

ISSN 0021-4043
A QUARTERLY
ON
JAINOLOGY

VOL. XXVII

JULY 1992

No. 1

Jain Journal



॥ जैन भवन ॥

JAIN BHAWAN PUBLICATION

a quarterly on Jainology

Jain Journal



જૈન ભવન

JAIN BHAWAN
CALCUTTA

Rupees Five

Copyright of articles, stories, poems, etc. published in the Jain Journal is reserved.

All contributions, which must be type-written, and correspondence regarding contributions, and book-reviews should be addressed to the Editor, Jain Journal, P-25 Kalakar Street, Calcutta-7.

For advertisement and subscription please write to the Secretary, Jain Bhawan, P-25 Kalakar Street, Calcutta-7. Subscription for one year : Rs. 15.00 : for three years : Rs. 40.00 Foreign : Rs. 90.00 for one year.

Published by Ganesh Lalwani on behalf of Jain Bhawan from P-25 Kalakar Street, Calcutta-7 and printed by him at Surana Printing Works, 205 Rabindra Sarani, Calcutta-7.

Editor : Ganesh Lalwani

Contents

Sacred Literature of the Jains	1
<i>Albrecht Friedrich Weber</i>	
History of Kharatargaccha	33
<i>Ram Vallabh Somani</i>	
Books Received	53

the central journal for Jainology



The Australian National University

GPO Box 4, Canberra, ACT 2601
Telegrams & cables NATUNIV Canberra
Telephone 062-49 5111
Telex AA 62760 NATUNI

reference 27 April 1992

Editor
Jain Journal
P-25 Kalakar Street
Calcutta.7
INDIA

Dear Sir

I enclose a copy of a book I recently compiled that was published by the Press of the Australian National University. Please accept it as a complimentary copy for favour of mention or review in your journal which is of course the central journal for all matters relating to Jainism and studies of Middle Indo-Aryan.

Yours sincerely

Royce Wiles
Royce Wiles

Sacred Literature of the Jains

[from the previous issue]

have excerpted. He states furthermore⁹⁰ that the *arhadvacanānuyoga*⁹¹ is divided into four groups : *dharmakathānuyoga uttarādhyayanādikaḥ*, *gaṇitānuyogaḥ sūryaprajñāptyādikaḥ*, *dravyānuyogaḥ pūrvāṇi sammatyādikaś*⁹² *ca caritrakaraṇānuyogaś cā cārādikaḥ* ;⁹³ the last is *pradhāna-tamaḥ*, *śeṣāṇāṃ tadarthatvāt*. These statements are in all essentials a reproduction [259] of those in *Āv. niḥj. 8,54* where *uttarādhy.* is represented by *isibhāsiyāim*, which the commentator however explains by *uttarā*° ; see on *aṅga 4,44*.

II. The second *aṅgam*, *sūyagaḍa*, *sūtrakṛta* destined for the fourth year of study, see p. 223f. likewise treats in two *śrutaskandhas* (of which the first is composed in *śloka*s and other metres,⁹⁴ the second in prose with the exception of a small portion : *ajjh. 5,6*) of the *sādhvācāra*, the right course of action ; and is at the same time chiefly polemical in character.⁹⁵ According to *aṅga 4* and *Nandī*⁹⁶ 363 heterodox opinions *annadiṭṭhiya* (*aṅga 4*, *pāsaṃḍiya N*) are here combated ; viz. : those of 180 *kiriyaṇāi*, *kriyāvādin*, 84 *akiriyaṇāi*, *akriyāvādin*, 67 *annāṇiyavāi*, *ajñānika*, 32 *veṇaiyavāi*, *vaiṇayika*.^{97*} In consequence of this the commentary frequently cites the names of Cārvāka, Śākya, Bauddha, Sāṃkhya, Vaiśeṣika, as those who are to be understood by the *ege* cited in the text as opponents. These are also referred to in the text as *jāṇayā*, explained in the comm. by *pañḍitammanyā Bauddhāḥ*. But as the root *jñā* is elsewhere used by the Jains chiefly in a good sense,⁹⁸ I should at least give expression to the conjecture that by these *jāṇayā* the Vaideha king Janaka was meant,^{99*} [260] concerning

⁹⁰ The following passage is found also in Śānticaṇḍra on *up. 6*, according to which Śilāṃkācārya commented also upon the second *aṅga*, cf. Kl. 247b.

⁹¹ *sūtrād anu paścād arthasya yogo anuyogaḥ*, *sūtrādhyayanāt paścād arthakathanam*.

⁹² ? likewise *Śāntica*. ; by this the rest of the contents of the *dṛṣṭivāda* is perhaps referred to which treated partly of the different *dṛṣṭis* or *sammatis*.

⁹³ 'ācārāṃgādikaḥ *Śāntica*.

⁹⁴ *vaitāliya*, *triṣṭubh*, but not *āryā*.

⁹⁵ *iha hi pravacane catvāro 'nuyogaḥ* (see p. 258) : *caranākaraṇānuyogaḥ*, *dravyā°*, *dharmakathā°*, *gaṇitā°* ; *tatra prathamam śrīmadācārāṃgam caranā° gaprādhānyena vyākhyātam*, *athe daṃ śrīśūtrakṛtākhyam dvitīyāṃgam dra° gaprādhānyena vyākhyāyate* ; *sūtram svapara samayasucanam kṛtam yena tat sūtrakṛtam*.

⁹⁶ Cited from this as well as from other sources in the introduction to Malayagiri's Comm. on the second *upāṅga* and in many other places.

^{97*} It is a most curious fact that a Tibetan text quoted by Schiefner *Ind. Stud.* Vol. IV. p. 335 exhibits also an enumeration of 363 heterodox opinions. As in Buddhistic texts this number is not found anywhere (as far as I am aware) it might be that one day Tibetan translations of Jain texts should turn up.—L.

⁹⁸ cf. also the designation of their founder under the name of Nāyaputta, cf. p. 261.

^{99*} Janaka from Janaka, as Bauddha from Buddha. Another explanation of the term

whom and his guru Yājñavalkya all sorts of statements are preserved in the legends of the twelfth book of the *Mahābhārata*, representing either the king or both the king and his guru as having affiliations with Buddhism. See *Ind. Stud.* 1,482.¹⁰⁰ Jacobi, whom I consulted in the matter, proposed (April 6th, 1880) that *yānaka* (cf. *hīnayāna*, *mahāyāna*) might be thought of in connection with *jāṇaya*.

The titles of the 23 *ajjhayaṇas* of the *sūtrakṛta* are enumerated in the fourth *aṅga* § 23 (=S) in their present order ; also in *Āvaśy.* 16, where, however, the sixteen *ajjh.* of the first *śrutaskandha* are apparently placed after seven *ajjh.* of the second *śrut.* In v. 65, 66 in the first place the first sixteen are enumerated by themselves and in v. 102 the seven others by themselves ; but after *nālamdam*—the last one—we read *solasāim ca tevīsam*. It is, to be sure, not impossible that these words *solasāim ca* are a mere reference to the earlier enumeration in v. 65,66 ; but, at any rate, we should have expected that this reference would occur before the first of these seven names and not after the seventh. Also in the *Vidhiprapā* (= V), the names are singly enumerated ; they are :

a. First *śrutaskandha*.

1. *saṃaya*, with 4 *udd.*, 89 vv. ; *bhūtavadādimataṃ nirākriyate* ;—*udd.* 1 closes : *Nāyaputte Mahāvīre* [261] *evam āha Jīnottame tti bemi* ||27|| H. Jacobi (*Kalpas.* p. 6.) is the first scholar who identified the name of Mahāvīra¹⁰¹ occurring here, with Nigaṇṭha Nātaputra (or Nigaṇṭha-

jānaya applied to the Bauddhas may perhaps claim more attention than the one ventured in the text by Prof. Weber. We know that the founders of religious systems in India as well as elsewhere were as a rule called by *epitheta ornantia* (such as *buddha jina mahāvīra* &c. &c.). Two of these epithets as applied to Śākyamuni or in fact to the Buddhas in general in Buddhist texts are *janaka* and *prechaka* i.e. “knower” and “asker” (see for instance *Divyāvadāna*, ed. Cowell and Neil, pp. 184 & 290 ; by the editors rendered by “general interrogator” !). Most probably those two epithets refer to the supposition pervading not only Buddhist but also Jain texts that the founder of the religion knew everything, but nevertheless, when conversing with any one, asked as if he knew not. Now it might well be that the Jain author of the above metrical passage of *aṅga* 2 chose in metre—as he would perhaps not have done in prose—a term not very common but still perfectly clear to his contemporaries for referring to his adversaries of Buddha’s party, the terms *janaka* and *prechaka* being not found (as others are e. g. *buddha jina* &c) with reference to Mahāvīra in either of the two literatures, of Bauddhas and Jainas.—L.

¹⁰⁰ The legend of the six false teachers found in the Buddhist texts, (see my *Vorles. über ind.* L-G. 304 (249,1), Burnouf, *Lotus*, p. 485, Weber’s *Ind. Streifen*, 3,504), is told of Janaka and Yājñavalkya. For the peculiar use of the word *Videha* or *videha* among the Jains, (see page 261n) the reader is referred to *Bhagav.* 2,305, and to my treatise on the *Śatr. Māh.* p. 20.

¹⁰¹ According to the legend Vīra first descended into the womb of the Brāhmaṇī

nātha, “fils de Jñāti”. Burnouf, *Lotus*, p. 450, 486) who is mentioned in the Buddhistic legends as a contemporary of Ajātaśatru or of Buddha. A reference similar to that given here is found in 3 (cf. 5 and 6). See my remarks on *aṅga* 10.

2. *veyāliya*,¹⁰² *vetāliya* °liya *V*, *vaidārika*, with 3 *udd.*, 76 vv.; *yathākarma vidāryate*. It begins *sambujjhaha : kiṃ na bujjhaha ? sambohi puṇa pecca dullahā*. This *ajjh.* is not referred by the Scholiast to Vīra, but is characterized as a teaching of Rṣabhasvāmin to his sons; with which statement the conclusion of the third *udd.* is however not in harmony. This chapter is composed in the metre called *vaitāliya* by Piṅgala (*chandas* 4,32) and by Varāhamihira (104,55). In my opinion great importance must be attached to this circumstance. It is very probable that the similarity of this name with that of the title of our chapter is to be explained by the assumption that the metre had taken its name from the text in that metre. This designation would not only be a direct testimony [262] to the existence of this text at the time of Piṅgala and of Varāhamihira, but also—inasmuch as it rests¹⁰³ upon a representation of the Prakrit word *veyālia* in Sanskrit which was liable to be misunderstood, or upon an incorrect spelling with inorganic *t*—might be regarded as a proof that even at that early period the title of this chapter had been handed down in this incorrect form. Both of these probabilities are of extreme interest. We must here notice that Varāhamihira expressly cites Māgadhi as a “Prakrit” synonym of *vaitāliyam*—see *Ind. Stud.* 8,295—from which we may with probability infer that a direct reference is made to the language of our text or to the language of Buddha.¹⁰⁴ Of interest, furthermore, is the fact that on 2, 1, instead of *māhaṇa* (= *brāhmaṇa*) used in a good sense—which is a proof of the antiquity of the text—, the scholiast mentions the various reading *je viū* (*vidus*), *yo vidvān*. The latter is probably an intentional change of a secondary nature or per-

Devānandā, wife of the Brāhmaṇa Usabhadatta (Kodālasagotta), in Kundaggāma; thence into the womb of the khattiyāṇi Tisālā, wife of the khattiya Siddhattha (Kāsavagotta), of the race of the khattiya called Nāya, in the same place, Vīra is therefore called their son. Cf. also (see page 263) the statements of Abhayadeva : Viśālā Mahāvīra-janani ! He is designated both as Nāe Nāyaputte Nāyakulacāṇḍe and as Videhe Videhajacce (*Kalpas* § 110).

¹⁰² With inorganic *t* : *vetāliamaggam āgao* at the conclusion of *udd.* 1 is explained by *karmanām vaidārikaṃ vidāraṇasamarthaṃ mārgam*. *veyālia* in the name of the *dasave*⁹ is explained quite differently.

¹⁰³ The derivation from *vetāla* (*Ind. Stud.* 8,168,178) would then be overturned.

¹⁰⁴ Buddha seems to have made use of this metre, since it is used in the *Dhammapada*, etc.

haps a removal of the original. At the conclusion of *udd. 3*, which is composed in prose, we read : *evam se udāhu anuttaramāṇī anuttaradaṃsi anuttaranānadamaṇadhare arahā Nāyaputte bhagavaṃ Vesālīe viyāhie (vyākhyātavān) tti bemi*. The scholiast illustrates Jñātaputra strangely enough by Vardhamānasvāmī Rṣabhasvāmī vā and explains *Vesālīe* in the first case (*i.e.* when Jñātaputra means Vardham.) by Viśāla-nagaryām, in the second (*i.e.* when Jñātap. means Rṣabha) by *vaiśālikaḥ (viśālakulodbhavatvāt)*. In any case this epithet, which is probably a nominative, is of extreme interest in this connection. Abhayadeva, too, [263] on *Bhag. 2,1,12,2* explains *Vaiśālika* by Mahāvīra and in fact as a metronymicum(!) : Viśāla Mahāvīrajananī. The *Vesālīya-sāvaga* appear elsewhere in the Jaina legends, but—and herein is to be found a divergence from the Buddhist legend—in a favourable light see *Bhagav. 2,197,249 ; 1,440*.

3. *uvasaggaparinnā, upasargaparijñā* with 4 *udd.*, 83 vv. ; *pratikūlāḥ* and *anukūlāḥ upasargāḥ, taiś cā 'dhyātman viśādaḥ*.

4. *itthiparinnā, thiṇṇa° V, strīparijñā*, with 2 *udd.*, 53 vv. ; *strīpariśaho jeyah* ; conclusion in prose : *icc evam āhu se Vīre dhuyarae... tti bemi*.

5. *narayavibhatti, niraya V, narakavibhakti* with 2 *udd.*, 52 vv. ; *strīvaśagasya narakapātaḥ tatra ca yādṛśyo vedanāḥ*. "I asked the *kevalia mahesi*"—thus the author, according to the scholiast Sudharmasvāmin begins his recital. "Thus questioned by me, *Kāsave āsupanne (āsuprajñāḥ) i.e. Vīra*, spoke."

6. *Viratthao, Mahāvīrastava*, with 29 vv. ; it begins : "The *samaṇas* and *māhaṇas*, the *agārins* and the *paratitthiyas* (Śākyādayaḥ) asked about the doctrine and life (*nāṇam, daṃsaṇam, sīlam*) of the Nāta."

7. *kuṣīlaparibhāsiyaṃ °bhāsā V, kuṣīlaparibhāṣā*, with 30 vv. ; *sarve jīvāḥ sukhaiṣiṇaḥ*.

8. *vīriyaṃ* with 26 vv. ; of *bāla* and of *paṃḍiya* ; in v. 25 *buddhāḥ* in a good sense — *jñātattvās*.

9. *dhammo* with 36 vv. ; in v. 1 *māhaṇeṇa maimayā, brāhmaṇena matimatā* referred by the Schol. to Vīra. It concludes : *goravāṇi ya savvāṇi nivvānaṃ saṃdhae*¹⁰⁵ *muṇi tti bemi* [264].

10. *samāhi, samādhi*, with 24 vv. ; it concludes : *no jīviaṃ no maraṇā 'bhikaṃkhī carejjā bhikkhū valagā vimukko tti bemi* ; in place of *valagā* we find in 12,22, 13,23, where the same conclusion recurs : *valayā*, and

¹⁰⁵ *mokṣaṃ saṃdadhyāt*.

in the schol. *valayam* is explained by *bhāvavalayaṃ*, *māyā samsāraḥ*. If this reading is correct, perhaps Vedic *valaga* might be thought of.¹⁰⁶

11. *maggo*, *mārga*, with 36 vv., ; in v. 1 *māhaṇeṇa matīmatā* as in 9,1.

12. *samosaraṇaṃ*, *samava*°, with 22 vv. ; *kumārgatyāgaḥ* ; four *samavasaraṇāni paratīrthikābhyupagamasamūharūpāṇi*, i. e. the 180 *kiri-yāvāi* etc. (see p. 259,266).

13. *ahatahaṃ*, *yathātatham* (hence by the ampliative *ika* or *ya* also) *āhattahie*, *āhittihie*, *āhattahijam* ; *avitaha* (Āv), with 23 vv. ; *samyak-caritram*.

14. *gaṃṭha* (*gaṃdho* V), *grantha*, with 27 vv. ; *gaṃṭham dhanādikaṃ tyaktvā* ..

15. *jam-aīam*, *yam atītam* (according to the opening words), or *ādūṇiyam* ; with 25 vv.

16. *gāhā* or *gāthāṣoḍaśakam* ;¹⁰⁷ despite this name, a prose explanation of the names *māhaṇa*, *samaṇa*, *bhikkhu*, *niggaṃṭha* and their identical signification (*ekārtha*).

b. Second *śrutaskandha*.

1. *pumḍarie*, °*riyam* V, *pumḍarika*.¹⁰⁸ Comparison of the *bhikkhu* with a lotus flower in the middle of a pond ; it begins (see above, p. 248) : *suaṃ me āusaṃ, teṇaṃ bhagavayā* [265] *evam akkhāyam ; iha khalu pomḍariya nāmaṃ ajjhayaṇe, tassa naṃ ayaṃ aṭṭhe pannatte*. This introductory formula, the second part of which occurs again in *aṅga 6 et seq.*, is repeated with corresponding modification in *ajjh. 2-4*. All four *ajjh.* are in prose.

2. *kiriyaṭhāṇaṃ*, of the 12 or 13 *kriyāsthāna*.

3. *āhāraparinṇā*, °*parijñā*. In the schol. a variant of the scholars of Nāgārjuna is adduced with the words *Nāgārjunī(ya)s tu paṭhamī*. *Nāgajjunavāyaga*, or °*nāyaria*, °*narisi*, is mentioned with great honour in the opening of the *Nandī* and of the *Āv.*, in the list of teachers v. 39, 40, 45, and in fact as separated by three gradations merely—

¹⁰⁶ cf. also the manner of death *valayamayakam*, up. 1.70, "death by magic arts ?" Little can be made out of the commentaries. See the excellent glossary of Leumann which reaches me, May 1883, while these sheets are in the press.

¹⁰⁷ *gāthāṣoḍaśākhyam ṣoḍaśam adhyayanam*. In V., *gāhāsolasagonāmagao*.

¹⁰⁸ cf. *aṅga 6*, 1, 19.

Bhuadinna, Lohicca and *Dūsagaṇi*—from the author himself, whom the scholiast calls *Devavācaka* = *Devarddhigaṇi*, Jacobi, *Kalpas*, p. 15n.

4. *paccakkhāṇakiriya*, *pratyākhyānakriyā*.

5. in S. *Āv. V. aṇagāraṇ* (°*rasuya* S.); here however correctly *aṇāyārasutam*, *anācāraśrutam*, in 34 vv.; it opens as follows : *ādāya baṁbhaceraṇ ca āsupanne (āsuprajñāḥ paṇḍitaḥ) imaṇ caraṇ | assim (asmin) dhamme aṇāyāraṇ n'āyareyyā kayā i vi ||*

6. *Addaijjaṇ Ādrakīyaṇ*, in 55 vv. A sermon of Ādraka, the son of a merchant who, according to the scholiast, from the sight of a picture of Jina sent to him as a debt of gratitude by Abhayakumāra (the son of the king Śreṇika of Rājagṛha), obtained *jātismaraṇam* and turned to *pravrajyā* so as to receive the *pratyekabuddha* dignity, etc. The sermon appears to be addressed to Gośāla. In the last verse : *buddhassa āṇāe imaṇ samāhiṇ (tattvajñasya śrī Virasya ājñāyāṇ .)*, *buddha* is used directly as a name of Vīra. [266]

7. *Nālaṇḍaijjaṇ*, °*dā V.*, *Nālaṇḍiyam*,¹⁰⁹ in prose ; (*śrāvaka* *vidhiḥ*).¹¹⁰ Legend of Udaya (Udaka) Peḍhālaputta Metajja,¹¹¹ a Pāsāvaccijja, Pārśvāpatyīya, i.e. scholar, or follower of Pārśva, whom the *bhagavaṇ* Goyama (Indrabhūti) leads to Mahāvīra, after he has heard the same from the *Kumāravuttiya* (*Kumārāputriya*), *nāma samaṇā niggaṇṭhā*. Udaya thus¹¹² leaves the *cāujjāma dhamma* of Pārśva and accepts the *paṇcamahavvaiyaṇ sapaḍikkamaṇaṇ dhammaṇ* of Mahāvīra.

The table of contents in *aṅga* 4 (or *Nandī*) is as follows : *kiṇ taṇ sūyagaḍe* ?¹¹³ *sūyagaḍe ṇaṇ samamayā sūjjaṇṭi parasamayā s. samamayaparasamayā s.*, *jivā s. ajivā s. jivājivā s.*, *logo s. alogo s. logālogo s.*;¹¹⁴ *sūyagaḍe ṇaṇ jivājivā*¹¹⁵ *-punna-pāv-āsava-saṇvara-nijjara-baṇḍha-mokkhāvasāṇā payatthā sūjjaṇṭi* ; *samaṇāṇaṇ acirakālapavvaiyāṇaṇ kusamayamohamatimohiyāṇaṇ saṇdehajāya-sahajabuddhi-pariṇāma-*

¹⁰⁹ Named from Nālandā, a suburb (? *bāhrikā*) of Rājagṛha.

¹¹⁰ In the preceding 22 *ajjh. sādhy-ācāraḥ prarūpitaḥ*.

¹¹¹ *Medāryagotrena* schol. ; I conjecture that this is a misunderstanding for *Mevārya*—see above, p. 235 *Metārya* is regarded as the tenth scholar of Mahāvīra ; see Hem. v. 32.

¹¹² s. *Bhagavatī* 2, 185 and Jacobi, *ante*, Vol. IX. p. 160.

¹¹³ *sūcanāt sūtraṇ, sūtreṇa kṛtaṇ tat sūtrakṛtaṇ*.

