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Book Review


The Faculty of Asian Studies of the Australian National University is to be congratulated for publishing 26 articles of L A Schwarzschild on Middle Indo-Aryan. The book, in Royal Octavo size and containing 223 pages, is compiled by Royce Wiles and is published “on the occasion of Dr Luise Hercus’s retirement in 1991 from the Readership in Sanskrit which she has held since 1973 in the Faculty of Asian Studies of the Australian National University”. It is a good thing that ‘some of her colleagues, friends and former pupils have decided to reprint in book form the collection of 26 articles in the field of Middle Indo-Aryan studies which she published under the name of L A Schwarzschild between 1953 and 1979’. The articles are lithographically reproduced from the original Journals with original type-setting and pagination, giving, of course, the new pagination mark at the bottom. As the articles are printed in different type-setting, the book reminds us the shades and flavour of original sources and taste. It is true, indeed, that many of these articles are well-known to scholars working in the same field, ‘but some of those published in commemorative volumes are less well-known and are not easy to come by’. The members of the Faculty Council of the Asian Studies have rendered a yeoman’s service to the scholarly world for making these scattered articles available in a book form, for which they are to be thanked.

Besides 26 articles and a preface by K. R. Norman of the
Cambridge University, the book contains a list of publications by L. A. Schwarzschild on Middle Indo-Aryan year by year showing the progress and the development of her writings. The book has a grammatical index and indexes of Old, Middle and New Indo-Aryan words prepared respectively by Colin Mayrhofer and Royce Wiles. It is nicely printed and bound. The cover of the book is crowned with a manuscript folio which has enhanced the quality of the book.

This book is not a full-fledged grammar on Prakrit, or on Middle Indo-Aryan, but several problematic topics on Prakrit and Apabhramśa focussed by her from time to time in different Journals are put together in a book form. As the articles are printed in a chronological order the pattern of a grammar book is not found. The problems discussed by Schwarzschild are not obviously touched by any earlier writers, such as, Christian Lassen (Institutiones Linguae Pracriticæ, Bonnæ ad Rhenum, 1837), Nicolaus Delius (Radices Pracriticæ, Bonnæ ad Rhenum 1839), E. B. Cowell (A Short Introduction to the Ordinary Prakrit of the Sanskrit Dramas with the Grammar and a List of Common Irregular Prakrit Words, London 1875), Eduard Müller (Beiträge zur Grammatik des Jaina-Prakrit Berlin, 1879), Richard Pischel (De Grammaticis Pracriticis, Vratislaviae, 1874, and Grammatik der Prakrit Sprachen, Strassburg, 1900), Richard Schmidt (Elementarbuch der Sauraseni, Hannover, 1924) and many others. But the problems raised by her are scholarly and deep thought-provoking, and the majority deal with broad concepts.

Apart from the fact that this is not a book on Grammar, her articles can be arranged fairly in a grammatical order in the following manner:

I Phonology : 18, 19, 23, 24 = 4
II Morphology : 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 14, 20, 21, 25, 26 = 13
III Syntax : 22 = 1
IV Word-studies : 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17 = 7
V Miscellaneous : 10 = 1

In phonology, four articles are contributed and they are all very much thought-provoking. In Some Sporadic Changes of Vowels in Middle Indo-Aryan (No. 18, pp 134ff) and Some Unusual Sound Changes in Prakrit (No. 23, pp. 164ff.) her discussions on sporadic sound changes are straightforward. She has illustrated her paper by citing
some examples, such as, Skt. guru > Pkt. garua, practically coming from the base gar— as found in Skt. gariyas (cf. Gk. βαγός) and Skt. gartṣha, garimā, Pkt. garamā. Even the Pkt. garua is from Skt. garuka (Cf. Hemacandra’s sūtra garua ke vā, I. 109). Other examples are Skt. puruṣa, > Pkt. purisa, Skt. cubuka > Pkt. cibua, and so on. The reason which has actuated her to write this interesting phenomenon of Prakrit is due to the fact that ‘sporadic changes’ in Prakrit have not been studied as thoroughly as the regular sound changes. In a similar way, she has also noticed some irregular sound changes (pp. 164ff), such as, Skt. cikītśa > Pkt. tēūcchā, tīgīcchā, Skt. jyotsnā > Amg. S. dosinā, Skt. yugma > Desi dogga, Skt. taksatī > Pkt. caccchai (Hc. IV. 194). With regard to the changes of dentals to palatals due to the association of palatal y she has once again raised the problem of the pronunciation of the palatal series of consonants in Middle Indo-Aryan. The problem was started by G. A. Grierson (The Pronunciation of Prakrit Palatals, J.R.A.S., 1913, pp. 391ff), and reassessed by S. R. Banerjee (The Eastern School of Prakrit Grammarians, Calcutta, 1977, pp. 103-106), even though her analysis throws some new dimensions on the problem. The other two articles—The Middle Indo Aryan prefix vo ‘off’ and Some Phonological Problems Associated with It (No. 19, pp. 141ff) and Initial Retroflex Consonants in Middle Indo-Aryan (No. 24, pp 169ff)—are worth reading.

In morphology, there are thirteen articles which cover almost all the major important aspects of morphological features. In the domain of declension three problems are indicated by her three papers: Notes on the Declension of Feminine Nouns in Middle Indo-Aryan (No. 6, pp. 42ff), Distinction and Confusion: a Study of Neuter Plural Endings in Middle Indo-Aryan (No. 26, pp 186ff) and Variant Forms of the Locative in Middle Indo-Aryan (No. 25, pp. 175ff). In the first article her emphasis is mainly on two points: the oblique endings and the formation of the ending with—he (as in mālāhe) in Prakrit feminine. Though she has discussed quite a lot about the origin of tāhe (in order to elicit he from that base), her explanation of its origin either from tisyaḥ or dhi > hi > he, or from *bhim (cf. Gk. ἄδι) > him > he is not accepted by all. The simple origin of it is suggested at the end from tassa > tāsa > tāha > tāhe which form is then transferred to the locative ending (p. 48). In the second article, the problem of ‘the nominative accusative plural of the common neuter noun in a the grammar states that—ā—āim—āi, and āṇi are all used in Prakrit. In her opinion some of these are dialectal variations (p. 186ff). Her paper on locative is quite interesting. Prakrit has various forms in locative singular. They have mainly come from two sources:
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(i) Prakrit e corresponds to Skt. e and (ii) - .si, - .mi, - .mni, mni, - .mhi and later on- .ším, - .sím, Pali—.smi mín Mg. dhim, Ap. him are all derived from the Sanskrit pronominal ending - .smi. In her opinion these different endings, though could be used indiscriminately in Middle Indo-Aryan, 'show that many of these are regional and chronological variants possibly indicating scribal traditions, and some of them are of stylistic significance' (p. 185). In Notes on Two Post-positions of late Middle Indo-Aryan (No. 12, pp. 99 ff) her speculation on the origin of the two postpositions tanaya and resi (resamni) is praiseworthy.

In her article The Possessive Adjectives of Late Prakrit (No. 2 pp. 12ff) Schwarzschild has observed that 'possessive adjectives are not strictly essential parts of speech, their place can often be taken by the genetive of the personal pronouns. This has led to a certain lack of continuity in their development which has, however, often been exaggerated. Apart from very isolated survivals like maía, the Sanskrit possessives had already died out in Prakrit,' (p. 12). As a result, instead of discussing the problem from the point of view of Prakrit, her main emphasis is on Modern Indo-Aryan Vernaculars like Hindi, Rajasthani, Gujarati, Marathi and so on. This article is worth reading, at least, for understanding the origin of Proto-New Indo-Aryan possessive forms.

In verb morphology there are four articles and they are on the future, imperative, infinitive and gerund. In the 'Notes on the Future System of Middle Indo-Aryan (No. 1, pp. 1ff), she is mainly concerned with the future forms of New Indo-Aryan languages where the remnants of the MIA future system are reflected. The MIA future system is regulated by s-type and h-type. The s-type of future occurs in Gujarati, Lahnda, and Jaipur, and the h-type is preserved in Marwari, Hindi (Brajabhaṣa), Bundeli, Bhojpuri and Awadhí, as well as in Kāsmiri. Both these types are found in MIA, e.g., dāhanti and hohamhi in Asokan Inscriptions, and dāsāmi and dāsāmo in the Jaina canon, the process being OIA-sya > Pkt. > -sas > Pkt -sa→ha with the connecting vowel-i. This type of future forms is found in almost all the Prakrit dialects. In her opinion they are not all developed in one time. In a similar way her paper on A Study of Some Features of the Imperative in Middle Indo-Aryan (No. 20, pp. 146ff) though tells us how some of the MIA imperative endings are also found in some NIA languages, the main emphasis is not on its development in NIA, but how the Prakrit imperative endings behave in different Prakrit dialects like Maharāṣṭri, Sauraseni, Apabhraṃśa and others. This paper is interesting mainly for its usages.
Prakrit infinitives are sometimes confused with gerunds. Though Schwarzschild has not suggested any new derivations of the origin of Prakrit infinitive, her paper shows that she is still not very happy with some of the explanations offered by some earlier scholars like Weber, Müller, Pischel and others. The usual practice of tracing the origin of Prakrit -um or ium is from (i) tum and -tæa from Vedic tæyai or tavai along with all its variations -yæa, Æya, -æe or even -åyæa. In fact, the latter forms are gerunds used infinitively. Though short, her paper on gerund, Some Forms of the Absolutive in Middle Indo-Aryan (No. 5, pp. 37ff), discusses the origin and usages of gerund in Prakrit. There are many gerundial forms in the Middle Indo-Aryan of which two types are noteworthy. They are:

$tv$ types: -ttæ, -ttána(m) -t(í)una(m)
-ccã, -ccána(m),
-avi, -ivi, -evi
-eppi, epínu

$ya$ type: -ya, -a, iya, (i)yána(m), -i.

"The geographical and chronological distribution of these forms are complex", says Schwarzschild, yet she thinks that "(i) samprasræa to tu is perhaps characteristic of the Southern dialects, (2) assimilation to -tt of the Eastern dialects, (3) assimilation to -pp of the Western dialects, while (4) palatalisation to cc is very sporadic (cf. p. 37)". Her explanations need further investigation.

Her papers on adverbs (Quelques Adverbes Pronominaux du Moyen Indien etc, No. 8 pp. 57ff), on conjunctive (Remarques sur Quelques Conjonctions du Moyen Indo-aryen, No. 21 pp. 153ff) and one on indeclinable (The Indeclinable je in Middle Indo-Aryan No. 44, pp. 104ff) and also one on syntax (Some Interrogative Particles in Prakrit, No. 22, pp. 159ff) are straightforward. Some seven or eight papers are devoted to the study of some Prakrit words.

In the Bibliography of the Prakrit Language prepared by S. R. Banerjee (Calcutta, 1977), Schwarzschild's articles published between 1953 and 1960 were included. This shows that a Prakrit bibliography-maker was quite conversant with the rise and growth of a scholar like Schwarzschild. I, therefore, believe that this book will rouse enthu-
siasm among the younger scholars of the globe. It is painful to say that in modern times in Europe the Prakrit studies have been living in a realm of sad and doleful neglect. This timely broughtout treatise will generate some congenial atmosphere among the younger scholars of the world. I heartily recommend this book to the academic world and hope that the book-shelf of every library of this universe will be adorned with this book.

—Dr Satya Ranjan Banerjee
Department of Linguistics
Calcutta University
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Sacred Literature of the Jains

[from the previous issue]


We have for this aṅga the commentary of Abhayadeva. For a special table of contents for the first two books, two-thirds of the third book, for books 34-41, cf. my treatise, of which mention has often been made here and which created a new course for Jaina investigations: “On a fragment of the Bhagavati” part first 1866 part second 1867. 285

253 vyākhyaṭyaṇte...yasyām sa vyākhyaḥ; viyāhe iti puliṅganirdesāḥ prakṛttatvāḥ; saṭṭhiṁ saṁsaharasānām (vyākaranaṁ) darśanāt śrutartho vyākhyaaye iti: vyākhyasambhādhāh. 254 N has here the order loe ..., jivā- ..., sasamāe ..; the verb is here correct, viyāhijjai with loe; samea, "śijmi with jivā. 255 viyāhe naṁ C; the following is omitted in N, 256 vīthara A; nāṇāvihaḥ surair. vivihasamsahaya-vadhēḥ prīṭaṇām; Mahāvītareṇa. 257 drayaa...parināmaṁnām yathāśhitabhāvinagama-niṣṭyepanayapramānasununupanopakrama vivihapakarāḥ prakataṁ pradarśito yair vyākaranaṁ tāṇi teṣaṁ...naya nainagmadayaḥ. 258 lokalokau prakāśitau yeṣu. 259 saṁsārasamaṇḍrasavā vīśtiṇyāsa uttarāte samarthānaṁ. 260 suṣṭhā dṛṣṭaṁ, dvisahutiṁ; anyunakāṇi saṭṭhiṁsaṁsaharaṁ yeṣaṁ tāṇi, iha makāro' nyathāpadaśiṁ c prakṛttatvā anomadayaṁ. 261 teṣāṁ darśanāt prakāśanāt upariśamhādhit ity a, athava teṣāṁ darśaṁ upadarśakā ity a. 262 śrutarthāḥ, te ca bahuvihapakāraś ca 'tī vigrahaḥ, śrutarthānām va bahuvihdhāḥ prakārāḥ iti vigrahaḥ. 263 śiṣyatiḥ iṣṭarthaḥ. 264 gunamahathāḥ [{'B.C.}; gunahastā guṇaparyāpyātyālakṣaṇo hasta iva hastaḥ pradhanayavayoḥ yeṣaṁ te (cf. Pet. Dict. s. v. hasta i 1). 265 In the enumeration of daily labours, I. 378, the statement in lines 9 and foll. is to be explained thus: “at most a whole sayam on one day, a moderate measure in two days, at least a sayam in three days” — see above p. 250. āyamīla in 14 stands for āyamīla acāmāma and signifies a meal taken during a fast consisting of a “sour swallow”, a portion of sour pap cf. Leumann Aupap. p. 101, and in a derived sense a division of time necessary for this meal — I. 18 read: “need a day each”; 1.19 read “sêṭhāsayāṁ (book 34)” . Much must be now changed in the middle portion of the treatise.
VI. The sixth angam, Nāyādharmamakahāu, [306] Jñāta dharmakathās, in two suvakhaṇḍhas (śrutaskandha), which are very different in extent. The first in 19 aṭṭhakathās contains the nāyāni, which word is explained by udāharaṇa, dṛṣṭānta, i.e. edifying tales or parables, designed to serve as moral examples; the second which is much smaller, contains n 10 vaggas the dhammakahāu, i.e. edifying legends. The specific difference in the contents of both parts is not rendered clear by this method of division,267 which itself is characterized in the legendary introduction to the text as a constituent part of the same.

In this introduction, which begins with the formula usually found in legends—tenaṃ kāleṇaṃ tenaṃ samaṇenaṃ—the work is referred to a dialogue between Mahāvīra’s scholar Suhamma and the latter’s scholar Jambū,268 which took place at the period of king Köna of Campā. Suhamma represents the transmission of the [307] sacred texts as proceeding directly from Mahāvīra. He prefaces “the fifth angam is now ended (pāñcamassā angassā ayaṃ aṭṭhe pannatte), what is the contents of the sixth angam?” and then continues with a detailed presentation of its division as given above, citing the titles of each of the 10 aṭṭhakathās of the first suakkhaṇḍha. Hereupon follows one of the usual ajjhayaṇa introductions which from this point on is found at the beginning of each of the following aṭṭh.

This style of introduction and of tabulation of the contents recurs269 in exactly the same form in the case of the aṅgas 7-11, and proves that these six aṅgas especially are bound together and have perhaps been the subject of treatment at the hands of the same redactor. They are connected like links in a chain, inasmuch as in the beginning of each aṅga reference is made to the aṅgas preceding it. The first four aṅgas have a mark of unity in their introductory formula suyaṃ me and in their close ti hemi. The fifth aṅga occupies an isolated position.

266*See Schol. Hem. 243 p. 319 (Bkg.-Rieu) for the length of the ā in Jñāta.—The same length is observed in the Vedic compound idhmā-barhīs ; see also the Vienna Oriental Journal, Vol. III, p. 331, note 2—L.

