

ISSN 0021-4043  
A QUARTERLY  
ON  
JAINOLOGY

VOL. XXX

No. 3. JANUARY

1996

# JAIN JOURNAL



॥ जैन भवन ॥

JAIN BHAWAN PUBLICATION

## Contents

Punyakuśala's Indebtedness to Māgha Dr Satya Vrat	73
Dānacintāmaṇi Attimabbe Dr Kamala Hampana	77
Vijayadeva Sūri of Tapāgaccha Rāmvallabh Somāni	80
Book Review :	
King Śūdraka and His Drama by Biswanath Banerjee Satya Ranjan Banerjee	92
Syntactic Studies of Indo-Aryan Languages by Sukumar Sen Satya Ranjan Banerjee	98

## BOOK REVIEW

Biswanath Banerjee—*King Śūdraka and His Drama*, Orientalia, Collana di Studi Orientali del CESMEO diretta da Irma Piovano, V, Torino, Italy, 1994, pp. 215, price. £. 35.000 or \$ 25.

The world of Prakrit and Sanskrit is enriched by the publication of Biswanath Banerjee's *King Śūdraka and His Drama*, because the drama *Mṛcchakaṭīka* of Śūdraka belongs to both the languages. Very few scholars (can be counted on fingers) have seriously attempted to study exhaustively the different aspects of the *Mṛcchakaṭīka*, and its author Śūdraka. From the time of its first appearance in 1829 (*Mṛcchakaṭīka*, with a commentary explanatory of the Prakrit passages, Calcutta, 1829, pp. 2+343) till today, though edited texts and translations in English, French, German, Dutch, Swedish, Danish, Italian, Russian and in many other languages of Europe have been done, the studies of the drama are very few. Historically, though we may trace the studies of the *Mṛcchakaṭīka* as early as 1826 by H.H. Wilson and followed by H.C. Kellner (1872), by Mahesh Nyāyaratna (1877), E. Windisch (1885), Sylvain Levy (1890), A. Boltz (1894) and others, their studies are only on some aspects of the drama, and not on a systematic pattern. It was Nishi Kanta Chaṭṭopādhyāya who made a study of the drama as early as 1902 (mentioned by Banerjee) by pointing out the many-sidedness of Śūdraka. The book was long out of print and now it is edited, revised, and augmented with an Introduction, Bibliography and extracts by Satya Ranjan Banerjee. Even then a thorough study of the *Mṛcchakaṭīka* was a desideratum, and Professor Banerjee has fulfilled that long-felt want. In the *Corpus of India Studies*, Calcutta, 1980, pp. 281-296, Biswanath Banerjee also wrote an article on *King Śūdraka and the role of Śākāra in the Mṛcchakaṭīka*.

It is, therefore, quite in the fitness of things that Professor Banerjee with his long standing research experience has undertaken such a project for the benefit of the scholarly world. It goes without saying that Professor Banerjee has shown his critical faculty in describing the different aspects of Śūdraka and his drama.

The book has seven chapters and three appendices along with Prefatory Note, Introduction and select Bibliography. In the Prefatory Note the writer has stated that it is "a brilliant composition in the

history of World Classical Literature remarkable for its exceptional dramatic qualities and unique in its content, character and treatment" (p. 9). The author has also said that he will make an effort to appreciate Śūdraka's dramatic skill and will try to assess his merits through a critical and analytical study of the immortal classic, and the book is a reflection of his promises.

In the Introduction the author has delineated the general aspects of the drama, the pattern of plot and sub-plot, the unique nature of the composition of the drama, and above all, a sort of appreciation that makes the drama quite readable. On the whole, though this Introduction is brief, it makes the beginning of the treatise remarkable.

His chapter I on Authorship and Date is quite straightforward. Two points are discussed side by side. His conclusion is that "the dramatist flourished between the first and the second centuries of the Christian era and we do not find any reason why the drama should not be ascribed to a person named Śūdraka and who was a king as well" (p. 36). Though the discussion of Professor Banerjee seems to be quite lively and not controversial, and there is no reason why we should not adhere to his conclusion, there are still some other considerations which need clarification before any new theory is propagated. The date of Śūdraka varies from 2nd century B.C. to 7th cent. A.D., of which two dates are considered acceptable—2nd cent. B.C. or 2nd cent. A.D.—of which again most of the scholars cling to the second one. Unless any new material is discovered, these two dates will remain tentative. This much can be said that the word *ṇāṇaka* (I. 23) meaning 'coin' is not the surest indication to fix his date after the first century A.D. as this coin "is supposed to have come into vogue in India by the time of Kaṇiṣka". It appears to me that the word *ṇāṇaka* in verse I. 23 may not mean "coin", but it could be *ṇāṇaka* ('knowledge') as the literary appreciation demands it from the context. Professor Banerjee has also suggested this meaning at p.81. (For a fuller discussion see my forthcoming publication, *Samskṛta Sāhitya Samālocanā Saṃgraha*, pp 225ff.). There was a time when the word *ṇāṇaka* had led the scholars to believe that the word *ṇāṇaka* in the *Mṛcchakaṭika* referred to a Buddhist coin. But the time has come now to change that earlier view. However, this does not detract in any way from the merit of the discussion on the date of Śūdraka, particularly when his life is terribly shrouded in darkness. But yet I shall say that Professor Banerjee's treatment of the subject is remarkable and praiseworthy. This dull and insipid problem has become lively by his lucid and florid style of presentation.

His chapter II deals with the sources of the drama. The author has merely said that the story element of the drama has resemblances with some stories in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, *Daśakumāracarita*, in the *Nāyadhamma-kahāo*, and in the Buddhist *Jātakas*. The writer has also shown which stories have the semblances with what texts. Professor Banerjee admits that it is difficult to solve the problem for want of adequate data. But this much can be said that most of the authors might have taken the story-elements from floating stories like Udayanakathā, Cārudattakathā, Naravāhanadattakathā etc. as we have the Arthurian legends in the middle Europe (550-1500 A.D.), from which most of the European writers have drawn their story-elements. The similarity of Cārudatta story in Bhāsa and Śūdraka is a problem which is difficult to solve at this stage, and that is why the writer has not touched upon this problem. But yet I admire Professor Banerjee for his impartial, balanced opinion about the problem. Personally, I enjoyed very much reading this chapter.

In all probability his chapter III on Critical Appreciation is the highest and the best in delineating the merit of Śūdraka's composition. In a nutshell, the writer has rightly pointed out that "our dramatist has an excellent command over sense and sound. In his intelligent selection of words and phrases he has exhibited his skill in making the dialogues lively, refreshing and attractive" (p. 43). This chapter of the author manifests his appreciation about Śūdraka, and the author has also shown his alacrity in depicting them. Professor Banerjee's penmanship is excellent in this respect. Though lots of controversies may gather round this chapter, it is pretty certain that the writer's views are clear and in true perspective.

In chapter IV, Professor Banerjee has analysed the plot of the drama. It offers act-wise summary along with some comments here and there. The presentation of the story elements is quite readable.

Professor Banerjee has shown his mastery over depicting the characters of the drama (chapter V). The major characters are Cārudatta, Vasantasenā, Maitreya and Śākāra. Except Śākāra, in all other characters the writer is straightforward, but very cautious in presenting them. The writer is a bit lavish on Cārudatta and Vasantasenā. But in the case of Śākāra, his outlook is quite different. I believe this chapter is unique and proves the power of observation of the writer.

Humour (ch. VI) is one of the features of Sanskrit dramas and the *Mṛcchakaṭika* is full of it. Long ago, D.K. Kanjilal wrote a treatise on

Humour in Sanskrit Literature (*Samṣkṛta Sāhitye Hāsyarasa*) where he had shown how the Sanskrit Kāvya-writers were conscious about it. But the present author has surpassed all his predecessors, particularly in the case of the *Mṛcchakaṭika*. The writer has given several examples with English translation. We only wish he had given more than what were presented in the chapter. I hope the readers will enjoy this chapter.

The contemporary society (ch. VII) as depicted by Professor Banerjee in the seventh chapter of his book is mainly based on the *Mṛcchakaṭika*, even though the author has said that “the *Mṛcchakaṭika* and the *Daśakumāracarita* are the two major works in Sanskrit literature which provide us with the most detailed information about their respective times” (p. 114). The subject is so vast and the materials are so abundant that it is impossible to give a complete picture of the society of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* in thirteen pages, but yet the author has described them in a compact way. By reading this chapter we are quite at home with the society of Śūdraka. All his references point to the time of Śūdraka alone. Though R.G. Basak, as early as 1929 wrote an article (*Indian Society as pictured in the Mṛcchakaṭika*, IHQ, Vol-V, 1929, pp. 299-325) on the society of the *Mṛcchakaṭika*, Banerjee’s scope has gone beyond the periphery of that article. Incidentally, he has compared with other literary documents to show how those features of the society have perpetuated down to the later stages. Professor Banerjee is right when he concludes : “The society of Śūdraka seems to have been a rich, opulent and lively one with all virtues and vices, qualities and defects, strength and weaknesses that can be conceived of any society of any time in any country” (p. 125).