¹¹⁴ In N. we first read *loe*, *aloe*, *loyāloe*, then *jivā aj. j.* lastly *sasamae* p. *sasamaaparasamae* ; so also in the following *aṅgas*. The verb is in each of the nine instances in the plural ; *sūjjaṇṭi*. The triads ; *jivājivājivāṇ (jivā ajivā. jivājivā) loka'loka lokah. (lokālokaḥ)*, *sat asat sad-asat* are assigned specially to the *Terāsiyas*, *Trairāṣika*, by Abh. on *aṅga* 12, 1.

¹¹⁵ *jivāji°* to *visohaṇattham* is omitted by N.

*saṃsaiyāṇam*¹¹⁶ *pāvakaramaliṇamaiguṇavisohanattham*, *asiyassa kiriyāvāi-sayassa, caūrāsie akiriyāvāṇam*, *sattatthiē annāṇiyavāṇam vattisāe veṇaiyavāṇam, tiṇham tesatthāṇam annadiṭṭhiya*¹¹⁷ *sayāṇam būham*¹¹⁸ [267] *kiccā sasamae ṭhāvijjai*,¹¹⁹ *nāṇadiṭṭhāṃta*¹²⁰ *vayaṇā nissāram suṭṭhu darisayaṃtā vivihavitttharāṇugamaparamasabbhāva-guṇavisitthā mokkhapa-hodāragā*¹²¹ *udūrā annāṇatam 'amdhakāraduggesu divabhūyā sopāṇā ceva siddhisugaigharuttamassa*¹²² *nikkhobhaṇippakampasuttatthā*.¹²³

I have before me the commentary of Harṣakula¹²⁴ from the *Tapāgaccha*. It was composed "varṣe 1583," but not after Vīra, but after Vikrama, i.e. A.D. 1527.¹²⁵ The origin of the *Tapāgaccha* dates from Vīra 1755.

III. The third *aṅgam*, *ṭhāṇam sthānam* : an enumeration arranged in categories designed for the instruction of the more advanced and in fact for the eighth year of their instruction.¹²⁶ The categories comprise successively subjects or conceptions conceived as one, two, and so on up to ten. Hence the whole text consists of 10 *ajjhayaṇas*, which are called *ekasthāna*, *dvisthāna*, etc.; *ajjh.* 2-4 each contain 4 *udd.*, *ajjh.* 5 three *udd.* the rest of the *ajjh.* have no such sub-division, and exist as *egasarāṇi* (V) of one *udd.* each.

From the miscellaneous contents of this compendium I extract the following : the *nakṣatras* : *addā*, *cittā*, *sāti* [268] are designated as *egatāre*, and then the number of the stars of the other *nakṣatras* is enumerated.¹²⁷ In an enumeration of the divisions of time in 2, 4—

¹¹⁶ *saṃdehajatāśca saḥajabuddhipariṇāmasaṃsayitāśca ye.*

¹¹⁷ *pāsamḍiya N.*

¹¹⁸ *pratikṣepaṇi.*

¹¹⁹ *°vijjāṃti N.*

¹²⁰ *nāṇā°* etc. omitted in N.

¹²¹ *mokṣapathāvatāraḥ.*

¹²² *gṛhottamasya,*

¹²³ *sūtram cārthaś ca niryukti-bhāṣya-saṃgrahaṇī-vṛtti-cūrṇi-paṃjikādirūpa iti sūtrārthaḥ.*

¹²⁴ We have a commentary to the fourth *painna* by a certain Harṣakuśala.

¹²⁵ The statements in reference to genealogy at the end are in agreement with Dharmasāgara's *Gurvāvalī* of the *Tapāgaccha*, of the members of which patriarchs 44, 52-57 are mentioned; so that between 53 and 54 a *Jagaccandramuni* is referred to. See Kl. p. 257ab.

¹²⁶ *tatra bhavyasya mokṣābhilāṣiṇaḥ sthitagurūpadeśasya prāṇino'sṭavarsapramāṇapravrajyā-paryāyasyai 'va sūtrato 'pi sthānāṅgam deyam*, Abhayadeva; see above, p. 223, 224.

¹²⁷ See my treatise on the *nakṣatras*, 2, 381. *Iud. Stud.* 9, 448, 10, 293. According to the schol. we have here to do with the *kṛttikā* series cf. *Bhag.* 1, 373, 441. The names of the *nakṣatras* appear here invariably in their secondary form; *dhaniṭṭha*, *bhaddavayā*, etc. The name of the *ahibudhnya* is (2, 3) corrupted into *vividhī* (see *Ind. Stud.* 10, 296).

beginning with *āvaliyā* and reaching to *sisapahelia*,¹²⁸ *pallovama sāgarovama, osappiṇī, ussappiṇī*—the *yuga* is inserted between the year and the century as intermediate gradation and the quinquennial *yugam* is thereby still used as a means of calculation. On the other hand, we have here the same enormous extension of periods of time, which we find in *upāṅga* 6 (*Jambūddivapannatti*) and in the *Anuyogadvārasūtra*; see *Bhagav.* 1, 427,¹²⁹ though the latter works contain some modifications not present here. The existence of the above-mentioned *upāṅga* is furthermore recognised directly in 4, 1 : *cattāri pannattīu aṅgabāhiriya paṃ (nattāu), taṃ (jahā) : Caṃdapannatti, Sūrapannatti, Jambūddivapannatti, Divasāgarapannatti*. The three *pannattis*, which are here mentioned in addition, occur again in 3, 1 : *tao pannattīu kāleṇam ahijjanti, taṃ : Caṃdapannatti, Sūrapannatti, Divasāgarapannatti*. Here and in 4, 1, are found the titles of *upāṅga* 7, 5, 6, in 3, 1, those of *up.* 7. 5; to which in both cases the *divasā*° is joined, which, though not an independent member of *Siddhānta*, appears however as a section of the third *upāṅga*. That we have here to deal with the *upāṅgas* respectively named so and not merely [269] with homonymous doctrines, is proved by one circumstance especially; that besides the above-mentioned enumeration of the periods of time, the *abhijit* series of the *nakṣatras*, which belongs to these works, is here already known—see *ajjh.* 7 near the end.¹³⁰ And even if the direct mention of *upāṅga* texts is in this case doubtful because such mention in the *aṅgas* does not occur in the text, but in the insertions at the hand of the redactor, in this case the designation (in 4, 1) of the four texts as *aṅgabāhiriya* is so distinct and so points to their actual existence apart from the *aṅgas*, that all doubts are put at rest. How far the existing texts of *upāṅga* 7, 5, 6, are meant by this, is, as we shall soon see, still an open question. One circumstance is worthy of note; the order of names here is different from that of the existing text; and the fourth name is equivalent merely to a part of the third *upāṅga* and not to the *upāṅga* itself.

We find in chapter 10 a second and more important statement or mention of texts existing apart from the *aṅgas*. In that chapter are

128 A number of 194 places ! *tasyāṃ caturnavatyadhikāṃ aṃkasthānaśatāṃ bhavati.*

129 According to Leumann's communication this occurs also in *aṅga* 5,5,1. 6,7,25,5.

130 *mahānakkhatta sattatāre paṃ taṃ : abhitiāyā naṃ satta nakkhattā puvvādāriyā paṃ taṃ : abhi, savane, dhanitthā, sattabhisayā, uttarabhaddavayā, revatī : assinīyādīyā naṃ satta nakkhattā dāhinādāriyā paṃ, taṃ : assinī, bharaṇī, kattiya, rohinī, magasira, addā, puṇavvasu ; pussātiyā naṃ satta nakkhattā avarādāriyā paṃ, taṃ : pusse, asilesā, mahā, puvvāphagguṇī, uttarāphagguṇī, hattho, citta ; sārīyādīyā naṃ satta nakkhattā uttarādāriyā paṃ, taṃ : sāti, visāhā, anurāhā, jetthā, mūlā, puvvā āsādhā, uttarā āsādhā, cf. Nakṣ. 2,377n, Ind. Stud. 10,304, and see my comments on *aṅga* 4, 7.*

specified not merely the names [270] of ten *dasāu* (i.e. texts containing ten *ajjhayaṇas*), but also the names of each of the 10 *ajjh.* Among these are the names of four *aṅgas* (7-10), references to a fifth (11), and the name of the fourth *chedasūtra*; the other four names have in our *Siddhānta* no place whatever (*asmākam apratitāḥ*, *Abh.* fol. 285a).

At the head stand the *kammavivāḍasāu*; by this name the eleventh *aṅga* is meant—*vivāḍasue*, *vipākaśrutam*; it contains, however, not merely 10 but 20 *ajjah.*; and the names adduced here as being those of the ten *ajjah.* are found only in part in *aṅga* 11. Two of them, at least, are exactly the same (1,4) and three partly so (6-8); so that we cannot gainsay that there is some connection¹³¹ between these *dasāu* and *aṅga* 11. The names of the ten *ajjah.* here are: *Miyāputte*,¹³² *Guttāse*,¹³³ *aṇḍe*,¹³⁴ *Sagaḍe* 'ti ā vare¹³⁵ *māhane*, *Naṇḍiseṇe*¹³⁶ *ya*, *Sorie*¹³⁷ *ya*, *Udumbare*, *sahasuddāe āmalae*¹³⁸ *kumāre* *Lecā* 'ti *ya*. It is well to be noted that in *aṅga* 4 (§ 43) too a text entitled *kammavivāya* is mentioned, [271] though 43 *ajjah.* are ascribed to it; and in the *Kalpa-sūtra Jinacar.* (§ 147) 55 *ajjah.* are attributed to the *pāvaphalavivāyāim* alone: this was a subject which invited repeated working over!

The titles of *aṅgas* 7-9 appear as *dasāu* 2-4; and complete agreement exists in reference to the *uvāsagadasāu* (*aṅga* 7), even as regards the names of the ten *ajjhayaṇas*. The eighth and ninth *aṅga*, the *aṁtagaḍa-dasāu* and the *anuttarovavāiyadasāu* have here however only ten *ajjh.* allotted them, whereas in the *Siddhānta* they have 93 or 33. The names of the ten *ajjh.* are for *aṁtagaḍa*: *Nami Mayaraṅge Somile Rāmagutte*^{139*} *Sudamṣaṇe ceva/Jamālī ya Bhagālī ya Kimkamme Pillate*

¹³¹ *Abh.* identifies them directly with the first *śrutaskandha* of the eleventh *aṅga* and represents the names and the contents of the single 10 *adhy.* as being all in harmony with the contents of the 10 *adhy.* found there.

¹³² *Mṛgā*, wife of *Vijaya*, king of the city *Mṛgaḡrāma*.

¹³³ *gās trāsitaṇ itī Gotrāso...idam eva co'jjhitaka nāmnā Vipākaśrute ujjhitaḡam ucyate.*

¹³⁴ cf. *aṅga* 6, 1, 3; *kukkuṭādyaneḡavidhāṁḡakabhāṁḡavyavahāriṇo...*; *Vipākaśrute cā bhaggaṣena itī 'dam adhyayanam ucyate.*

¹³⁵ *śakaṡam itī cā' paraṁ.*

¹³⁶ *Vipākaśrute ca Naṁḡdivardhanaḡ śrūyata.*

¹³⁷ *Saurika.*

¹³⁸ *sahasuddāe* A (with *h* fallen out), *sahasuddāhe* B; *sahasū akasmāḡ uddāhaḡ prakṡṡodāhaḡ sahasrāṇāṁ vā lokasyo 'ddāhaḡ sahasroddāhaḡ āmalae itī raśruter laśrutir itī āmarakaḡ samastyena mārir.* ...

^{139*} *Rāmaputra*, with the *Digambaras*, see the *Tattvārthavārttika* in Prof. Peterson's *Second Report*, p. 17. Also the existent *Śvetāmbara* text presents *Rāmaputte*, see below p. 324.—L.

ti ya, Phāle Ambaṭṭhaputte^{140*} *ya 'em (evam) ete dasa āhiyā ||* Among these I can discover but one name, *Bhagālī*, which shows any connection with *aṅga* 8,4,2 (*Mayālī*) ; or perhaps we may extend the number to two names connected with 9,3,4,5 Pellae, *Rāmaputte*. The names of the ten *ajjh.* of the *aṇutt°* are, *Isidāse ya Dhanne ya Sunakkhatte kattite (kārttika) ti ya | Saṁdhāṇe Sālibhadde ya Āṇaṁde Teyālī*¹⁴¹ *ti ya | Dasannabhadde Aimutte em ete dasa āhiyā ||* Among these are at least three names which recur in *aṅga* 9, 3, 1-3.

It is perfectly manifest that the author of *aṅga* 3 possessed entirely different texts of *aṅgas* 8,9, than those in our possession. The same holds good in the case of *aṅga* 4, since it ascribe to these *aṅgas* only ten *ajjh.* each. See below. The means made use of by Abhayadeva to reconcile this discrepancy are very simple. He says, on *aṅga* 8, after [272] recognizing the fact of the discrepancy : *tato vācanāmtarāpekṣayāṇī ('kānī ?) 'mānī' ti saṁbhāvayāmo, navajanmāmtaram apekṣayai 'tāni bhaviṣyanti 'tī vācyam, janmāmtarāṇam tatrā'nabhidhiy'mānatvād iti*—and likewise on *aṅga* 9 : *tad evam ihā'pi vācanāmtarāpekṣayā adhyayanavibhāga ukto, na punar upalabhyamānavācanā-pekṣaye 'ti*. His statements in reference to the stories themselves are given with tolerable detail on *aṅga* 9.

As the fifth member of the ten *dasāu* the *āyāradasāu* are enumerated. The names cited for the ten *ajjh.* belonging to these are identical with those of *chedasūtra* 4. This therefore proves that the latter is to be understood by the *āyāradasāu*.

As the sixth of the *dasāu* texts the *Paṇhāvāgaranadasāu* are named. This is to be sure the name of the tenth *aṅga*, which is also divided into 10 *dāras* but not into 10 *ajjh.* The names of the ten *ajjh.* quoted here show very plainly that here, as in the case of *aṅgas* 8, 9, the author had quite a different, and in fact an older, text before him than the one we now possess. These names are in agreement with the name of the *aṅga* itself, whereas our text of this *aṅga* shows no connection with it. The names are : *uvamā, saṁkhā,*

^{140*} Thus B. *Avvaddha°* A. With the Digambaras we find (1. c) *Yamalī kavalīka- Niṣ-kambala-Pāl'-Āmbaṣṭaputra*. In some better MS the first name might turn out to be *Yamālī* and in the second some name corresponding to *Bhagālī* may be hidden.—L.

¹⁴¹ *Taitālisuta iti yo jñātādhyayaṇeṣu (aṅga 6,1,14) śrūyate sa nā'yam tasya siddhi-gamaṇaśravaṇāt.* We have here in all probability an intentional variation.

isibhāsiyāim,^{142*} āyariyabhāsiyāim, Mahāvīrabhāsiyāim, khomagapasiṇāim komalapasiṇāim, addāgapasiṇāim, aṁguṭṭhapasiṇāim, bāhupasiṇāim. The names of *ajjh.* 6, 8, 9, 10, recur in that table of contents of *aṅga* 10 which is found in *aṅga* 4 (and *Nandī*) so that there the text which existed at the period of *aṅga* 3 and not our present text, is meant. Abhayadeva says, in so many words : *praśnavyākaraṇadaśā iho'ktarūpā na drśyamte, drśyamānās tu paṁcāśravapaṁcasamvarātmikā iti, ihoktānām tū' pamādinām adhyayanānām akṣarārthaḥ* [273] *pratyamāna eve ti*.¹⁴³

The names of the following four *dasāu* do not recur elsewhere. The names of the 10 *ajjh.* of *dasā* 10 are mentioned, not as parts of the *Siddhānta* but as belonging in or to it. In the seventh place appear the *baṁdhadasāu*, the 10 *ajjh.* of which have the following names : *baṁdhe*¹⁴⁴ *ya mukkhe ya deviḍḍhī Dasāramamḍale ti ya | āyariyavipadivatti' uvajjhāyavippadivatti' | bhāvaṇā vimottī sāsate kamme*. In the eighth place we find the *dogiḍḍhidadasāu* (*dvigṛddhi*) with the following names.¹⁴⁵ *vāte vivāte sukhette kaṣiṇe ti ya | bāyālisam suvinā' tisam mahāsuvinā hāre*¹⁴⁶ *Rāmagutte ya eyam ee dasa āhiya*.¹⁴⁷ In the ninth place the *dīha-dasāu* with following names : *camde sure ya sukke ya, Siridevi, Pabhāva | divasamuddovavatti, Bahu-putti, Maṁdare ti ya | there 'Saṁbhuyaviḥḥae, there Pamha-ussāsanissāse |*. Abhayadeva points out here some connection with the *narakāvalikā* or *nirayāvalikā-śrūtaskandha*, i.e. *upāṅgas* 8-12.¹⁴⁸ Finally in the tenth place are the *saṁkheviyadasāu*¹⁴⁹ with the foll. names *khuddiyā vimāṇapavibhatti, mahalliyā vimāṇa* [274] *pavibhatti, aṁgacūliya, vaggacūliya vivāhacūliya, Aruṇavavāe, Varāṇo-*

^{142*} This text is treated in greater detail on *aṅga* 4 § 44. It has been discovered by Prof. Peterson, see his *Third Report*, p. 26 and 253.—L.

¹⁴³ *kṣaumakādiṣu devatāvatāraḥ kriyata iti, tatra kṣaumakam vastram, addāgo ādarśaḥ*.

¹⁴⁴ *baṁdhādy-adhyayanām, śrautenā' rtthena vyākhyātavyāni*.

¹⁴⁵ *dvigṛhi (!) dasāś ca svarūpato 'py anavasitāḥ*.

¹⁴⁶ *var. ; hare, hāle*.

¹⁴⁷ These are but nine ; in a MS. belonging to Sir Mon. Williams, according to Leumann, *bāvattariṁ savvasuminā* are named in the tenth place. For the dreams cf. the *mahāsuvinā* above. p. 224, also cited among the *anaṅgapavivṛtta* texts in the *Pakṣikas*, and in the *Vidhipr*.

¹⁴⁸ *dūrghadasāḥ svarūpato 'navagatā eva, tad-adhyayanāni (kāni) cin narakāvalikā-śrūtaskandha upalabhyante ; tatra caṁdravaktavyatā-pratibaddham caṁdram adhyayanam, tathāhi : Rājagṛhe ; seṣāni trīṇy apratitāni*.

¹⁴⁹ *saṁkṣepikā dasā apy anavagatasvarūpā eva, tad adhyayanānām punar arthaḥ : khuddie tyādi, ihāvalikā-praviṣṭetaravimāṇapavibhajanaṁ yatrā 'dhyāyane' tad vimāṇapavibhaktiḥ, tac caī 'kani alpagramhārtham ; tathā' nyan mahā-granthārtham*.

vavāe (*Varu*^o in the Schol, perhaps Dhara^o) *Garulovavāe*, *Velandharovavāe*, *Vesamaṇovavāe*. All these names recur in the *anaṅgapaviṭṭha* list of the *Nandī* (*Pākṣikas*, *Vidhipr.*). We have seen above, p. 223, 224, that the five *ajjhayaṇaṣ* beginning with *khuddiyavimāṇa* are designed for the eleventh year of study, the five¹⁵⁰ *ajjha*, which begin with *aruṇovavāa* for the twelfth year of study. From this two facts are plain : first, that they still existed at the date of composition of the *versus memoriales* in question, secondly, that they were of great importance in so far as their study is made to occur after that designed for *aṅga* 5 i.e. the tenth year. By *vivāhacūliyā* (*vyākhyā bhagavatī tasyāś cūlikā*) we may remark in passing, we are to understand one or more of those supplements to *aṅga* 5, all of which now appear to have been incorporated in that *aṅga*.

We cannot doubt that all the texts mentioned above were thus constituted at the period of the existence of *aṅga* 3. Hence the extreme interest of this detailed presentation of the subject. It is only as regards *aṅga* 7 and *chedasūtra* 4 that this account is in entire agreement with the existing text of the *Siddhānta* ; in all other particulars this account is either widely different or has reference to texts,¹⁵¹ which are not found in the *Siddhānta* at all. The proof here given of the fact that from the mention of a work in one place or another there does not [275] follow the identity of the then existing texts with the present (though in reality proof of a fact that is self-evident) is nevertheless not out of place in the present case, since it has become so customary in these days to draw from the titles of Chinese, etc., translations of Buddhistic works conclusions in reference to the existence of the latter in their present form. The proof here carried out in reference to *aṅga* 8 to 10 is intended as a reminder that greater caution must be used in the future. (See *Ind. Stud.* III. 140).

Of great interest is furthermore the enumeration in *ajjh.* 7 of the names of the seven schisms¹⁵² together with those of their founder and of their localities : *evaṃ ceva samaṇassa bhagavato Mahāvīrassa titthammi satta pavayaṇantiṭthagā paṃ tam ; bahurayā, jīvapadesiyā, avvattiyā,*

¹⁵⁰ This first 5 of the preceding ten *ajjh.* are doubtless meant by this statement. At least in the *Nandī* they preserve the same order of succession.

¹⁵¹ These texts may be concealed, i.e., absorbed by larger texts—a conjecture which is very probable e. g. in the case of the *vivāhacūliyā*. See above.

¹⁵² cf. *Kup.* 794 (4) where the words “in connection with *Ayyarakkhia* and *Pūsamitta*” belong to the last line after *gotthamāhila* ; see *Av.* N. 8, 89.

sāmucchetiyā, dokiriyā, terāsiyā, avaḍḍhiyā (!); eesi naṃ sattanaṃ pavayaṇaṇiṃhagaṇaṃ satta dhammāyariyā hotthā, taṃ : Jamālī, Tisagutte Āsāḍhe, Āsamitte, Gaṃge, Calue, Goṭṭhāmāhile; eesi naṃ paṇaṃ satta uppattinagarā hotthā, taṃ : Sāvattthī, Usabhapuraṃ, Seyabiyā, Mihilā, Ullagātīraṃ, puram Aṃtaraṃji Dasapura(m) niṃhaga-uppattinagarāṃ. According to Āvasy. nijj. 8, 61, 88, the last of these schisms occurred in the year Vira 584; from this we may derive some basis for chronological determination.^{153} See Jacobi, *Kalpas*. p. 15.*

An exact examination of this important text is a great desideratum, since in it are contained a large number of significant [276] statements and data. It constitutes a perfect treasure-house for the correct understanding of innumerable groups of conceptions in distinguishing which from one another the pedantic formalism of the Jains was wont to run riot.