267 Accord. to the Comm. this difference consists herein, that in the first part ātopaḻambhājñātair dharmārtha upantāḥ, in the second part sākṣat kathābhīr abhi-dhiyate. The second part contains, it is true, no parables and similitudes, but the first, as well as the second contains kathās. As Leumann informs me the term nāya is treated in great detail in aṅga 3, 4, 3.

268 The Prakrit text Jambūdīṭṭhaṇa, or Jambūsvaṃkathānakam, in 21 uddeśas, deals with him ; the Prakrit in it is very like the apabhraṇa.

269 The tenth has now, it is true, another introductory formula. Abhayadeva however cites a different one which is exactly the same as that found before aṅgas 7, 8, 9, and 11.
The fact that this *introducitio solemnis* is found in all six *aṅgas*, alike, is proof enough of its late origin and of its being the work of a hand which brought all six into close conjunction. If this be so, it is possible to conceive that the explanation of the name *nāyā-dhammakahāṭu* which occurs in *aṅga 6* (*nāyāṇī ya* [308] *dhammakahāṭa ya*) is not in harmony with its original signification. I prefer the foll. explanation: first separate the word into *nāyādhamma* and *kahāṭu* and understand by *nāyādhamma* the “dharma of the Jñāta” i.e. of Mahāvīra (see above, p. 261, on *aṅga 2, 1, 1, 6*), and understand the meaning to be “Recitals for the dharma of the Jñāta.”

But we must not suppress an objection. In the *aṅga* section in *aṅga 4* and *Nandi*, both parts of *aṅga 6* are especially recognized, and in fact by the same titles: *nāyāi*, and *dhammakahāṭu*. This misunderstanding, if such here exist, must have been anterior to the date of *aṅga 4* and N. I cannot however regard this as a cogent objection, since the *Nandi* is the work, according to all probability, of Devardhīgapi himself (980 Vīra), and the section of *aṅga 4* is perhaps, in the last instance, the production of a still later period (cf. above, p. 284.).

The statements in reference to the extent of the second part of *aṅga 6* contained in *aṅga 4* and identical with those of the *Nandi*, are full of the most fabulous exaggerations, cf. p. 286, 289. Each of the *dhammakahāṭas* is said to contain 500 *akkhāyīs*, each of these 500 *uvakkhāyīs*; each *vv. 500 akkhāya-uvakkhāyīs* with a total of “3½ *koṭis*”, i.e. 35 millions of *akkhāṭas*. This latter sum excites the hostility of surprise since, if we reckon each [309] of the ten *vaggas* of the second part as a *dhammakahāṭi*, the result for all 10 is if we trust the above quoted statements, 125 *koṭis*, namely 10 × 500³, i.e. 1250 millions! According to the Schol. on the *Nandi* this riddle is solved by the assumption that of the 125 *koṭis*, only 3½ *koṭi* are “apunarukta”, and the remaining 121½ *koṭis* have occurred in the nine *ajjh. 11-19* of part 1, each of which in turn contains 540 *akkhī*, having each 500 *uvakkh*, and these 500 *akkhī, uvakkh* each.

270 The length of the *a* of *nāyā* (cf. Pāñ, 6, 3, 129, 130) is irregular according to both explanations.—See however the first note on this *aṅga*. It certainly militates against the plausibility of the above conjecture, that the recitals of the first part are cited in the references of the redactor under the designation of *nāyā* (*jaḥa anḍānde, jahā Mallaṅāe*)—L.

271 There is no reason whatever to suppose a misunderstanding in the above passages only to please an etymology of the 19th century; even in this very *aṅga 6* the term *nāyā* is applied to the first and twelfth *ajjh*, as will be seen from their titles given later on. Remember also the term *nāyāḥ-hāvaṇāṁ* spoken of above on *aṅga 419*. 
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57
Dismissing such calculations as mere child’s play, let us examine the actual state of things. In the first place the titles of the 19 aijhayanas of part I are enumerated at the outset (see page 307), and are found singly in Āvaśy, 16,82.83 (Āv.) and in the Vidhiprapā (V.).

They are as follows:

1. Ukkhitānā, Utkṣiptam : the “raised” but not replaced foot of an elephant, the first birth of prince Megha, whose history is here related ab ovo (pregnancy of his mother, birth of the child, education, marriage, instruction at the hands of Mahāvīra). See Paul Steinthal: “Specimen der Nāyādhammakāh,” Leipzig, 1881. The contents are said by Abh. to be anucitaprayāttikasya sīgyasyo pālambhāḥ.

2. Saṃkhāḍa (Av. saṃghāḍa V), saṃghāṭakah; śreṣṭhīcaurayar ekabaṃdhanabaddhatvam; or anucitaprayāttikocitaprayāttikayor anarthārthaprāptiparamparaḥ.

3. Arīda, mayūrāṇḍam (cf. p. 270 note 4); pravacanārtheṣu saṃkṣītā saṃkṣītayoḥ prāṇinor dosagunau [310].

4. Kumma, kūrma; asamīlāṃdriyetarayor (i.e. asamīlāṃdriyasaṃlineṣṭiaryor) anarthārthau.

5. Selaa, Śailako rājarśih; pramādavato' pramādavatas ca 'nartheṣare (i.e. anarthārthau, evil and weal.)

6. Tumba (tumbaya V), alābā; prāṇātipātādīmatāṁ karmagurutābhāvene taresāṁ ca laghutābhāvena anarthārthāptītare. 7. Rohinī śreṣṭhīvadhāḥ; mahāvratānāṁ virāḍhanāvirāḍhanayor anarthārthau.

8. Mallī, ekanaviṇṇatamajinasatīnnotpannā tirthakari; mahāvratānām evā ‘lpenā’ ‘pi māyāsalyena dūṣītānām ayathāvatsvaphalasādhakatvam, or māyāvato ‘nartheḥ.

9. Maini (Māyaṇḍi V); Mākaṇḍi nāma vaṇik, tatputro Mākaṇḍiśabdene ‘ha grītāḥ; bhogēṣu aviratimato ‘nartho, viratimataś cārthāḥ.

272 I extract these explanations or, as the case may be, statements of contents, from the introductions to each of the aijh. in Abhayadeva’s Comm.

273 On page 4 twenty-one aijh, of part I are erroneously spoken of; there are but nineteen.

274 viz. aprāṇāti’.

275 i, e. anarthārthaprāptyartha-prāpti.

276 See Kup. 10 (800).
10. Caṅḍamā (caṇḍīma V) caṇḍramāḥ; guṇavrddhiḥnālakṣaṇāv anarthārthau pramādy-apramādināḥ.

11. Dāvaddave (āge Āv.), samudratate vṛksaviṣeṣāḥ; mārgārādhana-virādhanābhyyām anarthārthau, or cāritradharmasya virādhatvam ārādhakatvam ca.

12. Udaga nāe, udakāṁ nagaraparikājalaṁ; cāritrārādhakatvaṁ prakṛtiścaktimānaṁ api bhavyānāṁ sadguruparikāraṁā bhavati: or samsargaviṣeṣād guṇotpākarṣaḥ.

13. Maṁśukke, Maṁśukkaṁ naṁdīmanikāra-sreṣṭhījīvah; saṁsarga-viṣeṣābhavaṇṇa guṇaṇākarṣaḥ; or satāṁ guṇaṇāṁ sāmagry-abhāvē hānir.

14. Tevali i ya (Teuli Āv.), Tetalisutaḥbhidhāno-māryaḥ; tathāvi-dhasamagrisadbhāve guṇasampapupajāyahe; or apamāda viṣayatvāgah. See pp. 271 note 2. 317.

15. Naṁdiḍphala : [311] naṁdīvṛkṣābhīdhanataruphalāṇi; Jīnopadeśāt (viṣayatvāgah), tatra ca saty arthāprāptiś, tadbhāve tv anarthāprāptiḥ; or viṣayābhīṣyanāṃ yā naṁdiḍphalātā.

16. Avarakahkā, Dhaṭṭakśamāṇa Bhaṭaratārājadhāni; tad-viṣayanidānyaśa (anarthaphalātā); or nidāṇā (t) kuśitaćānād va anarthāh.

17. Āinne, ākīrṇa jātyāḥ samudramadhyavartinośvāḥ; inārtyebho niyantritēbhayaḥ sa (anarthaḥ) ucyate; or inārdiyavasavartinnām itaresāṁ ca 'narthetarau.379

18. Suṁsumā (Suṁsa Āv.), Suṁsumābhīdhanā sreṣṭhidhūkāt; lobha-vasavartinnām itaresām ca tav eva (anarthārthau); or asaṁvṛtāśravasye' tarasya ca 'nartheṣtarau.

19. Punjārāte, punjaṅarikāṁ;380 cirāṁ saṁvṛtā'sravo bhūtvā'pi yah paścat anyathā syāt tasya alpakālāṁ saṁvṛtāśravasya ca tav (anarthērāv) ucyete.

After the conclusion of ajjh. 19 there follows a special conclusion for the first suyakhaṇḍhe,381 then the usual beginning for the second suyakhaṇḍhe held in the same strain as the introduction to the ānga itself, and giving in detail the contents of each of the ten vargaś.

---

277 Tevaliputhe in the text.
278 Here there is a detailed account of the Dovat (Draupadi).
279 i.e., anarthārthau.
280 See ānga 2, 2, 1.
281 The statement that 19 days are necessary to finish the 19 ajjh. is found here.

---
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These treat of the aggamahisto, 1, Camarassa, 2, Balissa Vairoyanaranço, 3, asurîndavajjiyânam dâhiîllâyam iîndâgam, 4, uttarillânam asurîndava- 
jjiyânam bhavantvasî-iîndâyan, 5, dâhiîllâyam vînamantarâyan, 6, uttarillânam vânam, 7, chaîndasssa, 8, surasssa, 9, Sakkassa, 10, Isânassa [312].

The actual composition of the text of the second part is quite summary. To the first vagga five aîjhayanâs are ascribed,282 their names being Kâlî, Râti, Rayanî, Vijju, Mehâ, names of the five wives of Camara. The history of the first alone is really related, and that in quite brief fashion; that of the second is very much abbreviated and is identified with the first by the use of the customary marks of abbreviation (evam jahâ Kâlî, tam ceva savam jâva); that of the third is still shorter, and the fourth and fifth are settled with a word or two.

The text of the remaining vargas is despatched in a like-summary fashion with but few words, although quite a number of aîjh, are allotted to several of them. Their contents is as follows: varga 2 five aîjh., vargas 3 and 4, 54 each, vargas 5 and 6 each 32, vargas 7 and 8 each 4, vargas 9 and 10 each 8.—In the Vidhiprapâ however 10 aîjhayanâs each are allotted to varga 1 and 10 to varga 2.283

The extent of the second part in the MSS. is one-twenty-first of the first part. In one MS. the commentary on part 2 is despatched in four lines. Even if all due regard is paid to the second note on aînga 7 given below on p. 315, how curious are the statements, p. 286, 289, 308, from aînga 4 and Nandi.

The events take place in Rayagiha, Câmpâ, Varanâsi, Bâravati, Viyasogâ, Teyalipura, Ahicchatât, Hatthisisâ, Pundaragiñi In the first account we find an [313] enumeration of non-Aryan peoples; some are not found among those quoted, p. 302, from aînga 5, others are found here which are wanting there. We read (see Steinthal, p. 28) : bâhûhin Cîlîiyâhin khujjhihin vâvanî(1)-vaçabhi(1)-Babari Vaûsi- 
Joniya - Palhari - Isinî - Thuruigma - Làsitya - Lâusiya - Damili - Sinhaîî- 
Aravi-Pulimî-Pakkanî, Bahali-Murumî-Sabari-Pàrasthiin. There is, further-more, mention made here of 72 kalâs (cf. p. 282 and Steinthal,

282 paîhamassa vaggassa paîca aîjhayanâ paî ham taî : Kâlî ..Mehâ.
283 ...paîhamavaggo, tammi dara aîjhayanâ ..vie dara aîjhayanâ, (see above, p. 231).
The word javanīya (St. p. 14), yavanikā, “curtain”, refers to a stage-curtain or to the theatrical plays of the Greeks. We must not fail to notice the mention of 18 desibhāsā (St. p. 29) in a list which does not go into detail (see below, p. 336 and on up. 1 Cf. Ind. Stud. XVI. 38 on the word talavara (St. p. 14).

There is a commentary by Abhayadeva.

The table of contents in aṅga 4 or Nandi (N) is:—se kiṃ taṁ nāyādhmakkahādu294? nāḥ hāsaṁ nāyānaṁ295 nagaraṁ ujjānaṁ ceiyāṁ vanasamālā (ḍāṁ N) rāyāno296 ammāpyaro samosaraṇaṁ dharmānyarīyaṁ dharmakahāu iha-loīya paraliyā ṭaṭṭhvisēṣa bhogaparīcecaḥ pavajāy suyaparīgghahā tavo-vahāṇīṁ pāvavamanāṁ297 devalagamaṇaṁ298 sukula-paccaṁyā299 puṇa-bohilā299 antakiryaṁ [314] ya291 aghaviyaṁ jāva292 nāyaḥ293 nām pāvavāyaṁ viṇa-yakaranajīnasāmānasāna-vare294 samajapaināpālāna-dhi-māva-vāsāya-dulla-bhāṅaṁ295 tavanīya-tavo-vahāṇa-ranaduddhābharahabhaṅgān-sahāhāni-satthānaṁ296 ghoparīsahaparājīyaṁ, sahāpāraddharuddha-siddhālaya-

294 jnātāny udaharanaṁ tatpradhānā dharmakathāṁ jnātāṁ thā, dirghaṁva saṁjnātrīvā; nāyādh is taken here as karmadh...not as a dvandva.
295 nāyaṁ BC, jnātānāṁ udaharanaṁ bhaktānāṁ Megahakumārdhānāṁ nagaraṁyā akhyayante, nagaraṁyā dvā bhiśaṁ padāṁ kaṁhāyānti.
296 The foll. is inverted in nāyaṁ rāṁ ani dha hāva dhārīyaṁ ihalagaparīcchā yaddhivisesa bhogaparīcchā pavajāy parīgghā suapaṁ pavovā सामे भट्टपराकक्काः; in aṅga 7 lg. the case is similar.
297 pāvaṁ A, pāvayaṁ N,
298 N ed. has according to Leumann the following just as in aṅga 7 (p. 307),
299 ? pavaya BC, pavayaṁ A, pa acato N.
300 labhā N.
301 yat A, yo N. ‘yato ya BC.
302 jāva signifies that here anyāṁ paṁca padāṁ da(r) śyāni, i.e., aftē āgh., the usual five words pannaviyaṁti pariṇi damś ti dañāṁś ti uvadamsi. consists.
303 jāva nāyāṁ to the end is omitted in N; in which there follows dasa dharmakahāṇāṁ vagga and the remarks in reference to the number of the akkhātas.
304 sāṁ omitted in BC. ‘sāṁsa-vare ṣeṣaparavananpekeṣuḥ pradhānapavanacare ity a, pāṭhāntareṇa; samanāṁ viṇa-yakaranajīnasānaḥ (perhaps an older ‘reading’ pavare.
305 paṁca, thiti, duvallānāḥ A: samyamapriyūṣa samyamābhyyupagunah; sai ‘ya dur-śiṣṭhānaṁkathāva ca pāṭalāmiva pāṭalām (other reading), tatra dhītraṁyavasāya durlabhā yeṣām te tathā; pāṭhāṁtareṇa samyamapratī-śnāpālaṁyā dhītramātyavasāya yeṣu durlabha ye, teṣām.
306 duvadhara bhārabhāgaḥ A: tapoṣiṇyamata-papūdadhane, te eva ranāṁ ca kātanaraka-kṣobhakathāvaḥ samgrāmo...ramakāraṇatvat durbharbhāca ca, tābhāyām bhāghaḥ, parāmukhābhāghaḥ, tathā niḥṣahā nitarāṁ atakta eva. niḥṣahāka, niṣṭṣet ca niṣṭaṁyā niṣṭaṁyā ya te; prakṣāntaṇe, kakālōpa-saṃdhyakaranābhyām bhāghaṁ ity adau dirghatvam avasayam.
VII. The seventh áṅgam uvasagadāsū, upāsakadāsās, in ten ajjhayanās; legends about ten upāsakas or pious fathers of families (gāhāvai), who, by means of asceticism, &c., attained the divine condition and thereby release.