One of the good things of the book is the selection of some verses and good sayings in the appendices A and B. Although the text is not edited, some 105 beautiful verses and 52 proverbial sayings have been selected in original with English translation and notes. These verses will enable the readers to appreciate the best part of the drama, and to know the power of observation of Śūdraka as a dramatist, and these will serve the purpose of almost reading the text. The English translation is very apt and will help the reader to understand the text. These selections will also prove what Professor Banerjee has said in his earlier chapters about Śūdraka.

In appendix C (Selected important words in the *Mṛcchakaṭika*), some interesting words from the *Mṛcchakaṭika* are picked up and have been explained. This theme is a new one, and I personally feel

that this is one of the unique features of the book. Most of the words are interesting and will help the lexicographers to take note of them for their Dictionaries. One such interesting word is Pkt. *ṛāṇaka* (I. 23). At page 204, he gives the meaning "a kind of coin" which is the common meaning of the word; but at p. 81, he incidentally mentions that Pkt. *ṛāṇa* could be Skt. *jñāna* which meaning he could also give in the appendix.

*Himāṇahe* could be *hi + māṇaha* where *hī* stands for *dhīk* and *māṇaha* (=Skt. *mānadha*, *mānaṃ dhatte itī*) 'one who cherishes honour in him', therefore, 'man'. *himāṇahe*, therefore, means 'Oh, man', i.e. 'Oh what a man, I am'. Secondly, it means 'Oh, alas', So grammarians say *himāṇahe vismaya-nirvede* (Hemacandra IV. 282) "which means 'in Śauraseni the word *himāṇahe* is used in the sense of surprise (*vismaya*) and grief (*nirveda*)".

Another interesting word given by him is *goḍḍa* as in *ahaṃ de muṇḍe goḍḍaṃ daissaṃ* (V. 11.43) 'I shall set my foot on your head', and *kiṃ ṇiadeṇa vaddhā se goḍḍā* (VII. 4.13). 'Are her feet bound up by chains?' The etymology of the word is uncertain. It is regarded as a Deśi-word; but neither *goḍa* nor is *goḍḍa* recorded by Hemacandra (1088-1172 A.D.) in his *Deśināmamālā*, even though it was used in the *Mṛcchakaṭika*. The word may be reconstructed from a Deśi-word *goḍa* with the suffix *-rak* making it \**goḍra*, a hyper-Sanskritization, meaning being, 'the root of a tree', and therefore, 'a foot', i.e.. \**goḍra* > Pkt. *goḍḍa* > Hindi *goḍa*, Bengali *goḍāli* with *-āli* suffix. The parallel can be drawn from *aṅhri* or *aṃhri*. Just as from *aṅh* / *aṃh* 'to set out', 'to go', 'to commence', we have *aṅhri* and *aṃhri* (with *-ri* suffix) meaning 'a foot', or 'the root of a tree', lit. 'by which we move or go', i.e. 'a foot', so also we form the word *goḍḍa* from \**goḍra* (with *-rak* suffix).

Another tricky word is *gāmeluā* 'rustics'. It could be *grāma* with *elu + (k)ā = gāma + elu + ā = gāmeluā* (cf. Pischel § 595). The suffix *-elu* is used instead of *-illa* in Prakrit in the sense of 'having that', e.g., *gāmilla* (*ālvi-llo-llā-la-vanta-mante-tterra-maṇā matoḥ*, HC. II. 159), and the Sanskrit equivalent of *gāmilla* is given as *grāmīṇa* or *grāmya*. Some may like to give the etymology from Sanskrit *grāmelukāh*, meaning thereby 'one who finds (*luk*) his livelihood from roaming village to village', and therefore 'an aimless man', 'a rustic fellow'. They consider *lukā* from the root *luk* 'to see', 'to find' (cf. *avalokana*). Hemacandra has not recorded this as a Deśi-word, but has recorded another word *gāmaroḍo* (*Deśināma* II.90) [which Trivikrama says as *gāmareḍo*], as a Deśi-word. The meaning of this word is applied to *gāmeluā* also. The meaning of *gāmaroḍo* as given by Hemacandra is

as follows : *chalena grāmabhoktā antarbhedam kṛtvā yo māyayā grāmaṃ bhunakti*—‘one who creates disunion among the inhabitants of village and earns his livelihood thereby’. However, it is true that the etymology of the word is not clear.

The meaning of *vuḍḍhakola* or *vuḍḍhakoḍa* is given as ‘an old jackal’. This does not seem to be the correct meaning. *koḍa* is a Deśi-word (HC. II. 80) meaning ‘lame’ (*khañja*) cf. Bengali *koḍā*, ‘a lame man’. So *ṽṛddhakoḍa* may mean ‘an old lame man’, instead of *ṽṛddha-ṣṛgāla* as given by the commentator. In a similar way, *kola* may stand for *khola* which is a Deśi-word meaning ‘a small donkey’ (*laghu-gardhabha*—HC). So *vuḍḍhakola* may be ‘an old donkey’ (*ṽṛddha-gardhabha*) instead of a jackal (*ṣṛgāla*).

The Prakrit *kuluttha-jūsa* may be Skt *kulattha-yūsa* instead of *kulittha-yūsa*, because in Pāṇini’s sūtra (*kulattha-kopadhād an*, IV. 4.4) the word *kulattha* ‘a kind of pulse’ is recorded. The word is used in the *Āyurveda* also as a kind of herb from which medicine is prepared.

Whatever etymology is offered, *hulubhuliṃ* is a sort of onomatopoeic word which is connected with Skt. *hulihuli* meaning, ‘nuptial music’, then ‘roaring’, ‘howling’, or *hulahuli* ‘inarticulate sounds made by women on joyful occasions’, then *huluhula*, ‘an exclamation of joy’. So the sentence — *ovālida-śalile gaḍia śiāle bhavia hulubhuliṃ kaledi* (VIII. 30.13) means ‘going perhaps with his body concealed and acting like a jackal might make a roaring or howling sound’. *hulubhuliṃ* does not mean *kapaṭa* ‘false’ or ‘cheat’, because the sentence begins with *kavaḍa-kāvaḍike eṣe bamhaṇe ....* ‘this sly deceitful Brahmin’.

There is no need of saying that this list of words is not complete, far from it; but it would have been better, if the author had included some more words on the list. For example, *goḥa* in *laddhe gohe* (II. 6.8). Here *goḥa* is translated in Sanskrit as *manuṣya*, ‘a man’. But etymologically *goḥa* could be a guṇated form of the root *gūh*, ‘to conceal’ meaning thereby ‘an absconder’ *palātaka*. So *laddhe gohe* means ‘an absconder is got’ (i.e. found). Some might also say that *goḥa* might come from *\*goghna* which becomes *\*goggha* in Pkt. and then *\*gogha* which becomes *goḥa* meaning ‘killer of cows’, an abusive term used to a low type of people. The first meaning is more appropriate than the second as far as the context is concerned.

The world of Prakrit would have been much benefited, had



Professor Banerjee devoted a chapter to the language of the drama. The *Mrcchakatika* is a farrago of Prakrit dialects and as such it is interesting. However, this has not diminished the merit of the work.

In fine, we can say that both the author and the publisher are to be congratulated for undertaking such a publication for the benefit of the academic world. The book is well-bound and printed, and the quality of paper is exceedingly nice. I believe every lover of Sanskrit and Prakrit will welcome this book, and their library will be adorned by the inclusion of this publication.

**Satya Ranjan Banerjee**

Sukumar Sen – *Syntactic Studies of Indo-Aryan Languages*, Institute for the study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, Tokyo, 1995, pp. 402.

The Prakrit language has been crowned by the reprint of the *Historical Syntax of Middle Indo-Aryan* by Sukumar Sen together with his other two books on Syntax, namely, *The Use of the Cases in Vedic Prose* and *Syntactic Studies of Buddhist Sanskrit*. These three books of Sukumar Sen have been reprinted by the Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, Tokyo, 1995, under the title, *Syntactic Studies of Indo-Aryan Languages*. All these three books became out of print for a long time. In the language of T. Nara who in his Foreword says that in order to fulfil his guru's (i.e. Sukumar Sen's) last wish he wants to see "a buried treasure book taken out and opened once again under the sun-light to gratify all those scholars and specialists who had been long devoid of opportunity to get access to the precious academic information contained therein". It is indeed true to say that the Tokyo Institution has rendered yeoman service to the scholarly world by reprinting these books.

There is no denying the fact that the *Syntactic Studies* will promote the historical and comparative studies of Indo-Aryan languages on syntax matters. His studies on syntax, particularly on the Middle Indo-Aryan, is a pioneering work and will act as a torch-bearer for the future generations. That is why, even after the lapse of so many years, we still feel the necessity of consulting his syntaxes. It would have been better, if his another article entitled, *Notes on the use of the Cases in the Kāthaka-Saṃhitā*, published in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, New series, Vol-XXI, 1925, pp. 1-28, were published in the same volume. Though short, the inclusion of this article would have certainly enhanced the quality of this book.