The table of contents in *aṅga* 4 and *Nandī* (N) reads : *se kiṃ taṃ thāṇe ? thāṇe naṃ sasamayā thāvijjanti parasamayā sasamayaparasamayā ; jīvā thāvijjanti ajīvā jīvājīvā ; logo alogo logālogo thāvijjanti*,¹⁵⁴ *thāṇe naṃ davva-guṇa-khetta-kāla-pajjavapayatthā naṃ selā salilā ya samudda-sūra-bhavaṇa-vimāṇa-āgarāṇadio nidhaya purisajāyā*¹⁵⁵ *sarā*¹⁵⁶ *ya gottā ya joisaṃvālā*¹⁵⁷ *ekavihaṃ vattavvayaṃ duvihaṃ jāva dasavihaṃ vattavvayaṃ jīvāṇa poggalāṇa ya logaṭṭhāṃ ca naṃ parūvaṇayā āghavijjai*.¹⁵⁸

The commentary is by Abhayadeva, who both here at the end and elsewhere is frequently called *navāṅgivr̥ttikāraḥ*. Commentaries to *aṅgas* 3-11 are ascribed to him ; and we have one from his hand on *upāṅga* 1.

He calls himself a scholar of Jineśvarācārya¹⁵⁹ and of Buddhisāgara

^{153*}The Jain records on the above seven schisms have been translated into German by Leumann, *Ind. Stud.* XVII, p. 91-135.—L.

¹⁵⁴ In N, we read *jīvā ajīvā jīvāj.* at the beginning ; then follows *loe aloe loyāloe ;* and *sasamae p. sasamayaparasamae* forms the conclusion, (as also in the case of *aṅgas* 4 et. seq.) ; the verb is *thāvijjanti* in each one of the nine cases—i.e. in the plural

¹⁵⁵ *Purisajāyā tti puruṣaprakāra unnatapranatādibhedah ; pāṭhāntareṇa pussajoga tti upalakṣaṇatvāt puṣyādinakṣatrāṇaṃ caṃdreṇa saha pāścimāgrimobhaya-pramādādiko yogah.*

¹⁵⁶ *svarāś ca ṣaḍjādayo.*

¹⁵⁷ *cālā B C. ; jyotiṣaḥ tārārūpasamvālanāni (cāl° ?).*

¹⁵⁸ N has instead of *thāṇe naṃ davva°* the following : *taṃkā kādā selā siharino' pabbhārā kuṃḍāṃ guhāo āgarā dāhā naio āghavijjanti ; thāṇe naṃ egāiyāe eguttariyāe vuddhīe dasaṭṭhānavivaḍḍhiyāṇaṃ bhāvāṇaṃ parūvaṇā āghavijjanti.*

¹⁵⁹ The founder of the Kharataragaccha ; see the *paṭṭāvalī* at the end of the *Śabda-prabhedaṭṭikā* v. 2 (ms. or. fol. 813), and *KI*, 248^a (11).

the younger [277] brother of the former. The present commentary was prepared by him Saṃvat 1120 (A.D. 1064) in Aṇahillapāṭaka with the help of Yaśodevagaṇi, a scholar of Ajitasinhācārya for a *paṇḍitapar-ṣad*, conducted by Śrī-Droṇācārya. According to Dharmasāgara's *Gurvāvali*, the "*navāṃgavṛttikṛt*", Abhayadeva died Saṃvat 1135, according to others 1139. See *Kl.* 248b, 253b. (12.30).

IV. The fourth *aṅga*, *Samavāya*, "association, group, rubric", in one *ajjhayana*, that consists of very heterogeneous parts. The contents of the first two-thirds is in general the same as that of the third *aṅga*, both being designed for instruction in the eighth year. See above. There is however the difference that the categories here exceed 10,¹⁶⁰ and continue by progression up to 100,¹⁶¹ and then *per saltus* far exceed 100. Immediately following, but without any logical connection with this, is a detailed table of contents and extent of all the twelve *aṅgas*; then all sorts of statements which cannot be united into one class and which deal partly with doctrine, partly with hagiology and, if we may use the expression, history or legend. This third part is without doubt to be regarded as an appendix to the first part, and the whole as a supplement to the third *aṅga*; as in fact we learn from § 57 that *aṅgas* 1 to 3 were regarded as a connected unit. We have here a compendium of everything worth knowing, [278] a perfect treasure-house of the most important information which is of the greatest value for our understanding of the *Siddhānta*. Of especial significance are, in the first place, the statements of literary and historical content in § 1-100, in reference to the extent and division of the separate *aṅgas*, etc. (statements which were doubtless the principal cause of the addition of the full treatment of this subject); the mention of various celebrated Arhats of the past¹⁶² together with the number of their scholars (this was the cause of the addition of the concluding part); and the frequent reference to the lunar and *nakṣatra* computation of time and to the quinquennial *yugam*. The references to the *yugam* are exactly in the manner of the *jyotiṣa vedāṅga*, *kṛttikā*, etc., being the beginning of the series of the *nakṣatras*.

Aṅga 4 begins, after prefacing the customary introduction (*suyam me āusam, teṇaṃ bhagavānteṇam evaṃ akkhāyaṃ*) with a fresh statement

¹⁶⁰ In § 1-10 there are many statements which recur in the same form in *aṅga* 3.

¹⁶¹ They are counted up to 100 as first, second, third *samavāya* (or in the neuter *samavāyam* up to the hundredth).

¹⁶² e.g. Kumtha § 27.81, Kumthu § 95, Pāsa § 38,70,350. Paṇami (Nami B. C.) § 39, Aritthanemi § 40, Nami § 41, Vimāla § 44,56, Muṇisuvva § 50, Malli § 55,57, Usabha Kosalīa § 63.83.89. Moriyaputta § 65. Suvihi Pupphadanta § 75.86. Bharaha § 77,

in reference to the authorship of Mahāvīra : *iha khalu samanenaṃ bhagavayā Mahāvireṇaṃ* (then follows the regular *varṇaka* with about 40 attributes, among which are *Jiṇeṇaṃ ..buddheṇaṃ bohaṇeṇaṃ*) *ime duvālasaṃge gaṇipidaḥ*¹⁶³ *pannatte, taṃ jahā :* (then follow the names of the 12 *aṅgas*)¹⁶⁴ [279] *tattha naṃ je se caūtthe aṅge samavāe ti āhie*,¹⁶⁵ *tassa, naṃ ayam aṭṭhe...* In *aṅgas* 1-3 we do not find at the outset any such designation as first, second, third *aṅgam*.

I extract the following from the remainder of the *aṅga*. In § 1 repetition of the statements of the third *aṅga* in reference to the asterisms *addā, cittā, sāti* being called *egatāra* ; further on the same statements are made about the remaining *nakṣatras* ; in § 7 the 28 *nakṣatras* are divided into four groups, viz. : *kittiyāiṇi* (*ādika*) in the East (*puvvaḍāriyā*), *mahāiṇi* in the South, *aṇurāhāiṇi* in the West, *dhaniṭṭhāiṇi* in the North. After¹⁶⁶ the sentence *kittiyāiṇi satta nakkhattā puvvaḍāriyā paṃ* (*pannatā*) the words *pāṭhāntareṇa abhahiyādiyā* (A, *abhīyāiṇi* BC) are inserted ;¹⁶⁷ whereby, as the schol. explains, *abhijit., aśvinī, puṣya, svāti* are indicated rather than the names in question. This insertion purposes to put the series of *nakṣatras*, first invented by the Jains and taught especially in *upāṅgas* 5, 7 (see *Ind. Stud.* 10,220, 304) in the place of the old *kṛttikā* series, which still maintained its validity at the time the fourth *aṅga* was first composed.¹⁶⁸ The new view had not yet received the authoritative stamp of orthodoxy. [280] We must however here notice that (cf. p. 269) in the third *aṅga* § 7 we find statements completely identical with those in this insertion. In § 18 enumeration of the 18 kinds of writing usual for the *bambhī livi* (but not so correct as in *up.* 4 on which account I cite them there) ; § 18

Seyyasa § 80, Siyyaṃsa § 84, Siyala § 83,90. Maṃḍīyaputta § 83, Supāsa § 86,95,200, Ajiya § 90, Imḍabhūti § 92, Caṃdappaha § 93, Sāṃti § 93, Sumai § 300, Sambhava § 400, Ajia § 450, Sagara § 450, Vāsūpujja § 700.

¹⁶³ This word, which in § 57 is used especially for *aṅgas* 1-3 belongs of course to the *tipiṭaka* of the Pali texts, but has no reference to the number three. The designation of "basket" inclines one to think of its having been committed to writing. On the first mention of the name *tipiṭaka* see *Ind. Stud.* 5,26 ; *Vorles. Ind. Lit.*—G². 311, appendix, page 15.

¹⁶⁴ All of the preceding from *iha khalu* on gives an impression of secondary origin. This is the first occasion that we meet with the *varṇaka* of Mahāvīra.

¹⁶⁵ *ākhyāta*, I assumed several years ago (see *Bhag.* 1,410,2,251) under the erroneous belief that this form belonged especially to the *Sūryaprajñapti* (see *Ind. Stud.* 10,254) that *āhia* *āhijai* were derived from the root *khyā* weakend to *khi, hi*, I should now prefer to regard them as a species of retrogressive formation from the common *āhaṃsu* (root *ah*),

¹⁶⁶ Thus in A ; in BC before.

¹⁶⁷ The same case is found § 72.

¹⁶⁸ The schol. however regards the *abhijit* series as *siddhāntamatam*: he then adds: *iha* (in the text) *tu matāntaram āsṛitya kṛttikādini.....bhaṇitāni : caṃdraprajñaptau tu bahutarāṇi matāni darsitāni* (*Ind. Stud.* 10,285).

atthinatthipavāyassa puṇṇassa (this is the fourth *pūrvam*) *aṭṭhārasa vatthū* ; in § 19 enumeration of the 19 *nāyajjhayaṇas*, i.e. of the 19 books of *aṅga* 6, in *kārikā* form ; in § 23 enumeration of the 23 *suyagaḍajjhayaṇas*, i.e. of those of *aṅga* 2 ; in § 25 enumeration of the 25 *ajjh.* of *aṅga* 1 ; *āyārassa bhagavāo sacūliyaḍgassa*, the *mahāparinna* being mentioned in the ninth place and the *nisīhajjhayaṇa* being designated outright as “25th *ajjh.*” The latter is probably the *cūliyā* (see § 57 and p. 254) ; the designation as *bhagavant* is found also in § 85, c.f. also § 84 ; in § 36 enumeration of the 36 *ajjh.* of the *uttarajjhayaṇa*, i.e. of the first *mūlasūtra*, and in fact with a few insignificant variations of the names given here ; see below § 43 *teyālisam kammavivāgaḍajjhayaṇa paṃ (nattā)* ; the names are however not enumerated ; accord. to the schol. the 20 *ajjh.* of the eleventh *aṅga*, called *vivāgasuya* are hereby referred to, as also the 23 of the second (!) *aṅga*. Cf. page 270 in reference to the *kammavivāgaḍasāu* in ten *ajjh.* mentioned in *aṅga* 3, 10 ; § 44 *coyālisam ajjhayaṇā isibhāsiyā devalogacuyobhāsiyā paṃ (nattā)* ; both of these texts, at least under these names, are no longer extant.^{169*} I have found the *devalogacuyabhāsiyā* mentioned in this place alone ; the *isibhāsiyā* however are often mentioned. We have already come across them (see p. 272) in *aṅga* 3, 10 as third *ajjh.* of *aṅga* 10 (!). [281] In the *Nandī* they appear among the *aṅgaṇapavittīha* texts ; the author of the *Āvaśy. nijj.* confesses that he (2, 6) is author of a *nijj.* to the *isibhāsiā* too, and (8, 54), placing them in the second place, describes them together with *kāliasua*, *sūrapannatti* and *diṭṭhivā* as the four kinds of *aṇuo* (see p. 258) ; Abhay. however here characterizes them as *kālikaśrutaviśeṣabhūtāni*. Haribhadra on *Āv.* identifies them, on one occasion (2, 6) with *pāinna* 7, on another (8, 54), he calls them *uttarādhyaṇādini* ! See above, p. 259. They appear also in connection with the *painnas*, embracing 50 (!) *ajjh.* in the *Vidhiprapā*, where their connection with the *Uttarajjhayaṇa* as *matāmtara* is also referred to — § 46 *diṭṭhivāyassa naṃ chāyālisam māuyāpayā (māṭṭkāpadāni) paṃ (nattā) bambhie naṃ livīe chāyālisam māuarakkhā (madurakarā BC. perhaps māuakkkharā ? māṭṭ + akṣ°) paṃ*. In reference to the 46 *māuyāpayā* of *aṅga* 12 see below. By the “*lekhyavidhau 46 māṭṭkāḍṣarāṇi*” of the Scriptures are according to the schol., to be understood¹⁷⁰ a to ha, with the addition of *kṣa*, but with the omission of *jha-ḍa-ṭṭi* (?)—*ūm* (?)—*la* (?).¹⁷¹ These statements are of the most remarkable character. The

^{169*}See however the last but one asterism note.

¹⁷⁰ The *Pāṇinīyā śikṣā* counts 63 or 64 *varṇas* and (as is very remarkable) “both for Sanskrit and for Prakrit (!)” See *Ind. Stud.* 4, 348, 349.

¹⁷¹ Among the Brāhmins too there is found an enumeration of the alphabet in order to form a diagram. Cf. my treatise on the *Rāma Tāp.* Up. 1.62, p. 309. This enumeration contains 51 *akṣaras* (16 vowels, 35 consonants), which, after deducting 5

number of 46 *akṣaras*, whether written signs or sounds (which can have reference to Sanskrit alone and not to Prakrit, since *kṣ* is included in the list), I am as yet entirely unable to explain^{172*}—§ 57 *tiṇhaṃ gaṇi-piḍagāṇaṃ āyāracūliyavajjāṇaṃ sattāvannaṃ ajjhayaṇā paṃ (nattā) āyāre* 24, *sūyagaḍe* 23, *thāṇe* [282] 10 ; here the first 3 *aṅgas* are taken together as a unit and called 'the three *gaṇipidagas*' *par excellence*. It is here worthy of note that only 24 *ajjh.* are ascribed to the *āyāra* after the separation of the *āyāracūliya* ; and in fact (p. 254) only the *nisiḥajjhayaṇaṃ*, which in § 25 is called the 25th *ajjh.*, can be meant by *āyāracūliya* ;—in § 59 fifty-nine day-nights (*rātimdiya*) are allotted to each season of the lunar year ; § 61 *paṃcasam vaccharassa naṃ jugassa ridumāsenaṃ miyyamānassa egasaṭṭhi udumāsā paṃ (nattā)* ; see on this *Jyotiṣa* v. 31 (my treatise, p. 93) ;—§ 62 the quinquennial *yugam* has 62 full moons, 62 new moons ; §—67 67 *nakkhattamāsā* ; according to § 71, the winter of the fourth lunar year (in the *yuga*) has 71 *ῥυχθῆ'μepa*—*caūtthassa naṃ caṃdasaṃvaccharassa hemantāṇamekasattarīte rātim-diyehiṃ vitikkamtehiṃ* ;—in § 72 enumeration of the 72 *kalās* which are essentially identical with those which recur in *aṅga* 6, 1, 119, *upāṅga* 1, 107 and elsewhere ;¹⁷³ the repeated use of the word *lakkhaṇa* probably forms a literary synchronism with the *Mahābhāṣya* and the *Atharvaparīṣiṣṭas*. See *Ind. Stud.* 13, 460, Burnell, *Tanjore Catalogue*, p. 9 fg. ; the names are :

Lehaṃ 1, *gaṇiyaṃ* 2, *rūvaṃ* 3, *naṭṭaṃ* 4, *giyaṃ* 5, *vāiyaṃ* 6, *saragayaṃ* 7, *pukkharagayaṃ* 8, *saṃatālaṃ* 9, *jūyaṃ* 10, *jaṇavāyaṃ* 11, *porevaccam* (A. *kavvaṃ* B.C.)^{174*} 12, *aṭṭhāvayaṃ* 13, *dagamaṭṭiyaṃ* 14, *annavihiṃ* 15, *pāṇavihiṃ* 16, *leṇav*¹⁷⁵ 17, *sayanaṇav* 18, *ajjapaheliyaṃ (ajjaṃ pa° B.C.)* 19, *māgahiyaṃ* 20, *gāhaṃ*¹⁷⁶ 21, *silogaṃ* 22, *gaṃdhajuttim* 23, [283], *madhusittham*¹⁷⁷ 24, *ābharaṇavihiṃ* 25, *taruṇīpaḍikkammaṃ* 26, *itthilakkhaṇaṃ* 27, *purisal.* 28, *hayaḷ.* 29, *gayal.* 30, *goṇal.*¹⁷⁸ 31, *kukkuḍal.* 32, *miḍhayaḷ.* 33,

akṣaras, shows the 46 *māuyakkharā* ascribed in *aṅga* 4, 46 to the *bambhī livi*. In reference to their use see page 462. It is however doubtful whether the use of the latter (on page 462) represents an example of the *māuyakkharā*.

^{172*} *tāni cā 'kārāḍini hakāraṃdatāni (°rāntāni) sakṣa kārāni jha-ḍa-tri-um-lam (!)*. (Leumann proposes to me to read *ri, ri, li* ; but what is the meaning of *jha* and *ḍa* (!) *ty eva (!)* *ity etadakṣarapaṃcakavarjitāni saṃbhāvyante*.—The letters meant are indeed *ṛi, ṛi, li, li, and ḷ*, see Weber's *Cat.* II, p. 408, n. 2—L.

¹⁷³ See Paul Steinthal, Specimen of the *Nāyadh.* p. 29 and Leumann, *Aupapāt.* p. 77, where especial notice is taken of the variant readings here.

^{174*} *Nāy.* has here *pāsayaṃ* and reverses the position of 12 and 13.—*The right name of the 12th *kalā* is no doubt *porekaccham-pauraṣkṛtyam*.—L.

¹⁷⁵ *Vilevaṇa Nāy.* with the addition of *vatthav*.

¹⁷⁶ *Nāy.* adds *gūtiyaṃ*.

¹⁷⁷ Instead of 23, 24 *Nāy.* has *hiraṇṇajuttim, suvaṇṇaj, cunṇaj*.

¹⁷⁸ Steinthal has *gaṇal°*.

cakkal.¹⁷⁹ 34, *chattal*. 35, *daṇḍal*. 36, *asil*. 37, *maṇil*. 38, *kāgaṇil*. 39, *cammal*.¹⁸⁰ 40, *caṇḍayal*. 41, *suracariyaṃ* 42, *rāhucariyaṃ* 43, *gahacariyaṃ*.¹⁸¹ 44, *sobhākaraṃ* 45, *dobhākaraṃ* 46, *vijjāgayaṃ* 47, *maṇṭag*. 48, *rahassag*. 49, *saṃbhāvaṃ* 50, *vāraṃ* (? *cāraṃ* BC) 51, *paḍivāraṃ* (*cāraṃ* BC).¹⁸² 52, *būhaṃ* 53, *paḍibūhaṃ* 54, *khaṇḍhāvāramāṇaṃ* 55, *nagaramāṇaṃ* 56, *vatthumāṇaṃ* 57, *khaṇḍhāvāranivesaṃ* 58, *nagaraṇivesaṃ* 59, *vatthunivesaṃ* 60, *isatthaṃ* 61, *charuppavāyaṃ* (*pagayaṃ* BC) 62, *āsasikkhaṃ* 63, *hatthisikkhaṃ* 64, *dhaṇuvedaṃ* 65, *hariṇavādaṃ* (*hiraṇṇavāyaṃ* BC) 66, *suvaṇṇavādaṃ* 67, *maṇipāgaṃ* 68, *dhāupāgaṃ* 69, *bāhujuddhaṃ* 70, *daṇḍaj*. 71, *muṭṭhij*. 72, *aṭṭhij*. 73, *juddhaṃ* 74, *nijuddhaṃ* 75, *juddhātijuddhaṃ* 76, *suttakheḍḍaṃ* 77, *nāliyaḥheḍḍaṃ* 78, *vaṭṭakheḍḍaṃ* 79, *dhammakheḍḍaṃ*.¹⁸³ 80, *camharevaṭṭaṃ* (! *pamhakheḍḍaṃ* BC) 81, *pattacheyyaṃ* 82, *kaḍaga* (*kaṇṇaga* BC) *cheyyaṃ* 83, *piṭṭagacheyyaṃ* 84, *sajīvaṃ* 85, *nijīvaṃ* 86, *saūṇaruyaṃ* 87, *iti*. Of these 87 names, 15 are to be removed, whether they are *pāṭhāntaras* (see on No. 80), or interpolations. For the v. r. from *Nāy*. see below ;—§ 81 *Vivāhapannattī* (in the fifth *aṅga*) *ekkā-sīṃ mahājummasayā* [284], (*mahāyugmaśatāni*) *paṃ* (*nattā*) ;—§ 84 *vivāhapannattī* *naṃ bhagavaṇe caūrāsīṃ payasahassā padaggeṇaṃ pannattā*. Later on in the course of our investigation we will recur to the fact that this statement in reference to the extent of the text is less by 100,000 *padas* than that of the present text. See § 85 and § 25 on the designation as *bhagavatī*, which has remained the exclusive property of this text.—§ 85 *āyārassa naṃ bhagavato sacūliyaḡgassa paṃcaśīṃ uddesaṇakālā* ;—§ 88 *diṭṭhivāyassa naṃ aṭṭhāsīṃ suttāṃ paṃ taṃ* ; *ujjusuyaṃ, pariṇayāpariṇayaṃ, evaṃ aṭṭhāsīṃ suttāṇi bhaṇiyavvāṇi, jahā 'Naṃdie*.' This reference to the *Nandī*, by which any further enumeration has been spared, is very remarkable from the fact that the statements in it, a few pages further on, are found in exactly the same detail in the fourth *aṅga* itself at this very point, in the consideration of the contents and extent of all the *aṅgas*. This being the case the reference ought to have followed the collective statement found several pages further on in the same *aṅga*. We are therefore compelled to believe that the *Nandī* is the original source of information for this presentation, common to *aṅga* 4 and the *Nandī*, and that this presentation was

179 *Nāy*. omits 33,34.