Áṅgas 7-9 belong to the second group of áṅgas (see above p. 249, 307), from the general connection of the contents of each, from their common designation in áṅga 3,10 as dasāu,10 “decades,” from the special common denomination of their introduction (ukkheva, upakṣepa) or conclusion (nikheva), and from their very limited extent,311 [316]

291 sahayārabdhānudhāyih, ātā eva saddhārgaj jñānādēr. nirgatah.
292 tīrāt eva yatigvaiḥ śaṅkāḥ; padatrayaṣya ca karmadhārayahḥ: virādhita-cari-
traṣaṇādārāyana-yatigvai-vividhā-prakāraṇaṁśrā-saṅkāyānaṁ.
293 pavanne BC.
294 jiṣya- senidhīttidhānaya A; jītama pariṣatākṣayasyaśayयā yaiḥ, dhiṭer dhanīkāḥ
svāminah (cf. Āgapati. § 32 p. 126), samyame utṣāho...aṇayāmśāhī yēsām.
295 śisitā A; niṣiṣalyo mithyādarānādīraḥitā.
296 bhurūga B.C.
297 siddha B. C.
298 bodhana B. C.
299 pavatte BC. pratrayaṣya ca, bodhakāraṇabhūtiṃ vākyāni.
300 jahāṭhiyai B. C.; lokamunayāḥ...parivirajakādayo yathā ca yena prakāreṇa sthitāḥ (ś)
śāsane.
301 uveti C, uveli A.
302 “kkha A.
303 evam āhī 'ttha vichiṣṭa ya A.
304 aṭṭhaḥyaṁanārāpāṭh: see Hem. abhidh. v. 244. We saw it is true, above (p. 270
seqq.) on áṅga 3, 10 that the designation dhasī suits only the texts cited there, but
not our texts of áṅgas 7-9 with the exception of áṅga 7; these must consequently
be regarded as secondary in comparison to the former.
311 The smallness of these áṅgas is however to some extent only one of appearance, in
so far as each of the numerous tales, which, from being identical with previous
aṅgas 7-9 thus stand in immediate connection with each other and bear the stamp of an undeniable unity.

This conclusion is drawn from the method of treatment which prevails in them, and which explains their inconsiderable extent. The first account contains (as is the case in part 2 of aṅga 6) the pattern on which all the others are modelled. We need therefore refer merely to the points of contact, and make mention of what is new in the presentation of the subject. An especial characteristic of aṅga 7 is this: Though different localities are adduced for the single stories, which all belong to the period of Mahāvīra, the king is in every case (the name Sepia in the eighth story is the solitary exception) called Śiyasattu, the origin of which name must be sought in the Ajātashatru of the Buddhistic legends. The titles of the ten stories are found in aṅga 3,10 (S), and are in general the same as those given here; see above, p. 271:

1. Āṇamūḍa in Vāṇiyagāma.
2. Kāmadeva in Caṃpā.
4. Surādeva, in Bāṇarasī.
5. Culla sala (se S, sayaga V) in Ālabhiyā.
7. Saddalaputta in Polāsapura; he was a potter and adherent of the Ājīvias (ājīvikāḥ Gosālaśisyaḥ, Schol.).
8. Mahāsaya (sayaga V) in Rāyagiha.

Vardhamānadeśana is the title of a metrical treatment in Prakrit gāthās of the contents of this aṅga, to which I have had access. The MS is cut short at v. 865 in the history of Ānanda. An interlineal version in Sanskrit accompanies the Prakrit; its first verse cites the ones, are reduced to some phrases only, must be counted in full. At the end especial mention is made of the number of days necessary for the uddeśanam i.e. recital or recitation of each of the aṭṭhayaṇas or vṛgas. The Vidhiprapā charac-
terizes the 10 aṭṭh. as egasora because they are not divided into uddeṣagas.

512 In each account there is a name beginning with Aruṇa; in the first the name Aruṇa itself, in the others it forms the first member of a compound e.g. Aruṇābhē, Aruṇappahe, Aruṇakathte, Aruṇasitthe, &c.
title *Vardhā*. The sixth name is the same (v. 8) as in S V; kolīka (kolika), the eighth (v. 9) Mahāsayana (but śatakā in the *chāya*), the tenth Tealipio (Tetalipriya, see p. 310).

There is an anonymous commentary, which refers to a *vyākhyā* on *aṅga* 6 by the same author. The word *kaṁīhya* (often erroneously *kamīya*), which is frequently used in the scholia when the meaning of a passage is plain and needs no further comment, implies that these passages are "in everybody's throat, intelligible by themselves". This I owe to the courtesy of a communication from Bühler.

The table of contents in *aṅga* 4 and *Nandī* is as follows:—*se kīṁ taṁ uvāsagadasāu? uvā<s>sāsu nāṁ uvāsagānaṁ (samovā N) nagarāṁ ujjā ceī vaṇa (N omits) rāy;*<sup>313</sup> ammā samo dharmijāya dharmakāhā ihaloparalogapa-iddhī<sup>314</sup> visēsā, uvāsagānaṁ ca<sup>315</sup> silawaya-veroamanā-guna<sup>316</sup> pacca [318] kkhāṇa-posahovavāsa-pādīvajjanayāyū<sup>317</sup> suvaparigghāhā tavo' vahānāṁ paṭīmānu<sup>318</sup> uvasagga samilehaṇā bhuttapaccakkhaṇāu ("nāmī N) pāvagama (paṇvagamanāṁ N) deva<sup>319</sup> sukula<sup>319</sup> punābohi<sup>319</sup> amatkiriyāya ya (N omits) āghavijjamī ; uvāsagadasāsu<sup>320</sup> nāṁ uvāsagānaṁ riddhivisesā parida<sup>321</sup> vitharadhamausahaanā<sup>322</sup> bohilāba-abhigama-sammattavisuddhāthā-thirattan<sup>323</sup> mūlaunottaraṅgaṇā aticārā thitivisesā<sup>324</sup> ya bahuvisesā paṭīma<sup>325</sup> bhiggahaṇa<sup>326</sup> pūlanā uvasaggāhiyasana<sup>327</sup> nirvasaggayā ya<sup>328</sup> tav<sup>329</sup> ya ca rittī silavayagunaveramanapaccakkhaṇaposahovavāsā apaccim-

<sup>313</sup> N has again an inverted order (and the complete words) *sa, rā. am. dhō hāo dhīriyā.*

<sup>314</sup> iddhī N.

<sup>315</sup> uv., ca N omits.

<sup>316</sup> Inverted in N : bhogapariccaya pariyāgā suvaparigghāhā tavo'vahānāṁ stilā paṭīvajjanayā paṭīmao.

<sup>317</sup> gunaveramanā N (inverted).

<sup>318</sup> silavratāhy aqurvattā, viramanātī rāgādī(vi)rā(a)yaḥ (!), guṇā guṇavartiṇī, pratīkhyātānam namaskārasahitāḥ ; posadag īthamālīparvātāni, tattvāravānām āhāraśatrasatākāriyāgaḥ ; pratipadātāto... 

<sup>319</sup> devalogamanāṁ sukulapacehā punābohilābha N.

<sup>320</sup> What follows, omitted by N

<sup>321</sup> mātātiparpurādākhyāntara (!) pariṣaṭ, dāśīdāsamitrāddikā vā.

<sup>322</sup> vistaraḥdamāravānā mahāvārdhāṇaṁ saṁnidadhau.

<sup>323</sup> samyakva visuddhatā sthiratva.

<sup>324</sup> adhīti A ; gunataramahātyāryā thitivisesā B. thīti C.

<sup>325</sup> samyogadānādiparimah.

<sup>326</sup> bhiggahagahanāpā C.

<sup>327</sup> hītsamā B C, upasargādhisahanāni, sec Leumann, Aupap. p. 100.

<sup>328</sup> esagga ya B C.

<sup>329</sup> tava ya to *nāmītya ya omitted in A.*
VIII The eighth aṅgam, aṁtakṛtaṁdāsā, aṁtakṛtaṁdāsas, or aṁtakṛṛdaṁdāsas, see Hem. abh. v. 244; in eight vaggas, embraces in all 93 aţijhayanās, viz. (10, 8, 13, 10, 10, 16, 13, 10). It deals with legends concerning the pious, who have “put an end” to their worldly life.

The number of the vaggas, eight, is very remarkable, as it is not in harmony with the concluding part of the title. Our surprise is however increased when we reflect that in aṅga 3 and aṅga 4 (see above 271, 286) ten aţijhayanās were allotted to our text; in aṅga 4, besides, seven vaggas and ten uḍdesaṇākālās. The Nandi agrees with our text in apportioning to it eight vaggas (and eight uḍḍ.), but makes no mention of aţijhayanās whatever. Furthermore the titles of the ten aţijhayanās cited in aṅga 3, 10, have scarcely anything in common with those of our text (see p. 271, 322); some appear in aṅga 9. There is therefore here a violent opposition between [320] the tradition and the actual constitution of the text. We have seen above, p.

330 paścāttālābhāvīnāyaḥ, akāraś ca moṁgaḷaparīhārārthahā (?) muraṇarūpe aṁte bhava muraṇāṁtiṁyaḥ.  
331 Thus A. samlehaṇajhospaṁtih B. C.; ātmanāḥ sartrasya jivasya ca saṁlekhanaṁ tapasā rāguḍijavasikaranānānīnāṁ jhospaṁ tī jōsaṇa sevaṇā.  
332 cheyardūva A; chedayātya.  
333 kalpavaresu yāṇi vīmaṇāṇy uttamaṇi teṣu.  
334 varatpaṁdārasesu A.  
335 k. bh. utt. omitted in A.  
336 bohi B, laddhaṇa A.  
337 rajā A. rāyogha B; tamo-rajā-oṁaṇipramuktah ajñanakarmaprasāva-vipaṇa.  
338 uveṁti omitted in A; upayanti.  
339 aksyaṇam apinanarvītikam.  
340 Likewise in the Vīdhiprapa.  
341 aṁto vinnāḥ, sa ca karmanas tatphalasya ca saṁsārasya kṣī yais teṁtakṛtas te ca trthaṅkaradāyaḥ.  
342 The scholiast seeks to reconcile the contradiction as follows:—pradhamaṁvarga daśā dhivyayanānī tī tattvamāṁhyā aṁtakṛtaṁdāsa. This is of course a mere make-shift. If Abh. appeals to the Nandi on this point (see p. 291n), he can mean nothing else (since the Nandi contains nothing of the kind) than that the Nandi cites for our aṅga eight “vaggas” instead of ten “aţijh.” This so-called “explanation” substitutes, without a word of warning “aţijh. for vaggā.”
272, 291, that even Abhayadeva on āṅgas 3 and 4 confessed that he was unable to explain the differences between the statements made there and the text constituting the āṅga.

In harmony with this is the fact that the existing text is in an exceedingly fragmentary condition, and is filled with references to sections in āṅgas 5 and 6, upāṅga 2 and according to the scholia, to the Daśā-śrutaskandha, the fourth chedaśutraṁ. In many instances, the later ajjhayaṇas of a vagga, just as was the case in part 2 of the sixth āṅga and in āṅga 7, present us with nothing more than a mere title. Each vagga is preceded by a statement in kārika-form of the contents of the ajjhayaṇas, which are therein contained. The scholiast on the Nandi thinks that by the vaggacālityā 343 (mentioned among the anāṅgapavittha texts) the 8 vaggas of the Antakeśadasās are intended. The same statement is found in the scholion on āṅga 3, 10; though there appears to be no proper place for any cāliya whatever.

The scene of the first story is in Bārāvatī at the court of king Amdhayavaṇhi (Amdhakavṛṣṇi), or of Kāhe nāmaṁ Vāsudeva rāyā; the names Vasudeva, Baladeva, Aritoṭhanemi, Pajjunna, Samba, Aniruddha, Jāmavati, Saccabhāma, Ruppiṇī &c., which belong to this story, and also that of Bāravati itself, are met with frequently as the reciprocal proceeds. The ninth story of the first vagga treats of Pasepai, [321] Prasenajit. The third vagga begins with the history of Anśīyasa, son of Nāge nāma gāhāvari, Sulasā nāma bhārīya, 344 under king Jyasiṃhū of Bhaddilapura. The sixth vagga begins with the history of Makaiyū under king Seṇia of Rayagiha. The other localities are essentially the same as those in āṅga 7, viz.-Vāṇiyagâme, Sāvatthi, Polāsapura, Vaṇarasi, Čampā, and also Sācē (Sāketa). The last vagga treats especially of the ten wives of king Seṇia, step-mothers (cullamāya) of king Koṇiya : Kalī, Sukalī, &c., who one and all zealously studied the sāṃdiya-m-dīyām ekkārasya āṅgāmin and are instructed therein by the Ajja Cāndaṇa (about whom no further notice is given). This piety is probably connected with the death of the sons of each, cf. upāṅga 8 (Nirayāvalisutta); and their grandsons—sons of these sons—become ascetics if we may ascribe any probability to the legend, Cf. upāṅga 9.

---

343 The text has vṛka, but Pāksikāstra and Vidhiprapā and also āṅga 3, 10 (above p. 274) have likewise vṛga.

The kārikās with the titles of the ajjhayaṇas for the single vargas are:

1. Gotama\textsuperscript{345} Samudda Sāgara Gambhīre ceva hōt Thimete ya/ Ayale Kamppille khalu Akkhobhe Paseṇai Vinhut/.
3. Aṇiyase Aṇaṁtaseṇe Ajjīyaṣeṇe Anihayariṇi Devaseṇe Sattuseṇe/ Sāraṇe Gae Sumuhe Dumuhe Kūvāe Dāsae Aṇāhiṭṭhī/.

\[322\]4. Jāli Mayāli Uvayāli Purisaeṇi ya Vāriṣeṇa ya/ Pajjuteṇa Saṁbā Auiruddha Sacaṣeṇi ya Daḷhaṇeṇi/ For the first 5 names see aṅga 9, 1.
6. Makāyi Kinḵam(m)e\textsuperscript{346} ceva Moggarapāṇi ya Kā̯savē/Khemaṭe Dhitidhare ceva Kelāse Haricaṇḍane/ Vāraṭte Sudanāseṇe Punnabhadda taha Sumaṇabhadda Supaṭṭhe/Mehāṭṭinutte Alakkhe aṭṭhayaṇāṭhān tu solasayam/.

7. Naṁdā Naṁdavatī ceva Naṁdvatārā Naṁdvatīya ceva/Maruta Sumarutā Mahāmarutā Marudevā ya aṭṭhamā/ Bhaddā Subbdda ya Sujaya Sumaṇtī ya/Bhūyadinna ya bodhavā Sehiyabhajjāna nāmāti/.
8. Kāli Sukkālī Mahaṅkāli Kaṇṭhā Sukkaṇṭhā Mahākaṇṭhā/ Vīrakṣaṅkṣaḥ bodhavā Rāmaṅkṣaḥ taheva/Piṭuseṇkṣaḥ navamī dasamī Mahāseṇkṣaḥ ya/

It is impossible to reconstruct any correct metre in these kārikaḥ, since the lines are a confused mass of śloka and aṭṭhā homistiches.

The table of contents in aṅga 4 or Nandi (N) is as follows:—se kīṁ tath anāṅgaḷasaṭāḥiḥ? anāṁ ṣaṁ anāṅgaḷaham nāgarāṁ ujjñāṁ ceiyāṁ vaṇaḥ rāyāḥ annāpiyā samosaraṇam dhammaṇyariṇā dhammaṅkahāḥ\textsuperscript{347} ihalogarapalagāḥ\textsuperscript{348} bhogaraparicāgam āvaiḍuḥ suya\textsuperscript{349} tavo

\textsuperscript{345} Also in the Vidhiprapāḥ: ittha aṭṭhayaṇāṭhā Goyama m-aṁañ.
\textsuperscript{346} Kinḵamme is found in aṅga 3, 10, for aṅga 8; this should have been stated on page 271. In reference to the question where Mayāli is identical with Bhagāli, see the same page. Is Jāli equal to Jamalī? The account here entitled Gae treats of Somila, as Leumann informs me, See ibidem.
\textsuperscript{347} In N we find the same transposition as in the case of 6, 7, saṅ ṛaṅ aṅ ṛaṅ dhaṅ hāṅ ṛiṅyā.
\textsuperscript{348} Ṩaṅgarapalagāḥ N.
\textsuperscript{349} N inserts pariṅyāgā before suya.
IX. The ninth aṅga, anuttaravrāvīyadasāu, anuttaraupātikadaśaśa;\(^{361}\) in 3 vaggas with 33 ajjhayaṅgas (10, 13, 10); contains legends of saints each one of whom attained the highest (anuttara) heavenly world (vimāna)\(^{362}\).