The study of Indo-Aryan syntax started, in a sense, from the first quarter of the nineteenth century. E. Burnouf's *Sur un usage remarquable de l' infinitif sanscrit* (*Journal Asiatique* 1824, pp. 120ff) is more or less the first attempt to understand the use of Infinitive in Sanskrit. But the major contributions to syntax are made by Berthold Delbrück in several of his books and papers beginning from 1864 down to 1900, the remarkable among them being *Der Gebrauch des Conjunctivs und Optativs in Sanskrit und Griechischen*, Halle, 1871; *Altindische Tempuslehre*, Halle, 1877; *Die Altindische Wortfolge aus dem Çatapatha-brāhmaṇa*, Halle, 1878; *Altindische Syntax*, Halle, 1888, and *Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik der Indogermanischen Sprachen* in three volumes, Strassburg, 1893-1900. The last one is a comparative IE syntax with other IE languages. Almost forgotten is the work of A. Hofer's *Vom Infinitiv besonders im Sanskrit*, Berlin, 1840. Later on, Alfred Ludwig's *Der Infinitiv im Veda mit Systematik des Litauischen und Slavischen Verbs*, Prague, 1871, is a comparison of Vedic Infinitive with Lithuanian and Slavic. So also the works of Eugenius Wilhelm's *De infinitivi linguarum Sanskritae* (1873) and E. Herzog's *Die Syntax des Infinitivs* (*Jahrbücher für Klassische Philologie*, 1873, pp. 1-33), and Julius Jolly's *Geschichte des Infinitivs im Indogermanischen*, München, 1873, are the contributions to the Infinitives. J.S. Speijer's two books on Syntax (*Sanskrit Syntax*, Leiden, 1886, and *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, Strassburg, 1889,) though small in size, yet famous for Sanskrit syntax. Delbrück's books on syntax have already been mentioned. Apart from W.D. Whitney's *Sanskrit Grammar* (1879, 3rd edn. 1896) where he has discussed the Sanskrit Syntax *inter alia* in treating morphology, his article "On the Narrative use of Imperfect and Perfect in the Brāhmaṇas" (*Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 1892, pp. 5-34) is worth mentioning in this context.

But the first half of the twentieth century was flooded with cartloads of Literature on Sanskrit syntax. A volume will be required to register them. In the year of Dr Sen's first instalment of the use of the cases in Vedic Prose appeared Hanns Oertel's *The Syntax of Cases in the Narrative and Descriptive Prose of the Brāhmaṇas*, Heidelberg, 1926, and Jacob Wackernagel's *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, Basel, 1926. After that we have hosts of scholars who worked on Sanskrit syntax. But none have practically surpassed Dr Sen's contribution to the subject. All his three treatises are inundated with copious examples not only from Sanskrit, but also occasionally from Avestan and Greek. Incidentally it can be mentioned in this connection that L.H. Gray's two articles on Avestan syntax (*Contribution to Avestan*

*Syntax : the Conditional Sentences*, Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, Vol-12, No. 13, 1900, pp. 549-588 and *the Preterite Tenses of the Indicative*, JAOS, Vol-21, 1900, pp. 112-145, are the earliest studies of the subject.

But the study of syntax on Middle Indo-Aryan is almost a barren subject. Dr Sen contributed to it for the first time. Historically, though some scholars have done some works on MIA syntax, but they are not worth mentioning in comparison with Dr Sen. Siegfried Goldschmidt has written one article on Prakrit Infinitive (*Der Infinitiv des Passivus in Prakṛt*, ZDMG, 28, 1874, Leipzig, pp. 491-493). Otto Franke as early as 1890 wrote his *Die Casuslehre des Pāṇini Vergleichen mit dem Gebrauch des Casus im Pali und in den Aśoka-inschriften*, Beiträge zur Kunde der Indogermanischen Sprachen, Göttingen, 1890, where the application of Pāṇini's rules in Pali and Aśokan Inscriptions is found. But in the twentieth century, apart from Dr Sen, A.N. Upadhye and A.M. Ghatage have done some stray works on the subject. Upadhye's *Syntactic Position of Preposition*, IHQ, IX, 1933, pp. 987-88, is an illustration of the subject. In a sense, Ghatage has contributed much more than Upadhye. Ghatage's major contributions are—*Instrumental and Locative in Ardhamāgadhī* (IHQ, XIII, 1937, pp. 52-58), *Repetition in Prakrit Syntax* (NIA, 11, 1939, pp. 47-55) and *Concord in Prakrit Syntax* (ABORI, XXI, 1940, pp. 73-96). In his *Introduction to Ardhamāgadhī*, Kolhapur, 1951, he has a chapter on Ardhamāgadhī syntax. But Dr Sen started working on MIA syntax from 1928 onwards. From 1939 (IL, Vol-VII, 1939, pp. 65-86, 180-86; IX, 1944, pp. 10-29) till the appearance of the *Historical Syntax of Middle Indo-Aryan* in 1953 (IL, XIII, 1953, pp. 1-68 and then as a separate book, 1953), Dr Sen had continuously worked on the subject. But after Dr Sen the subject has not advanced much.

So the *Syntactic Studies of Indo-Aryan Languages* is a timely reprint for which the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies is to be congratulated. The book is exceptionally well-bound, the paper and printing are both excellent, and overall get-up is attractive. I am sure that the scholars will be much benefited by the reprint of these three syntaxes.

**Satya Ranjan Banerjee**

# JAIN JOURNAL

Vol. XXX

No.3 January

1996

## PUNYAKUŚALA'S INDEBTEDNESS TO MĀGHA

DR SATYA VRAT

As discussed elsewhere<sup>1</sup>, the *Triṣaṣṭīśalākāpuruṣacarita* (TṢŚPc.) of Hemacandra forms the basis of Puṇyakuśala's *Bharatabāhubali-mahākāvya* (BBM.)<sup>2</sup> which seeks to detail in eighteen cantos, a brief episode from the life of Bharata, the first *Cakravartin* celebrated in the Jaina tradition, with such poetic trappings as the mahākāvya admits with profusion, though it has occasionally drawn upon the *Ādipurāna* as well. To be sure, the two burly texts represent respectively the Śvetāmbara and Digambasra versions of the fascinating story of Bharata's fight with his refractory younger brother, Bāhubali and its resultant sublimation, with the heady combatants ultimately discarding worldly glory that driven them to the suicidal course of deadly confrontation. While in the conception of his story Puṇyakuśala's indebtedness to the aforesaid Purāṇas is beyond question, in its execution he seems to follow with a measure of tenacity, the sequence of Māgha's poem which is known to have exercised powerful influence on the successive generation of Sanskrit poets. The quantum of debt that Puṇyakuśala owes to the author of the *Śiśupālavadha* can be gauged from the fact that it extends to both the substantial and the peripheral.

In imitation of Māgha, Puṇyakuśala has plunged headlong in the story without so much as observing the formality of the benediction. The two poems thus concur in having what is known in the jargon of the poeticians as the *vastunirdeśātmaka* type of *maṅgalācaraṇa*. The *Śiśupālavadha* has earned the sobriquet of *śryaṅkakāvya*, because of its deliberate use of the auspicious word Śrī in the last verse of each canto. By skilfully interweaving the phrase *puṇyodaya*<sup>3</sup> in the concluding verse of each canto, Puṇyakuśala has not only respected the tradition, but has also thereby made a veiled reference to his name, which is otherwise conspicuous by its absence in the poem. The *Śiśupālavadha* is marked in its beginning by Nārada's descent from the heavens which has prompted the author into a bout of rich

1. SATYA VRAT: Studies in Jaina Sanskrit Literature, Delhi, 1994, pp. 168-175.

2. Jaina Vishwa Bharati, Ladnun, 1974.

3. For example - *kṣītipati-bhavanamyātyanta puṇyodayādhyam* BBM I. 79.

imagery. With respect to the true identity of the emerging figure. Puṇyakuśala's poem, on the other hand, opens with the despatch of an envoy to Bāhubali to secure his submission to his elder brother Bharata. While Nārada succeeds in his mission, the envoy draws a resounding rebuff from the lord of Taxila, making the clash thus inevitable for the haughty brothers.

Three of Puṇyakuśala's cantos (VI–VIII) are infested with sizable descriptions of the march of Bharata's army, its encampment and subsequent departure besides the time-worn digression like the sports of the soldier-couples and their sexual orgy, as also the sketches of scenic beauties. The descriptions of love-sports and sexual orgy are supposed to have no locus standi in the Jaina Purāṇas. They are indeed conspicuous by their absence in the TṢSPc. But surprisingly, Jinasena has detailed with abandon all these frivolities including the sexual orgy (35. 152–236), the only difference is that in the *Ādipurāṇa* these concern themselves with Bāhubali's soldiery. Puṇyakuśala, however, is not indebted to Jinasena for these trappings. He evidently owes them to Māgha (VII–XI) who has been instrumental in providing sound footing to these mannerisms. It would not be unreasonable to presume that even Jinasena was indebted to the illustrious author of the *Śisūpālavadha* for these poetic aberration, otherwise the very idea of this reckless orgy in the midst of the *sainyaprayāṇa* is simply abhorrent in a writing like the *Ādipurāṇa*.

