinabhadra criticised him (for his concept of the simultaneity of perception and cognition for an omniscient being.)

15. In his edition of the Samaraiccakaha, Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta 1925, he takes Siddhasena to be a contemporary of Dharmaśīrśa whose term abhrānta he used in the Nyāyavatāra.

16. In his ‘Introduction’ to the Nyāyavatāra, Bombay 1928. He takes him to be Digambara if identified with the kṣapana (of the Jyotirvindabharana). His style, Vaidya felt, is post-Kālidāsa. Siddhasena upholds his views against the apologetic position taken by Jinabhadra: hence, according to Vaidya, he is younger in time.


18. The foregoing footnotes reveal that Vidyabhusana favours sixth century for Siddhasena.

19. Jacobi, Vaidya, and others.


23. Cf. footnote 2 (i).


25. This problem has been discussed in my Introduction in Gujarāti (with Jitendra Shah) to Siddhasena’s 21st hymn to be shortly published.


27. Ibid., p. 294.

28. Ibid., p. 291.

29. There is no unanimous agreement on the date of Dīnāga which in part depends on the date of Vasubandhu. If he is a direct disciple of Vasubandhu, then he must be dated either c. A.D. 450-510 or earlier by a few decades if Vasubandhu’s date is finally fixed at c. A.D. 350-430. However, the current opinion of the Western as well as Japanese specialists do not favour the earlier brackets. So following them, I have adopted here c. A.D. 480-540 for Dīnāga.
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Nirgrantha

31. His “Pariśīṣṭa 1,” Ibid., p. 287.
34. Since in the present discussion the point is of subsidiary importance, I forego citing sources and the current writings and controversies on it.
37. Malwaniya, discussion in his “Pariśīṣṭa 1.” Following his earlier perceptions on the date and authorship of the Nyāyāvatāra, Malwaniya of course then had noted that Akalaṅka had made a fair use of the Nyāyāvatāra. The position is now reversed.
39. Ibid., p. 288.
41. The citation refers to the fact that the bowl and the monastic robe are ultimately meant as an aid on the path of salvation; by themselves they cannot be termed as possession; for attachment on a thing or an object is possession.
42. For instance his commentary in Prakrit on the Jīta-kalpa-sūtra of Jinabhaḍra. Citations from his works also figure in the Nisītha-cūrṇī of Jināda gaṇi Mahattara (c. A. D. 675).
43. This commentary is full of citations from the āgamas and at places refutative discussions from the epistemological standpoints of the other systems, but mainly Buddhist.
44. For details, vide their “Introduction” to Sammaipayāraṇa (Hindi Edition), Ahmedabad 1963.
48. Ibid.
49. This is included in H. R. Kapadiya, Bhaktāmarā, Kalyānamandira and Namiūga, SDLJPFS No. 79, Surat 1932, p. 243. It has been edited also by J. Mukhtar, “Siddhasenka Siddhīśreyasamudaya stotra” (Hindi), Anekānta 1/8-9-10, pp. 499-504. Also, it has been edited by Muni Kirtiyaśavijaya (with translation in Gujarāṭi) in the Arhnannasmārāvalī, Bombay-Ahmedabad 1983, pp. 47-66. After the 12th verse, the remaining part seems an
addition at some posterior date. This *stotra* is strongly influenced by the epithetic terms taken from the *Namostu-nam Stava* (Ardhamāgadhī, c. 1st cent. B. C.) and from Siddhasena Divākara’s *Parāṇa-dvātriṃśikā* (No. 21).

50. अनुभवस्यनिः सर्वभवाभवजीवीनिः श्रवणाय अर्थस्यहस्तस्य अलंकृतपूजणीयाय अचिन्तचिन्तनीयाय अकामकामवेने अस्तुर्दुःधितिपतलमुहम्माय अचिन्तचिन्तनीयाये चतुर्दशसङ्गात्मकार्जीवयोऽकृत्वृत्ताये चतुर्दशलक्षजीवयोऽनि-
प्राणिनाथाय प्रत्यार्थनाथाय अनाथानाथाय जीवानाथाय देवानाथानाथसद्दुसेनाधिनाथाय।

51. लोकोत्सवो निध्रुतिमन्त्रमेव, तव शाश्त्रं महत्तमंधीरश !

त्वामेकमहं ! शरण प्रपदे, सिद्धिसद्यमस्थलमेव।