The name ('dasāu) is here too at variance with the constitution of our text, but is in agreement with the statements of angas 3 and 4, where only 10 ajjhayaṅgas are mentioned; while aṅga 4 recognizes but ten (the Nandi but three) uddeśanakālas, see above p. 286,—[324]. We have already seen that, of all the names given in aṅga 3, 10 as those of the 10 ajjh., but three recur in aṅga 9. This proves that we have here to do with a text that has suffered a transformation. Our text has been handed down to us in an exceedingly fragmentary state, consisting chiefly of references to Meha (6, 1, 1) and Khaṇḍava (5, 2, 1); the

---

\(^{350}\) 14 paḍīmātē BC; N has instead of paḍīmātē merely sāmheṇavā bohattapaccakkhaṇaṃ pāyavamanā sukulpaccāṣī punavohilābha aṁtakirīyāga u āghavijjānti:— dvādaśa bhikṣupratimaṃ māsikyādayayaḥ (cf. Leumann on Aup, § 24).

\(^{351}\) sic. A, bahuvihāto BC.

\(^{352}\) śaucān ca satyasahitaṃ.

\(^{353}\) yāto samiḥ gūttō ceva BC, samiṭayo guptaya ca.

\(^{354}\) svādhyaśādhyāvāyaḥ.

\(^{355}\) jñānādē labhaḥ.

\(^{356}\) paryāyaḥ pravrajyālakṣaṇaḥ, āvāmi ca yāvadvarṣādipramāṇaḥ yathā yena tapo-viṣesayārayādayino prakāraṇā pālito munibhiḥ.

\(^{357}\) munṣṭhitāṃ pātoccagato ya BC.

\(^{358}\) prāyopagamābhidhānam anasaṇam pratipanno yo munir yatra.

\(^{359}\) anitakṣ toxins. Jata iti sēgaḥ.

\(^{360}\) raūṣṭha A, ratogha BC.

\(^{361}\) This should strictly be "pādika"; cf. my remarks on upaṅga 1.

\(^{362}\) nā śāmad uttaro vidyate ity anuttarāḥ, upapāto ("paḍo") jñamārthaḥ, anuttarāḥ pra-dhānaḥ anyasya tathāvihāsya bhāvad upapāto ("paḍo") yesām te, ādavatvayātprapaṇībadhyā dāta dastādhyayanopadālakṣītā.
first story alone of each varga is passably complete, the others are cited merely by their catch words.

The events of these recitals transpire in Rāyagihā, Sāgeta Vāṇīya-gāma, Hatthiṇapura. The names of the personages involved are to be extracted from the kārikās, which cite the titles of the 33 ajjhāyaṇas; viz: —


2. Dihaseṇe Mahāseṇe Laddhadarīne (again 1) ya Gūḍhadarīne ya Sudhadarīne ya Halle Dumme Dumasēṇe Mahādumaseṇe ya āhite || 1 || Sīhe ya Sihaseṇe ya Mahāsihaseṇe ya āhite Pumasēṇe ya bodhavve tera-same hoi ajjhāyaṇe || 2 ||

3. 364 Dhamne ya Sunakkhatte Isidāse ya āhite Pellae Rāmaputte Pacamāmā Puṭṭimāi ya || 1 || Peḍhalaputte (cf. anga 2, 2, 7) aṇagāre Poṭṭileiya Vehalle dasame vutte ime ye dasa āhiyā || 2 ||.

Our information in reference to these persons is limited almost entirely to their names [325] alone. In the first history (of Jāli), which is a prototype of the rest, it is at least related that he ēkkārasa anāgāim ahijati.

It is surprising that the table of contents in anga 4, or Nandī (N), is particularly explicit. This is probably to be explained by the fact that it had as its subject an entirely different text from that which we possess. It is as follows:—se kim tam aṇuttarovavāiyadasāo? aṇa'sāsu nan aṇuttarovavāiyāṇām nagaraī ujjā cēvo vanā 365 rāya cēma samō dhāmmāva dhāmmakāhā 366 ihaloga 367 pavaijjā suya 368 tavo paṭimā 369 samlehaṇā bhatta pavā aṇuttarovavatti (A, vāto BC. o rovāyatti N) sukulaṇaṇcāyaī (yāti BC, ccāto N) puṇābohī amtaṅkriyā āghaviṣjāntī;

363 Ittha ajjhāyaṇāṇī Jāli-m añī, Vīdhippāpā.
364 Five of these names recur in anga 3, 10 for angas 8 and 9, cf. p. 271.
365 N omits (an error of the scribe).
366 N inverts sa 1 ra c am 2 dhō 3 hāo dh 2 riya.
367 ihalogaparti A, ihalogapāraloga BC, ihaloipāraloīta rikdhiviṣēśā bhogaparicegā pavajjā N.
368 paviyaśa before suā in N.
369 paṭimātāve, A, merely padi BC, paṭimā uvasaggā N.
X. The tenth *āṅgama, paṅkhāvagaranāṁ, praśnavyākaraṇāṁ*, in ten *dāras*, treats in a dogmatic form and not in a doctrinal text, of the ten ethical duties, viz.; first of the 5 *adhammas or āṅhayas, āśraṣa*, which

[ to be continued ]
Contribution of Jaina Literature in the Development of Medical Science: Treatment of Leprosy

Nagendra Kumar Singh

The present paper attempts to highlight the contribution of Jaina physicians in the field of medical science. The science of medicine (tégicchya or áyurveda) has been counted in Jaina texts among the nine sciences.¹ The practice of pāvasuya is said to have been discovered by Dhanvantarī.² It contains eight branches: kumārabhiccya (pediatrics), salāga (surgery and midwifery), sallahattha (the treatment of eye, ear, nose and throat), jangda (taxocology), bhāyavijja (demonology), rasāyana (method of restoring health in old age), vājikarana or khāranta (sexual rejuvenation) and kāyatigicchya (treatment of body diseases).

The physicians carried their bags of surgical instruments (satt̬hakose)³ and gave various treatments according to the nature of the disease, viz. sīnehapāna (rubbing with oil drinks), vamana (vomitting), vireyana (purging), avadhāhana (branding), avanāhana (medicated baths), amvasana (oil onema), kṣethikamman (famigation), niruha (purging by drugs), sirāveh (opening veins) tecchana (cutting), pācchana (scraping), sirobothi (bathing the head with oils), lappana (nourishing the body with oils).⁴ Besides these methods, several other methods of treatment has been adopted by the Jaina physicians.

The Acārāngā Sūtra mentions the following sixteen diseases: kuṭṭha (leprosy), gāndi (boils), rāyanise (consumption), avamāriya (epilepsy), kāniya (blindness), kuniya (lameness), khejiya (jumpback), udarī (dropsy), mvyā (numbness), suniya (swelling), gilasani (over-appetite).

¹ Thānāṅga Sūtra, p. 678.
² Nīthha Cārni, 15, p. 944.
³ Ibid., 11, p. 701.
⁴ Vivāgasuya, I, p. 8.
vewai (trembling), pidhasappi (disablement), silivaya (elephantiasis) and madhumeha (diabetes). The causes of diseases are over-eating, eating unwholesome food, over-sleeping, over-working, checking calls of nature, travelling, irregularity of food, and indulgence in sexual intercourse.⁵

The practice of using skin with or without hair (saloma or nirloma) for curing the Jain monks and nuns is pretty old and is referred in the Brhatkalpasūtra. It is said that if a nun suffered from udodhavata (safaltulence) or from dhauggha (paralysis) or from piles or from acute pain or her hand or foot due to dislocation or her whole or a part of the body being affected by wind, she was made to lie down on a skin.⁶ The leg of a vulture was tied to cure paralysis, the teeth and the nails of the bear, and the hair of the ram were also used for similar purposes.⁷ If her waist or hand was affected by vata (rheumatism), the skin of a taraccha (hyena) was wrapped around the affected part; if she was bitten by dog, she was made to lie down on a divicamna (tiger-skin).⁸ In the same way the hairless skin was prescribed for the Jain monks, who suffered from galantakodha (leprosy), piles, kacchu or kidibha.⁹ Dropings of a ram or cow urine was used to cure leprosy known as pama.¹⁰ The gośrṣa-sandal was also used to cure kimikuttha (leprosy) full of maggots.¹¹

The drinking of urine was another practice described in the Brhatkalpasūtra.¹² The monks and nuns drank each others urine for the cure of snake-bite.¹³ The fly dropping was used in the case of vomiting and the horse fly (asamakkīva) to remove dirt from the eye. They used pills to cure eye-sores.¹⁴ Flesh was used to cure fistula and in its absence rice powder mixed with honey and ghee was used.¹⁵ For madness it is stated that if a monk or a nun became mad, they were to be tied gently and kept in a room or a well without water.¹⁶ Various types of

⁶ Brhatkalpa Bhāṣya, pp. 3816-18
⁷ Ogha Niṇjūṭṭi, p. 134.
⁸ Brhatkalpa Bhāṣya, op. cit.
⁹ Ibid., pp. 3829-40.
¹⁰ Pīḍanāṇjūṭṭi, p. 48.
¹¹ Āvāyaṇa Cūḍī, p. 133.
¹² Brhatkalpa Bhāṣya, p. 1277.
¹³ Niṭṭha Cūḍī, pp. 58-121.
¹⁴ Ogha Niṇjūṭṭi, p. 129.
¹⁵ Brhatkalpa Bhāṣya, p. 1277.
¹⁶ Vavaḥāra Bhāṣya, p. 1225.
oil such as *hamisatella satapāgatella, sahasapāgatella* and *marutella* are also mentioned in Jaina canons for external use.\footnote{Niśṭha Cūrl, p. 109 ; Bhaṭṭakalpa Bhāṣya, p. 6031.} Besides medical treatment surgical operation also seems to have been carried out.

Here we meet an important experiment curing a patient of leprosy by Jīvānanda as recorded by Hemacandra.\footnote{Sri Jain Atmananda Sabha edition of the First Parvan, edited by Muni Caturvijyaji, Bhavanagar. 1936, verse 718-788.} Jīvānanda was born as the son of the physician Suvidhi at the city of Kṣitipratishṭhita in Videha. He studied, the science of Āyurveda in all its eight branches and *rasa* (taste) *vīrya* (power), and *vipāta* (efficacy of the drugs). As such he became the foremost amongst physicians, full of wisdom and unquestionable skill, even like the sun among the planets.

One day when Jīvānanda was sitting with his five friends at his residence a Jaina monk arrived there begging alms for breaking his three-days fast. He was none else but prince Gupākara, son of King Prthvipāla, who had taken to monkhood abandoning the kingdom like dirt. His body had emaciated on account of penances even as the current of a river due to summer heat. Moreover he was afflicted by worm leprosy on whole of his body on account of eating untimely and unwholesome food. Being desirous of emancipation, he never cared for any cure of this disease.

On beholding the leprous monk prince Mahīdhara, one of his friends, said tauntingly to Jīvānanda, ‘‘You do possess thorough knowledge of the disease, its drugs and its treatment; the only thing wanting in you is just compassion. Alas ! like courtesans, you people won’t even look at a patient unless he pays your fees, even though he might be well-acquainted, suffering; the discerning ones however should not solely be greedy; in some cases treatment must be offered for the sake of dharma. Pie upon all your efforts in treatment as well as diagnosis that you are disregarding such a worthy one afflicted with a disease.’’\footnote{Ibid., verses, 738-741.} Jīvānanda retorted promptly, ‘‘Well said, my noble friend. You have struck me with wonder. Indeed, a Brāhmaṇa without animosity, a merchant not deceitful, a lover free from jealousy, an embodied one free from diseases, a scholar who is wealthy, a virtuous one lacking pride, a woman not fickle, and a prince with good behaviour are seldom seen.’’\footnote{Ibid., verses, 742-44.} He further stated
that the great monk must certainly be treated by him but the lack of drugs was hindrance. He however admitted that he had laksapaka oil but he did not have gośrśa-candana and ratna-kambala.

At this, the five friends of Jīvānanda—Prince Mahīdhara, Subuddhi, Purṇabhadra, Guṇākara and Keśava went to the market and enquired of an old merchant about the two things. He showed the objects and said that each of them would cost a hundred thousand Dinārs, and asked why they wanted such costly objects. On learning the noble purpose, the merchant said to himself "what a contrast between their youth intoxicated with wildess, joy and love on the one hand, and their thoughts that are very abode of discernment suitable for old age, worthy of a person like myself." With these thought, he handed over both the commodities and did not accept the price at all. He remarked, "I shall take imperishable dharma as the price. Well, you have allowed me to share dharma like brothers."

They took all these remedies to the monk, who was standing under a banyan tree in the kāyotsarga posture. Bowing down to him, Jīvānanda begged his pardon for disturbing him and took his permission to apply the medicines. Then, they brought a cow's body recently dead and started the treatment. First of all they anointed all his limbs with the laksapaka oil which disappeared in the body. The patient became unconscious on account of the great warming power of the oil and the worms, confused by the heat, came out of the body. Jīvānanda then covered the monk with the ratna-kambala. The worms struck to it because of its coolness. Jīvānanda, then, slowly shook off the ratna-kambala over the cow's body causing the worms fall down on it. He then, soothed the monk by rubbing gośrśa-candana which gives life to the creatures like nectar.

Since only the worms from the skin had come out, the physician anointed the patient again with the oil and again many worms emerged out; which clung to the covering ratna-kambala, even as bacteria of curd, more than two days state, cling to a lacquered cloth. Again he laid it down on the cow's body, and then comforted the monk with

21 Ibid., verse, 753.
22 Ibid., verse, 755.
23 Ibid., verses, 761-67.
24 Ibid., verse, 770.
showers of gośīrṣa-candana.\textsuperscript{25} The third application of the oil forced the worms in the bone to come out.\textsuperscript{26} Again he shook the worms clinging to the ratna-kambala off on the cow’s body.\textsuperscript{27} The physician then smeared the monk with the juice of gośīrṣa-candana with great devotion as if he was a God. And at last glowing with fresh skin grown by virtue of application of healing drugs the monk glittered like a statue of polished gold.\textsuperscript{28}

Hemcandra has, thus, described an actual experiment of curing a leper. All the same, the problem of identification of these drugs has proved a hard nut to crack. Lakṣapāka taila is translated by Helen Johnson, as the oil with a hundred thousand ingredients, gośīrṣa-candana as gośīrṣa-sandal and ratna-kambala as jeweled-blanket.\textsuperscript{29} The present writer has discussed the problem with several well-known practitioners of Indian medicine and has carefully consulted a number of standard treatises, both ancient and modern on the subject but satisfactory solution, however, was not found. It appears that all the three commodities were very costly. The ratna-kambala and the gośīrṣa-candana were more costly than the lakṣapāka-taila in as much as the physician had the same with him while the other two had to be procured from the market at a price of hundred thousand Dināras each.

Did lakṣapāka oil comprised of as many as hundred thousand ingredients? Or was it prepared by giving a hundred thousand pūta-pākas\textsuperscript{30} to its constituents? Or was its ingredient was something like lac which was known in sanskrit as lakṣa? These questions have still remained unanswered. Regarding other two objects some thing can be said. Gośīrṣa-candana is definitely a kind of sandal and as such it might have a soothing effect. Apte explains ‘Gośīrṣa’ as a yellow pigment prepared from the urine or bile of the cow.\textsuperscript{31} This explanation suggests identification of gośīrṣa with gorocana.\textsuperscript{32}

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., verse, 772.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., verse, 773.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., verse, 774.
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., verse, 776.
\textsuperscript{29} Gaekwad’s Oriental Series, No. L1. 1931, p. 67.
\textsuperscript{30} Pūta-Pāka is a particular method of preparing drugs wherein the various ingredients are wrapped in the leaves (or earthen pots), and being covered with clay are roasted in fire for a fixed period.
\textsuperscript{31} The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Poona, 1890, p. 469.
\textsuperscript{32} Chandraraja Bhandari, The Vanauḍadhi Candrodaya (Hindi), vol. III, Indore, N. D. p. 284.
Mr. Bhandari states that it is bile of the cow’s head. It is described there as very cool, palatable, enhancer of bodily charm, and useful for leprosy. This description also tempts us to identify our gośīrṣa-candana with the gorocana. The gorocana was stated to be used for the auspicious tilaka mark on the forehead, while gośīrṣa-candana is stated to be used for smearing the different limbs of the body. Even at present gorocana is available as a ball of compact yellow powder which is much lighter inside than on the external surface.