While Māgha's descriptions are distinguished by prolixity and ornate style, those in the *BBM* are on a subdued note. Contrary to Māgha, Puṇyakuśala has shunned to detail the various types of heroines in the course of the love-sports of the soldiery, though his descriptions are not wholly void of the mannerism. While the *asārādā* (*prauḍhā*) *nāyikā* is expressly mentioned in the *BBM*<sup>4</sup>, a veiled reference is made to the *kalahāntarītā*, *mugdhā* and *khaṇḍitā*<sup>5</sup>. Māgha's descriptions are loaded with sāstric contents, while in Puṇyakuśala they are marked by ease and simplicity. But he is so charmed by Māgha's description some of the ideas and motifs from him<sup>6</sup>. However, whatever their worth, the love-sports of the Yadus do not square even with Māgha's theme dominated by the heroic sentiment ; their descriptions by the Jaina monks with gay abandon in a poem which culminates in renunciation is not only absurd, it tends to make a mockery of his much-acclaimed puritanism.

4. ...*nāyita citta kāmamunātya sārādā*. *BBM*. VII.21. Also VII.37, 41–42

5. *Kalahāntarītā*, *BBM*. VII.59; *Khaṇḍitā*, *BBM*. VIII. 37–38.

6. *Śisūpālavadha*, VII 21, *BBM*., VII. 21; *Śisū*. VII. 52; *BBM*; VII. 31 etc.

Not unlike the *Śiṣupālavadba* (XVIII – XX), two of the cantos in the *BBM* are devoted to the description of the *yuddha*. The encounter of the rival forces, as detailed in the *BBM*, is not traceable to either of its main sources. It is unmistakably suggested and inspired by the terrific clash between the armies of Kṛṣṇa and Śiṣupāla, described with verve in the eighteenth canto of the *Māghakāvya*. Cantos fourteen and fifteen of the *BMM* are imbued with an aura of the traditional *Caritakāvyas*. Herein are encountered the hackneyed motifs like the gearing up of the soldiery, their self-vaunts, terrific cries of the heady warriors, trumpeting of the elephants and dances of the headless bodies (*kabandhas*). These mannerisms, howsoever, banal and worthless, owe themselves to Māgha (XVII–XVIII) and serve as prelude to the final encounter. It is interesting to find that originating in Māgha, these motifs had filtered down to the *Vīragāthā* and *Riti*-periods of Hindi poetry and the later Sanskrit *Mahākāvyas*, and had evoked a measure of esteem. While Māgha is lost in the labyrinth of frustrating *Citrakāvya*, Puṇyakuśala has spun out a brilliant sketch of the battle. It is no exaggeration to say that the fifteenth canto of the *BBM* reflects the poetic talents of the poet more than the ferocity of the clash. Perhaps Puṇyakuśala means to present this canto as an opposite pole to Māgha's *Citrakāvya*, which otherwise had set the norm in describing the 'War : Bharata's duel with Bāhubali is doubtless based on the *TṣṢPc.*, but it seems to have drawn sustenance from the combats detailed in the *Kirātārjunīyam* and the *Śiṣupālavadham*.

The description of the impatience of the women-folk in canto six owes itself to the corresponding description in Māgha XIII, where the citydamsels are likewise said to have thronged to have a glimpse of Kṛṣṇa as he enters Yudhiṣṭhira's metropolis though the two differ in their objectives. He might have drawn upon Kālidāsa's parallel descriptions as well<sup>7</sup> which seem to have established the motif on a firm footing.

In imitation of Māgha, Puṇyakuśala has described the six traditional seasons that come to wait upon the hero. The entire description in Māgha is infested with fearsome *yamaka*. Puṇyakuśala has resorted to the gimmick in describing the *śarat* only, and that too in the fifteenth canto, away from the integrated depiction of the six seasons (XVIII. 1–57). Otherwise also Puṇyakuśala's *yamaka* does not present in superable difficulty in resolving it.

With 'war' as its focal point, the *BBM*, like Māgha's poem, has

7. *Kumārasambhava*, VII. 56–62, *Raghuvaṃśa*, VII. 6–11

*vīrarasa* as its chief sentiment. Puṇyakuśala's expertise in depicting the Heroic sentiment in tune with the genius of the poem is as unquestioned as that of Māgha. While the supremacy of the *vīrarasa* in the *BBM* is beyond dispute, Śṛṅgāra in both its aspects has been depicted evidently in imitation of Māgha, with such a tenacity that not unoften it threatens to overwhelm, if not eclipse, the predominant sentiment. While going through the middle part of the poem, one cannot escape the impression that it is basically an erotic work. And the Śṛṅgāra as depicted by Puṇyakuśala is, not unlike in Māgha sensuous and voluptuous for the most. It may create momentary excitement, but it fails to leave lasting impression on the reader. Puṇyakuśala is a master of the art of love rather than an expert in dealing with the *Rasarāja* in its sweep and depth. And there too he concurs with his mentor, Māgha.

While 'war' forms the central issue in both the poems, they differ widely in their culmination. The *Śīsupālavadhā* closes at its natural end—the assassination of Śīsupāla : in the *BBM*. the war undergoes sublimation. Though treading different paths, both Bharata and Bāhubali taste the bliss of *kaivalya*, which represents the fulfilment of human life in the Jainistic tradition.

Despite heavy indebtedness, Puṇyakuśala has no fascination for Māgha's artificial style, flamboyant phraseology, excessive ornateness and the despicable *citrakāvya*. His objective might have deterred him from these frustrating gimmicks.

## **Arbelts India**

Export House Recognised by Govt of India

**Proprietor - Sanjit Bothra**

8/1 Middleton Road

5th Floor Room No. 4

Calcutta - 700 001

**Phone : 201029/6256/4730**

**Telex : 0212333 ARBI IN**

**Fax No. : 0091-33290 174**

### *In Memory of*

**Late NARENDRA SINGH BAID**

Mira Baid

83/B Vivekananda Road

Calcutta - 700 006

Phone : 241 0719

## DĀNACINTĀMAṆĪ ATTIMABBE

DR KAMALA HAMPANA

Wherever and whenever an important woman moves, there is history and there is poetry. It is very much so in the case of Attimabbe, who is described as the cream of Indian Culture and an embodiment of the essence of non-violence. As a towering personality of the 10th century, she deserves a unique position among the great women of the world.

Attimabbe was born and brought up in a family of ministers and army commanders who patronised art and literature alike. A number of documents have given a vivid account of Attimabbe and her family of four generations.

Nāgadeva, the elder son of Dallappa, was a man of mettle and had no match on the battle ground. He had imbibed from his father all the proficiency in the art of war. Nāgadeva succeeded his father as the Field-Marshal of the Chālukyan army. He married Attimabbe and Guṇḍamabbe, who were the daughters of Mallapa, a devout Jain and connoisseur of literature.

Like all his kith and kin, Nāgadeva spent most of his life in wars. As was the ordeal, on one such occasion Nāgadeva, when he was at the height of his fame, met a heroic death on the battle field. When Nāgadeva succumbed to the injuries inflicted by his enemies, his wife Guṇḍamabbe observed the custom of Satī (self-immolation) on her husband's pyre.

But Attimabbe did not resort to the act of burning herself with husband's corpse. Instead, she decided to lead a life of devotion to her faith and serve the poor and the sick. The sudden death of her husband made her more and more introspective and brought a great change in her attitude, slowly but surely taking a turn for the better, both quantitatively and qualitatively. She started giving liberal donations to the destitute, supplied free medicine to the poor and the distressed. Attimabbe was duly honoured by Chālukya king Tailapa, with the celebrated and immortal title '*dānacintāmaṇī*' which means 'a gem yielding everything wanted by its possessor'.

Attimabbe seriously started the movement of constructing temple. It is practically astonishing that she erected 1501 Jain shrines. She



got 1500 wooden chests for placing idols, 1500 gong and bells to ring while worshipping and freely distributed all these worshipping items.

Ranna, a Poet Laureate in the Chālukya court, has concentrated his poetic skill, highly balanced in its presentation, crystallizing the illustrious life of this extraordinary woman Attimabbe. Poet Ranna has so effectively portrayed her that it leaves an everlasting imprint on the minds of readers. This graphic description does not just place us in time or other accomplishments of Attimabbe, but by a series of incidents in chronological sequence, including her struggle and triumphs. Some of her accomplishments breathe life into unsung heroines and tireless women workers, whose contributions have often been overlooked in the chronicles of Indian history. Ranna, through the lustrous portrait of Attimabbe, tries to answer the much asked question of how and why women were held high in Society. In its sweep and depth of coverage, Ranna's depiction does more than justice to this indomitable woman, who stood over and above all men of great name and fame, who were her senior contemporaries. During her life time and later after her death, nearly 32 inscriptions have eulogised Attimabbe, and her virtues.