180 40-50 omitted in *Nāy*.

181 Are they to be regarded as planets or are they to be understood according to the fashion of the Ath. Paris. 53.54 ?

182 Instead of 51-57 there are in *Nāy*. the following 31 names ; *vatthuvijjaṃ, khaṇḍhāramāṇaṃ* 56, 53, 54, 51 (BC), 52 (BC) *cakkavūhaṃ* ; *garulavūhaṃ* ; *sagaḍavūhaṃ* ; 74-76, 73, 72, 70, *layājuddhaṃ* ; 61, 62, 65-67.77.79.78.81.82.85-87.

183 Omitted in BC, where we read instead *pāvāntare* (*pāṭhāntare*) *camha*,° by which *camha*° is manifestly designated as v. 1. to *pamha*.°

at a later period taken from the *Nandī* and inserted in *aṅga* 4 ; furthermore, this insertion must have occurred at a period succeeding that to which the above reference of the redactor belongs. Or have we merely to do with a later act of the scribes ? Were this the case, this act of theirs is at least very remarkable, if not unfortunately executed. There is, however, one difficulty in the way of the assumption that the *Nandī* is the ultimate source, viz. : there are all manner of differences between the treatment in the *Nandī* and that here, differences in which the *Nandī* does not always [285] contain the more ancient statements. See below. The fact that the table contents in N. is much shorter than that here makes, it is true, *eo ipso*, an impression of greater antiquity ; and N. offers in this table of contents many readings which are decidedly older and better.

We have now reached a point where we may discuss the *collective presentation* itself. It begins simply ; *duvālasaṅge gaṇipīḍage paṁ* (*natte*), *taṁ* : then follow the names of the 12 *aṅgas* and then the details in reference to contents, division and extent of each of the twelve. I insert here what I have collected from the statements in reference to division and extent, that the reader may obtain a general survey of the whole. I subjoin the v. r. from the *Nandī* (N) which, after what I have said above, may in the last instance claim priority over those of the *aṅga*.

1. *Āyāre*, 2 *suyakhaṁdhā*, 25 *ajjhayaṇā*, 85 *uddesaṇakālā*, 85 *samuddesaṇakālā*, 18 *payasahassāṁ* *payaggeṇaṁ*.

2. *Sūyagaḍe*, 2 *suyakh.* 23 *ajjh.*, 33 *udd.*, 33 *samudd.*, 36 *padasahassāṁ* (36,000) *padaggeṇaṁ*.

3. *Thāṇe*, 1 *suyakh.*, 10 *ajjh.*, 21 *udd.*, 21 *samudd.*, 72 *payasahassāṁ* (72,000) *payaggeṇaṁ*.

4. *Samavāe*, 1 *ajjh.*, 1 *suyakh.*, 1 *udd.*, 1 *samudd.*, *ege coyāle payasahasase* (144,000) ; *saya* is omitted in the incorrect Berlin MS. of N., but accord. to Leumann is in the N. Ed.) *pay.*

5. *Viyāhe*, 1 *suy.*, 100 *ajjh.* with a residue (!) *ege sāirege ajjhayaṇa-saye*, 10 *uddesagasahassāṁ*, 10 *samuddesagasahassāṁ*, 36 *vāgaraṇasahas-sāṁ*, 84 (!) *payasahassāṁ* (84,000) *payaggeṇaṁ* :—the latter statement is found also in § 84—see above page 284—N, however, has : *do lakkhā aṭṭhāsū* (288,000) *payasahassāṁ*, which corresponds to twice the former steady increase in 1-4.

6. [286] *Nāyādharmakahāu*, 2 *suyakh*, 19 (A N Edit., 29 BCN) *ajjh*.¹⁸⁴ 10 *dharmakahāṇaṃ vaggā* (this omitted in N), 19 (A N Ed., 29 BCN) *uddesaṇakālā*, 19 (A N Ed., 29 BN), *saṃkhejjāṃ payasayasahassāṃ* p. (*saya* omitted in N., also in Ed. ; 576,000 Schol.)—Between, 10 *dh. vaggā* and 19 (or 29) *udd*, we find inserted : in each *dharmakahā* 500 *akkhāyā*, in each *akkhāyā* 500 *uvakkhāyā*, in each *uvakkhāyā* 500 *akkhāyā-uvakkhāyā*, in all $3\frac{1}{2}$ *akkhāyakoḍḍio*.¹⁸⁵ In N this statement from *dasadharmakahāṇaṃ vaggā* (inclusive) on, is at an earlier place in the description of the contents.

7. *Uvāsagadasāo*, 1, *suyakh.*, 10 *ajjh.*, 10 *udd. kālā*, 10 *saṃuddā*, *saṃkhejjāṃ payasayasahassāṃ* p. (*saya* omitted in N, also in Ed. 1,152,000 Schol.)

8. *Arantaḍḍasāo*, 1 *suyakh.*, 10 *ajjh.* (N omits), 7 (8 N) *vaggā*, 10 (8 N) *uddā*, 10 (8 N) *saṃuddā*, *saṃkhejjāṃ payasayasahassāṃ* p. (*saya* omitted in N, also in Ed. ; 2,304,000 Schol.).

9. *Anuttarovavāyadasāo*, 1 *suyakh.*, 10 *ajjh.* (omitted in N Ed), 3 *vaggā*, 10 (3 N) *uddā*, 10 (3 N) *saṃuddā*, *saṃkhejjāṃ payasayasahassāṃ* p. (*saya* omitted in N, also in Ed. ; 4,608,000 Schol.).

10. *Paṇhāvāgaraṇāṇi*, 1 *suyakh.*, (45 *ajjh.* N), 45 *uddā*, 45 *saṃuddā*, *saṃkhejjāṇi payasayasahassāṇi* p. (*saya* omitted in N, also in Ed. ; 9,216,000 Schol.).¹⁸⁶

11. *Vivāyasue*, [2 *suyakh.* N], 20 *ajjh.*, 20 *uddā*, 20 *saṃuddā*, *saṃkhejjāṃ payasayasahassāṃ* p. (*saya* omitted in AN, also in Ed. ; 18,432,000 Schol.).¹⁸⁷

12. [287] *Diṭṭhivāe*, 1 *suyakh*, 14 *puvvaṃ*, *saṃkhejjā vatthū*, *saṃkhejjā cūla* (culla N) *vatthū*, *saṃkhejjā pāhuḍā*, s. *pāhuḍapāhuḍā*, *saṃkhejjāu pāhuḍiyāu*, *saṃkhejjāu pāhuḍiyapāhuḍiyāu saṃkhejjāṇi payasahasāṇi*.

The most remarkable feature of the above is the statement in reference to the number of the words of each *aṅga*. According to

¹⁸⁴ *egūnavisaṃ* A. N. Ed, *ekonaviṃśati*, Schol. (also on N), *egūnattisaṃ* BCN.

¹⁸⁵ Cf. my remarks on *aṅga* 6 in reference to this remarkable number. We are led to expect a much higher figure. N. Ed. has *kahāṇagako* accord. to Leumann instead of *akkhāyakoḍḍio*.

¹⁸⁶ *dvīnavatir lakṣāḥ ṣoḍaśasahasrādhikāḥ*.

¹⁸⁷ *ekā padakoṭṭis caturaśītir lakṣāḥ dvātriṃśac ca sahasrāṇi*.

Abhayadeva in the scholia,¹⁸⁸ the number of words in the case of *aṅgas* 1-4, increases continually by half till the eleventh *aṅga* is reached ; and the *Nandī* and an anonymous writer thereupon asserts the same with the modification that, instead of *aṅgas* 1-4, *aṅgas* 1-5 are said to show this increase. This view is however in direct opposition to the actual facts of the case, for *aṅgas* 7-11 are the least of all as regards their extent ; which is so very small that there can be no thought of 100,000¹⁸⁹ countable *padas*,¹⁹⁰ "countable" meaning here probably "those that need a special count", "numerous" or "innumerable". If we reckon on the average for each *padam* three *akṣaras*¹⁹¹ and for each *grantha* (*śloka* i.e. 32 *akṣa.*), twelve *padas*, the following is the result of a comparison of the number of these *granthas*, stated¹⁹² as in the MSS., with the above *pada* numbers [288].

1. <i>aṅga</i>	2,554	gr. i.e.	30,648	<i>padas</i>	instead of	18,000 p. ^{193*}
2	„	2,300	„	„	27,600	„ „ 36,000
3.	„	3,750	„	„	45,000	„ „ 72,000
4.	„	1,607	„	„	19,284	„ „ 144,000
5.	„	15,750	„	„	189,000	„ „ 84,000
					or	2,88,000N

188 Likewise also Nemicaṇḍra in the *Pravācaṇasāroddhāra* § 92 v. 726 : *paḍhamam āyāraṅgam atthārasasahassapayaparimāṇam/evam sesaṅgāṇa vi duguṇā duguṇappamāṇam/*

189 N at least has only "thousands."

190 Accord. to Leumann *saṅkhejja* signifies merely an indefinite number that is still to be counted, and not always a large number.

191 See *Bhagav.* 1,377. This is true in the case of the prose ; in verse we must reduce the number somewhat. The preliminary question is of course—What does the author understand by *pada* ? (Malayagiri in the *Nandī-ṭīkā* says p. 425 *yatrārtho-palabdhis tat padam.* L.) In this approximation of three *akṣaras* to a *pada* I have reckoned the single members of compounds as a single word, in so far as the compounds can lay claim to be considered as such.

192 See above, p. 250. The *grantha* enumeration is of secondary origin in comparison with the *pada* enumeration.

193* So also in *niśīthabhāṣya* *pedh.* 1 (taken from the *Ācāra-niry.*). It must, however, be noted that the above number (18,000) is referred to the first Śrutaskandha only. Malayagiri says (*Nandī-ṭīkā* p. 425 : *atra para āha yath' Ācāre dvau śrutaskandhau pañcaviṁśatir adhyayanāni padāgreṇa cāstādaśa pada-sahasrāṇi tarhi yad bhaṇitam nava bambhaceramāio atthārasa paya-sahassao veo iti tad virudhyate : atra hi nayabrahmacaryādhyayana-mātra evāstādaśa-padasahasra-promāṇa Ācāra ukto, 'smiṁs tv adhyayane dvau śrutaskandhau pañcaviṁśatir adhyayanāni etat samagrasya Ācārasya parimāṇam uktaṁ, astādaśa pada-sahasrāṇi punaḥ prathama-śrutaskandhasya nayabrahmacaryādhyayanasya, vicitrārtho-nibaddhāni hi sūtrāṇi bhavanti, ata eva caisām samyagarthāvogamo gurūpadeśato bhavati nānyathā, āha ca cūrn.-kṛt : do suyakhandhā paṇavisām ajjhayaṇāni, eyaṁ āyāragāsahiyassa (?) Āyārassa pamāṇam bhaṇiyam ; atthārasa paya-sahassā puṇa paḍhama-suyakhandhasa nava-*

6.	<i>aṅga</i>	5,375	gr. ¹⁹⁴	i.e.	64,500	<i>padas</i>	instead of 576,000
7.	„	812	„	„	9,744	„	„ [1,152,000]
8.	„	890	„	„	10,680	„	„ [2,304,000]
9.	„	192	„	„	2,304	„	„ [4,608,000]
10.	„	1,300	„	„	15,672	„	„ [9,216,000]
11.	„	1,316	„	„	15,792	„	„ [18,432,000]

In the case of *aṅgas* 1 and 5, the numbers above given are less in the case of all the others, greater than the actual state of the case. In a majority of cases the difference is simply ridiculous. The statement in reference to *aṅga* 5 (84,000)¹⁹⁵ is not in harmony with the increase in 1-4 i.e. twice the number of the previous. We should expect that *aṅga* 5 should have preserved the same ratio, as is the case in N. This statement is in direct contradiction to those statements which are found in the MSS. of *aṅga* 5 ; according to which its extent is not 84,000 (and not 288,000 as is stated in N) but 184,000 *padas* (*Bhag.* 1,377), which corresponds well enough to its actual extent : 15,750 gr. = 189,000 *padas*. The peculiar nature of our statement in reference [289] to 84,000 *padas* is, finally, rendered more apparent by the fact that it is found in § 84 of the first part of our *aṅga*, on the strength of which it has again found a place here.¹⁹⁶ In that § it is so free from suspicion that I consider it correct for that period and find in this very circumstance a critical criterion or testimony that, at that time, the fifth *aṅga* had not yet reached its present extent.

As peculiar as the statements in reference to numbers of *padas* are those concerning the “3½ koṭi” i.e. 35 millions, in *aṅga* 6. That all this is perfect nonsense, is perfectly apparent. See below. Finally there are several differences of a very surprising nature in the other

bambhaceramayassa pamāṇam, vicitta-attha-nibaddhāni ya suttāni, guruvaesao esīm attho jāṇiyavvo tti. This view of the *Cūrṇikṛt* (translated by Malayagiri into Sanskrit) seems to be all the more right as the Digambaras ascribe also 18,000 *padas* to the *Ācāra* without acknowledging any second *Śrutaskandha*, see Prof. Peterson's Second Report, p. 134.—L.

¹⁹⁴ Another statement 5,500 gr., or 4,155 gr.

¹⁹⁵ Or *sarva-mīlanena* 1841 (v. 1. 1894) *granthas* !

¹⁹⁶ So also Abhayadeva, who shows that he is evidently embarrassed in his statement : *caturāṣṭipadasahasrāṇi padāgreṇe 'ti samavāyāpekṣayā* (“in reference to § 84”) *dvigūṇatayā (tāyā ?) iti (?) nāśrayanāt (?)*, *anyāthā tad dvigūṇatve dve taksde aṣṭāṣṭiḥ sahasrāṇi ca bhavaṃti.* In the following *aṅga* he states the number of *padas* to be 576000 i.e. twice that of those in *aṅga* 5, according to his computation.

statements which are not so readily set aside as incorrect or impossible, differences which exist partly in these statements themselves, partly in their relation to the actual facts. First, the difference to the number of *ajjhayanāṣas* in *aṅga* 6, according to A and Abhayad, there are 19 and such is the actual state of the case—but according to BCN^{197*} there are 29. Then as regards *aṅga* 8 the 10 *ajjh.* are wanting in N.¹⁹⁸ The number of the *vaggas* (7), of the *udd.* (10) and of the *samudd.* (10) is in N everywhere 8; likewise as regards *aṅga* 9 N has the number 3 as in the case of the *vaggas*, and in that of the *udd.* and *samudd.*; in the case of *aṅga* 10 N adds 45 *ajjh.* and in that of *aṅga* 11 likewise 2 *suyakh.* In reference then [290] to the actual facts, we must make the preliminary observation that the division into *uddesagas* in the case of *aṅgas* 8-11, and that into *samuddesagas* in general in all the *aṅgas*, is not denoted in the MS.^{199*} The other differences refer chiefly to the fifth *aṅgam* which has no division into *ajjhayanāṣas*; in that *aṅga* they are called *saya* (*śata*), and their number is not 100 but 41 or, including the sub-*sayas*, 138; likewise the existing text has only 1925 (not 10,000) *uddesagas*. A special demarcation of *vāgarāṇa* sections is unknown.²⁰⁰ What can possibly be the meaning of 36,000 *vāgarāṇas* and only 84,000 *padas*! (cf. *Bhag.* 1,376). The differences in reference to *aṅgas* 8-11 are not less remarkable. As regards the *vaggas* (8), *aṅga* 8 agrees with N. but has, not 10 (cf. *aṅga* 3,10), but 93 *ajjh.*;—*aṅga* 9 has likewise not 10 (cf. again *aṅga* 3,10), but 33 *ajjh.*; *aṅga* 10 has ten *dāras* cf. the ten *ajjh.* in *aṅga* 3,10 whereas we have here no information about *dāras* or *ajjh.*, and N, on the other hand, speaks of 45 *ajjh.*—*aṅga* 11 has in agreement with N the 2 *suyakh*, which are not mentioned in the source of information before us. In the case of *aṅga* 12 there is no possibility of comparing the statements in question with the text, since there is no longer any such extant.—See below.²⁰¹

197* According to Leumann N Ed. has 19 and not 29—Here again, as with *aṅga* 1, only the first *Śrutaskandha* is intended by the assertion of there being 19 *ajjhayanāṣas* and not 29. In the same way only Part I. of *aṅga* 11 has been known to the author of *aṅga* 3, 10 as has been shown above on page. 270.—L.

198 According to Leumann this is not so in N Ed.

199* This statement requires some modification: see the closing words of *aṅgas* 8-10 in Weber's Cat. II., 502 (8). 507(9) 520(10: *dasasu ceva divasesu uddisijjanti.....*); *aṅga* 11 has in the place a reference to *aṅga* 1 (see *ibid.* 534) which, however, has the same bearing.—L.

200 This demarcation, or the number 35,000 representing it, is also found in the table of contents of *aṅga* 5 preceding the statements in reference to the extent.

201 I will note here merely the fact that in the section in reference to the twelfth *aṅga*, Bhaddabāhu is mentioned by name, whom tradition proclaims to be the last teacher of this *aṅgam* or of the fourteen *pūrvas*; see above, p. 214. It is furthermore stated that therein was contained a section in reference to Bhaddabāhu and to his history.

The question now arises how are these differences to find a fitting solution ? It is self-evident, that, so far as the extraordinary character [291] both of our information in regard to the number of *padas*, and of the *akkhāias* in *aṅga* 6 is concerned, they are a fabrication of the author ; nor is it improbable that a similar explanation may hold good in the case of the special differences of detail. The carefulness of statement which we notice here, renders it, on the other hand, possible that the author has based his statements on those of his authorities, and that we have to deal with genuine discrepancies between two different texts. Abhayadeva declares here that he is unable to explain the contradiction²⁰² in the case of *aṅgas* 8 and 9 and in the case of *aṅga* 10 all that he does is to admit the existence of the conflict.²⁰³ But in his commentary on *aṅga* 10 he adduces (1) a further case of divergence—an introduction at variance with the general character of the introductions in that it allots to the *aṅga* two *suyakkhamdhas*, and (2) refers especially to the conflict between the *pūrvācāryāḥ* and the *aidamyugīnāḥ*. See below. Of primal importance for *aṅgas* 8 to 10 (11) is the fact that the statements in *aṅga* 3,10 too render it [292] probable that these *aṅgas* had then a text different from our own. The irreconcilability of title and contents show that in the case of *aṅga* 10 something must have occurred to cause the present condition of affairs.

As we have seen that there are important differences between the statements made here or in N. and the actual state of things in the eleven *aṅgas*, so far as extent and division are concerned, we now discover that the same holds good as regards the statements now under examination, concerning the contents. These statements, which in N are much more brief than those in *aṅga* 4, are, it must be said, of so general a character and so colourless that their real contents can only be discovered with difficulty. They appear in a form that is purely stereotyped (see the common introduction in *aṅgas* 2-5,²⁰⁴ and in 6-9 and 11,²⁰⁵) whereas there is no such similarity of contents between

202 On 8 : *daśa ajjayāṇa tti prathamavargāpekṣayai'va ghatate, Nāṃdyā tathai 'va vyākhyātātvaṭ* (see below) ; *yathe (yac ce) 'ha pathyate satta vaggā tī tat prathamavargād anyavargāpekṣayā yato' tra sarve 'pyaṣṭa vargā Nāṃdvām api tathā paṭhitāḥ ;...sarvāṇi (adhyayanāṇi) ca'kavargagatāṇi yugapad uddiṣyāṃte, ato ('tra) bhaṇitāḥ ; attha uddiṣyāṇi ity ādi, iha ca daśo 'ddesanakālā adhiyāṃta itī nā syā 'bhiprāyaṃ adhigacchāmaḥ ;—and on 9 : iha 'dhyayanasaṃmūho vargo daśa 'dhyayanāṇi, vargaś ca yugapad evo 'padiṣyate, ity atas traya evo 'ddesanakālā bhavāṃti evam eva ca Nāṃdvā adhiyate, iha tu diṣyate : daśe 'ty, atrā 'bhiprāyo na jñāyate.*

203 *Yady api 'ha adhyayanāṇāṃ daśatvād daśai 'vo 'ddesanakālā bhavāṃti, tathā'pi vācanāntarāpekṣayā* (cf. N) *pañcavatvārtiṇśad itī saṃbhāvyāṃte itī paṇayālīsam ity ādi aviruddham (!).*

204 *Samaya, loya, jīva.*

205 *Nayarāṃ* etc. N limits herein its treatment of the subject entirely to this common introduction and gives nothing else in addition.

each of the single members of these two groups ; and the statements in question are not in exact accordance with the contents of any single one. This latter remark holds good in the case of the special statements in reference to the contents of *aṅga* 10, to which we do not find any such stereotyped introduction. These special statements suit the name of the *aṅga*, but not its present contents. It is of great significance that the statements in *aṅga* 3, 10 (see above, p. 272) are essentially in accordance with these now under discussion. This agreement [293] makes it extremely probable that the contents of the tenth *aṅgam*, as it then existed, was in harmony with these statements.

To the detailed consideration of the 12 *aṅgas* there is appended here, as in the *Nandī*, a passage on the entire *duvālasaṅgam gaṇipīḍagam*. This deals partly with the attacks, which it was subjected to in the past,²⁰⁶ which it now experiences in the present and will experience in the future, partly with the devoted acquiescence which is its lot to meet with in these three periods and concludes with the declaration of its certain existence for ever : *na kayāi na āsi, na kayāi na'tthi, na kayāi na bhavissati*.

The concluding portion of the fourth *aṅga* consists of frequent reference to the legendary hagiology and history of the Jains, genealogical enumerations (and others of different content) of parents, wives, etc. of the Kulakaras, 24 Tīthakaras, 12 Cakkavaṭṭis 9 Baladevas, 9 Dasāras, 9 Vāsudevas, partly in metrical form (*śloka* and *āryā*). Towards the end there is a transition to prophecy (construction in the future). Our information here varies in part very materially from that contained in Hem. 26 fg. 691 fg. and is not preserved in the MSS. with any great consistency. Hence it appears that our knowledge is not complete, but is derived from accounts of a partial nature which is in need of additional supplementary testimony. Some of the MSS. afford at one time generous information and at another limited data.