Now kambala is a blanket of wool. Ratna-kambala would, therefore be blanket of wool studded with jewels. This phrase is employed elsewhere also in the present work, where it is stated that traders from Yavana-dvīpa showed their ratna-kambala to Jīvayaśā, daughter of the King of Magadha, who purchased it for half the price demanded. These blankets we described to be cool in hot weather and warm in winter made of thick fine wool.

The phrase ratna-kambala occurs in some other Jaina texts also. Prof. H. R. Kapadiya has listed it among fabulous objects. He refers to its occurrence in Maladharin Hemacandra’s Tippanaka on Jinabhadra Gaṇi’s Viśeśavaśyakabhaśya (verses 2551-52). The reference is that Śivakoṭi alias Sahasramalla, a native of Rathavīrapura and a brother of Uttarā was given by the ruler of his native place, a costly blanket called ratna-kambala which his preceptor did not like as it is inconsistent with the life of a Jaina monk. It may however, be pointed out that here the reference is not to a jeweled blanket, but a gem amongst the blanket, i.e. an excellent blanket which the preceptor got cut into pieces and these pieces were distributed among the disciple monks as kerciefs for cleansing their feet.

Another reference given by Prof. Kapadiya is Śilaṅkadeva’s (8th century A.D.). Ācārāṇga Sūtra Vyttī (II. 1.5.1), where a ratna-kambala is stated to be prepared from the fur of mice who live in the potters’ furnace as do fish in water and that for cleaning, it is exposed to fire. Here also, it may again be pointed out, the phrase employed is kambala-

33 Somaprabhaśārya, Satarthakāvyya, Pracin Sāhityoddhār Series, No-2, II ii. 89.
34 Ibid., I. iv. 1-20 ; II. ii 463, 565, 573 ; II. iv. 31, 252 ; II. v. 115 ; II. vi. 643.
35 Ibid., VIII. vii. 135, 137,
ratna not ratna-kambala. His third reference is Śīlankācārya’s Vivaraṇa on the Niruykti (verse 122) of the Sūtrakṛtāngā Sūtra (1.13) where the commentator mentions that a ratna-kambala becomes warm in cold weather, and cools down when it is oppressive heat. The pertinent portion is as follows:

uṇhe karei sīya uṇhatanāṁ puṇa karei
kambalakṣāṇādināṁ esa sahābo muṇeyanyo

But this reference could not be traced in the edition available at the Oriental Institute, Baroda. Here also the first word in the second line suggests that it is kambala, not ratna-kambala.

Prof. Kapadiya refers also to its occurrence in Triśaṭṭi-śalākā-puruṣa-carita (I. i) only in a casual way. The phrase ratna-kambala thus is met with in Hemacandra’s Triśaṭṭi-śalākā-puruṣa-carita (I. 746, 768 and 770) where the life of Jīvānanda was dealt with its price. He further pointed out that narratives about king Śreṇīka-Śālibhadra, and Sthūlabhadra furnish references pertaining to ratna-kambala and the story of Sthūlabhadra suggests that ratna-kambala could be had from Nepal.

It is not always intended to consider ratna-kambala simply as a fabulous object. Pt. B.L. Shanbhagace says that the thick woolen Persian carpet is still called ratna-kambala in Konkani. Moreover we have already seen above that in the seventh sarga of the eighth parvan of Triśaṭṭi-śalākā-puruṣa-carita, Yavana traders are stated to have brought the ratna-kambala to India for selling at very high price. The worms burning due to the application of the lakṣapāka oil, which is described by Hemacandra as uṇṇavīra i.e. a powerfully scorching drug, would naturally be tempted to resort to the jeweled woolen blanket which would be comparatively cool and soothing. We have already noted two references specifying the characteristic of the blanket of giving heat in cold weather and coolness when it is oppressive heat.

38 Acārāṅgaśūtra with Bhadrabāhu’s Niruykti and Śīlankācārya’s Vivaraṇa, Agamodāya Samiti edition, Mehsana, 1966, p. 392b and 393a.
40 Triśaṭṭi-śalākā-puruṣa-carita. VII. 8.
The dead body of cow was brought there just for giving shelter to the tortured worms as ordained by the principle of non-violence. Modern doctors would destroy the germs by means of some sort of germicides in order to prevent the disease being spread by them.

The ratna-kambala may be replaced by any other cool and soothing covering, but the most important drug is the lakṣapāka oil. I request therefore the modern experts in Āyurveda whose duty it is to search out this drug not for the sake of world-renown but just for the sake of the ailing humanity.
Jain Origin of a Hindu Temple

S. Padmanabhan

Nagercoil, the name of which is derived from the five-headed serpent shrine which is now the headquarters of Kanyakumari District of Tamil Nadu was a part of Travancore State upto 1956. The temple of Nāgarāja is situated in the heart of the town. The attention of every visitor to the temple is drawn to the two big stone images of hydra-headed serpents and the five inscribed granite slabs that are erected nearby. There are nine separate inscriptions on the five slabs.¹

The eight inscriptions which are dated from Kollam Era 681 to 697 refer to the gifts of lands made at different times for the conduct of worship and the supply of offering to the serpent deity in the temple. The lands were left in the custody of Kerala Narayanan alias Gunaveerapandithan and Jeevakarudaiyan alias Kamalavahanapandithan who were supervising the temple affairs. The small slab containing the inscriptions of the Kollam Era 820 gives a list of donors for making an ornamental lamp stand and donation of oil for its use.²

Of the nine inscriptions on the granite slabs eight of them mention the names of Gunaveerapandithan and Kamalavahanapandithan and call the name of the place as Kottar and not by the present name Nagercoil. The words Palli and Pallichantham also occur in all these eight inscriptions. One of the inscriptions which was dated Kollam Era 696 mentions the name of the Venad King Bhuthala Sri Veera Udaya Marthanda Varma. The inscription dated Kollam Era 764 (1588 A.D) found on the western wall of Ānandakṛṣṇa shrine³ which does not mention Palli or Pallichantham denotes that the temple might have passed into the hands of the Hindus during this period. The particulars mentioned in these inscriptions thus unfold a glimpse of the history of the town, the temple and the ruler of the period.

¹ Inscriptions of Kanyakumāri, Part 3 Nos. 1968/275, 276, 277, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286.
² Ibid., No. 1968/281,
³ Ibid., No. 1968/279.
The very names Gunaveera and Kamalavahana mentioned in the inscriptions are reminiscent of Jain nomenclature. The term ‘Palli’ and ‘Pallicham,’ inscribed therein are clear proof that this was a Jain temple originally. The word ‘Palli’ even today indicates temples other than those of Hindus. ‘Pallichanham’ means royal gifts of lands to the deities of other religions, while ‘manyam’ represents the gifts made to Hindu temples.

On the pillars of the temple there are many images of Jain Tirthankaras. The image in standing pose under the hood of a five headed serpent is Parsvanatha, the 23rd Tirthankara in the line, the 24th and the last being Vardhamana Mahavira. The seated figure carved on the pillar is undoubtedly of Mahavira, for, at the bottom of the seat are seen sculptured figures of lions, the totem peculiar to Mahavira. Over the head of the image is the triple umbrella, one of the characteristic features of Jain iconography. The image of a lady under the hood of a three headed serpent is Padmavati, the Yakshi of Parsvanatha.

From the hymns of Thrugnanasambandar, it can be surmised that Jainism was a prominent religion in Kottar and the surrounding area during his days. He has described the naked Jain monks and the staunch Buddhists roaming in the streets of Kottar as “Udaiilathu Ulalginra Kundarkal Unarum thavathaya Sakklyarum”. It is interesting to note that Therur near Nagercoil was once a centre of Buddhists of Theravada School.4 There is also epigraphic evidence to show that there were flourishing Jain settlements in Kottar, Kurandi, Tiruchcharanathamalai and Tirunandikkari which are all in the present district of Kanyakumari. From the Jain vestiges and inscriptions found in Samanormalai in Madurai district, Kalugumalai in Chidambaranar district and Tiruchcharanathamalai in Kanyakumari district we learn that a large number of Jain monks who were hailed from these four Jain centres in Kanyakumari area. The erudite Jain scholars and their disciples from these centres of learning left votive images cut on the rocks in different centres of Jain culture. There were several Jain scholars named Putbananda Adigal, Uttanandi Adigal, Vimalachandrar and Pathamooolathan Arangam Maran who had prefixed the word Kottar to their names.5 The line “Chattan Varagunan Seivittha Srimeni”6 which appeared in the inscription found

4 Dr. Shu Hikosaka, *Buddhism in Tamilnadu*, p. 192.
Dharanendra and Padmavati in the form of serpents at the entrance to the inner shrine of Nāgarāja Temple at Nagercoil.
The images of Parsvanatha, Padmavati and Mahavira fixed on the pillars of Nāgarāja Temple, Nagercoil, speaks of its being originally a Jain Temple.
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at Thiruchcharanathumalai denotes that the King Varaguna of Ay dynasty in the 9th century A.D. was a staunch Jain. From this inscription we also learn that Jainism flourished in the area with royal support.

The Jain scholars grouped together and formed a Sangham that is a study centre near Kottar in the 7th Century A.D. The name of a village Puravaseri near Kottar is derived from “Pulavarseri” which means a colony of scholars. One of the inscriptions found in the Kṛṣṇa Temple at Puravaseri mentions the land which was donated to the temple belongs to Jains (Pallichantham).

The gigantic images of the two serpents at the entrance to the inner shrine with the 23rd Tīrthaṅkara Pārśvanātha resting on the spiral-shaped thick coil of one of them narrate an episode in the life of Pārśvanātha and his connections with the serpents. This episode is depicted in the Uttarapurāṇa. The legend goes that a snake couple killed by the arrogant Mahīpāla listened to the soothing hymns of Pārśvanātha before they died and were reborn as the snake king and queen in the Netherworld. One day while the saint was in deep meditation his spiritual radiance halted the flight of God Samvara’s car. Annoyed at this Samvara caused a heavy downpour of rain, but failed in his attempt to disrupt the meditation of Pārśvanātha. In order to rescue the saint from the rising floods the snake King Dharaṇendra spread his hood over him, and his Queen Pādmapāti planted a lotus under his feet. Thus the saint rose above the waters and was saved. Thus these images which depict the episode in the life of Pārśvanātha also confirm the Jain origin of the Nāgarāja Temple.

In ancient days devotees from Kongunadu (present Coimbatore and Salem areas) came here and worshipped the deity. The illumination on the last Sunday of Avani is locally called Kongunattu Vilakku. It is interesting to note that Kongunadu was also a famous centre of Jains in ancient days.

At the time of reconstruction and renovation in the 17th Century A.D. the temple might have passed into the hands of the Hindus. When Jain Pallis became Hindu temples, certain alterations had to be made, particularly regarding the idols, in keeping with the requirements of the Hindu pantheon. All the deities except Nāgarāja were later additions installed by the Hindus. The very appearance of the
sanctum of the Śiva shrine proves positively the above statement. The shrines of Sastha, Durga, Balasubramanya and Idumba were only recent additional structures of the temple.

Another interesting fact to be noted here is the absence of the name of the deities Śiva and Ānandakṛṣṇa in the inscriptions of the temple. The earlier inscriptions from Kollam Era 681 to 697 (1506-1522) mention the name of the presiding deities as Nagar locally known as Nagaramman (Devi) that is the five-headed serpent in the northern side of the shrine and Nāgarāja, the King of serpents who stands under the hood of a five-headed serpent in the southern side. They are only Padmāvatī and Dharmendra who are worshipped by Jains. Now the deity Nāgarāja is locally called Ānandakṛṣṇa. Most of the inscriptions found in the temple read thus: “Kottattu Nagarkkum and Nagarajavukkum” (Nagar and Nagaraja of Kottar). The inscription dated Kollam Era 764 found on the western wall of the shrine calls the deity Nāgarāja as Thiru Ananda Alwar and the inscription dated Kollam Era 819 calls the deity as Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The devotees of the local area later combined the two names and used to call the deity Nāgarāja as Ānandakṛṣṇa. From these facts it can be surmised that the deity Nāgarāja became Ānanda in 1588 A.D. and Śrī Kṛṣṇa in 1643 A.D. The inscription dated Kollam Era 817 and the image of the Venad King Veera Ravivarman Kulasekharaperumal bearing the Saivite marks on his forehead which is carved under the inscription denote that the shrine of Śiva might have been erected in between the shrines of Nagaramman and of Nāgarāja and the temple was renovated and reconstructed by the King. It is astonishing to note that the name of Śiva and Ānandakṛṣṇa are not mentioned in any of the inscriptions found in the temple. The temple of Nāgarāja is thus a fine example of the transformation of a Jain shrine into a Hindu one.

At present, the temple of Nāgarāja may be regarded as a splendid monument showing at its best the fusion of the four streams of Indian religion. Besides the presiding deity Nāgarāja, the images of Lord Śiva and of Ānandakṛṣṇa have been enshrined in the ardhamāṇḍapa and the pillars of the māṇḍapa bear carved figures of Jain Tīrthaṅkaras, Pārśvanātha and Mahāvīra. The beautiful southern gateway of the temple known as Mahamerumaligai reminds us of a Buddhist vihāra. Thus the Nāgarāja temple stands as an embodiment of the four creeds Śaivism, Vaiṣṇavism, Jainism and finally Buddhism.
Kundakundacarya: His Life and Works

K. B. Jindal

The year of ascension (*nirvāṇa*) of Lord Mahāvīra is 527 B.C. After him there were only three persons who obtained omniscience in this cycle of time—Gautama,¹ Sudharmā and Jambū. After these Kevalins (omniscients), there followed a long succession of apostles who can be classified into four categories depending upon their store of knowledge. Those who had complete knowledge of the spoken word (*śruta-jñāna*), those who had limited knowledge of the ten *Pūrvas* and the eleven *Āngas*, those who knew only the *Āngas*, and those who had knowledge of only one *Āṅga* (*Ācāra*). The periods of their ministry are detailed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-Kevalins</td>
<td>Gautama</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sudharmā</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jambū</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-Śruta-Kevalins</td>
<td>Viṣṇukumāra</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nandīmitra</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aparājīta</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Govardhana</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhadrabāhu</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-Pūrva-Āṅgins</td>
<td>Viśākha</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prosthila</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kṣatriya</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jayasena</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nāgasena</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siddhārtha</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dhṛtisena</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vijaya</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buddhiliṅga</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Gautama was Gaṇadhara of Mahāvīra. A Gaṇadhara is an interpreter of the sermons and discourses of a Tīrthaṅkara.
Gaṅgadeva 14
Dharmasena 14

IV-Aṅgins
Nakṣatra 18
Jayapāla 20
Pāṇḍu 39
Dhruvasena 14
Kañsa 32

V-Ācāra Aṅgins
Subhadra 6
Yaśobhadra 18
Yaśobāhu 23
Lohārya 10
Māghanandī 4
Jinaçandra 9
Kundakunda 52

Total 583

Taking away the fifty-two years of his own ministry, Kundakundācārya started preaching 531 years after Lord Mahāvīra. Since only in his forty-fourth year he became an Ācārya, the date of Kundakundācārya would be 40 B.C.

The personality of great teachers is lost in obscurity and shrouded with traditions. It is said that in a town called Kurumarai in the district of Pidat Nadu in the South, there lived a wealthy businessman by name Karamunda. His wife was Śrimati. They had a cow-herd who tended their cattle. His name was Yativar. One day when he was driving his cattle to an adjoining forest, he saw to his great surprise that the whole forest was consumed by forest fire except a few trees in the centre, which retained their luxuriant green foliage. This roused his curiosity and he went and inspected that place. There he found on the branch of a green tree a Śāstra, written on palmyra leaves and wrapped in cloth. Yativar brought down the Śāstra, and carried it home with great awe and reverence. He placed it on a high pedestal and continued to worship it daily.