Ranna is one of the earliest of Kannada poets to recognise the feminist point of view and gives a woman her due place in history. He is not blind to the achievements of a widowed woman. Again, he is the first poet in the context of Kannada literature and in the history of Karṇāṭaka, to write an authentic biography of a woman celebrity, who played such a prominent role in the socio-religious and socio-political milieu of her time. Ranna deviates from the traditional, worn out path of just describing a woman from the aesthetic point of view. He is not concerned with physical beauty; on the other hand, Ranna is more interested in her attitude towards fellow beings. Epitomizing her lifetime achievements, Ranna vividly captures different articulations of sociological import, both sacred and secular. Obviously it turns out to be the first ever study to explore the sociological orientations Attimabbe's astonishing personality.

Attimabbe, and her brave life, has a unique voice in the increasingly important contemporary feminist global discussions. Her exemplary life will not only introduce feminists to an enriching set of theoretical perspectives, but set a high critical standard for feminist dialogues of the social status of widowed women as well, particularly at their early age. Attimabbe is not an escapist. Generally, most of the widowed women abscond, bolting away from facing the challenges of society. Attimabbe was not to be vanquished into the oblivion. She had the strength to sustain any onslaught under hostile circumstances.

Attimabbe had to compete in a race with unequal terms in a world which was male-dominated. But the way Attimabbe faced the male-dominated society a thousand years ago, shoulder to shoulder, with the increasing confidence, makes the feminist theory move in a practical direction with the hope that some of these ideas might be implemented under the newly constituted Indian Law. Attimabbe enjoyed a great deal of freedom. She was not dependent either on her parents or brothers or husband or children. She was completely independent, both in her father's house, before marriage, and in her father-in-law's house, after marriage. In brief, Attimabbe demonstrates a model of a more practical feminist theory. She provides an outlet for new research in women's history and promotes scholarship among women that is broadly representative of a typical Indian and an archetype of a Jain woman.

Success and attainments of Attimabbe incorporates a broad spectrum of human concerns; in the sphere of polity, in social sphere and in the sphere of religion she had her say.

Attimabbe patronised writers, sculptors, singers (both Instrumental and the Vocal), dancers, storytellers, warriors, orphans and the beggars and so on. Usually these are the privileges of the male, as is the custom and tradition in the Indian family; but Attimabbe, a daring woman, alone did all these and a lot more.

Without sacrificing her identity, Attimabbe stands like Olympus against the vast canvas of Chālukyan society. No other power or person, male or female, could wield so much command and awe, over the length and breadth of the early Chālukyan period or at any period of history, as Attimabbe could. Apart from the acts of courage, with her goodwill she had determination, motivation and a goal for women's overall development. She did not want to be a passive beneficiary, and therefore she distributed all her wealth. Equality, peace and development are the main issues that highlighted her long struggle for recognition. Her equal participation in everyday life was exceptional. With the participation of such dynamic women like Attimabbe, the struggle for women's emancipation gathers momentum.

In the fitness of things to commemorate and perpetuate her memory, it is laudable that the Government of Karṇāṭaka has decided to honour any woman, with brilliant record of achievements, by awarding a cash prize of one lakh rupees in the name of Attimabbe. One cannot contemplate a better way of remembering and celebrating the '*Sahasra-manotsava*' of Attimabbe than initiating '*Attimabbe Praśasti*'.

## VIJAYADEVA SŪRI OF TAPĀGACCHA

RĀMVALLABH SOMĀNI

Hiravijaya Sūri was much venerated by Akbar who bestowed upon him the title *Jagad-guru*. The Sūrijī returned to Gujarāt from the Mughal-Court in 1586 AD via Nāgaur, Pipād, Bairāt, Rāṇakpur and other places<sup>1</sup>. He had a large number of learned and eminent scholars. Among them Śānticandra, Upādhyāya, Kalyāṇa Vijaya, Vijayasena and many others remained much popular. Śānticandra composed *Kṛpā-rasa-kośa*. It is stated that he recited some verses in the presence of Akbar who became much pleased and always held high opinion about him. When Hiravijaya Sūri started for Gujarāt in 1587 AD the Emperor again ordered to issue a *Firman*, prohibiting the slaughter of animals and proclaiming to abolish *Jaziyā* tax, which he had already abolished much earlier in his empire. Thus for a period of six months, the slaughter of animals was prohibited.<sup>2</sup> The order was followed strictly as Badāoinī and Abul Fazl have mentioned it. Kalyāṇavijaya was the pupil of Hiravijaya. He was much tenacious and had studied *Veda - Purāṇas* and many other subjects. He was having a profound knowledge of non-Jain and Jain philosophies. He had widely travelled in Mārawār Godawār, Bairāt and other places. His descendant Yašovijaya remained a profound scholar of the present time.

Vijayasena was invited by Akbar to Lāhore. Its attempts were made by Durjanśal Jadiyā. The emperor agreed to the proposal and *Firman* was given to Bhānucandra, a monk of *Tapāgaccha*, then present in the court. On receiving the *Firman*, Vijayasena reached Lahore on 31-5-1593 AD. Akbar gave him much veneration. At that time Nandivijaya of *Tapāgaccha* did *Avadhāraṇā*. The Emperor was much pleased and endowed upon him the title *Khus-Fahum*. Rāmadāsa Kachāwā, a famous Hindu noble, made a specific complaint that the Jains did not believe in the *Vedas* and in God. On the attempts of Abul Fazl, a religious debate was organised between the Jains and the Brāhmiṇs. On the replies given by Vijayasena, Akbar became much

- 
1. Jinavijaya-*Prācīna-Jaina-Lekha-Saṅgraha* Vol II No. 12 and 379/Mohanlāl Dalicand Desāi - *Bhānu candra gaṇicarita*, Intro pp.18.
  2. A. L. Śrīvāstava, *Akbar*.

pleased and granted an epithet "*Vardhamāna Vidyā*" upon him. However, on hearing the illness of Hiravijaya Sūri he decided to move to Gujarāt.<sup>3</sup>

#### EARLY LIFE OF VIJAYADEVA SŪRI

Vijayadeva was born at Idar on Posa Sudi 13(Sunday) VE 1634 (1578 AD). His early name was Vāsudeva of Bāsu Kumār. It is due to his innate interest to become a Jain monk, he insisted to leave the family life. After much pressure, he was converted into a Jain monk at Hāzi-Patel-Pole-Ahmedābād in VE 1643. He was named as Vidyā-Vijaya. It is due to his hard labour he got a good knowledge of *Jñāna-kriyā* (knowledge and its practical application). Soon he obtained a profound knowledge of Prākṛit, Sanskrit and others. An epithet *Paṇḍit* was given to him.<sup>4</sup>

At Khambāt, where *Sreṣṭhī* Māllu and his brother Soma conducted a celebration. Vijayasena gave the title "*Ācārya*" to Vidyā-Vijaya renaming him as Vijayadeva on Besakh Sudi 4, VE 1657. Its celebration was also arranged on Posa Budi 6, VE 1658 at Pātari. It is known as *Vandanā-mahotsava* of Vijayasena in 1671 VE Vijayadeva was succeeded as the *Bhaṭṭāraka*.<sup>5</sup>

#### BHĀNUCANDRA AND SIDDHICANDRA

After the death of Hiravijaya Sūri, the party politics continuously prevailed in the *Tapāgaccha*. Even during his time also similar incidents took place. But he carefully avoided them. Dharmasāgara, a monk of the *Tapāgaccha*, composed *Kumati - Kudāl* containing several glaring facts against Jainism. Objections were raised by several writers and monks against the above work. According to the *Kharataragaccha* sources, Jinacanda Sūri did religious discussions with him about the contents of the above book and defeated Dharmasāgara. Vijayadeva Sūri had thrown the book in the water. But the struggle continued and Dharmasāgara drafted another book.

Bhānucandra and Siddhicandra remained much venerated writers. Akbar respected them very much. They had composed many

3. Mohan Lāl Dalicand Desāi – *op. cit.* Introduction p.18.

4. Meghavijaya–*Devānanda-Mahākāvya* (edited by Becardās, SJGM, Intro p12). According to Śrīvallabha the father of Vijayadeva took his wife and son to become a Jain monk (*Vijayadeva Sūri Māhātmya* canto V verses 1-2).