The survey of contents of *aṅga* 4, contained in the detailed account of the *aṅgas*, runs as follows : *se kiṃ taṃ samavāe ? samavāe naṃ sasamayā sūijjanti* [294] *parasamayā s. jāva logāloge sūijjanti*²⁰⁷ ; *samavāeṇaṃ egādiyāṇaṃ egatthāṇaṃ eguttariyaparivaḍḍhiya*²⁰⁸ (*duvālasaṃ-*

²⁰⁶ According to Abh., attacks at the hands of Jamāli, Goṣṭhāmāhila, etc., i.e. the representatives of the seven schisms.

²⁰⁷ N. has instead of *sūijjanti* everywhere *samāsijjanti* and, as in the case of 3, the order *jīvā., loe..., sasamae.*

²⁰⁸ *parivuḍḍhiya A.*

*gassa ya gaṇipīḍagassa pallavagge samanugājjai*²⁰⁹ *ṭhāṇagasayassa*²¹⁰ *barasavihavittharassa*²¹¹ *suyanāṇassa jagajivahiya*²¹² *bhagavato samāseṇaṃ samāyāre*²¹³ *āhijjai* ; *tattha ya nāṇāvihappagārā jivājivā ya vāṇiyā*²¹⁴ *vitthareṇaṃ, avare vi ya bahuvihā visesā naraya-tiriya*²¹⁵ *maṇuyasuragaṇā-ṇaṃ āhār'-ussāśa-lesa-āvāsa-saṃkhā-āyaya-ppamāṇa-uvavāya-cayaṇa ogā-hāṇ'-ohi*²¹⁶ *veyaṇāvihāṇa-uvaoga*²¹⁷ *joga-imdiya-kasāya*^{218*} *vivihā ya jivajoni vikkhambh'-ussehapari-rayappamāṇaṃ vidhivisesā*²¹⁹ *ya, Maṇḍarādīṇaṃ mahidharāṇaṃ, kulagara-titthagara-gaṇaharāṇaṃ samatta Bharahāhivāṇaṃ*²²⁰ *cakkiṇa ceva cakkahara-halaharāṇa ya, vāsūṇa*²²¹ *ya niggamā*²²² *saṃīe, ete anṇe ya evaṃ-āi ettha*²²³ *vitthareṇaṃ atthā samāsejjaṃti*.²²⁴

The commentary is by Abhayadevā.

V. The fifth *aṅga*, *viyāha* or *vivāha* (or *°pannatti*²²⁵) with the epithet *bhagavatī*, and lastly also [295] merely *bhagavatī* (Hem v. 243) ; in 41 *sayas*, *śata*²²⁶, of which some are divided into sub-divisions of the same name²²⁷, and both into *uddesagas*. The number of the latter cannot be discovered from the MSS. themselves, because the latter books (33-41) contain for the most part nothing but stereotyped descriptions, in reproducing which the greatest freedom has been taken.

²⁰⁹ *pallavā avayavās, tatparimāṇaṃ samanugīyate pratipādyate.*

²¹⁰ N is much better : *samāyāre ṇaṃ egāi-egūttariya thāṇasaya-vivaḍḍhiyāṇaṃ bhāvāṇaṃ purūvaṇā, āghavijjati : duvālasaṃgassa ga° gassa pallavagge samāsiḍḍjai*, N omits all the following. As the words *duvā°gājjai* interrupt in *aṅga* 4 the connection, I have enclosed them in brackets.

²¹¹ *bārassa A.*

²¹² *jiviyassa hi A.*

²¹³ *°yārī A.*

²¹⁴ *vinīyā A ; varṇitāḥ.*

²¹⁵ *naragatariya A.*

²¹⁶ *uggāhinoyahi A ; avagāhanā, avadhi.*

²¹⁷ *uvaūga A. B. C.*

^{218*} *kasāyā A. B. C. ; prathamā...lopaḥ.*—So *upāṅga* 1, 163 presents *Āraṇa—Accūyā-tiṇṇi ya* (see p. 88, note 6 of my ed. of the text).—L.

²¹⁹ *viddhasesa A.*

²²⁰ *samasta Bharatādhipāṇaṃ.*

²²¹ *varṣāṇaṃ Bharatādikṣetrāṇaṃ.*

²²² *°gamā ya BC.*

²²³ *ādi °ttha A.*

²²⁴ So A, *samāhijjaṃti BC samāśriyante athavā, samāsyāṃte.*

²²⁵ Accord. to Abhayadeva and Malayagiri (Schol. on *up.* 4) *vyākhyāprajñapti* (cf. Hem. Schol. p. 319) : or *vivāha°* or *vivādha°* (cf. Wilson Sel. W. 1, 281), s. *Bhagav.* 1, 371-72 See *ibid.* p. 368n. and below on *upāṅgas* 5 foll., in reference to the name *prajñapti* and the conclusions to be derived therefrom.

²²⁶ The reason for the name is as yet involved in obscurity.

²²⁷ *avāntarasaya* in *Vidhiprapā.*

Some *uddesagas* are indicated merely by catch-words. According to the usual general survey of extent and division of the work at the end of the MSS. there are in all 138 *sayas*, including all the sub-*sayas*, 1925 *uddesagas*, 184,000 *padas*; and these statements, especially those in reference to the number of words, are in exact agreement with the actual state of affairs, (see *Bhag.* 1,376), and agree so far as the number of the *uddesagas* is concerned, with the specific statements on this head in the *Vidhiprapā* (V), excepting in the case of an insignificant variation (there are only 1,923 *udd.* see p. 296n). In reference to the great difference especially as regards the extent 184,000 *padas* as opposed to the statements of *aṅga* 4 and of the *Nandī* the reader is referred to p. 288. Besides, in its general survey of the extent of the *aṅgas*, the fourth *aṅga* has in § 84, where there is no occasion for suspecting its truth, the same statement that the *vivāhapannattī bhagavatī* had 84,000 *padas*. This statement was transferred from there to the later general survey (see page 289), although it does not belong there. I do not scruple, therefore, for this very reason to regard it as [296] correct. It would then have to be relegated to a period in which the fifth *aṅgam* had not yet attained the half of its present extent. Cf. on this point the statements in *aṅga* 3,10 in reference to the *vivāhacūliya* as *ajjh.* 5 of the last of the ten *dasā* texts there cited. See above, p. 274. The *vivāhacū.* is also mentioned in a previous passage in the *Nandī* among the *aṅgaṇapaviṭṭha* texts (*bhagavatīcūlikā*, Schol.). On the other hand, it is noteworthy that *aṅga* 4 in § 81, that is to say just before the mention of the 84,000 *padas* of the *bhagavatī*, refers expressly to its 81 *mahājummas* (see above page 283); and consequently there is herein a direct reference to its latter books. But these very latter books give one at first glance the impression of containing secondary additions.

That *aṅga* 5 grew only gradually to its present extent of 15,750 *grāṁthāgra* or 184,000 *padas*, is proved by a glance at the different proportions of the single books—[1-8, 12-14, 18-20 with 10 *udd.* each, 9,10 with 34 *udd.* each, 11 with 12 *udd.*; 15 without *udd.*;²²⁸ 16 with 14, 17 with 17 *udd.*, but 21 with 80,²²⁹ 22 with 60,²³⁰ 23 with 50,²³¹ 24 with 24, 26-30 with only 11 each, 25 with 12, but 31, 32 with 28 each, 33, 34²³² with 124 each, 35-39 with [297] 132, 40 with 231, 41 with 196 *udd.*] Their contents too prove the gradual extension of *aṅga* 5.

²²⁸ *Gosālasayam egasaram* V.

²²⁹ With 8 *vagga* each with 10 *udd.* V.

²³⁰ With 6 *vagga* each with 10 *udd.*

²³¹ With 5 *vagga* each with 10 *udd.* V.

²³² 33 and 39 with 12 *avāntarasayas* (of which 8 with 11 each, 4 with 9 *udd.* each)

The first 20 books, which are the substructure of all, are clothed in a legendary form, and contain in irregular order, and without any recognizable connecting thread, the most varied legends in reference to the activity and teachings of Mahāvīra; his conversations²³³ with his first scholar Īmdabhūti (Goyama) at the time of king Seṇia of Rājagṛha being made of special importance. In *sayas* 21 ff. there are no such legends, and each *sayam* has not only a harmonious contents, but many of the *sayas* are connected together as groups, 21-23 treat of plants, 24-30 of the different conditions of living creatures (*jīva*), 24 of their origin, 25 of their *leśyādayo bhāvāḥ*, 26²³⁴ of their *karmabandha*, 27 of their *karmakaraṇa* [298] *kriyā*, 28 of their *pāpakarmādidaṇḍakanavaka*, 29 of their *karmaprasthāpanādi*, 30 of the 4 *samavasaraṇa* (see above, p. 264); 31-41, finally, in a most peculiar fashion of their state during the four *jummas* (*yugma-yuga*): *kaḍa*, *teoga*, *dāvāra*, *kaliyoga*. The make-up of these latter books, is, as I have already said, purely formal, and is almost similar to a mere table of statistics.

Since this is the case it appears to me a matter of tolerable certainty that *sayas* 21 ff. were added at a later period to *sayas* 1-20. It is perfectly clear that we have here to deal with a chance co-ordination of elements. On the other hand, this fact serves to lend a kind of authenticity to the single constituent parts and especially to those of a legendary colouring. After the most naïve fashion the discordant parts have been brought into conjunction without any attempt at change. That there was, however, a guiding hand in this conjunction is evident from two reasons: (1) Since an introductory verse in *āryā* precedes each *sayā* (only up to No. 26 is this true); which verse briefly

35-39 with 12 *avāntaras*, with 11 *udd.* each, 40 with 21 *av.* with 11 *u.* each; *evaṃ mahājummasayāni* (i. e. 35-40) 81, *evaṃ savvaggenāṃ sayā* 138, *savvaggenāṃ uddesā* 1923, V., to which a *yantrakam* i. e. a tabular enumeration of the *uddesas* and days belonging to each *sayas*, is appended.

233 The question 9,34, *purise naṃ bhaṃte purisaṃ haṇamāne kiṃ purisaṃ haṇati*? -- is an interesting parallel to *Bhagavadg.* 2,19; *Kaṭh.* Up. 1, 2 18, 19.

234 In V. and even in the MSS. of the *Bhag.* the foll. names are found for books 26-41: 26 *bandhisae*, 27 *karisuga* (or *karisuga*) *sae*, 28 *kamma-samajjīṇasae*, 29 *kammapaṭṭhavanāsae*, 30 *samavasaraṇasae*, 31 *uvavāyasae*, 32 *uvvaṭṭanāsae*, 33 *egimḍiyajummasayāni*, 34 *seḍḍhisayāni*, 35 *egimḍiyamahājummasayāni*, 36 *beimḍiyamahāj*, 37 *teimḍ*, 38 *caurimḍ*, 39 *asannipamcimḍ*, 40 *sannipamcimḍ*, 41 *rāsī-jummasae*. The fact that "*abhihāṇāni*" are expressly mentioned for these 16 *sayas* alone (*Jogavih* v. 37), gives them at the very start a separate place. See the remarks on book 15. Note also that, from book 26 on, the introductory *kārikās* no longer appear (book 26 has, it is true, one such) and that one of the MSS. of the text which I have before me, has before book 26 (but also before book 17) a special greeting, *namo suyadevayāe bhagavati*. This refers to a new section. If Leumann is correct we are to attribute no importance to the absence of the *kārikā* in the case of books 27 and foll., since the *kārikā* that precedes book 26 holds good in the case of the following books, which have the same arrangement as book 26.

marks the contents of each of the *udd.* of the *saya* by means of catch-words (titles). This occurs here for the first time, since it is found in no former *aṅga*; but from this time on recurs with considerable frequency. The (2) second indication occurs for the first time especially in this *aṅga*, and remains henceforth regularly. It consists in the frequent reference to other texts as parts of the *Siddhānta*, which often completely interrupts and destroys the context. There are also frequent references to those texts, which belong to the *upāṅga* group, e.g. *Rāyapaseṇaijjaṃ* [299] *Pannavanā*, *Jambuddivapannatti*, see *Bhag.* 1, 382ⁿ. It must however remain an open question whether in each single instance we have to deal with the work of a redactor or with the convenience of the scribe see *supra*, pp. 228-232. We must leave in doubt whether some of these citations are really to be found in the work from which it quotes, at least in its extant form. The passage cited from the *Rājaprasānīyam* by Jacobi, *Kalpasūtra*, p. 107 is found, according to Leumann, in the Edit. p. 185 fg.

The introduction consists of three parts. The actual beginning consists in the so-called *paṃcanamaskāra*, a benediction which from this point on recurs frequently : ²³⁵ *namo arihaṃtāṇaṃ, namo siddhāṇaṃ, namo āyariyāṇaṃ, namo uvajjhāyāṇaṃ, namo loe savvasāhūṇaṃ* or here with the addition *namo bambhīe livīe* (see *supra*, p. 220). Next follows the introductory *kārikā* of the first *saya* and then, after the insertion of *namo sayassa*, the customary beginning of legends : *teṇaṃ kāleṇaṃ teṇaṃ samaeṇaṃ Rāyagihe nāmaṃ nayare hotthā, Seṇie, rāyā, Cillaṇā devī, samaṇe bhagavaṃ Mahāvīre*

Of the legends which are adduced here, those claim a special interest which deal with predecessors or contemporaries of Mahāvīra, with the opinions of his heterodox opponents, *annaūtthiyas*²³⁶ or *ājiviyas*, and with their conversion. Apart from these are named the men, who have patronymic epithet [300] *Pāsāvacchijja* (*Pārśvāpatyīya*) attached to their names.²³⁷ Herein the name of Pārśva, the immediate predecessor of Mahāvīra can be recognised ; so, for example, in 1, 9 *Kālāsa-Vesiyaputte* (cf. *Bhagav.* 2,183 fg. Jacobi, *ante*, Vol. IX. p. 160), is styled a *Pāsāvacchijja*, and in 2, 5 there are four of this name : *Kāliyaputta*, *Mehila*, *Ānaṃdarakkhiya* and *Kāsava*, in 5,9 *Pājjā therā*

²³⁵ See *up.* 4, *Kalpasūtra*, p. 83.

²³⁶ Abh. explains this by *anyayūthika* ; Haribhadra gives, however, the preferable explanation *anyatīrthika*, cf. *prākṛ. tūha-tīrtha*, *Ind. Stud.* xvi. p. 46. See Leumann's glossary to *Aupapāt.* s. v. *annaūtthiya*.

²³⁷ See above, p. 266 from *aṅga* 2,2,7.

bhagavanto, in 9, 32 *Pañje Gaṅḡee*. *Pāsa* himself never appears here²³⁸ though the conversion of his adherents to the doctrines of Mahāvīra is often alluded to.²³⁹ The *Vesālī-sāvaya*s too and their adherents appear as his older contemporaries; this is the case in 2,1 *Piṅgalae Vesālī-sāvae* (s. *Bhagav.* 1, 440. 2, 184, 197, 249). 12, 2. See above, p. 262, 263 in reference to *Vesālīa* as a designation of Mahāvīra himself. The following are additional names: *Niyamthīputta* 5, 8, *Samkha-ppa-mokkhā samaṇovāsagā* 12, 1, *Pokkhalī*, *ibid.*, *Gaddabhālī* 2, 1, *Dhammaghosa* 11, 11, *Sumaṅgala* 15, 5, etc.

Irṇḍabhūti appears as the “oldest” scholar of Mahāvīra, *Aggibhūti* as the “second”, *Vāyubhūti*²⁴⁰ as the “third”. Some of the usual names of the scholars of Mahāvīra are not mentioned at all—especially that of *Sudharman*; and of those that are referred to *Moriyaputta* appears in an unusual connexion, viz as a predecessor [301] of Mahāvīra (3, 1),²⁴¹ while *Maṇḍiyaputta* is here too designated as his scholar (3,3.) Besides him there are other scholars whose names are not found in the later usual list of Vīra’s scholars; e. g. *Roha* 1, 6, *Khaṇḍaya*, *Kac-cāyaṇa*, 2, 1, *Kurudattaputta* and *Tīsaya* 3, 1, *Nārayaputta* 5, 8, *Sāmahatthi* 10, 4, *Ānanda* and *Sunakkhatta* 15, *Māgaṇḍiyaputta* 18, 3; see *Bhagav.* 2, 195. We find in 9, 33 the history of his opponent *Jamālī* and in book 15²⁴² that of his ‘shade of a scholar’ (*śiṣyābhāṣa*) *Gosāla Maṁkhaliputta* related in great detail. There are here and there a few statements of an historical colouring so e.g. the incidental mention (7, 9) of a victory of *Vajji Videhaputta* (cf. *up.* 8) over nine *Malaī-Mallaī Mallakī* and nine *Lecchai* (*Lecchaki* = *Licchavi*) kings of *Kāśī-Kosala* at the time of king *Koṇia*, *Kūṇia* of *Cāmpā*, or of Mahāvīra

²³⁸ In *up.* 10,11 he appears in person as a teacher; and even till the present day he has received honours as such. The *uvasaggaharastotram*, assigned to *Bhadrabāhu*, is dedicated to him, see *Jacobi*, l. c. p. 12,13, and my remarks on *upāṅg.* 2 below.

²³⁹ Conversion from the *cāujjāma dhamma* to the *pañca mahavvayāim* see *Bhagav.* 2, 185; *Jacobi*, ante, Vol. IX. p. 160.

²⁴⁰ These three names in *bhūti* are probably *nakṣatra* names; see *Ind. Stud.* 4, 380, 81,3,130; *Nakṣa.* 2,320.

²⁴¹ See *Bhag.* 1,440 in reference to chronological conclusions to be drawn from this name.

²⁴² *Gosāla’s anekadhā janma maraṇaṁ ca*; according to the *Vidhiprapā* this book had another title *Gosālayasaye teyanisaggāvaranāmaye anunnāe*. This name, which appears in the MSS. of *Bhag.* at the very close of the book, occurs (see page 224) as that of a text designed for the eighteenth year of study whereas *aṅga* is designed for the tenth year. Since this book, not like the others, is *egāsara*, i. e. not divided into *uddesagās*, it may be assumed that it is an independent text, which at a later period found a resting place here. *Leumann* thinks that he can discover in the *Bhag.* several other of the texts mentioned, p. 224; e. g. the *āṣivisabhāvaṇā* in 8,2,1 (cf. *aṅga* 3,4,4), the *cāraṇabhāvaṇā* in 20,9, the *mahāsum-ṇabhāvaṇā* in 16,6.

himself ; the history (12, 2) of Jayantī (aunt of the Kośāmbī king Udāyaṇa, son of Sayāṇiya (Śatānīka) grandson of Sahassāṇiya) who was the patron of the Vesālīsāvayas, and who, after hearing the sermon of Mahāvīra, became a bhikkhuṇī.

All these legends, [302] the number of which will be materially increased by a special investigation of the contents give us the impression of containing traditions which have been handed down in good faith. They offer, therefore, in all probability (especially as they frequently agree with the Buddhistic legends) most important evidence for the period of the life of Mahāvīra himself.

Among those statements which may be adduced as witnesses for the first composition of the existing form of the text, an enumeration of foreign peoples asserts the chief place. The names of these peoples recur frequently in some customary form in the remaining texts of the *Siddhānta*, though accompanied by numerous variations of detail.²⁴³ In 9, 33, 12, 2 there are enumerated the foreign female slaves and waiting maids in the house of a rich *māhaṇa* (*brāhmaṇa*) ; consequently the names are all feminine : *bahūhiṃ khujjāhiṃ Cilātiyāhiṃ*²⁴⁴ *vāmaṇiyāhiṃ*²⁴⁵ *vaḍahiyāhiṃ*²⁴⁶ *Babbariyāhiṃ*²⁴⁷ *Isigaṇiyāhiṃ Vāsagaṇiyāhiṃ*²⁴⁸ *Palhaviyāhiṃ Hlāsiyāhiṃ Lāusiyaṇiṃ Ārabhiṃ Damilāhiṃ Simhalihiṃ Pulimḍhiṃ Pukkalīhiṃ*²⁴⁹ *Bahalīhiṃ Muraṇḍhiṃ* (*Maruṇḍ°* Abh.) *Samvarīhiṃ* (*Sav°* Abh.) *Pārasīhiṃ nānādesivīdesa paripimḍiyāhiṃ*. Of these names *Palhaviyā*, [303] *Ārabī*, *Bahalī*, *Muraṇḍī*, and *Pārasī* are of special interest, since they deal with a period from the second till the fourth century A. D., the age of the Parthian Arsacids and the Persian Sassanids ; cf. on Pahlavas (Parthians), Noldeke's remarks in my *History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 338 ; on Muraṇḍa, *Ind. Stud.* XV. 280, on Bāhlī, Bactria, *Monatsberichte der Konigl. Akad. der Wiss.* 1879, p. 462. The Maruṇḍas especially appear together with the Śakas

²⁴³ I do not propose here to enter into a detailed discussion of these variations ; see *aṅga* 6.1, 117 (Steinthal, p. 28) *up.* 1, 55 (Leumann, p. 60) etc. Besides this enumeration, there is another which occurs only in those texts which are characterized as younger from the fact that they contain this second enumeration. I refer to that of the *Mlecchas*, in which some fifty (not sixteen) names are quoted ; see *aṅga* 10, *up.* 4.

²⁴⁴ *Cilātadeśotpanna* Abh. cf. *Kirāta*.

²⁴⁵ *Hrasvaśarīrābhiḥ* Abh.

²⁴⁶ *Vaḍabhiyāhiṃ maḍahakoṣṭhābhiḥ* Abh. (*vakrādhakoṣṭhābhiḥ* Schol. on *up.* 1).

²⁴⁷ Abh. adds *Vaūsiyāhiṃ*.

²⁴⁸ *Vārugaṇiyāhiṃ* Abh. who adds *Joṇiyāhiṃ* after this name.