One day Śrutasāgar Muni visited Kurumarai town. Karamunda offered him food. After taking his meals, the Muni gave his usual religious discourse to the people gathered at the residence of
Karamunda. Yativar was also in the audience. After listening to the discourse, Yativar offered to the Muni the Šāstra which he had salvaged from the forest. On account of these gifts—food from the Master and the scriptures from the servant—the Muni was very much pleased and blessed them both. The Master of the house who was issueless, was to have an intelligent son and old and faithful servant would be born as the promised son of the house. The happy event came to pass. Yativar was reborn in his next birth as the son of Karamunda and Śrīmati. He was christened as Kaundēś and received his education from Śrutasāgar Muni. Before Śrutasāgar left for his heavenly abode, he had admitted Kaundēś in the order of Munis with his formula of initiation: Simandharāya Namaḥ. Kaundēś inherited his preceptor’s water-bowl and peacock-feather broom (picht).

The newly initiated Muni Kaundēś later on came to be called Kundakunda. Throughout his life, he continued to chant his formula of initiation Simandharāya Namaḥ.

There is another version to this formula of initiation:

According to Jaina Cosmology, the terra firma (Jambūdvipa) is divided into six segments—Bharata, Airāvata, and Videha, with two antipodes of each. In the first two segments, there are twenty-four Tīrthaṅkaras in the fourth cycle of time (Duṣṣamā-Suṣamā). But in the Videha Kṣetra, there are twenty Tīrthaṅkaras in every cycle of time.

Kundakundācārya lived in Bharata Kṣetra in which we all live. There was a lingering doubt in the mind of Kundakundācārya which none in Bharata Kṣetra could dispel. A colleague of Kundakundācārya in his perious birth, became a Deva in the next birth. To dispel the doubt, the Deva physically transported Kundakundācārya to Videha Kṣetra. The first Tīrthaṅkara of Videha Kṣetra, Simandhara, gave audience to Kundakundācārya and cleared the cloud in his mind. Thus enlightened, Kundakundācārya was brought back to Bharata Kṣetra by the Deva. Kundakundācārya was deeply beholden to Simandhara Śvāmi for having lead him to right Belief and Right Conduct. In token of his respect and gratitude, Kundakundācārya constantly chanted the name of the Tīrthaṅkara—Simandharāya Namaḥ.

At the time of Bhadrabāhu there was a terrible famine in the north. Bhadrabāhu took a large body of ascetics with him and migrated to the South. The Pāṇḍya Kings of the South were Jainas from very
Karamunda. Yatîvar was also in the audience. After listening to
the discourse, Yatîvar offered to the Muni the Sāstra which he had
salvaged from the forest. On account of these gifts—food from the
Master and the scriptures from the servant—the Muni was very much
pleased and blessed them both. The Master of the house who was
issueless, was to have an intelligent son and old and faithful servant
would be born as the promised son of the house. The happy event
came to pass. Yatîvar was reborn in his next birth as the son of
Karamunda and Śrīmati. He was christened as Kaundėś and received
his education from Śrutasāgar Muni. Before Śrutasāgar left for his
heavenly abode, he had admitted Kaundėś in the order of Munis with
his formula of initiation: Śmandhārya Namaha. Kaundėś inherited his
preceptor’s water-bowl and peacock-feather broom (pīchī).

The newly initiated Muni Kaundėś later on came to be called
Kundakunda. Throughout his life, he continued to chant his formula of
initiation Śmandhārya Namaha.

There is another version to this formula of initiation:

According to Jaina Cosmology, the terra firma (Jambūdvīpa) is
divided into six segments—Bharata, Airavata, and Videha, with two
antipodes of each. In the first two segments, there are twenty-four
Tirthankaras in the fourth cycle of time (Duṣamā-Suṣamā). But in the
Videha Kṣetra, there are twenty Tirthankaras in every cycle of time.

Kundakundacārya lived in Bharata Kṣetra in which we all live.
There was a lingering doubt in the mind of Kundakundacārya which
none in Bharata Kṣetra could dispel. A colleague of Kundakundacārya
in his pervious birth, became a Deva in the next birth. To dispel the
doubt, the Deva physically transported Kundakundacārya to Videha
Kṣetra. The first Tīrthankara of Videha Kṣetra, Śimandhara, gave
audience to Kundakundacārya and cleared the cloud in his mind.
Thus enlightened, Kundakundacārya was brought back to Bharata
Kṣetra by the Deva. Kundakundacārya was deeply beholden to
Śimandhara Svāmī for having lead him to right Belief and Right
Conduct. In token of his respect and gratitude, Kundakundacārya
constantly chanted the name of the Tīrthankara—Śimandhārya Namaha.

At the time of Bhadrabāhu there was a terrible famine in the north.
Bhadrabāhu took a large body of ascetics with him and migrated to
the South. The Pāṇḍya Kings of the South were Jainas from very
early times and Bhadrabāhu accepted the hospitality of the then king, Bhadrabāhu migrated from the North to the South, but Kundakunda was the son of the soil. Guntakal is an important Railway Junction in modern Andhra Pradesh. Near it is the town of Kundakunda in the District of Anantapur. This is the birthplace of Kundakundācārya. In the days of the Ācārya, this entire area was called Pidat Nadu, referred to above. Indeed, Andhra Pradesh was carved out after 1950 from what was formerly Madras Presidency, and still earlier the greater Tamil Nadu.

125 kilometres from the Madras City, and eight kilometres from Vandvasi Tehsil is Ponnurmalai. On a hillock here, there are the footprints\(^2\) of Kundakundācārya. Below the footprints is inscribed:

\[
dakṣīṇa deśe malaye hemagrāme munīrmaḥātmāśīt
\]

\[
ḥelāṭcāryo nāṁnā dravila ḍaṇḍhīśvaro dhīmān
\]

Translated in English it means—“In the south hill range, there is nestled a village called Hemagrāma (Ponnur). In this village lived the wise and learned Elācārya, the leader of an Order of Saints.” Elācārya is the other name of Kundakundācārya.

During his itineraries, Kundakundācārya also visited Mylapore, on the sea-coast, very near Madras. It is here that he wrote the great Tamil treatise Tirukkural. Tirukkural is regarded as Tamil Veda. It is a great treatise on polity, morality and ethics. It was then a practice that anybody who wrote a treatise had to read it out to his Order to get their approval and sanction Kundakundācārya was a Digambar naked Sadhu and he could not personally appear and read out the treatise before the conclave. So he sent his disciple Tiruvulla Nainar to officiate for him. Tiruvulla Nainar took Tirukkural to Madurai and there he read out and explained the importance of the treatise to the conclave of Saints gathered there. The Saints mistook him for the author. And that is how Tirukkural came to be associated with Tiruvulla Nainar. The mistake in the identity of the author continues till today. Tirukkural has been translated in Hindi by Govinda Rai Sastri and printed and published by Kundakunda Bharati, Special Institutional Area, New Delhi. Between January, 1988 and December, 1992, this Hindi version of Tirukkural has had four editions. But in

\(^2\) Foot-prints are carved out at the place where the person concerned breathed his last.
each edition, the name of the original author in Tamil is mentioned as Tiruvulla Nainar (Tiruvalluvar).

At the time of Kundakundâcârya, the Pallavas ruled in Tamil Nadu, with Kâñjipuram as their capital. Śiva Mahârâj or Śiva Skandha Vârma was a Jaina King of the Pallava dynasty. For him Kundakundâcârya wrote the Prâbhrâ Trayî—Pañcâstikâya Sâra, Pravacana Sâra and Samaya Sâra. The Ācârya is reputed to have written 85 Pâhuḍas, out of which only twelve are extant—the three Prâbh्रîtas mentioned above, Niyama Sâra and Aṣṭa Pâhuḍas.

Pañcâstikâya Sâra treats about the five cosmic constituents. The five cosmic constituents are jîva (soul), pudgala (matter), dharma (principle of motion), adharma (principle of rest) and âkâśa (space).

Pravacana Sâra is in three parts. The first part states that a Kevalî absorbed in his Self, is above all sensual feelings—above pleasure and pain. The second part states that knowledge is in correlation to the five cosmic constituents. The third and last part deals with dravya and bhâva liṅgas, the externals and internals of a Muni—his eleven hall-marks and his true disposition.

Samaya Sâra describes the pure nature of the Soul. The word “Samaya” is used in the sense of absorption or realisation, Self-absorption is the central goal to be aimed at by the Soul struggling to be free from the fetters of the mundane bondage of karmas.

Niyama Sâra deals with the path of liberation, which is Right Belief, Right Knowledge and Right Conduct—the three jewels of Jaina faith. The word Niyama literally means “rule of law” and Sâra means “the right”. Niyama Sâra thus signifies the Right Rule, i.e., the true and indispensable law for the attainment of liberation. The whole gist of this treatise is to show that the all-pure, all-conscious, all-blissful and self-absorbed soul alone is the Siddha, a perfect soul. If a soul is in bondage with Karmic matter, i.e., if it has any connection, whatsoever, with the non-soul, it is imperfect and under delusion. When this connection with the non-self is completely severed, Siddha-pada, Perfection, is attained.
The Āṣṭa (Eight) Pāhūdas are discourses on:

1. Darśana — Right Belief
2. Sūtra — Twelve Aṅgas
3. Cārita — Right Conduct
4. Bodha — Eleven hall-marks of a Muni
5. Bhāva — Soul Activity
6. Mokṣa — Path to Salvation
7. Liṅga — Who is a real Muni?
8. Sila — True disposition of a Muni

The Āṣṭa Pāhūdas were written at a time when decadence had set in and there was schism in Jainism. In the Eight Pāhūdas, the Jaina Munis are reminded of the high Order to which they belong and they are exhorted not to deviate from the path of rectitude and asceticism set for them by their preceptors.

Question arises why the author chose to call his works as Pāhūda? In Volume I, Part 1, Gāthā 13, page 297 of Kaśāya Pāhūdas, there is question-answer:

pāhūde tti kā nīrutt? jaṁhā padehi phuḍām tamhā pāhūdam

Query: What is the etymological explanation of Pāhūda?

Reply: All that is written in verse-form is Pāhuda.

Thus in a generic sense, all that is written in Prakrit verse is Pāhuda. The Sanskrit equivalent of Pāhuda is Prabṛṭa. On the same page 297 of Kaśāya Pāhuda, the word Prabṛṭa is explained as under:

prakṛṣṭena tīrthaṅkarena āḥṛtaṁ prasthāpitam iti prabṛṭaṁ
prakṛṣṭairācāryairvidyāvittavadvirāḥṛtaṁ dhāritam
vyākhyātamanītamīti vā prabṛṭaṁ

3 By Guṇadhāraṇacārya, Digambar Jain Sangh Granthamālā, Series 1, second edition, 1974 publication.
"That which is laid down by the Tīrthaṅkaras is Prabhṛta. That which was imbibed by the Ācāryas and later on preached by them and carried over from predecessor to successor is Prabhṛta. The Ācārya’s only wealth is their learning."

In the Appendix to Samaya Sāra, it is said that when a vassal meets his lord, he offers his humble tribute to his lord. The soul in bondage is the vassal and the liberated soul is the lord. The Ātmā is striving to have a glimpse of the Paramātmā and, therefore, it makes a substantial tribute of the written word to the Paramātmā. All Śāstras are Prabhṛta, offerings or gifts, by the Ācāryas to the Arhatas and the Siddhas.

Thus we have three shades of meaning of the word Pāhuḍa or Prabhṛta:

1. All that is written in Prakrit verse-form;
2. All that was spoken by the Tīrthaṅkaras and imbibed by the Ācāryas and passed on to posterity; and
3. The written śāstra offered at the feet of the Masters. Numbers 2 and 3 are two sides of the same coin.
A Note on Sarasvatamandana

Satyavrat

The combined testimony of the Śṛṅgāramanḍana and Campūmanḍana reveals it beyond doubt that Prime Minister Maṇḍana had made substantial contribution towards enriching Sanskrit grammar, as well. While in the former he proudly projects himself as the illustrious author of Sārasvatamandana (and the Kāvyamandana), with equal fondness, he terms the Campūmanḍana as a work brotherly (junior) to it.¹ As is evident from its title, especially the alternative appellation Sārasvata-sūtravṛtti, the Sārasvatamandana purports to be a brief gloss (vṛtti) on Anubhūtisvarūpa’s Sārasvata Vyākaraṇa, which, not unlike other similar attempts, seeks to compress Sanskrit grammar, as exhaustively propounded in Pāṇini’s Aṣṭādhyāyī, within the space of mere seven hundred aphorisms. Suchlike compendiums are a veritable boon to the beginner, and serve as a gateway to the intricacies of Sanskrit grammar and semantics. The Sārasvata Vyākaraṇa indeed evoked wide following in the Jainistic tradition. It was perhaps to respect the tradition and minister to the academic needs of the young students that Maṇḍana took it upon himself to resolve the text with his perceptive vṛtti, other glosses thereon notwithstanding.

Unlike his other writings, the Sārasvatamandana is unhappily not available in print. Of two of its manuscripts deposited with the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, the one (New No 36) copied in V. S. 1632, is in a better state of preservation. Running into as many as 121 folios, the Ms is a riddle of sorts. While it is legible for the most, the text is hopelessly tarnished by tantalizing ambiguity and incoherence. The way the scribe has recklessly mutilated the simple words and known sūtras is an eloquent, though sad commentary on his poor equipment in Sanskrit. He had no qualms in turning baṁhayati into caṁhayati, ṣāṣa anuśiṣṭau into āṣa anuśiṣṭau, rāto ṇau puk into rāto nau puk. The Ms is infested with such fearsome howlers, though the scribe is blissfully unaware of their gravity. With such a

¹ yaḥ sārasvatakāvyamandananakavirdridyabhubhītpatiḥ, Śṛṅgāramanḍana, 107; Śrīśārasvatamandanasya viduṣām santoṣadasyānuevo, Campūmanḍana, p. 35.
hopeless text it is well-nigh impossible to decipher sizable parts of the
codex or extort any connected meaning from it. It is thus a frustrating
exercise to subject the Sārasvatamanḍana to a sustained appraisal.
Nevertheless, a patient study and analysis of the text, as it exists throw
up certain features which seem to settle down as the distinguishing
characteristics of the vṛtti.

Maṇḍana’s gloss is a exhaustive and useful to unravel the mysteries
of the Sārasvata Vyākaraṇa as a vṛtti on a grammatical text can be.
The author has indeed made a commendable attempt to elucidate the
Sārasvata text with his lucid gloss. His simple language and down-
to-earth style combine to prompt the reader to negotiate the jungle
of the corrupt text with a modicum of grit taken together, the vṛtti
reflects, in no small measure, the author’s equipment in grammar which
his biographer Maheśvara has underscored with warmth and frequency.3

What strikes one most is Maṇḍana’s technique of resolving the
text. While, in keeping with the norm, he has sought to deal with
the Sārasvata Vyākaraṇa sequentially reproducing the sūtras followed by
his gloss thereon; not infrequently he chooses to be casual in merely
paraphrasing the aphorisms in his language, without quoting them
bodily. No serious offence may be taken against the method in so
far as it serves to unfold the import of the relevant sūtras, but it can
hardly be claimed to be scientific or adequate enough to grapple with
a tough discipline like grammar.