5. *Ibid* p.12/*Vijayadeva Sūri Māhātmya* canto 5, verse 52.

books, when Bhānucandra was going to Gujarāt, Akbar gave him a *Firman* to abolish the taxes levied from the Jain pilgrims going to Śatruñjaya. Siddhicandra was a very handsome youth. He had a marvellous feat of memory and did 108 *Avadhāraṇās*. Akbar also granted him the title "*Khus-Faham*" (A man of sharp intelligence). During the reign of Jehāngir, some misfortune fell upon him. The Emperor asked him to get himself removed from the austerity and conduct a marriage with some beautiful girl. But Siddhicandra totally refused. The Emperor became highly infuriated and ordered to remove all the Jain monks from Āgrā. This event seemed to have taken place in VE 1670. Both Bhānucandra and Siddhicandra left Āgrā and came to Mālpurā and stayed there. Jinacandra Sūri of *Kharataragaccha* went to Āgrā and pacified the Emperor who had withdrawn the order of removing the Jain-monks from the said place. Jinacandra Sūri, thereafter, went to Bilarā, where he expired in VE 1670.<sup>6</sup>

At Mālpurā Bhānucandra and Siddhicandra completed a Jain temple of Candraprabha Svāmī in VE 1672. The icon was later removed. The temple now is having the *Mūlanāyaka* icon Muni Suvrata Svāmī. From Mālpurā both of them went to Jālore and stayed there for sometimes. Mubārak Khān, a newly appointed Governor of Gujarāt (1616 - 1618 AD), while going to Ahmedābād stayed at Jālore. He met Siddhicandra and asked him to accompany him. Siddhicandra agreed. He went to Ahmedābād.

A rift between *Tapāgaccha* monks, as already stated, sprang up. The other group headed by Bhānucandra, Siddhicandra and a few others slanted against Vijaydeva Sūri and a separate *Bhaṭṭāraka* named Vijayatilaka Sūri was appointed as the successor of Vijayasena. They did not honour Vijayadeva Sūri. After the death of Vijayatilaka Sūri in 1676 VE Vijayānanda was appointed. They had much support in Gujarāt and Sirohī areas. A *Saṅgha* led by Mehājal Jain Śreṣṭhī of Sirohī to Śatruñjaya was led by Vijayānanda and Siddhicandra. It was started in VE 1690. It seems that Bhānucandra had expired upto that time, as no details about him are known. After Vijayānanda, Vijayarāja Sūri succeeded. He consecrated more than 70 icons at Sirohī in the *Gomukhā* Jain temple in 1721 VE.

6. Mohan Lāl Dalicand Desāi *op. cit.* pp. 19-20/Chapter IV verse 334, *Vijayatilaka Sūri - Rasa* (Darśana Vijaya 1679 VE/ *Tuzuz-i-Jehangiri* vol I p. 438. The inscriptions of Malpurā were edited by the Author in the *Sodha-patrikā* Vol. 43 No. 2 pp. 61-63.

## VIJAYADEVA HONOURED BY JEHĀNGIR

A wide spread struggle between two groups of Jains sprang up causing much dispute between the followers. Vijayadeva Sūri was from the first group, while the other group stated above belonged to Vijayatilaka Sūri. The Mughal Emperor hearing the disputes between these Jains invited them to Māṇḍū, where he was staying, Vijayadeva was then staying at Cambay. He reached at Māṇḍū on Āśvina Śuklā 13 VE 1672 (Oct. 1617 AD). On hearing both the parties, the Emperor soon came to the decision that Vijayadeva was originally appointed by his *Guruji*, while the other dissident group had rivalling claim only. He bestowed the title "*Mahātapā*" upon Vijayadeva Sūri. The *Vijayadeva-Māhātmya* also mentions that the Mughal Emperor conferred upon the Sūriji much veneration. He was sent to his camp in a royal procession, having several Mansabdars accompanying it. On this occasion *Śreṣṭhi* Candraprabha of Māṇḍū spent lavishly. He did good celebration and had spread the gold coins on Sūriji. The Mughal Emperor granted the titles *Khus-Faham*, *Nādirā-a-Jamāna* and *Jahāngir-Pasanda* to Siddhicandra. However, the respects given to Vijayadeva was much higher. This has enlightened his followers who gave much respects to him. However, in Gujarāt, Vijayadeva could not get sufficient support in comparison with Siddhicandra. Vijayadeva also wanted to settle the matter with Siddhicandra. He invited the latter to join him. But he had totally refused. It seems that Vijayadeva was not disappointed. He decided to travel in the adjoining areas of Rājasthān, Mahārāṣṭra and Gujarāt<sup>7</sup>. The Emperor, however, remained much pleased from him. The Sūriji sent his disciple Dayākuśala Pranyāsa in 1618 AD to the Emperor. The Emperor became much pleased and asked the Sūriji to give details about him. He issued a *Firman* as below.<sup>7A</sup>

"Be it known to Vijayadeva Sūri, who discerns the right and practices of Yoga and who had obtained our special favour, as I had seen you at Pāttan (Māṇḍū) I constantly inquire for the news about you, and am sure that you would also be free from breaking connection with us as a true friend. At the present time your disciple Dayākuśala Pranyāsa presented himself before us, and news about you has been learnt from him, we are (thereby) very much pleased. Your disciple is also much experienced and possessed of logical faculty. We treat him

7. Śrīvallabha *Vijayadeva Sūri-Māhātmya* canto XVIII, Nāhar - *Jaina Lekha Saṅgraha* Vol. II No. 341 and 367; Mohan Lāl Dalicand Desāi *op. cit.* pp. 15-20.

7-A Mohan Lāl Dalicand Desāi *op. cit.* p.91.

with perfect kindness and whatever he says is being done. If there be any work here you will write it to your disciple (so that) the same be known by us (directly through him) and the same will receive our attention in every way. You will remain free from anxiety from us and will be engaged in praying for the permanence of our kingdom by worshipping those who are worthy to be worshipped. Nothing more remains to be written on the 19th of the month *Shāban* in the year 1027 (Saturday 1st August 1618 AD).

The seal contains the words "Sāha Nawāj Khān Murid (follower) of Jehāngir.

#### ACTIVITIES OF VIJAYADEVA SŪRI

##### (A) RĀJASTHĀN STATE

Vijayadeva Sūri had widely travelled in Rājasthān, Gujarāt and south India. It is due to slight support in Gujarāt he had liked to move in Rājasthān and south India.

We have already described that the temple of Mālpurā, Rājasthān, was built in VE 1672. The inscription refers to Vijayadeva Sūri also. One more inscription of that year of Vijayagaccha, available there, contains his name as the Bhaṭṭāraka who did consecration ceremony. He also consecrated the icon of Muni Suvrata there in VE 1691 and the statue of Hiravijaya Sūri in VE 1690<sup>8</sup>.

The Mewār state remained a notable centre of *Bāis - Sampradāya*. The areas of Bhilwārā, Cittor and Rājsamand have all the Jains belonging to that sect and the large number of Jain temples in the area are not regularly worshipped. However Mahārāṇā Karṇa Siṃha and Jagat Siṃha did notable honour to Vijayadeva Sūri. The *Tapāgaccha* sources speak that the respects given by Mahārāṇā Jagat Siṃha to Vijayadeva Sūri was equal to the veneration given by Kumārāpāla to Hemcandra. Vijayadeva Sūri visited Udaipur several times. During the reign of Mahārāṇā Karṇa Siṃha a religious discussion was held in the royal court between the *Bāis-Sampradāya* and Vijayadeva Sūri, where the *Bāis-Panthies* were badly defeated. In VE 1684 Vijayadeva Sūri also consecrated the icons at Khamnor, Nāhi, Āghāt and other places of southern Mewār. During the reign of Mahārāṇā Jagat Siṃha, he visited Udaipur and obtained the orders of prohibitions as mentioned below:

8. Meghavijaya-*Digvijaya-Mahākāvya* edited by Ambālāl Premcand Sāha, SJGMY, p. 137.

- (1) The slaughter of animals on Wednesday was strictly banned, as it being the day of the coronation of the Mahārāṇā.
- (2) Similarly in the month of Bhādavā, no slaughter of any animal was permitted, as it being the month in which the Mahārāṇā took his birth.
- (3) Fishing in the *Picholā-lake* was completely banned.
- (4) The Jain temple of Macind was to be renovated. It was consecrated by Somasundara Sūri in VE 1494

The Sūrijī also visited Delawārā, Mewār, in VE 1687, where a copy of a MS *Pākṣika-ṽṛtti* was made.

Vijayadeva also visited Udaipur in VE 1709 and did consecration of several icons in the Jain temples of Udaipur city.

Barakāṇā (Godawār) was then under the Mewār state. There is a large Jain temple and the place is among the *Pañca-tīrthas* of Godawār. An annual fair is regularly held there on Posa-Suklā 10. The taxes levied in the fair were exempted by the Mahārāṇā on the recommendations of Vijayadeva. The author has published the text of the inscription in the Sambodhi<sup>9</sup> (Ahmedābād).