²⁴⁹ *Pakka°* Abh.

and the Sāhān Shāhi on the inscriptions of Samudragupta as tributary to him, the tribute consisting, among other things, of girls (Lassen, 2, 952). The mention of the Ārabas²⁵⁰ can be explained by reference (cf. p. 237) to the flourishing state of trade with Arabia at this period. The name of a grain ālisāmdaga, in 21, 21, points to commercial intercourse at this date, since it may be explained, as I think, as signifying "coming from Alexandria" or "proceeding from A."²⁵¹ It is not explained by the commentary. Alexandria, or the Persian ports Apologos and Omana, carried on a brisk trade with India in *παρθενσι ευελδεῖς* as we learn from the *Periplus* (cf. Lassen, 2, 557, 957, 1159). Another point confirmative of this fact (see introduction to my translation of the *Mālav.* p. 47) is that *Yavanī* girls appear in Kālidāsa in the immediate surrounding of the king. Here then we have direct evidence on the part of the Indian tradition. The great frequency of the appearance of foreign female slaves as waiting-maids and as nurses, which is regarded as customary [304] in the Jain texts, is very surprising, and may be regarded as a proof of national pride, called into existence by a few victories over some foreign people, which can be ascertained only with difficulty. This national pride permitted these foreigners to appear in these menial capacities alone. In the inscriptions of Samudragupta we find immediate confirmation of this conjecture, as has been remarked above. The origin of these customary lists takes us as back to the period of the Guptas.

Besides the above-mentioned list of foreign peoples there is in 15, 17 an enumeration of native races. It contains 16 names :—Aṅga, Vaṅga, Magaha, Malaya, Mālavaya, Accha, Vaccha, Koccha (ttha ?), Paḍha, Lādha, Vajjī, Mālī, Kosī, Kosala, Avāha, Subhattara. This list has the stamp of considerable antiquity, especially if we compare it with the similar one, *up.* 4.

The mention of the planets, the absence of any allusion to the zodiac. (*Bhag.* 1, 44 ; 2, 228) and the statements in reference to the Brahmanical literature existing at the period²⁵² (*ibid.* 2, 246, 7) are in harmony with the date which we have assumed above. See above pages 236, 238.

[to be continued]

²⁵⁰ In *Brāhman* texts they occur only in the list of peoples in Varāhamihira 14,17.

²⁵¹ I would mention incidentally that in 22. 11 *pīlu* is mentioned among the names of trees and in 23, 1 *śīngavera* cinnamon among the spices.

²⁵² *riuveda-jajuveda-sāmaveda-athavyana-veda-itihāsa pañcamāṇam nighaṁtucchatthā-
ṇam cāinham vedāṇam saṁgovāṅgāṇam sarahassāṇam sārāe vārāe dhārāe pārāe,
saḍamgavi, saṭṭhitamavisārae, samkḥāne, sikkhā-kappe vāyaraṇe chaṁḍe nirutte
jotisān-ayāṇe, annesu ya vahūsu vāmbhannaesu parivāyāesu nāyesu supari-niṭṭhie.*

History of Kharatargaccha

Ram Vallabh Somani

The title “*Kharatar*” was bestowed upon Jineśvar Sūri by Cālukya king Durlabhraj of Anhilvād Pāṭan (Gujarāt) as a result of victory over Caityavāsī in a religious discussion held in his court.¹ Jineśvar Sūri was the pupil of Vardhamān Sūri, a competent scholar, who consecrated the Vimal-Vasati temple of Ābu in VE 1088 (1031 A. D.). Jineśvar Sūri, composed several works including *Kathā-Kośa-Prakaraṇa*. His younger brother Buddhisāgar and his pupil Dhaneśvar Sūri remained much popular. They had also composed some good works. Abhaydeva and Droṇacārya were the important Jain monks who had contributed several works. Jineśvar Sūri’s followers later formed a separate *gaccha* which is named as Kharatar-*gaccha*. It was a hard work to popularize this *gaccha*. Jinballabh Sūri started Vidhi-Caitya movement making Cittor as his base. This movement had improved the liturgical system in Jain temples. They got good response and a large number of people from Mewār, Vāgaḍ, Sapādlakṣa, and northern Rājasthān became his lay followers. He also got two inscriptions engraved at Cittor and one at Nāgaur. The detailed note of one of the Cittor inscriptions has been done on the basis of a MS now preserved in L.D. Institute, Ahmedābād. The other fragmentary inscription which is partly damaged and now fixed on the Gambhirī river Bridge of Cittor has been edited by the author.² Jinvallabh Sūri died at Cittor and was succeeded by Jindatt Sūri. But soon after the political condition changed and Cittor was captured by the Solāṅkies of Gujarāt, who were not happy with the Jain monks of Kharatar-*gaccha*. Jindatt Sūri, therefore, remained more active in Ajmer area. He did not visit Gujarāt. On the basis of various literary sources he had his influence in Bīkampur town, then under Jaisalmer State. He composed *Carcarī* in Vāgaḍ-area (in a Dharmanāth Jain temple of Vāygrapur) and sent

1 The *Kharatargaccha Bṛhad Gurvāvalī* (S. J. G. M.), pp. 4-6 ; Jinvijay, *Kathā-Kośa Prakaraṇa* (S. J. G. M.), Intro., pp. 41-45.

2 The first inscription has been edited but it is not published so far. I have used the text from Śrī Nāhatā. The other inscription has been edited by the author which has been published in the *Śodh Patrikā* (Udaipur) as “*Cittor Durg-se Prāpt Ek Mahatvapūrṇa-Śilālekḥ*”, pp. 44-45.

its copies to Śreṣṭhis Mehar, Viśal and others at Bīkampur. This place was then a strong-hold of Caityavāsīs. It is said that *Carcarī* had a vast influence on the Jains. Śreṣṭhī Samhiyā's son Devadhar, who was an ardent follower of Caityavāsīs changed his mind on reading its text and became a lay follower of Kharatar-gaccha. He invited Jindatt Sūri to Bīkampur where an icon of Mahāvīra was consecrated. Jindatt later made Ajmer his base of activities, which was the capital of Cauhān rulers. He died there on Āṣāḍh sudi 11, VE 1211. His contribution in the painting is unique.³ Several book-covers having the figures of Jindatt Sūri and others were prepared. These paintings have attractive colour scheme and good decorative motifs. Jincandra Sūri succeeded him. He was very tenacious in the studies and soon became popular for his sharp memory. He was appointed as an Ācārya on Baiśākh sudi 6, VE 1205 by Jindatt Sūri in a Mahāvīra temple at Bīkampur. The festivities at a large scale were arranged by his father Rāsal. After Jindatt Sūri, he was appointed as a Gaccha-Nāyak.

Jincandra Sūri visited Tribhuvangiri (Sawāi-Mādhopur) in VE 1214, from where he went to Mathurā. Previously Jindatt Sūri also visited the place and got king Kumārapāl as his follower. We have a good plate in Jaisalmer Bhaṇḍār, showing Kumārapāl of Tribhuvangiri and Jindatt Sūri. He also visited Māroṭh (now in Pakistan), which was ruled by Sinhabal Johiyā. A Jain temple of Candraprabha was constructed by Śreṣṭhi Gollak of Dharkat-caste. Its consecration was done by Jincandra Sūri in VE 1217.⁴ The festivities were arranged by Śreṣṭhi Kṣemendhar, whose descendants later moved to Jaisalmer. Jincandra Sūri also visited Uccā (now in Pakistan) It is said that while going to Delhi, a band of Mlecchas was seen by Jain Saṅgha. But due to active action of Jincandra Sūri they were saved. He breathed his last at Delhi in VE 1223.

Jinpati Sūri succeeded Jincandra. In VE 1225 and 1227 he arranged *dīkṣā-mahotsava* at Bīkampur. He also visited Uccā (Sind), where a large congregation of lay followers attended him. At Māroṭh (Sind) and Sāgarpeṭ similar festivities were arranged. At Bīkampur he consecrated a *stūpa* of Guṇacandra Bhaṇḍārī and a Pārśvanāth Vidhicaitya was consecrated at Phalodī in VE 1234. From VE 1235

³ Several book covers have been got prepared by him having the figures of Jindatt and others.

⁴ The colophon of MS *Hem-Anekānt*, Kośa, VE 1286, mentions that Śreṣṭhi Gollak constructed the temple. Śreṣṭhi Kṣemandhar also spent heavy amount in arranging the garlands, etc.

to 1239, he remained active in Sapādlakṣa territory. He renovated the Dādāvādī of Ajmer in VE 1235. In VE 1239, in presence of Pṛthvīrāj Cauhān he held religious discussion with Padmaprabha and defeated him. Jinpati Sūri was, therefore, highly honoured by Pṛthvīrāj Cauhān. In VE 1244 a large Saṅgha-yātrā was organised to Gujarāt. The Jain Saṅgha when visited Āsāpali (modern Ahmedābād) was instructed by Daṇḍanāyaka Abhayaḍ to make heavy cash payments to him. But Jagadeva, the prime minister of the state gave stern warning not to harass the people of Sapādlakṣa, as he had concluded a treaty with Pṛthvīrāj Cauhān with great troubles.⁵ After 1249 VE, when Pṛthvīrāj was defeated, a large number of Jain families moved from Sapādlakṣa in order to save themselves from humiliation, at the hands of invaders. The Jain icons too were taken from the temples and kept under the sand-dunes, in order to save them. The family of Kṣemandhar, moved to Jaisalmer. In VE 1260 his son Jagaddhar installed the icon of Pārśvanāth there.⁶ Puṇyabhadra, a notable Jain scholar was a pupil of Jinpati Sūri. He composed several good works named *Atimukṭaka-Carita* (VE 1282), *Dhanya-Śāli-Carita* (VE 1285) *Daśa-Śrāvaka-Carita*, *Daśa-Upāsana-Kathā* (VE 1375), *Caturviṃśati-Jin-Stavan*, *Śālibhadra-Carita* (VE 1285) and *Daśa-Śrāvaka-Carita-Gāthā* (VE 1309). All these works are now available in the Jaisalmer Bhaṇḍār. In VE 1273, Jinpati Sūri also held religious discussions with Pandit Manodānand in the court of Pṛthvīcandra of Nagarkoṭ and defeated him. The activities of Kharatar-gaccha were also influenced by the occupation of the Muslims. However, they had vast areas in the western Rājasthān, Gujarāt, Malwā, Mewār and other parts. Jālore the capital of the local Cauhān rulers remained a stronghold of Kharatar-gaccha. In VE 1277, Jinpati Sūri died at Jālore and Jineśvar Sūri succeeded.

Jineśvar Sūri remained mostly busy in the western Rājasthān specially at Jālore, Bhīlaḍī, Prahlādanpur, Bijāpur, Bāḍmer, Cittor and Jaisalmer.⁷ Śreṣṭhī Jagaddhar (son of Kṣemandhar) had 3 sons named Yaśodhaval, Bhuvanpāl, and Tribhuvanpāl. Yaśodhaval remained at Jaisalmer and constructed a Pārśvanāth temple there in VE 1321. It was consecrated by Jineśvar Sūri. Bhuvanpāl moved to Prahlādanpur. He was present in the Saṅgha which started from there to Śatruñjaya in VE 1326.⁸

5 The *Kharatargaccha Bṛhad Gurvāvalī*, p. 43 ; Pṛthvīrāj Cauhān and His Times by the author, pp. 55-56 ; Dashrath Sharma, *Early Cauhān Dynasties*, p. 106-7.

6 *History of Jaisalmer* by the author, pp. 136-138 ; Pṛthvīrāj Cauhān and His Times, pp. 160-161 ; *Jain Inscriptions of Rājasthān*, p. 212.

7 *Ibid.*, p. 160 ; Puṇyavijay, *Catalogue of Sanskrit and Prakrit MSS, Jaisalmer collection* (1972), pp. 70, 113-114, 285.

8 *Ibid.*, pp. 136-138.

Several *dikṣās* were made at Jalore, Prahādanpur and other places and many temples were built. Jineśvar Sūri died at Jalore in VE 1331. His period remained very peaceful and active.

Jineśvar Sūri was succeeded by Jinprabodh Sūri on Phālgun vadi 8, VE 1331. He also continued to travel in western Rājasthān, Cīttor and in Gujarāt. In VE 1333, he went with a Saṅgha to Śatruṅjaya. He installed some icons in Bhīlaḍi in VE 1339 also. The famous icon of Jindatt Sūri installed by him is now seen in the Jain temple of Pāṭan (Gujarāt). From Bhīlaḍī, he came to Cīttor in VE 1334 where honourable reception was given. Mahārāwal Samarsinha himself came in the procession. Jinprabodh Sūri remained there for a few months. Several Jain icons were installed and recruited many Jain monks.⁹ The MSS copied at that time in Cīttor are now lying in several Bhaṇḍars of Gujarāt and other places. Two MSS *Candradūtābhidān* and *Nighaṇṭu Śeṣa* were got copied by Śreṣṭhi Dhāndhal.

From Cīttor, he went to Prahādanpur in VE 1336, where he remained for about a year. His visit to Bijāpur in the year VE 1337 remained very useful. He spent more than two years there and performed several religious works. He went to Jalore and recruited several new Jain monks. In VE 1340, when he visited Jaisalmer, Mahārāwal Karṇa with other citizens and chiefs received him. On Akṣaya Trītiyā a *pratiṣṭhā-mahotsava* was arranged by Nemikūmar and Gaṇadeva. The Jain Saṅghas from Uccā, Bīkampur, Jalore and other places also came to attend the celebrations. Jinprabodh Sūri spent rainy season at Bīkampur, where came Jain Saṅghas of various places.¹⁰ From there he came to Jalore in VE 1341 and expired there. Jincandra Sūri succeeded him in Baiśākh sudi 12, VE 1342. He remained there for a few years and consecrated several icons. The *pratiṣṭhā mahotsava* was arranged at large scale, which was also attended by Mahārāja Sāmantsinha.¹¹ In VE 1346, Jincandra Sūri went to Sīvānā where Cauhaṇ Someśvar received him. He did consecration ceremony of the icon of Śāntināth. From there, he went to Prahādanpur, Bhīlaḍī and other places and did several religious works. On the request of Sinha from Jalore and Mohan of Maṇḍor he organised a Saṅgha to Ābu in

9 The *Kharatargaccha Bṛhad Gurvāvalī* (SJGM), p. 56. It was attended by Mahārāwal Samarsinha and his chief minister Arisinha.

10 *History of Jaisalmer*, p. 161; The *Kharatargaccha Bṛhad Gurvāvalī* (SJGM), p. 58.

11 The *Kharatargaccha Bṛhad Gurvāvalī* (SJGM), p. 60.

VE 1353, which was attended by several residents from Jalore, Sīvanā, Jaisalmer, Nāgaur, Roon, Bhīnmāl, Sāncor, Prahlādanpur, Bhīlādī and other places. A sum of 12,000 *Drammas* were spent on various religious occasions.¹² A *dikṣā*-ceremony was held at Jalore in VE 1354, wherein Vīrcand, Udaicand, Amṛtcand and Jaisundar were recruited as monks. It was arranged by Salakhān's son Sihā. At a village Sīriyānā Śreṣṭhī Jodhā did *pratiṣṭhā mahotsava* of the icon of Mahāvīr.

On the repeated requests of Mahārāwal Jaitrasinha, Jincandra Sūri visited Jaisalmer in VE 1356 (1308 A.D.). The *praveśotsava* was arranged by Nemīkumār and some other Jains. The Mahārāwal also attended it.¹³ Jincandra Sūri remained at Jaisalmer for more than three years. In VE 1358, Śrāvaka Keśava and his son Toli got the consecration ceremony done of several icons. It seems that the family of Keśava left Jaisalmer and went to Khambhāt where he constructed a Jain temple in VE 1366. The *Kharatargaccha Paṭṭāvalī* and the Khambhāt inscription of VE 1366 contain the details of the functions held at that time. The Jain Saṅghas from Pāṭan, Bhīlādī, Baḍmer, Sīvanā and other places also came to attend the celebrations. Keśava's other son Jaissal spent a large sum of money on this occasion. His elder brother Lākhu also came there. They organised Saṅgha-*yātrās* to Śatruñjaya, Gīrnār and other places. Jaissal held *praveśotsava* of the Saṅgha at Khambhāt. Jincandra Sūri spent rainy season there.¹⁴

From Khambhāt Jincandra Sūri came to Bhīlādī via Bijāpur. A Saṅgha-*yātrā* to Śatruñjaya, Gīrnār, Rewantak and other holy places was organised, which was attended by Śrāvakas of Pāṭan, Prahlādanpur, Jalore, Jaisalmer, Rānukoṭ, Nāgaur, Sāncor, Bhīnmāl, Ratnapur and other places. On completion of the Saṅgha-*yātrā* they returned to Bhīlādī.¹⁵ In 1369 Jincandra Sūri came to Pāṭan and converted several Jain Śrāvakas to his faith. The *dikṣās* were also organised there. In VE 1271, he came to Jalore, where the *dikṣā* was organised. Mantrī Devīsinha Bhojrāj and others spent money benevolently. But Jalore was suddenly invaded by Alauddin Khiljī in VE 1371. His army caused tremendous loss. Therefore Jincandra Sūri together with Jain Śrāvakas

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 61.

¹³ *History of Jaisalmer* by the author, p. 161 ; The *Kharatargacchu Bṛhad Gurvāvalī* (SJGM), p. 61.

¹⁴ Jinviṇay, *Jain Lekh Saṅgraha*, Vol. II No. 447 ; The *Kharatargaccha Bṛhad Gurvāvalī* (SJGM), p. 62.

¹⁵ The *Kharatargaccha Bṛhad Gurvāvalī* (SJGM), pp. 62-63.

left the place and came to Nāgaur.¹⁶ From there Jincandra went to Uccā in Sind and thereafter he returned to Devarājpur. A good number of Jain Śrāvakas from Māroṭh, Kyāspur and other places of Sind attended him. A *cāturmās* was organised there in VE 1374. From there he came to Nāgaur where the Śrāvakas of Delhi, Kanyānayan, Phalodī, Āsikā, Jalore and other places attended the celebrations. A *dikṣā*-celebration was also held there. From there he came to Phalodī Pārśvanāth where celebrations were arranged at large scale. Mantri Sodhu gave 12,000 (*Jethal*) while others also spent more money making a sum of 30,000 (*Jethal*), which were deposited in the Bhaṇḍār of Pārśvanāth temple there.¹⁷ In the year VE 1375 Thākur Acalrāj arranged a Saṅgha-*yātrā* to Hastināpur and Mathurā after obtaining a *firman* from Sultan Qutabuddīn. Several residents of Nāgaur, Kosāwanā, Jhunjhun, Meḍtā, Narhaḍ, Kanyānayan, Āsikā, Yoginīpur (Delhi) and other places also attended. Jincandra Sūri spent rainy season at Khaṇḍa Sarāy of Delhi and thereafter came to Meḍtā. He died at Kosāwanā near Meḍtā in VE 1376.¹⁸

In VE 1377 Jinkuśal Sūri was appointed as an Ācārya. He remained at Bhīlaḍī and performed a Saṅgha-*yātrā* at Śatruñjaya. Thereafter, he came to Pāṭan and spent rainy season there. Again in VE 1380, he performed a Saṅgha-*yātrā* to Śatruñjaya. It was arranged by Rāyapati of Delhi. Thakkar Pheru also accompanied. It was a big Saṅgha-*yātrā*, which was attended by several residents from Delhi and other places of Vāgaḍ, Derāwar, Kyāspur Jalore and Koraṇṭaka. Proper arrangements of escort was also made. At Śatruñjaya Saṅghapati Rāyapati performed liturgical activities with great pomp and show. He presented the gold *Tankās* to the dieties. After Saṅgha-*yātrā*, he returned to Delhi.¹⁹

In VE 1381, several icons were consecrated at Pāṭan. Few icons for the temples of Śatruñjaya, Uccā (Uccapuri) Devarājpur, Devakulpāṭak Delwārā (Mewār) and other places were also consecrated there. From Bhīlaḍī, a Saṅgha-*yātrā* was arranged. At Khambhāt after collecting necessary materials the Saṅgha went to Śatruñjaya and spent several *Dwillaka-Drammas*²⁰ there. The Saṅgha returned to Bhīlaḍī. Proceeding

¹⁶ Dashrath Sharma, *Early Cauhān Dynasties*, pp. 192. *Firistah* does not give any date. It was an invasion of Alāuddin Khilji against Jalore in VE 1371.

¹⁷ The *Kharatargaccha Bṛhad Guryāvalī*, p. 64.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 67-68.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 70-71.

²⁰ It seems that *Dwillaka-Drammas* were issued by some local rulers. *Ibid.*, p. 79.

from there the Ācārya came to Satyapur and after remaining there for one month he came to Bāḍmer.

The Ācārya went to Jalore in VE 1383, where several citizens from Bāḍamer, Jaisalmer and other places attended. From there he came to Jaisalmer where the ruler and other citizens received him there.²¹ We know Jaisalmer was captured by Alāuddin Khiljī in VE 1371. It was recaptured by the Bhatīs. It seems that the Ācārya remained in Sind and visited Devarājpur, Kiyāspur, Bahirāmpur Malikpur and many other places. He died at Devarājpur in VE 1389 Phāgan badi 5 and Jinpadma Sūri succeeded in VE 1390 Jeth sudi 5. The celebrations were arranged by Rihad Purpacandra's son Haripāl. Three statues of Jinkuśal Sūri were carved which were installed at Devarājpur, Kyāspur and Jaisalmer.²² From Derāwar Jinpadma Sūri came to Jaisalmer and passed one rainy season there. He also visited the shrine of Pārśvanāth there. From there he went to Bāḍmer. We have got no further details of his activities. He died at Nāgaur on Āsoj sudi 12 VE 1404.^{22-a} On his death Jinlabdhi Sūri succeeded, who died at Nāgaur in VE 1406. On his death, Jincandra succeeded. The Ācārya-ship was given to him by Tarunprabhācārya at Jaisalmer. The festivities were done by Rākhecā Sāha Hāthi of Nāgaur. On his death in VE 1414, Jinodaya Sūri was appointed in his place. He remained active in Jaisalmer and Derāwar areas. The Jaisalmer inscriptions of VE 1473 mention his manifold activities in Derāwar. The Rānkā family was his ardent follower. Rānkā Ambā Jindā and Mūlarāj arranged a Saṅgha-yātrā to Devarājpur under the guidance of above Sūriji. A large *pratiṣṭhā* was arranged in Sind in VE 1427. The Rānkā and other families undertook a Saṅgha-yātrā there in thousand carts with a large number of lay-followers. Jinoday Sūri died in VE 1432.²³

Jinrāj Sūri succeeded Jinoday Sūri. He also remained active in Jaisalmer and Mewār areas. Under his instructions, Rānkā Ambā, undertook Saṅgha-yātrā to Śatruñjaya in VE 1436. Again in VE 1449, Saṅgha-yātrā was arranged by the above family. It seems that the Ācārya spent much of his time in Mewār and other areas. The *Viñaptilekh* mentions that he was present in Mewār during the reign of Mahārāṇā

²¹ *Ibid*, p. 81.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 86.