Maṇḍana was actuated by the desire to make Anubhūtisvartāpa’s
text, the clearest possible. In order to realise his objective he has
resorted to a variety of devices. The most fruitful has been the method
to explain the more important/intricate sūtras by dissolving the various
compounds and/or paraphrasing the various units they are made of,
much in the manner of a commentator on drama or poetry. His vṛtti
is therefore brimming with expressions like vigṛhya vyācasṭe, spaṣṭatvād
vyācasṭe, viśeṣamāha. An idea of his anxiety to ensure transparency to
his elucidation can be had from the gloss on so well-known a sūtra
as janikartuḥ prakṛtiḥ. Says he: janīrjanidhāvartho janammiti yāvat/
janē kartā janikātā tasya prakṛtiḥ mūlakāraṇān/etadeva spaṣṭatvād
vyācasṭe jayamāṇasya kāryasya mūlakāraṇamadānasaṅgaṁ bhavati.3 He
has not refrained from dissolving such simple compounds as stōḥ and

2 jagradvyākaraṇāca nātakasubhālākāravijñastathā, Kārvyamohara, I. 12
3 Sārasvatamanḍana (Ms), pp. 48b, 49a.
abhvo in stoh ścuh ścuḥ and abhvornādau respectively. This is how he explains the latter aphorism—aśca bhūṣca tayoḥ abhvo iti nigṛhya vyācaksāno abhsvorityatra uvabhāvadoṣam śabdaniṛdeśati na pariḥaran vyācāSTE pūrvasyākārasya bhūṣabdasya ākārādeśo bhavati nādau sati dṛṛghakaraṇam pūrvākāravīṣayam na bhavātām tena hravā iti hravāḥ.⁴

Maṇḍana has the wont to shed light in his gloss on other related issues, as well. Why i in the sūtra i yam svare stands for long i also is lucidly explained in the vr̥tti. When a short vowel is used in the sūtra, it denotes both of its forms, but when followed by t or kāra, it stands for itself alone. i varṇa iti dirghamapi saṁgrhaṇīt iato varṇagrhaṇe/savarnagrhaṇam taparakaraṇe kāragrahaṇe ca tāvanmātra-graṇamātī.⁵

It is simply beyond the tiny frame of the vr̥tti to sequentially dwell upon the formation of the whole gamut of words. The feat can possibly be accomplished in an exhaustive commentary (bhāṣya). Maṇḍana's vr̥tti interestingly seeks to instruct, within its limits, the reader in the process of formation of words, explaining the procedure often with sūtras but mostly without them, with mere reference to the sequence involved therein. The style doubtless involves repetition but is extremely beneficial to young readers not well equipped to try conclusions on his own. This is how he explains the formation of the yananta narinṛtyate and causative pācayati, vr̥tti gātravikṣepe śad dītvam upachāyā rogāgamāḥ narinṛtyate/ya caḥ pratyayaḥ niivādata upachāyā iti vyddhiḥ dhātusajñā tiibādayaḥ ap kartari guṇaḥ ayādeśaḥ yācyati.

Pada forms the life breath of Sanskrit grammar. It is so sacrosanct to it that all else including the usage, sinks into insignificance. Maṇḍana has been happily chary of the pitfalls inherent in the system. He, therefore, set himself on illustrating, not infrequently the use of a plethora of forms with brief but apt examples. The device serves to bring him closer to the present day grammarian who is so keen to acquaint the readers with usage by mustering appropriate illustrations from ancient texts or those of his own. This is how he means to exemplify the various forms, accomplished in his vr̥tti: abhūt vr̥ṣṭīḥ jagāmāgatyo daksināṁ dīṣam cakhāna kūpam jāṃgatyare turagah gātyatryoyatiṣṭhatā sūtramuccarati.

With a view to ensure clarity to the subject and invest it with added interest Maṇḍana has occasionally resorted to the style of the

⁴ Ibid., p. 83a.
⁵ Ibid., p. 9a.
ancient bhāsyas in posing the issue under discussion and meeting them convincingly. That he resorted to it in the brief gloss, speaks volumes of his anxiety to dispell complexity from grammar that is otherwise inherent in it. Thus, in the case of the example dadhi iha intended to illustrate the savarṇadīrgha sandhi he raises, by way of pūrvapakṣa, the pertinent question as to why the sūtra i yam svare that prescribes the substitution of ya for i if it is followed by a vowel, does not apply here. He explains it on the ground that a special rule with its specific application takes precedence over a general rule which has indefinite sweep.6 Likewise his vṛtti on the sūtra dviśca which provides for doubling the root in case it is followed by the desiderative suffix sa, Maṇḍana asks inquisitively why the augment it is not added to the root bhū in accordance with the rule sīsatāsisyapāmit. It has been met with the simple aphorism vah which negates the augment it after roots ending in u, a and grah, guha etc. The sūtra nānit explains away the subsequent query that why the root bhū does not take guna though it is followed by an ardhaḥdītuka suffix (gunaḥ kuto na bhavati).

It is again to facilitate a clearer understanding of the text that the Prime Minister has inducted in the body of his gloss, the views of the proceeding grammarians both named and unnamed. He has referred to their observations by the stock phrase iti kecit. In the vṛtti on some of the sūtras he has quoted a multiety of alternative opinions. While explaining the aphorism lingārthe prathamā which prescribes the use of the nominative case, he has three views to offer, besides his own which combine/reveal the fierce controversy that has raged, down the ages with respect to its interpretation.7 At one place he has quoted Pāṇini, Kāśika and Nyāsa by name, but the text is so corrupt that it is difficult to make out what was actually intended here. The nomenclatures of the tenses in the Sārasvatya Vyākaraṇa widely differ from those in Pāṇini. They are uniformly named after the point of time they represent. Thus lat therein is vartamana, lut śvastana and lit śabādiprakriyā. Maṇḍana has invariably equated them with the betterknown Pāṇinian appellations which go far to remove the mist of ambiguity about them.

The Sārasvatamanḍana begins with an autobiographic verse in the śārdālāvikrīdelī metre, which sets forth the details of Maṇḍana’s

6 'i yam svare' ityādāṁ yakārādayah kuto na syurīyāḥ|sāmānyaśāstrāt viśeṣaśāstrāḥ balavat|bahūvyāpakān|sāmānyāḥ alpavyāpakā|viṣeṣāḥ|.....hetvāntaramāṇa pareṇa pūrva bādho bhavati|paraśato'tra iṣṭavacanam|tena iṣṭeṇa sāvarṇe dirghatvena savarṇaviṣaye yakārādāṁ bādhaḥ|ibid.|, pp. 10b, 11a,
7 Ibid., p. 49b.
lineage and attributes his success to the lotus-like feet of Jinendra. It is followed by an exhaustive evaluation of the maṅgalācaraṇa of the Śārasvata Vyākaraṇa which runs as follows:

praṇamyā paramātmamāṁ bāladhīvṛddhi siddhayē
sārasvatimṛju kurve prakriyāṁ nativistarāṁ

Maṇḍana is justified in his belief that the benediction has the sanction of the ancient masters. Thus in siddhe sabdārthasambandhe Patañjali has intended the word siddha to perform the function of the maṅgalācaraṇa. The imperatives of the benediction are likewise met by the auspicious word vṛddhi in the first sūtra of the Aṣṭādhyāyī (vṛddhirādaic). The author of the Maḥābhāṣya insists on the benediction not only in the beginning of the work but on the middle and end as well because in his view it brings name to the work and ensures fulfillment of the readers cherished desires. Maṇḍana has sought to respect the tradition in his gloss which is distinguished by benediction at the three prescribed places.

Maṇḍana is convinced that the lyabanta form praṇamyā has been accorded the first place in the benediction because of its happy connotation. Being indicative of excellence (prakarṣa), the author hereby means to wish the reader successive excellence in prosecuting his grammatical studies. As a matter of fact, it is the prefix pra that denotes excellence. Parama in the second phrase paramātmāmaṁ he opines/denotes the infinite and inscrutable power of God popularly known as his māyā the cause of universe. The word ātmā is meant to underscore his omnipresence. Paramatmā thus stands for Siddha Parameśvara. If dissolved as parāmatmāmaṁ, it would be synonymous with the highest consciousness. Bāladhīvṛddhisiddhayē in his view is intended to imply that the growth of intellect constitutes accomplishment (siddhi) and that adds up to one of the goals (puruṣārtha). The adjectival clause anativistarōm according to him denies only verbosity not the profundity of meaning. The author of the Śārasvata Vyākaraṇa means to convey a wealth of meanings in limited words because absolute or intricate diction tends to scare away the green horn (durbdhāccalanti bāláḥ).

8 maṅgalādīni maṅgalāmadhyāni maṅgalāntōni śāstrāṇi prathante virapuruṣakāṇi bha-
9 parā jagatkāraṇataya ukṭiṭā māyāśaktīryasya sāb paramaḥ, Śārasvatamaṇḍana, p. 1b.
10 atati satatāṁ gacchati yuddā prāpnoti sarvavāpakatayā prāpnoti, Ibid., p. 1b.
Maṇḍana has taken the opportunity to express his views on the objects of grammar as well. The five objectives—rakṣā, uḥa, etc. mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya are so well-known. But Maṇḍana soars high in holding Brahman (Saccidānanda Paramātman) as the highest object of all the śāstras. That should be taken to be the objective of the present treatise also (tadevātrāpi). The fourth aphorism (tattu samanvayāt) of the Brahmāsūtra describes him in detail. The author of the vṛtti is convinced that on closer scrutiny, rakṣā, uḥa etc. cannot be held to be the highest objectives of the study of grammar.

The word sārasvatīm in the maṅgala verse, in his opinion, means Sārasvatī praṇītam. The Sārasvatīa Vyūkaraṇa is traditionally believed to have been revealed to the author by the goddess of learning herself.

sūtrasaptaśattī yasmai dadau sākṣāt sarasvatī
anubhūtisvarūpāya tasmai srigurave nāmaḥ

According to Maṇḍana anatīvistarām and rju reflect laghu and asandeha, admitted as two of the objectives in the Mahābhāṣya.

In the author’s words, the present vṛtti is intended to dispell the haze of imprecise glosses that had enveloped Anubhūtisvarūpa’s text, over the years. Besides that the Sārasvatamanḍana is invested with historical worth in as much as it provides additional details about its author. Apart from the Kāvyamanohara, it is the only work to refer to him as Saṁghapati and Mahāpradhana (Prime Minister). It is again the solitary work to highlight his manifold equipment in various disciplines with the happy phrase sarvavidyā viśāradaḥ.

11 rakṣoḥgāmaladhasandehāḥ prayojanaṁ, Mahābhāṣya, op. cit., p. 5.
12 na ca vicāryamāge rakṣoḥgāmaśayo’ pi parama prayojanaṁ bavitum śakyāḥ, Sāra-
vatamanḍana, p. 2b.
13 srimanmannadanasamghopati praṇīte sārasvatamanḍane sandhi prakaraṇāṁ samāptaṁ, Ibid., p. 15a.
srimanmannadāḥ sūtravidalmasāhimahāpradhāno’ pyadadhātsaṁdhi, Ibid., unnumbered
verse.
iti……srimadadhāhoṁ tām ā gāyādīvāviśāradaḥ—śrimanmannadana praṇīte sārasvata
manḍane kyāntaprapkaraṇāṁ samāptaṁ, Ibid., p. 121.
The Ramayana Culture in Karnataka
Jainism

Vasantha Kumari

The epic story of the Rāmāyaṇa which has appealed to the imagination of the Indians has not only fascinated them down the ages but it has also had its influence on the general Indian way of thought and life. This has resulted in finding its expression in varied forms in Hinduism, Jainism and Buddhism, in other words, what may be described as Indianism. It is this popular appeal which indeed explains the secret of its survival.

The study of Jaina Rāmāyaṇa presents an interesting picture, because Rāma in Jainism has occupied the place of Baladeva, amongst the Tri-saṣṭi-śalākā-mahāpuruṣa and not that of Avatāra-puruṣa as he is generally imprinted in Vedic Brahmanical Rāmāyaṇas. In other words, the mythological frame of the Jaina Rāmāyaṇa is absolutely different in spirit and atmosphere from the Vedic Brahmanic frame.¹

Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa and Rāvaṇa form the eighth set of Baladeva, Vāsudeva and prati-Vāsudeva. Baladevas are of gentle and sober temperament while Vāsudevas are violent and impetuous. Since Rāma is considered to be Baladeva, he immediately attains liberation. Hence the Jaina scripture upholds Rāma as Siddha Paramātmā.³

Vimala Sūri is stated to have been the earliest amongst the prominent writers to record the complete narrative story of Rāma in the Jaina version. The date of Vimala Sūri Ācārya has been ascribed to 1st Century AD.² The tradition of Vimala Sūri was followed for centuries by the Jaina writers until Guṇabhadrācārya, who composed Uttara-

² Ibid., p. 20.
³ V. M. Kulakarni, Story of Rāma in Jaina Literature.
Puṇa in the 10th Century A.D.⁴ Guṇabhadračārya made certain changes in the Jaina tradition of Rāmāyaṇa, which had already been established by Vimala Suri in his independent work Paumacariya.⁵ The narrative story of Rāma in Guṇabhadračārya’s work Uttara Puṇa appears only in a single canto.⁶ The chronological assessment of Rāma is made by Guṇabhadračārya, who states in his work, that, Rāma lived during the period of Tīrthaṅkara Munisuvrata.⁷ Besides, many eminent scholars through the ages have carried the Rāma narrative in the Jainistic form based on the findings of either Vimala Suri or Guṇabhadračārya. The rich epic tradition is also well carried on by the Jaina writers in Kannada literature.

Cāmuṇḍarāya was the earliest and the most prolific of the Jaina writers to have dealt with the Rāma narrative story. He has gained a place for himself in the history of Kannada literature by his prose work entitled Trīṇaṭi-Lakṣaṇa Mahāpurāṇa popularly known as Cāmuṇḍarāya-Purāṇam. It is like a handbook of Jaina religion and deals with the 24 Tīrthaṅkaras, the 12 Cakravartis and each of nine Baladevas, Vāsudevas and prati-Vasudevas, a total of 63 salākā-puruṣas. Cāmuṇḍarāya was also a prime promoter of Jaina doctrine.⁸ Cāmuṇḍarāya-Purāṇam contains a canto entitled ‘Rāma-Lakṣmaṇa-Caitam’, which is, nothing but the Jainistic version of Rāmāyaṇa and it is narrated in the form of a supplement to the life of Munisuvrata, the twentieth Tīrthaṅkara.⁹ Cāmuṇḍarāya was primarily believed to have followed the tradition of Guṇabhadračārya while narrating the story.

There are a few key points to be noted in Cāmuṇḍarāya-Purāṇam, wherein Daśaratha is referred to have been the King of Vārānasipura in Kaśīviṣāya.¹⁰ But later he shifts to Sāketapura, where his other sons Bharata and Śatrunga are stated to have been born.¹¹ To Subalā was born Rāma, while Lakṣmaṇa to Śumitrā, but in Cāmuṇḍarāya-

---
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¹⁰ Ibid., p. 263.
¹¹ Ibid., p. 264.
Purāṇaṁ no reference is made of the mothers of Bharata and Śatrugna, though it upholds the paternity of Daśaratha. The description reveals the pitiful conditions of women, from birth onwards which is a sad commentary of women's position in society. Sītā was born to Laṅkaśvara Rāvaṇa and his chief queen Mandodari, who abandons the child after birth. Janaka who finds the child brings her up giving the name Sītā. Rāma marries Sītā. Nārada narrates the beauty of Sītā to Rāvaṇa. Rāvaṇa transforms Mārica into a golden deer. Sītā is kidnapped in his aerial car, i.e., Puṣpaka-vimāna—Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa search for Sītā, the meeting of Vali, Sugriva, Anjaneya follows. In the war which follows, Rāvaṇa dies by the discus of Lakṣmaṇa—such in brief, is the story as narrated by Cāmuṇḍarāya. Being a prime promoter of Jainism, Cāmuṇḍarāya has handed-over to his people, Guṇabhadraścārya’s Jaina Rāmāyaṇa tradition in their own language for better understanding and appreciation.

The tradition of Guṇabhadraścārya’s Rāmāyaṇa was followed by a set of scholars of the later period like, Nāgarāja, the author of Puṣyāsrava. This work was composed in 1331 AD. The Rāmāyaṇa narrative story appears, in the seventh canto entitled ‘Sūdevi-Kathā’. The author was highly impressed by the chastity of Sītā, who is also referred to as Jānakī. He begins the narrative, with an invocation stotra in praise of Jānakī. A reference to the names of the other three queens of Rāma, namely Prabhāvatī, Ratinibhā and Śridhāma are made. The speciality of the Jaina version of Rāmāyaṇa lies in the fact that, Rāma is a polygamist. The story deals with the later part of the Rāmāyaṇa, after Sītā’s banishment by Rāma. The events such as reunion, agnipraveśa, i.e., fire ordeal, are narrated. In the concluding part of this story, Nāgarāja, upholds the chastity of Sītā. Sītā who undergoes the fire ordeal appears seated on the lotus flower and is untouched by Agni. Later she renounces the world and enters the ascetic order.