Jālore had remained an important site of the Sonagarā Cauhāns. There were several Jain temples on the fort and near by areas. These were brutally devastated by Alāuddin Khiljī. At the instance of Vijayadeva Sūri, Jaimal Muṅṅot, the minister of Jodhpur state, renovated them. He was the father of Neṅasi, a famous writer of the 17th century AD. One temple was renovated by Pāmecā Svāmī Dās of Medatā. These temples were renovated in VE 1681, 1683, 1684 and in 1686. All the temples were consecrated by Vijayadeva Sūri, who also performed a *Cāturmāsa* there. Jaya Sāgara, a Jain monk, sponsored the project and properly looked after the construction work. It is interesting that the *Sūtradhāra*, Todā-Issar, Tohā, Duhā and others, who did construction work were highly influenced by the Sūrijī and built an icon from their own side. It was also consecrated by Vijayadeva Sūri.<sup>10</sup>

Nādol remained the capital of the local Cauhāns between the 10th and 12th centuries AD.

9. Edited by the Author in the *Sambodhi* Vol. VIII.

10. Jinavijaya No. 345 to 356, 358 to 359.



During Vijayadeva Sūri's time the territory was under the Mewār.

The place had several massive Jain temples which were molested during the battles between Mewār and Mughal Emperors. These temples were renovated by Mughal Emperors. These temples were removed by Jaimal Muhnot in VE 1686. These all were consecrated by Vijayadeva Sūri. Nādlāi, situated near Nādol, is a famous Jain *Tīrtha* having a large number of Jain temples inside the town and outside on the hills. Several icons were installed there in VE. 1674, 1686 and on other dates by several Jain *Śreṣṭhis*. All these icons were consecrated by Vijayadeva Sūri.

Pāli has a beautiful *Navalakhā* Jain temple built in the 10th century A. D. It was renovated by Sāha Duṅgar and Bhākar in VE 1688. Several icons were installed in the temple. The Mūlanāyaka icon was also changed. These were consecrated by Vijayadeva Sūri. Similarly Ghaṇaghāṇī, a famous old site of Pratihāra period, has a Jain temple built in VE 937. It was also renovated at the instance of Vijayadeva Sūri.<sup>11</sup>

Medatā remained an important town. A big *Pratiṣṭhā* was arranged there by Hirānanda's wife who belonged to Āgrā. This family remained much prosperous and did a *Saṅgha-yātrā* in VE 1661. Vijayadeva Sūri did *cāturmāsa* at Medatā and did consecration of several icons in VE 1677 and 1686.<sup>12</sup>

Kisangarh was then ruled by Rūpa Siṃha Rāthor. His minister Rāicand was the follower of *Tapāgaccha* and arrange a *cāturmāsa* of Vijayadeva Sūri there. The Sūrijī consecrated several Jain icons.<sup>13</sup>

At Sādari (Godawār) and Sirohī, Vijayadeva also did *cāturmāsa*. Sirohī had a large number of supporters of other group of *Tapāgaccha*. In VE 1682, when he reached there, the entrance-ceremony (*Praveśotsava*) was arranged by Tejpāl Porawāl. A *Saṅgha - yātrā* to Ābū and Śatruṅjaya was also led under Vijayadeva Sūrijī.<sup>14</sup>

The Sūrijī also visited Ālanpur, Bundī and other adjoining sites of southern Rājasthān and did *Pratiṣṭhās* there. In VE 1683 he visited Jaisalmer, where he consecrated 4 icons, three on Āṣāḍha Budi 4

11. *Ibid* No. 388.

12. *Ibid* No. 433 to 442.

13. Meghavijaya, *Digvijaya-Mahākāvya*, pp. 137-138.

14. *Ibid*. Amṛtalāla-Maganlāl Sāha-*Prasasti-Saṅgraha* p.190.

and one on Jeth Sudi 6. All the inscriptions have the words '*Jaisalmer Nagare*' which proves that the Sūrijī went there and did consecration ceremony.

#### (B) SOUTH INDIA

The Sūrijī, after spending some time in Gujarāt, decided to visit south India. For this purpose he came to Surāt. He held a religious discussion with the *Sāgara-pakṣīya* monks in the presence of Mīrmozā. It is said that initially the Sūrijī was in favour of the *Sāgara-pakṣa*. But later on finding the large scale opposition of his followers to this sect, he also relinquished it. In the discussions, the Sūrijī defeated the *Sāgara-pakṣīya* monks. This event took place in VE 1681, as is mentioned in several works. Later on several followers of *Sāgara-pakṣīya* also joined Sūrijī including Dhañji, a notable Śrāvaka. The colophon of *Hitopadeśa* (Ahmedābād) dated 1681 mentions the details of the discussion.<sup>15</sup>

From Surāt, Sūrijī went to Deccan sometime in VE 1694<sup>15A</sup> and visited Bijāpur, Gola Kuṇḍā Burahānpur, Navaraṅgpur and many other towns. Several Jain Śrāvakas, migrated from Rājasthān, also dwelt there. At Bagalānā, Caturā Bāi, an adherent follower of Sūrijī, also accompanied him. Sāhajādā Aurangjib, who was the incharge of the place, venerated him and issued an order to prohibit the slaughtering of animals. The Sūrijī thereafter spent a rainy season at Sāhapura. Devacandra Śrāvaka took active part in arranging the peaceful journey of the Sūrijī. Ādilśāha was the ruler of Bijāpur. He had shown very much respect to the Sūrijī. He also ordered not to kill any cow. The Karahedā Pārśvanātha, Kalikuṇḍa-Pārśvanātha and other Jain sites were visited by the Sūrijī with a large *saṅgha*. A good consecration ceremony of several Jain icons was arranged by Devacandra. These were consecrated by the Sūrijī.<sup>16</sup>

The Sūrijī then went to Aurangābād and also visited the Antarikṣa-Pārśvanātha Jain temple. From there he went to Burhānpur and Mallakāpur. Later on Sūrijī went to Telāṅ country via *Kulapāka Tirtha*, also known as *Mānakadeva Tirtha*. Amarcand Munī was bestowed the title of *Vācaka* upon him. The Caturā Bāi spent lavishly on the occasion. On the attempts of the Sūrijī, the ruler of Telāṅ country

15. Śrīvallabha *Vijayadeva-Sūri-Māhātmya* Canto. XI. Amṛtalāl Maganlāl Sāha- *Praśasti-Saṅgraha*, p. 190.

15A Nāhar-Jaina *Lekha Saṅgraha* Vol III Nos. 2207-8, 2214, 2329.

16. Meghavijaya, *Digvijaya-Mahākāvya* pp.137-138.

banned the slaughter of the cows. A religious discussion was held there with some Telaṅg Bhaṭṭa Paṇḍits who were defeated. The Sūriji returned back to Bijāpur. The large scale religious activities of the Sūriji had greatly affected the political circles also. The ruler of the place agreed to release all the prisoners from the Jail.<sup>17</sup>

In the south Devicand and Caturā Bāi had actively assisted the Sūriji. These activities had widely increased the prestige of Sūriji also in Gujarāt. He remained in the Deccan upto VE 1701 as is proved from the colophon of a MS of *Vāgbhaṭṭālaṅkāra* (Cāṇasmā Bhandār) mentioning that the Sūriji was then at Auraṅgābād<sup>18</sup> and in VE 1701 he was present at Sāhapur (Deccan).

### (C) GUJARĀT

As already stated, Vijayadeva Sūri was born at Idar and therefore, the people of that place had much affection for him. When he went there, Rāo Kalyān Mal also came to receive him. The *Jain Saṅgha* performed celebrations. Sahajū Sāha, a minister of the state, requested the Sūriji to nominate some monks as his successor, as he wanted to organise a function there. The Sūriji avoided it. When he was in Idar, Ratnasimha Pārakh of Sābli appeared before him and requested to visit his town, as slaughtering of animals at a large scale was common there. The Sūriji went there and got the Thākur agreed to stop the slaughtering of animals. The Sūriji came to Idar after some years in VE 1682, when the Śreṣṭhī Sahajū celebrated the festivities of nominating *Yuvarāja* to Vijayasimha Sūri on Besākh Sudi 6 VE 1682. In VE 1705 again the Sūriji visited Idar to consecrate the Jain temple built at Raṇamal and Cowkī of the place.<sup>18A</sup>

The Sūriji visited Ahmedābād, Pātan and other towns of Gujarāt occasionally and did *cāturmāsa* also there. While coming from Mewar in VE 1684, he spent some years in Gujarāt and also visited Śatruṅjaya and other places.<sup>19</sup> From the mount of Śatruṅjaya, a good number of epigraphs from VE 1670 to 1710 have been noted. In VE 1670, he consecrated the *Parikar* of Ādinātha installed by Śāntidāsa and others of Ahmedābād. The inscriptions of VE 1675, 1676 and 1677 are

17. *Ibid.*

18. Amṛtalāl Maganlāl Sāha-*Praśasti-Saṅgraha* pp. 212.

18A, Meghavijaya *op. cit.* pp. 137-138.