^{22-a} Agarcand Bhanwarlāl Nāhatā, *Kharatargacch-ke Acāryon-ki Katipaya Ajñāt Rucanāe*, p. 30.

²³ Pūracand Nāhar, *Śilālekh Saṅgraha*, Vol. III, Nos. 2112 and 2113.

Khetā and Lakhā and died there in VE 1461.²⁴ Jinvardhan Sūri succeeded him in Mewār. He travelled in eastern India and made several lay-followers at Jonpur (U.P.) and other towns. Several copies of illustrated *Kalpa-Sūtras* were made. The consecration ceremony of the Cintāmaṇi-Pārśvanāth temple at Jaisalmer was done in VE 1473 by him. More than 50 inscriptions on different *devakulikās* of the above dates are still available there.²⁵ On a suspicion that the fourth-*vrata* (celibacy) has been violated by him he was removed from the Ācāryaship. The charges levelled against him seem to be fictitious. He was quite an old man. However the whole Kharatar-*gaccha* Saṅgha was spilt into two parts in VE 1473. The followers of Jinvardhan Sūri formed a new *gaccha* known as Pippalikā-*gaccha*, which had a stronghold in Mewār. The entire Jaisalmer and other Saṅgha inducted Jinbhadra Sūri as new Ācārya. Even the Rānkā family whose religious activities were performed by Jinvardhan Sūri forsook his following. We do not find any mention of Jinvardhan Sūri in the colophon of *Kalpa-Sutra-Sandeh-Viśaṣadhi Vṛtti* dated VE 1497 got prepared by the above family.²⁶

Jinbhadra Sūri who was made an Ācārya at Jaisalmer in place of Jinvardhan Sūri, was a powerfull and able Ācārya. He established *Jñān Bhaṇḍārs* at Jaisalmer, Jalore, Devagiri, Nāgaur, Cīttor, Jāwar and many other places. He also brought several palm-leaf and other MSS from Khambhāt and kept these at Jaisalmer. He got several MSS copied at Jaisalmer including the *Nava-Tatva-Prakaraṇa* dated VE 1499. Thereafter he mostly concentrated his activities in Jaisalmer. The construction of Sambhavanāth temple was started under his instructions by the Coprā family which was completed in VE 1497. He widely travelled and also got several Jain temples built at Cīttor, Māṇḍu, Jāwar and other places. Several icons and *paṭṭas* were also installed in the Jain temples of Jaisalmer. A *paṭṭa* now preserved in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London has many Rājasthānī motifs and figures of Gaṇeśa and other Hindu deities. It was consecrated by Jinbhadra Sūri, but the place name is not given. The author believes that it was prepared at Jaisalmer.²⁷ It was

²⁴ The *Vijñaptilekh* was edited by Muni Jinvijay. It mentions the festivities arranged in Kāreri-Pārśvanāth temple in VE 1431. At that time Mewār state was very active and several Jain families lived there.

²⁵ *History of Jaisalmer* by the author, pp. 163-164.

²⁶ The *Kalpa-Sūtra-Sandeh-Viśaṣadhi Vṛtti* was completed by the Rānkā family in VE 1497. It is now in Jaisalmer Bhaṇḍār (Punyavijay, *The Catalogue of Sanskrit and Prakrit MSS in Jaisalmer Bhaṇḍār*, Ahmedābād 1972), p. 97.

²⁷ The author's paper published in the *Śodh Patrikā* and *History of Jaisalmer*, pp. 132.

Jinbhadra Sūri's influence that whole Kharatar-gaccha Saṅgha of Jaisalmer, Gujarāt and western Rājasthān became his ardent followers. He died at Kumbhalgarh in VE 1514 and was succeeded by Jincandra Sūri. Both Jinvardhan Sūri and Jinbhadra Sūri belonged to Delwārā (Mewār).

Kīrtiratna Sūri and Jaysāgar Upādhyāya were competent Jain Sādhus, who emerged during this period. Kīrtiratna was converted to Jain monkhood by Jinvardhan Sūri in the year VE 1463. He became a renowned scholar and composed *Nemināth-Mahākāvya*, the Sambhavanāth temple inscription of VE 1473 and many other works. When Jinvardhan Sūri was removed from the Ācāryaship of the Kharatar-gaccha, Kīrtiratna hesitantly agreed to be the new Ācārya. He was later given the titles of *Vācaka* and *Ācārya* by Jinbhadra Sūri. The present *Tīrtha* of Nakoḍā was established by Kīrtiratna Sūri. Five inscriptions of VE 1506 and 1518 of the Saṅkhwāl family also mention the words "*Kīrti-Ratna-Sūri-Pramukh-Parivār Sahitena*", which shows that he was honourably remembered by the members of his family.²⁸ He died at Mahobā, in VE 1525, where his *stūpa* was erected.²⁹

Jaysāgar was also a competent writer. He belonged to the Oswal family of Daradā-gotra. This family was also a millionaire. The Jain temple at Ābū was constructed by his brother Maṇḍalik in VE 1515, during the reign of Mahārāṇa Kumbhā of Mewār. The *Vijñaptitrivenī* (VE 1484) mentions that he started a Saṅgha from Māroṭh (Marukoṭ now in Pakistan) to Punjāb.³⁰ An illustrated copy of *Kalpa Sūtra* was also prepared by the Daradā family.

Jincandra Sūri succeeded Jinbhadra Sūri. He remained active in the western Rājasthān and Jaisalmer. In VE 1518, he consecrated the *paṭṭikās* of Śatruñjaya, Gīrnār, Nandīsvār and others.³¹ These *paṭṭikās* depict the *paṭṭa*-painting on stone. These were got done by the families of Saṅkhwāl, Gaṇḍhar Copāḍā, Pārakh and others. He died at Jaisalmer in VE 1530 where his *stūpa* was erected.

²⁸ Nāhar, III, Nos. 2122, 2123, 2382 and others. Details of Saṅkhwāl family have been furnished in the *History of Jaisalmer* by the author, pp 142-145.

²⁹ Vinaysāgar, *Nakoḍā Tīrth Śrī Pārśvanāth* (Jaipur 1988), pp. 112-124.

³⁰ Muni Jinvijay, *Vijñapti Lekh Saṅgraha*. The Saṅgha started by Jaysāgar passed through Devarājpur, Faridpur, Mubārakpur, Maman, Vahan and other places.

³¹ Nāhar, III, Nos. 2116-2119, 2140 and 2141.

On the death of Jincandra Sūri at Jaisalmer in VE 1530, Jinsamudra Sūri succeeded him. The ceremony was performed with ostentation at Jaisalmer in the year VE 1533 by Saṅghapati Śrīmālī Sonapāl. Two beautiful Jain temples of Śāntināth and Ṛṣabhadev (Aṣṭāpad) were completed in VE 1536. These were consecrated by Jinsamudra Sūri. The Jain Saṅghas from Sindh-Mārwar and other places attended it. The Śāntināth temple has got many beautiful icons of the Maṇḍowar and other parts. It is one of the best temples of the western India.³² The Ṛṣabhadev temple has got many colossal icons of Cakravartī Bharat, Marudevī and others.³³ Jaisalmer was then a great centre of Kharatar-gaccha. Several Svetāmbar Jain families of Tāteḍ, Rānkā, Kukadā, Baid, Bāṇṭhiā, Saṅkhwal, Pārakh, Coprā, Gaṇḍhar Copadā and others dwelt there. A good number of MSS were copied there.

On the death of Jinsamudra Sūri at Ahmedābād, Jinhaṅsa Sūri succeeded in VE 1555. He also visited several places in western Rājasthān and Bīkāner. A big *pratiṣṭhā* was done at Bīkāmpur in the year VE 1566.³⁴ He is also famous for performing miracles in the court of Sikandar Shāh of Delhi. He died at Paṭan in VE 1582.

Jinmāṇikya Sūri succeeded Jinhaṅsa Sūri. The *nandī mahotsava* was arranged by Sāha Devarāj. He mostly remained busy in Bīkāner. The Cintāmaṇi Pāraśvanāth temple inscriptions from Bīkāner dated 1592 mentions that the place was invaded by Kāmarān who did some destruction in the Jain temples. These icons were later consecrated by Jinmāṇikya Sūri.³⁵ On Māhg badi 1, VE 1593, he also consecrated several icons at Bīkāner.³⁶ The temples of Aṣṭāpad and Śāntināth at Jaisalmer were consecrated by him VE 1583. He also arranged the consecration of *Satruṇjaya Gīrnār paṭṭikā* in the above temples in the year VE 1585.³⁷ Due to large scale activities of Bāis Sampradāya Jinmāṇikya Sūri was invited to Bīkāner by Bacchāwat Sangrāmsinha. He remained there for a few years and tried to remove the influence of Bāis Sampradāya. While travelling from Bīkāner to Jaisalmer in VE 1612, he desired to pay homage to the *samādhi*

32 *Ibid.*, III, Nos. 2154.

33 *Ibid.*, III, Nos. 2139, 2406-2409 ; Samaysundar's *Gaṇadhar Vasati Stavan* published in *Samaysundar Kṛti Kusumāñjali* edited by Nāhatā.

34 Nāhatā, *Bīkāner Jain Lekh Saṅgraha*, No. 4.

35 *Ibid.*, Nos. 1 and 2.

36 *Ibid.*, Nos. 27, 28, 32 to 45.

37 *Ibid.*

of Dādāguru Jinkuśal Sūri. During his return journey from Derāwar to Jaisalmer, he died enroute in a village near Derāwar for want of water. He observed fast on that day of Pañcamī, but no water could be obtained during the day time inspite of best efforts. A *stūpa* was erected on the site, where he died.³⁸ This place is also now in Pakistan. Several illustrated *Kalpa Sūtra* and *Kālkācārya Kathā* were got prepared by him.³⁹

After the death of Jinmāṇikya Sūri the Saṅgha went to Jaisalmer and a quarrel broke out about the selection of successor. The matter was referred to Mahārāwal Maḍdeva, who selected Sumatidhīr (later known as Jincandra Sūri) in concurrence of Guṇaprabha Sūri of Begad-Kharatar-gaccha. Thus Jincandra was appointed as an Ācārya on Bhādwā sudi 9 VE 1612 at Jaisalmer.⁴⁰ Next year, he passed the rainy season at Bīkāner and instructed the Sādhus and Yatis to maintain austerity. These activities to remove *śīthilācāra* earned him good name. Kuśalalabh, a famous Jain poet, flourished at Jaisalmer during this period. He composed several good works in Rājasthānī language. His *Dholā-Māru* is very famous. He was much venerated by the royal family and non-Jains also. According to the Jain sources, he was Guru to Mahārāwal Harrāj of Jaisalmer. His other works are *Piṅgal-Śiromaṇi*, *Mādhavānal Kām Kandalā* and others.

Akbar invited Jincandra Sūri to his court and venerated him very much like Hīrvijay Sūri of Tapāgaccha. Jincandra also obtained *firman*s prohibiting the slaughter of animals on the certain days.⁴¹ While returning from Lāhore, he came via Derāwar, Uccā and other towns of Sindh. He paid homage to the *stūpas* of Jinkuśal Sūri and Jinmāṇikya Sūri. He was requested by Mahārāwal Bhīm to pass a rainy season at Jaisalmer, to which he agreed. He remained there in the year VE 1653 (1596 A.D.). In VE 1662, he remained at Bīkāner and consecrated several icons in the Jain temple situated at the Nahāton kī Guwāḍ (Rṣabhadev temple).⁴² After the death of Akbar, Jahāngir became the Emperor of India. He became displeased with Jain monks of Tapā-gaccha and ordered to take them away from Āgrā.

38 Vinaysāgar, *Kharatargaccha-kā Itihās*, p. 191.

39 One MS of it is in the collection of Kr. Sangrāmsinha of Jaipur. It has got some paintings.

40 Vinaysāgar, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

41 Agarçand and Bhanwarlāl Nāhatā, *Yuga-Pradhān Jincandra Sūri*, Appendix.

42 Agarçand and Bhanwarlāl Nāhatā, *Bīkāner Jain Lekh Saṅgraha*, pp. 185-197, Inscriptions Nos. 1399-1413.

Jincandra boldly faced the Emperor and convinced him not to do so. The Emperor withdrew his order.

Jincandra Sūri had a long entourage of scholars. Some of them are Māldeva, Mahimāsamudra, Pārśvacandra Sūri, Vinaysamudra, Sadhukīrti, Labdhikallol, Samaysundar, Kaṇaksom Hīrkalaś, Kuslalabh and many others. Samaysundar was a prominent writer of the time of Akbar and Jahāngir. He was born at Sāncor. He became Jain monk and soon got a good fame in Sanskrit, Prakrit and other languages. He was bestowed the titles of (i) *Gaṇi* in VE 1640 at Jaisalmer by Jincandra Sūri, (ii) *Vācaka* in VE 1649 at Lāhore by Jincandra Sūri, (iii) *Upādhyāya* in VE 1671 by Jinsinha Sūri at Laverā and *Mahopādhyāya* after VE 1680.⁴³ He had widely travelled in Rājasthān, Punjāb, Kāśmīr, Gujarāt, Saurāṣṭra and U.P. His disciple Harśanandan Gaṇi was also a notable monk.

Jincandra Sūri had to face a violent opposition of Dharmasāgar of Tapā-gaccha, who wrote *Kumatikudāl* and a commentary on *Āustrik Matro Sūtra*, wherein he mentioned certain facts against the Kharatar-gaccha. Jincandra successfully took other Jain monks in his favour and defeated Dharmasāgar.

On the death of Jincandra Sūri at Bilārā Jinsinha Sūri succeeded. He was bestowed the title of *Vācaka* in a celebration held at Jaisalmer in VE 1640 (1583 A.D.) by Jincandra Sūri. He had already received the honour from Akbar and Jahāngir. Mahārāja Rāisinha of Bīkāner venerated him very much. On his advice Rāisinha left Āgrā and went to Bīkāner, when Jahāngir came to the throne and went in pursuit of his son Khusro. Therefore, he became angry with Jinsinha Sūri. He invited him to the court but he died at Meḍṭā on Pauṣ sudi 13 VE 1674.⁴⁴

Jinrāj Sūri was appointed as successor of Jinsinha Sūri at Meḍṭā. He came to Jaisalmer when Bhansālī Jīvarāj arranged *praveśotsava*. Mahārāwal Kalyāṇ sent his eldest son Māldeva to receive him. The rainy season was passed at Jaisalmer. Thereafter he went to Lodravā, where he consecrated the famous Jain temple built by Bhansālī

⁴³ Agarcand Nāhatā : *Jinrāj Sūri Kṛti Kusumāñjali* (Intro.), p. 7 : Author's *History of Jaisalmer*, p. 169.

⁴⁴ Author's *History of Jaisalmer*, p. 169.

Thiru Sāha on Māgh sudi 12 VE 1675.⁴⁵ Karamsī Sāha and Mālu Arjun also led a Saṅgha-*yātrā* to Śatruñjaya under the guidance of Jinrāj Sūri on Baiśākh sudi 13 VE 1675 (1676). This Saṅgha later merged into the Saṅgha started by Rūpaji Somji of Ahmedābād. A *yātrāpaṭṭikā* depicting the scene of Saṅgha-*yātrā* was painted by a Jain Sādhu at Jaisalmer. It is now preserved in the Kharatar-*gaccha Bhaṇḍār* of Jaipur.⁴⁶ Jinrāj Sūri visited Jaisalmer in VE 1677, when Arjun Mālu did *praveśotsava*. He also visited Āgrā and was venerated by Shāh Jehān in VE 1686 (1630 A.D.)

An important event took place in VE 1686 (1629 A.D.) when the Jain Saṅgha of Kharatar-*gaccha* was again divided. Jinsāgar who remained a close follower of Jinrāj Sūri for many years, turned against him. The reason is not clear. But it seems that Samaysundar's pupil Harṣanandan, who was very competent scholar, was the main cause of this split. He took the side of Jinsāgar and a separate branch of *Ācārya-śākhā* came into existence.⁴⁷ Jinrāj Sūri again visited Jaisalmer in VE 1693 and consecrated the icons of Lodravā. He composed the *Śālibhadra Caupāi* which was illustrated in the Mughal art style. It is now in a private collection of Calcutta. Jinrāj Sūri also consecrated several icons which are now in the Jain temple of Nahaton-kī-Guwāḍ, Bīkāner bearing the dates VE 1686 to 1690. He died at Pāṭan on Aṣāḍh sudi 9 VE 1700.⁴⁸

On the death of Jinrāj Sūri at Pāṭan, Jinratna Sūri succeeded in VE 1703 (1646 A.D.). He remained at Jaisalmer in VE 1704 to 1707. We do not find any inscription of his time. He arranged some *dikṣās* in Jaisalmer. From there he went to Āgrā where he died in VE 1711. Jinratna Sūri succeeded him. He laboured hard to improve the conduct of the Yatis, who were indulging in the *śīthilācāra*. We do not have any inscription of his time from Jaisalmer and Bīkāner. He enjoyed a long life and died in 1763. On his death Jinsukh Sūri was appointed as an *Ācārya*. He visited Jaisalmer and composed a *Jaisalmer Caitya Paripāṭi*,⁴⁹ having the detailed description of the Jain temples. He died at Riṇī on Jeṭh sudi 11 VE 1780, and was succeeded by Jinbhakti

45 Nāhar, III, Nos. 2544, 2546, 2568, 2570, 2572.

46 Bhanwarlāl Nāhatā, *Jaisalmer-ke Kalāpūrṇa Maṇḍir*, pp. 52-56 ; The author's *History of Jaisalmer*, pp. 169-170.

47 Agarcand Nāhatā *Jinrāj Sūri* (Intro.).

48 Agarcand Bhanwarlāl Nāhatā, *Bīkāner Jain Lekh Saṅgraha*, Nos. 1417, 1424-1430

49 Nāhar, III, Introduction.

Sūri in VE 1780. He remained very active in Jaisalmer and did several *dikṣās*. He died in VE 1804, at Maṇḍavī in Kaccha. His foot prints were also installed in Bīkāner in VE 1852, which were consecrated by Kṣamākalyāṇ Gaṇi.

Jinlābh Sūri succeeded Jinbhakti Sūri in VE 1804. He remained active in Jaisalmer and Bīkāner. He came to Jaisalmer in VE 1804 and remained there for 5 years. He left for Bīkāner in VE 1810. In VE 1811 an *upāsarā* was built at Nāthusar (Bīkāner). He again visited Jaisalmer in VE 1816 and remained there upto 4 years. According to a *Vijñaptipatra* from Kaccha Bhuj⁵⁰ he was requested to visit their country. It was recorded there that the people of Jaisalmer who were famous for their sweet tounge, had enamoured Srī Puṇyājī. From Jaisalmer he went to Bīkāner, where his *śilālekhs* of VE 1827, 1828, 1829 and 1831 have been found. He died in VE 1834 and was succeeded by Jincandra Sūri. He arranged to construct a *pratiśālā* near the *stūpa* of Jinlābh Sūri at Jaisalmer and consecrated some Jain icons at Bīkāner, Curu and other places. He died at Sūrat in 1856 VE and was succeeded by Jinharṣa Sūri. In VE 1860 Jinharṣa consecrated 150 icons at Devīkoṭ (Jaisalmer). He led a Saṅgha organised by Rājārām Luniyā and Sāha Tilok Cand. He widely travelled in Bengal, South Gujarāt, Mewār, Jaisalmer and Bīkāner areas and consecrated several icons in Bīkāner and other towns. He died at Maṇḍor in VE 1892. He was succeeded by Jin-saubhāgya Sūri. He remained active in Bīkāner and other areas and several *pratiśthās* were done in VE 1904, 1905 and 1916. On his death Jinhaṅsa Sūri succeeded. He consecrated several icons at Bīkāner and other areas in VE 1931. After him Jincandra Sūri, Jinkīrti Sūri, Jincāritra Sūri, Jinvijayendra Sūri and others succeeded. They remained active in Bīkāner and other northern areas.

After Jinharṣa Sūri, some Śrāvakas and Yatis appointed Jinmahendra Sūri as Ācārya. The ruler of Bīkāner also confirmed this. The famous Saṅgha of Patwās was led by Jinmahendra Sūri in VE 1891.⁵¹ He remained active in Jaisalmer. He was succeeded by Jinmūrti Sūri, whose inscriptions have been found from Jaisalmer and Bīkāner areas.

⁵⁰ Jinvijay, *Vijñapti Lekh Saṅgraha*, p. 62.

⁵¹ Nāhar, III, Nos. 2576, 2530, 2518 and 2524.