In about 1540 A.D. Devappa composed the Rāmāvijaya-Kavya, based on the tradition of Guṇabhadraścārya. He has kept up the nāṁivalt of the chief characters of the Rāmāyaṇa narrative story as referred to by Guṇabharācārya. Accordingly he has mentioned the name of Kaikeyi as the mother of Lakṣmaṇa, but has abruptly

12 Ibid., p. 264.
13 Nāgarāja, Puṇyāsrava, p. 11, ed. Javaregowda, D.
14 Ibid., pp. 231-242.
brought into picture the name of Sumitrā as the mother of Lakṣmaṇa. From this, it is evident that the author was not very much in acquaintance with the nāmāvalī referred to by Guṇabhadrācārya.

The outstanding figure among the authors of the Jaina Rāmāyaṇa who belonged to the School of Vimala Sūri, was Nāgacandra, popularly known as Abhinava Pampa. He was a Jaina poet who flourished in Mysore at the Court of Viṣṇuvardhana, the great Hoysāla ruler in about 1140 A.D. His independent composition was Rāmacandra-carita-Purāṇa which is also known by the name Pampa-Rāmāyaṇa.

The following key differences may be noted in the nāmāvalī of Nāgacandra’s Pampa-Rāmāyaṇa and Cāmunḍarāya-Purāṇam.

Cāmunḍarāya-Purāṇam

Mother of Rāma is named Subala. Lakṣmaṇa was born to Sumitrā. (Uttara-Purāṇa of Guṇabhadrācārya refers Kaikeyi, as the mother of Lakṣmaṇa).

He fails to mention the name of the mothers of Bharata and Śatrugna.

He omits the interposing of Kaikeyi, the prime mover of the Rāmāyaṇa story.

Pamba-Rāmāyaṇa

Mother of Rāma is named Aparājita, Lakṣmaṇa—Sumitrā Bharata and Śatrugna—Kaikeyi. (While in Kumudendu Rāmāyaṇa, the 4th wife of Dasaratha Suprabhā is mentioned as the mother of Śatrugna).

There is a reference to the interposing of Kaikeyi.

Nāgacandra endorses Rāvana with super qualities. Rāvana is depicted as an ardent follower of Right Faith, Right Conduct and Right Knowledge, a Jina Bhakta, having a fine Śāntisvara basadi in the

15 Devappa, Rāmavijaya Kāvya, ed. Keshavakshatta, T.
17 Ibid., p. 5.
18 Cāmunḍarāya Purāṇam, op. cit. pp. 263-264.
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capital and many caityas all over his kingdom. Further Rāvana is portrayed as a true promoter of Ahimsā Dharma. Accordingly, he is said to have even issued orders through out Lāṅkā and its territories, that no animal life should on any account be harmed; and that his warriors should, for a time desist from fight: and that all his subjects should be diligent in performing the rite of Jina pūjā. Further, Nāgacandra depicts the war scene and states that the Yakṣas or Guardian spirits of the Jina shrines made appeal to Rāma and Lakṣmanā to withdraw. Finally a pact is made based on which anything may be done to bring down Rāvana’s devotion—so long as no harm is caused to his life and the palace and the temples are not destroyed. The above passages no doubt substantiate that the author had a knowledge of historical events as he lived in the court of a great king. He was aware of alliances and conflicts. Therefore he was able to get the real historical background to depict the events of the Epic War. It is even probable that he had some personal experiences on the contemporary social calamities and social scandals like religious strife and misadventures on Jaina basatis and their demolition by the divergent religious groups of his period. The credit may however be assigned to Nāgacandra for having built up the image of human Rāvana for he has portrayed Rāvana as an ardent Jina Bhakta. Thus it becomes evident that Nāgacandra’s motive was to suppress hateful ideas against Rāvana.

Kumudendu Ācārya’s version of the Rāmāyaṇa is based on the tradition of Nāgacandra’s Rāmacandra-carīta-Purōṇa. Kumudendu is specially glorified as Hoysālaraya Rājaguru in an inscription at Šrāvana-belgola, and this Hoysala King was Narasimha-III, according to the Banegudda inscription. He had many titles like, ‘Paravadigirivajra’, ‘Vādībala-Locana’, ‘Vādī Darudara Kulīśa’, ‘Paravādī Ganda-berunda’, ‘Vādīgajakesśa’ī’, ‘Sarasakavitilaka’. An interesting factor, which attracts the attention of the readers of Kumudendu Rāmāyaṇa is that, the work has been composed in different satpati meters by associating each with the specific rōga and the tāla. It is quite evident, that the author must have written this work with the intention

20 Ibd., Ch. XIV, St. 82 to 97.
21 Ibd., Ch. XIV, St. 75-105; E. P. Rice, A History of Kanarese Literature, 1921, pp. 40-41.
22 Šrī Śāhiśīya, p. 797 [collection of the works of B. M. Srikanthaiah]
24 M. A., R., 1911, pp. 48-49.
of composing the entire masterpiece in the musical form. In his composition there are references to the various rāgas like Bhūpali, Mala-hāri, Madhu Mādhavī, Dhānysā, Rāmakri, Pālamaṇjari, Deśigaula, Śaraṅga, Vasanta and Karuṇge and the tālas like Addatāla, Atta-tāla, Ghampe-tāla, Voddmatteye etc. 26 Though Rāma and Laksmana are basically the observers of Ahimsā Dharma, they uphold the Kṣatriya tenets like Duṣṭa-sikṣā and Śiṣṭa-paripālana. As found in the other versions of the Jaina Rāmāyaṇa, Kumudendu also abides himself to the traditional Jainistic pattern, but with a few glaring changes like the depiction of the fourth wife of Daśaratha namely Suprabhā, who is stated to have been the mother of Śatrugna. Although the position of Aparajitā and Sumitrā is unaltered, Kaikeyi is mentioned to have been the mother of only Bharata.

Devacandra, a well known Jaina scholar of the early nineteenth century (1770-1841), too wrote on the theme of the Epic story entitled Rāmakathāvatāra in Kannāda prose form. He traces back the origin of the Jaina Rāmāyaṇa to the times of Ādideva, the first of the Tīrthaṅkaras, who narrated the story to his son, Bharata. This was passed on from generation to generation till it reached Mahāvīra the last of the Tīrthaṅkaras. He in turn, tells the story to the King Śreṇika of Magadha, his devout disciple. In the course of time several writers like Kachi Bhaṭṭāraka, Nandī Muni, Kavi Parmeṣṭhi, Ravisena, Vīrasena, Siddhasena, Padmanandī, Guṇabhadrā, Sakalakīrti carried the Rāmāyaṇa tradition in their works. Even Kannāda writers like Cāmunḍarāya, Nāgacandra, Maghaṇāndi Siddhānt, Kumudendra, Nāyasena and others continued the same tradition. While concluding his work Devacandra adds that, he has clarified a few doubtful points which were found by him in the narration of Nāgacandra’s versions of the Rāmāyaṇa on the basis of the Rāmāyaṇa story narrated in Uttara-purāṇa. 27

Candrasāgar Varnī, another noteworthy Jaina scholar of the nineteenth century also composed Śrī Rāmāyaṇa 28. He is stated to have composed this work on the request made by the Bhavyas of Ganjam, i.e., the Jaina Śrāvakas of Śrīraṅgapāṭṭana. While featuring the main characters of the story, the author simply adopts the name of revered Kauśalyā as the mother of Rāma. Thus, the scholar sets aside the corresponding names like, Aparajitā, and Subalā mentioned in the

---
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28 Candra Sāgara Varnī, Śrī Rāmāyaṇa, published by Payasāgara Varnī, Bidare.
earlier texts. He refers to the four wives of Daśaratha, namely, Kauśalyā, Sumitra, Kaikeyi and Lakṣmaṇā Mahādevī, the last being the mother of Śatrugna.

The Impact of the Ramayana Culture on the Socio-Religious Beliefs of the People:

Bāhubali Colossal: Its Association with Rāma:

A few scholars have tried to refer to the antiquity of the image of Bāhubali to the Epic Rāmāyaṇa period, by associating the colossal statue with that of legendary Rāma. The Munivamsābhhyudaya of Cidnaṇḍa-Kavi, an incomplete work composed in the seventeenth century throws light on the fact that Rāma and Śītā were responsible for not only bringing the image of Gommaṭa from Śrī Laṅkā, but also for worshipping it on the larger hill.²⁹

In Rājāvalī-Kathā, Devacandra mentions that the image of Belgola was formerly worshipped by Rāma and Rāvana and also by the latter’s wife Mandodari. It is said that in ancient times there was a self-formed image at this place which was in the shape of Gommatesvara Svāmī which Rāvana, the monarch of the Rākṣasas, worshipped to obtain happiness.³⁰ Ananta Kavi, in Gommatesvara-Carite, tells us that the shooting of an arrow by Cauṇḍarāya resulted in the revelation of the image of Gommaṭa.³¹ These observances throw light on the natural tendency prevailing amongst the people who have always been valuing the sanctity of the legendary personages, than the truth of the historical accomplishments of the human beings.

Humcha Padmāvatī Basti. Its Association with Rama:

An inscription on the outdoor of Padmāvatī basti states that the basti was created by Lord Rāma and Lord Brahmā.³²

If such dogmatic beliefs are retold, generation after generation,

²⁹ Cidnaṇḍa Kavi, Munivamsābhhyudaya, Ch. IV. St, 17 to 24. Unpublished, I K.S., Mysore.
³⁰ Devacandra, Rājāvalī Kathe, p. 149, ed. B. S. Sanniah.
³¹ Ananta Kavi, Gommatesvara Carite, p. 12, ed. Dr. B. V. Sirura.
³² E. C., Vol. VIII, No 56( Nagar)
they get embellished and these beliefs are naturally passed on to posterity. However, it should be noted that, neither Rāma or Sītā were transformed into the objects of worship, nor were they adorned as mystic couple in the Jaina religious practice in Karnataka. Despite the fact that the Rāmāyaṇa tradition, in Jaina recension had been composed in greater numbers by the Jaina writers of Karnataka, the cult of Rāma did not develop in Karnataka Jainism. No stotra, either in praise of Rāma or seeking his blessings, were composed. It is significant that neither were the icons of Rāma and Sītā made, nor were they installed for worship in the basadis. Even the sculptural carvings, representing the scenes from Jaina Rāmāyaṇa failed to adorn the panels of the basadis.

Semblance of highly reputed personalities of the ruling powers, with Rāma, Sītā, Lakṣmaṇa, Daśaratha, Kauśalyā are found in the Jaina inscriptions, specially those which belonged to the period of the Gaṅgas and the Hoysālas. But, such references are very few in number. However, it is in this regard that Rāmāyaṇa has left its imprints on the Jaina society in Karnataka. The inscriptions eulogises the Epic personages as embodiments of high ideals. They appreciate the noble qualities of Rāma and consider him to be an ideal King, a stern relentless hero, an ideal brother, and above all the promoter of Dharma. Thus he is assigned a place of honour by the Jainas, while Sītā, par excellence is depicted as an ideal wife.

Didiga and Mahādeva, who are stated to have been the founder of the Gaṅga dynasty, are compared to Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa.33

The early Hoysāla royal couple, Ereyanga and his queen Echaladevi, are described as Rāma and Sīta because of their renowned qualities and the protection of Dharma. Echaladevi was wellknown for her beauty like Sītā. They are also regarded as Daśaratha and Kauśalyā and their son Biṭṭideva is described as Rāmacandra.34 King Vinayāditya is upheld for his chastity, and is described as Hanuman to other's wife.35 Hulla, a minister who served many Hoysāla kings was also a prime promoter of Jainism. He and his wife are compared to Rāma and Janaki.36 Lakṣmi, wife of Gaṅgarāja was a Sītā in her devotion

33 E. C., Vol. VIII, No. 110, (Sorab)
35 Ibid., No. 176.
36 Ibid., No. 481.
to her husband. She is also compared to Chetni for her faith in the worship of Jina.\textsuperscript{37} Baladeva Daṇḍanāyaka and his wife Bachikabbe are also compared to Rāma and Sītā. Their sons, Nāgadeva and Singana are stated to have resembled Rāma and Lākṣmaṇa in their good qualities. Baladeva is described as an unassisted hero—Rāma in the battle.\textsuperscript{38} Viṣṇuvardhana the great Hoysāla king is compared to Rāma for being a stern, relentless hero in the battle. His renowned queen Sāntalā the prime promotor of Jina Dharma, is extolled as Sītā in the loftiness of devotion to her husband.\textsuperscript{39} It is also stated that a few of the royal ladies even excelled Sītā. Chandekabbe, wife of Nāgavarman Daṇḍanāyaka also claims her superiority over Sītā, in the loftiness of devotion to her husband.\textsuperscript{40} Echiyakka, daughter of Nāgadeva Daṇḍanāyaka is stated to have been even superior to Sītādevī on earth.\textsuperscript{41} Chāṭṭaladevī, daughter of Rakkasa Gaṅga has also been compared to Sītā.\textsuperscript{42} She is also hailed as the daughter of Sītā.\textsuperscript{43}

The Jaina tradition strongly upholds the view that Śrī Rāma attained nirvāṇa on the Māṅgi-Tuṅgi hill. The earliest reference to this effect is made by Śrī Kundakundācārya, in one of his compositions Daśa Bhakti in which he has stated that, Śrī Rāma, Hanumanta, Sugrīva, Nīla, Mahānīla, etc. attained nirvāṇa at Māṅgi-Tuṅgi.\textsuperscript{44} The same tradition has also been carried by Ācārya Pujyapāda. In his composition, Nirvāṇa Bhakti in which he states that Śrī Rāma attained nirvāṇa at Tuṅgi hill. Even a few Ācāryas of the later period have composed aṣṭakas eulogising Māṅgi-Tuṅgi as Siddha-ḳśetra by associating this with Śrī Rāma.\textsuperscript{45} Further, the sculptural depictions of Śrī Rāma, Hanumāna and Sugrīva seated in the padmāśana posture are also found in one of the caves on Māṅgi-Tuṅgi hill. It is significant to note that, this hill bears testimony to the fact that it is being a Jaina centre. The other caves on the hill too bear the sculptural carving of Tīrthaṅkaras and Yakṣa and Yakṣi, etc. Presently, Māṅgi-Tuṅgi hill is known by the name Galana hill and it is situated in Mahārastra (almost eighty-six km from Manmad Station.)\textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., No. 160. 
\textsuperscript{38} Ibid., No. 174. 
\textsuperscript{39} Ibid., No. 176. 
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., No. 176 (Chikkabetta) 
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., No. 174 (Chikkabetta) 
\textsuperscript{42} E. C., Vol. VIII, No. 39 (Nagar) 
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., No. 192 (Thirthahalli) 
\textsuperscript{44} Kunda Kundācārya, Dāśabhakti, ed. A. Santaraja Sastri, p. 129. 
\textsuperscript{45} Santinatha, K. Hosapete, Māṅgi-Tuṅgi Kṣetra. 
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid.
But, the religious value of Māṇgi-Tuṅgi hill hardly has played any influence on the Jaina writers of the Rāmāyaṇa in Karnataka. Neither has any writer made any reference to this Siddha-kṣetra or Śrī Rāma, nor has it been looked upon by them as a pilgrimage centre. In Uttara-purāṇa and Cāmuṇḍarāya-Purāṇam, however, Sammedā Śikhara is mentioned as nirvāṇa-bhūmi of Śrī Rāma. Thus it is apparent that the myths and legends have always been a dominant factor in the socio-religious beliefs of the people. Stala Purāṇas, Icons, Sculptural Carvings, Festivals, Feasts, etc.—all these form the infra-structures. Through them, the legendary figures have merged into the religious beliefs and practices, thus, by and large they have mixed up with the historical facts.

Hence, on the basis of what has been discussed above and from the nature of the records, it becomes clear that the impact of the Rāmāyaṇa, in the Jaina way of life, was only superficial and did not reach the popular level, as in the case of Hinduism. Neither Rāma nor Sītā was included in the pantheon of gods and goddesses of the Jainas. It is also obvious that the Rāma Cult neither prevails nor has played any significant role in the socio-religious life of the Jaina community in Karnataka.
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