19. Ācārya Kaṇakasāgara Sūri and Pramoda Sāgara Sūri, *Śatruṅjaya - Girirāja - Darśana* Ins. No 45, 57, 59, 71, 87, 89, 312, 410 and other last pages.

noticed from there mentioning of some families of Ahmedābād. On Jeth Sudi 6 VE 1678, the Sūrījī accompanied the Jain families of Udaipur to Śatruñjaya and consecrated to icon of Sambhavanātha. In VE 1683, he accompanying a *Saṅgha* arranged the *Pratiṣṭhās* of some icons installed by Jaimal of Jodhpur and some Śrīmārī families and others from Surāt. It seems that he was having his much influence in Pātan, Māngrol, Dīva and Surāt. Except a few inscriptions of Ahmedābād of VE 1670, 1675 to 1676 and 1686, no other record of the place is known mentioning Vijayadeva Sūri. The following inscriptions are also known pertaining to Pātan, Dīva, Surāt, Māngrol and other towns :

1. 1683 and 1687 from Surāt.
2. 1681, 1682, 1683 and 1685 from Pātan.
3. 1686 from Dīva.
4. 1682 from Māngrol.
5. 1686 from Medatā.
7. 1694 from some town having the last letters Pātan.

It shows that Vijayadeva visited Śatruñjaya several times with the pilgrims from Rājasthān and Gujarāt and consecrated the icons there. The colophon of a ms. *Hitopadeśa* (VE 1681) mentions a *Saṅghayātrā* to Śatruñjaya with the *Saṅgha* of Sirohī started in the leadership of Tejapāl.<sup>19A</sup>

Vijayadeva visited Sorath to pay homage to Śaṅkheśvara Pārśvanātha, Siddhācala Rewantaka and other ancient sites. He went to Azāhāhar-Pārśvanātha, Unā and spent a rainy season there. The Sūrījī thereafter went to Girinār. At Nawānagar, he met the Jāma-ruler Devarāja and gave him religious instructions (*Pratibodha*). After spending the *cāturmāsa*, he went to Surāt, and then visited south India.

When Sūrījī came back from south India, he became much popular. He came to Gāndhār Port when several notable citizens from Ahmedābād, Surāt, Pātan and other places came to receive him. At the request of Ratanji Sāha and Dhanji Sāha, the Sūrījī stayed at Gāndhāra, Sāhibdeva's son and Akhe Sāha spent lavishly on this occasion.

From Gāndhāra, the Sūrījī came to Ahmedābād and stayed at

19A. Amṛtalāl Maganlāl Sāha *op. cit.* p. 190.

Sāhāpur. He spent a rainy season there. Dhanji Sāha did good celebrations spending a large number of Mahāmudi coins. The Sūrijī's presence in Sāhāpur (Deccan) in VE 1701 is proved from the colophon of a MS *Nyāya-Ratna-Prakarāṇa* of the Jain Bhāṇḍār Cāṇasmā.<sup>19B</sup> Thereafter he came to Gujarat.

#### DISPUTE WITH SĀGARA-PAKṢIYA ĀCĀRYAS

The *Vijayadeva-Sūri-Māhātmya* composed by Śrīvallabha of *Kharataragaccha* contains details of the dispute between Vijayadeva Sūri and *Sāgaragacchīya Ācāryas* in chapter 11. In the colophon of the MS *Hitopadeśa (Jñāna-Bhāṇḍāra, Ahmedābād)* it is mentioned that in VE 1681 Muktiśāgara and Śāntidāsa were excommunicated as they had given their support to *Sāgara-gaccha*. It is also mentioned that the Ahmedābād *Saṅgha* and Sirohī *Saṅgha* became the lay follower of Vijayadeva Sūrijī. But he was not correct. It seems that originally the Sūrijī was on the side of *Sāgara-gaccha* but later finding slanting support of his followers he deserted then.<sup>20</sup>

#### DEATH OF THE SŪRIJĪ

Vijayadeva initially appointed Vijayasimha Sūri as his successor in VE 1682. He was nominated as a successor in VE 1684. But he died before Vijayadeva Sūri in VE 1708 Āsāḍh Sudi 2 at Ahmedābād (Nūtanpurā). Later on the Sūrijī appointed Vijayaprabha Sūri in VE 1710 as his successor.

Vijayadeva Sūri then went to Vimalagiri with a *Saṅgha*. Rāicand and others had also accompanied him. From there he came to Unā to pay a visit to the *Samādhī* of Hīravijaya Sūri. But he fell ill and died there in VE 1713. Asāḍh Sudi 11, Śreṣṭhī Rāicand built a beautiful *Vihār* there.

#### SOURCES OF THE HISTORY

Vijayadeva enjoyed a longlife about 80 years. He was bold, energetic and carefree monk. Looking to the great opposition against him in Gujarāt and Sirohī areas, he did not care and tried to have his journeys in Rājasthān and south India. The detailed history of the above monk was composed by Śrīvallabha of *Kharataragaccha*. The work contains the DETAILS OF THE LIFE OF THE SŪRIJĪ upto VE. 1687. It is the only work having the details of his life. The book has 19 chapters. The chapters I and II record the early life of Vijayadeva

19B. *ibid* p 212.

20. *Ibid. op. cit.* pp. 190.

Sūri. The chapters III and IV refer to the life of Hiravijaya Sūri and Vijayasena. The life history of Vijayadeva is given in the chapters V and VI and VII. The chapters VIII to X have the details of various *Pratiṣṭhās*, *cāturmāsa*, *Dikṣā* and other celebrations. He nominated Vijayasimha Sūri, as his successor. The details of the dispute with the *Sāgara-Pakṣa* are recorded in chapter IX, the celebrations done at Medatā, Jālōre, Ghangāni and others are given in chapter XII to XIV. The details of *Cāturmāsa* of Khambat are given in the chapter XVII. The meeting with Jehāngir is described in the chapter XVIII. Next chapter contains the general description of Sūrījī.

A few more MSS have some contents of his life (i) *Vijayadeva Sūri Sañjāya* by Jayasoma (ii) *Vijayadeva Nirvāṇa Sañjāya* (VE 1713) by Premavijaya (iii) *Vijayadeva Sūri Nirvāṇa Svādhyāya* by Darśana Vijaya and (iv) *Vijayadeva Sūri Nirvāṇa* by Saubhāgya Vijaya. All these MSS are in the collection of L.D Institute, Ahmedābād. These contain mostly the last days account of Vijayadeva Sūri. The *Dig-Vijaya-Mahākāvya* of Meghavijaya contains some account of the life of Vijayadeva.

#### FIRMAN AND VIJŪNĀPTI-PATRAS

Some *Firmans* of Jehāngir were sent to the Sūrījī and others, the details of which are given below :

1. The *Firmān* pertaining to stoppage of the slaughtering of animals. Its date is not clear. Either it is 1605 AD or 1610 AD. It mentions the names of Vijayasena and Vijayadeva.<sup>21</sup>
2. The *Firmān* prohibiting the slaughter of animals at Śatruñjaya and not to levy any entrance tax there. It was issued on 1608 AD. It also has the name of Vijayadeva Sūri.
3. The *Firmān* prohibiting the slaughter of animals on *Paryuṣaṇa* days was issued in 1610 AD. It also has the name of Vijaya-deva Sūri.
4. The *Firmān* dated July 1616 AD was issued from Ajmer, allowing all the Jain monks to have complete freedom for doing religious duties. It also has the name of Vijayadeva Sūri.
5. The *Firmān* dated 1st August 1618 AD, asking Vijayadeva Sūri to inform if he had any work from the Emperor. It is interesting to note that the Emperor had much respect for him.

A few *Vijñapti-Patras*<sup>22</sup> were also noted wherein the Sūrījī was requested to visit Gujarāt and other places. But these have no specific dates and as such nothing can be said about them. These have panegyric account of the Sūrījī.

21. Mohanlāl Dalicand Desāi *op. cit.* pp. 80-91.

22. Muni Jinavijaya - *Vijñapti-lekha-Saṅgraha* SJGM No. 8 9, 15, 21 and 22.

# **BHILAI ENGINEERING CORPORATION LTD.**

**Industrial Area, Post Box No. 31**

**Bhilai 490 001, Madhya Pradesh**

Telephones : 355417/356447/355358

Fax Numbers : 0788 355527/355427

Telex Numbers : 0771-214/245/204

**Manufacturers Erectors of Equipments**

**for**

**Coal Mining, Steel Plant, Power Plant, Cement Plant**

**and**

**Manufacturers of Sulpheric and Super Phosphate**

**Fertilizers**

*Regional Offices*

**13 Masjid Moth, Local Shopping Centre**

**New Delhi 110 048**

Telephones : 6445815 6445819 6434987 6414390

Fax Number : 011 6445819

**4B Little Russel Street, 2nd Floor**

**Calcutta-700 071**

Telephones : 242 7606 / 3372

Fax Number : 033-2427061

**31 Makers Chambers III**

**3rd Floor, Nariman Point, Bombay 400 023**

Telephones : 231724 2043647 244208 2873789

Telex Number : 0118 4054

Fax Number : 022 287 3611