Some Important Branches of Kharatargaccha

i) *Madhukar Kharatar*

It is said to have been established during the time of Jinvallabh Sūri.⁵² But the name of the Ācārya who founded it is not known. Several names of Sādhus of this branch, namely—Dhanaprabha, Muni-prabha, Citraprabha Sūri, Guṇaprabha and others are known. It laid stress on “*Caturdaśīpakṣa*”.

ii) *Rudrapāliya Kharatar*

It was initiated by Jinśekhara Sūri in VE 1204.⁵³ After Jinśekhara Sūri we find the names of the Ācāryas as Jinpadma Sūri, Vijaycandra Sūri, Abhyadeva Sūri, Prabhānanda Sūri, Śrīcandra Sūri, Jinbhadrā Sūri, Jaitilak Sūri, Guṇacandra Sūri, Abhaydeva Sūri, Jinhaṇsa Sūri, Jinrāj Sūri, Jinodaya Sūri, Jincandra Sūri, Devasundar Sūri and others. A separate branch of the disciples of Prabhacandra Sūri started where we get the names of Vimalcandra Sūri Guṇaśekhara Sūri, Saṅghatilak Sūri, Somatilak Sūri and others. However this Rudrapāliya branch is almost extinct now except for a few families of Kulaguru Matherans as is evident from the colophons of several MSS of the 19th century A.D.

iii) *Laghu Kharatar*

During the time of Jineśvara Sūri, Jinsingha Sūri went to Bhīmāl and established there a Laghu-kharatar branch. Jinprabha was his successor, who was a very competent teacher. Sultān Muhammad Tughluq, Fīroz Tughluq and others had venerated him very much. Rāghavacetan, a Brahmin famous as *mantrakār* also met him. Jinprabha Sūri wrote several works and earned good fame.⁵⁴ His successors were Jindeva Sūri, Jinmeru Sūri, Jinhit Sūri, Jinsarva Sūri, Jincandra Sūri, Jinsamudra Sūri, Jintilak Sūri, Jinrāj Sūri, Jincandra Sūri, Jinbhadrā Sūri, Jinmeru Sūri, Jinbhānu Sūri and others.

iv) *Pippalikā Śākhā*

It was started by Jinvardhana Sūri after VE 1473. We know, he

⁵² Vinaysāgar, *Kharatargaccha-kā Itihāsa*, p. 217.

⁵³ *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. I, p. 119.

⁵⁴ Jinvijay, *Kharatargaccha Bṛhad Gurvāvalī*, pp. 95-96.

was removed from the Ācāryaship on a suspicion that he had violated the fourth *vrata* (celibacy) and inducted Jinbhadra Sūri in his place. We do not find the exact date of the event. But it seems that it happened in Jaisalmer in VE 1473. There is an inscription of VE 1473, available on a *dehari* of Pārśvanāth temple mentioning Jinbhadra Sūri as an Ācārya. Jinvardhan Sūri continued to have mentioned as a successor of Jinrāj Sūri in an inscription of VE 1478 available on the Ambikā sculpture in the Supārśvanāth temple (Nahāton-ki-Guwāḍ, Bīkāner). It proves that the Pippalikā branch was started thereafter.

Jinvardhan Sūri after his removal from the Ācāryaship, went to Mewār and remained there. It seems that he might have started a new branch of Pippalikā sometimes between VE 1478-80. On his death Jincandra Sūri succeeded in VE, 1486, at Delwārā (Mewār). It was a prosperous site. The *nāndī mahotsava* was done by Sahanpāl Navalakhā, the prime minister of Mewār state.⁵⁵ On Jincandra Sūri's death in VE 1490, Jinsāgar succeeded. The *nandī-mahotsava* was organised by Sāha Dungar, Bhākar, Palhā, Parwat and others.⁵⁶ He remained very active and consecrated several icons at Delwārā (VE 1491 and 1493), Nāgadā (VE 1494 and 1495), Kareḍā (VE 1496) and other places.⁵⁷ Mahārānā Kumbhā respected him. On his death Jinsundar became Ācārya. The *nandī mahotsava* was done by Sāha Pālhā Dungar and others at Cittor. The beautiful *Śṛṅgār Canwari* Jain temple of Cittor was consecrated in VE 1505 by him.⁵⁸ A few more inscriptions of VE 1512 and 1513 were there in the temple, mentioning his name. On his death in VE 1517, Jinharṣa Sūri succeeded. After him Jincandra Sūri, Jinśīla Sūri, Jinkīrti Sūri, Jinsinha Sūri, Jincandra Sūri, Jinratna Sūri, Jinvardhan Sūri, Jinhaṇsa Sūri and Jincandra Sūri succeeded one after the other. After Jincandra Sūri's death at Khambhāt in VE 1794, this branch became gradually extinct and no account is known of its later monks.

v) *Ādhyapakṣīya Śākhā*

It is an offspring of Pippalikā Śākhā which was initiated by Jindeva in VE 1506. After him Jinsinha Sūri and Jincandra succeeded. The

⁵⁵ Vinaysāgar, *Kharatargaccha-kā Itihās*, p. 226.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 227 ; Vijayadharma Sūri, *Devakulpāṭak*, pp. 18-19.

⁵⁷ *Mahārānā Kumbhā* by the author, Appendix A.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

famous temple of Kāparḍa was consecrated by Jincandra Sūri. He was very famous teacher. After him Jinharṣa Sūri, Jinlabdhi Sūri, Jinoday Sūri, Jinsambhava Sūri and others became the Ācāryas.

vi) *Bhāvhr̥ṣiya Śākhā*

It was initiated by Bhāvharṣa Sūri in VE 1616 or 1621. Among the Ācāryas of this branch the names of Jintilak (VE 1628-76), Jinoday and Jincandra (died at Jetaran in VE 1773) are known.

vii) *Begaḍ Kharatar*

The Begaḍ Kharatar remained very popular in Jaisalmer. It was started by Jineśvar to whom the epithet of “Begaḍ” was given by Sultān Muhammad Begaḍā of Gujarāt. It is believed that he performed miraculous feats which influenced the Sultān. Soon his fame increased. His brother of Chājeḍ clan spent lavishly on this occasion at Ahmedābād. From there Jineśvar Sūri came to Sāncor, where Mantrī Laxmansinha of Ratadharā arranged his reception. He spent 4 years there preaching religious teachings. He died at Śaktipur (Mārwar), where his *stūpa* was erected. No other literary and epigraphic sources about him are known. He was succeeded by Jinsekhar Sūri. He also continued his work in South-Western Rājasthān and Jaisalmer. Jindharna Sūri succeeded him, who was very prominent. Under his instructions several MSS were copied at Jaisalmer, Surat and other places.⁵⁹ We find the name of Devabhadra, a Jain monk, who had copied several MSS during this period. A few of them are *Kalāpa-Vyākaraṇa*, *Kālakācārya Kathā*, *Syādvād Prakaraṇa*, *Vajjalagga*, *Mahāvīr-Carita*, *Āvaśyaka Nirukti* and many others.

After Jindharna Sūri Jincandra succeeded. He also remained very active in Jaisalmer and Sind areas. He consecrated the icon of Nemināth on Phāgan sudi 3, VE 1532 installed by Chājeḍ Dharma-sinha and others.⁶⁰ It was the period, when Jaisalmer was embellished with beautiful Jain shrines and several religious festivities were being organized there. Jincandra Sūri died about VE 1555. The MS *Āvaśyaka-Nirukti* was copied out during his life time in the above year. The

⁵⁹ Punyavijay, *Catalogue of Sanskrit and Prakrit MSS, Jaisalmer Collection* (1972), Ahmedābād, p. 279.

⁶⁰ *Nāhar*, III, No. 2437.

earliest known date of his successor Jinmeru is of MS *Samācārī* dated VE 1562. It was copied by Gyānmandir Gaṇi at Jaisalmer.⁶¹ Jinmeru died in VE 1582.

He was succeeded by Jinguṇaprabha Sūri of Chājeḍ clan of Jodhpur. From Jaisalmer, a Saṅgha headed by Devapāl, Sadārang, Jīyā, Bastā, Rāimal and others came to Jodhpur and requested Śrījī to visit Jaisalmer. He accepted their request and came to Jaisalmer on Aṣādh badi 13 VE 1587, and remained there for several years.⁶² In VE 1594, when he was in Jaisalmer, there was a serious drought and people suffered much for want of water. It is said that Mahārāwal Luṇakārṇa requested him for redressing the plighat of the people. While loitering in *Upāsara*, he with the power of *mantras* got opulent rainfall on Bhadwā sudi 1. This increased the fame of Begaḍ *gaccha*.⁶³ He enjoyed a long life and died at Jaisalmer at the age of 90. He was contemporary to Mahārāwal, Luṇakārṇa, Māldeva, Haīrāj and Bhīm. He enjoyed a respectable position and several festivities were arranged under his supervision. He led a Saṅgha to Siddhācal started from Jaisalmer. At the time of selection of Jincandra Sūri of main branch of Kharatar-*gaccha*, Mahārāwal Māldeva consulted him. The *Sūri-mantra* was given by him to Jincandra Sūri. A good number of MSS copied at Jaisalmer during this period are *Ogh-Niryukti* (VE 1629), *Kalpa Sūtra* (1623), *Nandī Sūtra* (VE 1627), *Raj-Praśnīya* (1619) *Aupapātika Sūtra* (VE 1617) and others.

After Jinguṇaprabha's death Jincandra Sūri succeeded. He consecrated a *stūpa* of Jinguṇaprabha Sūri in VE 1663 (1603 A.D.) at Jaisalmer. There is a long inscription of 21 lines engraved by Chājeḍ clan of Oswāls.⁶⁴ Jincandra Sūri was the son of Bāfnā Rūpājī Sāha. He was converted to Jain monkhood by Jinguṇaprabha Sūri, and it was he who nominated him, as his successor. Mahimāsamudra, a Jain monk, composed two good poems in his praise. The copying of MSS by Begaḍ monks continued at Jaisalmer. Mahimāsumudra copied *Deśi-Nāma-Mālā* in VE 1701. A copy of MS *Uttarādhyana Sūtra* was made in VE 1711 in Pārśvanāth temple of Jaisalmer by Ratnasom. The *Pāṇḍava-Rāsa* was copied at Meharā (Sind). It seems that these monks continued their journeys to Sind. The copies of *Sārasvata Vyākaraṇa* (VE 1707) and *Dvādaśa Sandhi* (VE 1695) were also made.

61 Puṇyavijay. *op. cit.*, p. 201, 185, 189.

62 Vinaysāgar, *Kharatargaccha-ka Itihās*, p. 205.

63 *Ibid.*, pp. 205-206.

64 Nāhar, III, No. 2505.

After the death of Jincandra, Jinsamudra Sūri succeeded. He widely travelled in Gujarāt (Surat), western Rājasthān and Sind.⁶⁵ Māldās and Mahimāharṣa composed several poems describing the details of his visit to Surat. Several monks of Begāḍ-Kharatar continued to work at Jaisalmer. The MS *Srīpāl-Bālāvabodh* (VE 1725) and *R̥ṣi Maṇḍal Prakaraṇa* (VE 1726) were copied in Jaisalmer by Begāḍ Kharatar monks named Ratnasom and Samudra Gaṇi. At Nasaratpur in Sind Saubhāgyasamudra copied a MS *Karṇa Kutuhāl*.

Jinsamudra's successor was Jinsunder. Keeping their base at Jaisalmer, these Kharatar monks continued their journeys to Sind. The MS of *Gurvāvali* (VE 1773), *Jñān-Sukhadi* (VE 1676) and *Sandhi-Tantra-Bālāvabodh* (1779 VE) were copied at Thaṭṭā. Jinsunder was succeeded by Jinudai Sūri before VE 1781. The Beghaḍ-gaccha-*Upāsarā* inscription of Jaisalmer dated VE 1781 (1724 AD) has his name as an Ācārya.⁶⁶ A good number of followers of a Begāḍ-gaccha remained in Jaisalmer. It seems that the Ācāryas of main branch of Kharatar-gaccha became less effective in Jaisalmer and as such the influence of Begāḍ-gaccha increased. In VE 1806 the foot-prints of Matisāgar were installed at Jaisalmer.

After Jinudai, Jincandra Sūri succeeded him before VE 1812 (1756 AD). The foot-prints of Jinudai were installed in VE 1812 at Jaisalmer.⁶⁷ Jincandra was succeeded by Jineśvar Sūri whose inscriptions dated VE 1843, 1846 and 1861 have been found in Jaisalmer. We do not find full details of the successors of Jineśvar. Jinkṣamā-candra Sūri was the last Ācārya of this branch who died in VE 1902.

viii) Ācārya Śākhā

On the death of Jinsingha Sūri Jinrāj Sūri succeeded him at Meḍṭā in VE 1674. At this time Jinsāgar actively helped him and maintained cordial relations with him, for more than 12 years. On some points, perhaps due to Samaysundar's pupil Harṣanandan, a quarrel arose between the two. Jinsāgar Sūri made a new branch as Ācārya Śākhā of the Kharatar-gaccha. In this way the Saṅgha was split and many important families, Śrāvaka and Sādhus were divided. The *Nirvāṇ Rās* of Jinsāgar Sūri mentions the details of the split.

⁶⁵ Vinaysāgar, *op. cit.*, p. 210.

⁶⁶ *Nāhar*, III, No. 2446.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, III, No. 2509.

Samaysundar with his entourage and Śaṅkhwāl Jains of Jaisalmer became his followers. Harṣanandan was a competent scholar. Jinsāgar Sūri died in VE 1712 and was succeeded by Jindharna Sūri, Jincandra Sūri, Jinvijay Sūri, Jinkīrti Sūri, Jinyukti Sūri, Jincandra Sūri, Jinuday Sūri, Jinhem Sūri, Jinsiddha Sūri and Jincandra Sūri, one after the other. We do not find much details after Jincandra Sūri. In Dādavaḍi of Jaisalmer there is an inscription of VE 1936 (1879 AD), mentioning the name of a monk Dharmacandra of Ācārya Śākhā of Kharatar-gaccha, in whose memory, the Oswāl Pañcāyat constructed a *varaṇḍāḥ* there.⁶⁸ Some MSS copied by the monks of Ācārya branch have been known.

ix) *Jinraṅg Sūri Śākhā*

It was started by Jinraṅg Sūri in VE 1701. He performed a big *pratiṣṭhā* at Udaipur. It is said that the epithet “*Yug-Pradhān*” was bestowed upon him, by some Mughal Emperor. After him Jincandra Sūri and Jinvimal Sūri succeeded one after the other. Mahārāṇā Jagat Singh-II accorded a great honour to Jinvimal Sūri. After him Jinlalit Sūri, Jinakṣaya Sūri, Jincandra Sūri, Jinnandīvardhan Sūri, Jinjay-śhekar Sūri, Jincandra Sūri, Jinratna Sūri and others became Ācāryas one after the other.

x) *Mandovar Kharatar*

After the death of Jinharṣa Sūri, a group separated and appointed Jinmahendra Sūri, as their Ācārya at Māṇḍor in VE 1892. After Jinmahendra, Jinmukti Sūri, Jincandra Sūri and Jindharaṇendra Sūri became the Ācāryas one after the other.

We find the names of many Sādhus of Kīrtiratna Sūri Śākhā, Śāgaracandra Sūri Śākhā. Kṣemakīrtti Śākhā, Laghu Kharatarācārya Śākhā and others.

⁶⁸ *Nāhar*, III, No 2501.

Books Received

ACARYA SRIVIJAY KALAPURN SURI, *Sarvajña Kathit Param Sāmāyik Dharm* (in Hindi), Prakrit Bharati Academy, Jaipur, 1989. Pages 24 + 167 Price Rs. 40.00.

The Science of Equanimity as spoken by the Omniscients. Translated into Hindi by Sri Narendra Prakash Jain.

LALWANI, GANESH & BENGANI RAJKUMARI, *Triṣaṣṭiśalākā-puruṣacaritra*, Vol. 3 (in Hindi), Prakrit Bharati Academy, Jaipur, 1992. Pages 8 + 268. Price Rs. 100.00.

Gives Hindi translation of *Parva* 3 and 4. *Parva* 3 contains lives of Sambhavanāth, Abhinandan, Sumatināth, Padmaprabha, Supārśvanāth, Candraprabha, Subidhināth and Śīṭalanāth (from 3rd to 10th Tīrthaṅkaras). *Parva* 4 contains the lives of Śreāṇsanāth, Vāsupūjya, Vimalanāth, Anantanāth, Dharmanāth (from 11th to 15th Tīrthaṅkaras). Besides Tīrthaṅkaras it contains lives of Acala, Triprṣṭha, Aśvagrīva (1st Baladev, Vāsudev, Prati-vāsudev), Vijay, Dvīprṣṭha, Tārak (2nd Baladev, Vāsudev, Prati-vāsudev), Bhadra, Svayambhu, Merak (3rd Baladev, Vāsudev, Prati-vāsudev), Suprabha, Puruṣottama, Madhu (4th Baladev, Vāsudev, Prati-vāsudev), Sudarśan, Puruṣasimha, Niśumbha, (5th Baladev, Vāsudev, Prati-vāsudev), Maghavā (3rd Cakravartī), and Sanat-Kumara (4th Cakravartī).

MAHOPADHYAY CANDRAPRABHASAGAR, *Samśār Aur Samādhi* (in Hindi), Sri Jityasri Foundation, Calcutta, 1991. Pages 159. Price Rs. 15.00.

A Collection of his speeches,

MALBANIA, PANDIT DALSUKH, *Āgam-Yug kā Jain Darśan*, Prakrit Bharati Academy, Jaipur, 1990. Pages 23 + 320 + 35. Price Rs. 100.00.

Depicts the progress of Jain Philosophy from the time of Lord Mahāvīra.

OUR DONORS

J. KUTHARI & CO.

12 INDIA EXCHANGE PLACE, CALCUTTA-700001
Phone : Office 20-3142/1059, Resi. 50-5744

PARSAN BROTHERS

18B SUKEAS LANE, 1st Floor, CALCUTTA 700001
Phone : Office 27-8621, 26-3870/0104, Resi. 36-1142

APARAJITA

1 SHAKESPEARE SARANI, CALCUTTA 700071
AIR CONDITIONED MARKET
Phone : 22-4649, Resi. 47-2670

METROPOLITAN BOOK COMPANY

93 PARK STREET, CALCUTTA 700016
Phone 29-2418

M. CHANDRA & COMPANY

22 RABINDRA SARANI, CALCUTTA 700073
Phone 27-1301/3361

R. D. BUILDERS

8/1 LAL BAZAR STREET, CALCUTTA-700001
Phone 28-5146/6941, 28-3350

TARUN TEXTILES (P) LTD.

203/1 MAHATMA GANDHI ROAD, CALCUTTA 700001
Phone 38-8677, 39-6097

SURANA MOTORS PVT. LTD.

24-A SHAKESPEARE SARANI, CALCUTTA 700017
84 Parijat, 8th Floor
Phone 40-7450

LODHA CHARITABLE TRUST

14 GOVERNMENT PLACE EAST, CALCUTTA-700001
Phone 23-7102

PUSHRAJ PURANMULL

65 COTTON STREET, CALCUTTA 700007
Phone : Gaddi 39-7343/4566, Office : 21-1907

B. W. M. INTERNATIONAL

BIKANER — BHADOHI — CALCUTTA
2324 5378 20-3071

C. H. SPINNING & WEAVING MILLS PVT. LTD

BOTHRA KA CHOWK
GANGASAHAR, BIKANER

JAICHANDLAL VINODKUMAR

1/1 NOORMAL LOHIA LANE, CALCUTTA 700007
2nd Floor, Phone 38-3328/9678, 39-3450

JAYANTILAL & CO.

20 ARMENIAN STREET, CALCUTTA 700001
Phone : 25-7927/6734/3816, Resi. 40-0440

NAHATA BROTHERS

4 JAGAMOHAN MALLICK LANE, CALCUTTA 700007
Phone : Office 38-4755, Resi. 38-0817

BOYD SMITHS PVT. LTD.

B-3/5 'GILLANDAR HOUSE'
8 NETAJI SUBHAS ROAD, CALCUTTA 700001
Phone : Office 26-2139, Resi. 29-0629/0319

ELECTRONIC INDUSTRIES OF INDIA

Sister Concern of SUMERMAL ROYCHAND

143 COTTON STREET, CALCUTTA 700007
Phone 38-4329/8471

STANDARD ELECTRIC COMPANY

49 EZRA STREET, CALCUTTA 700001
Phone 26-5187, 27-5380

KUMAR CHANDRA SINGH DUDHORIA

7 CAMAC STREET, CALCUTTA 700017
Phone 22-5234/0329

MOTILAL BENGANI CHARITABLE TRUST

12 INDIA EXCHANGE PLACE, CALCUTTA 700001
Phone 20-9255

K. C. DUGAR & SONS

12 INDIA EXCHANGE PLACE, CALCUTTA 700001
Phone ; Office 20-8166/8143/9839, Resi 47-5011/7391

BALURGHAT TRANSPORT CO.

2 RAMLOCHAN MULLICK STREET, CALCUTTA 700073
Phone 38-9397/7098

HIND ELECTRICALS

1 GANESH CHANDRA AVENUE
CALCUTTA 700013
Phone 26-2008

BHIKAMCHAND DIPCHAND BHURA

2 CLIVE GHAT STREET, CALCUTTA 700001
5th Floor, Unit No. 8
Phone 20-3592/0131/5121/5229

BHUTAN DUARS TEA ASSOCIATION LTD.

11 R. N. MUKHERJEE ROAD, CALCUTTA 700001
Nilhat House, (6th floor)
Phone 28-1883/8582

JAIN & CO.

P-21/22 RADHA BAZAR STREET, CALCUTTA 700001
Phone : Office 22-6541/7215/9190/4618,
Resi. 71-1190/2611

ELECTRO PLASTIC PRODUCTS (P) LTD.

22 RABINDRA SARANI, CALCUTTA 700073
Phone 27-4039/7423

AAREN EXPORTERS

12A NETAJI SUBHAS ROAD, CALCUTTA 700001
1st Floor, Room No. 10
Phone 20-1370/3855

PHILATELIA

1 MOTI SIL STREET, CALCUTTA 700013
Phone 28-8549

PRASANCHAND GAMBHIRCHAND

12 INDIA EXCHANGE PLACE, CALCUTTA 700001
Phone 20-2603

THE CAMERA EXCHANGE

The Photo & Cine People
17/2A CHOWRINGHEE ROAD, CALCUTTA-700013
Phone 29-1647
Famous Photographic People Since 1933

A. M. BHANDIA & CO.

23/24 RADHA BAZAR STREET, CALCUTTA 700001
Phone 22-1022/6456

*Creativity is a
Modern
Religion*

Nahar

Designers of prestigious interiors

*Studio - 5/1 Acharya Jagadish Bose Road
Calcutta - 700020, Phone - 446874*