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THUS SPAKE LORD MAHAVIRA
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As Earth is the Stand-point of all beings
Peace is to the Enlightened.

Whatever thou wishest unto thyself, so unto
all living beings.
This is the Path of the Enlightened.

Those who say they alone are right
And all the others and their ways are wrong
Are out of the Way of the Blessed Ones.

I beg forgiveness from all beings
I extend forgiveness unto them all
I am the friend of all living beings
I am enemy of none whosoever.

As the ocean is the abode of all water beings
so truth is the abode of all virtues.

Millions of hills of silver and gold
Can’t quench the thirst of avarice. Cravings
are like the boundless sky.

Those who control their senses
Those who master their passions
Those who meditate on the Self
Are the true Followers of the Path.

My self is the river Styx of Hell
My self is the sword-bladed tree
My self is the Wish-granting Cow
My self is the Garden of Paradise.
My self is the doer or undoer of
All its weal and woes.
Doing good makes you your best friend
Doing evil your worse enemy.

The one who has won his own self
Is better than a victor of thousand battles.

Fight against the evils within
And not with other living beings
Your true victory is over your self
The door to eternal happiness.

Never think these four small
The borrowed money, wounds, fire and passions,
For they grow being with passing of time.

By shaving head you are not a Saint
By uttering OM not true Brahmin
By dwelling in jungle not a Hermit
By bark-clothes not an Ascetic.

Equanimity makes one a Saint
Victory of passions a Brahmin
Enlightenment a true Hermit
Austerity a true Ascetic.

Control over passions is the true fasting
—the fasting of the heart.
Therefore the Saints, although they eat,
Are always on the fast forever.

Defiance unto world is defiance unto self
Regard unto others is true self-regard.

Dharma alone is the true shelter, abode,
Stand-point, the island in the midst of the
boundless ocean of existence.
UMĀSVĀTI IN EPIGRAPHICAL AND LITERARY TRADITION

M.A. DHAKY

Umāsvāti is remembered, revered, and reckoned as one of the more luminous, and hence more celebrated, figures of the Nirgrantha-darśana. In our times, he is recognized as an author who pioneered writing in Saṃskṛta, in lieu of the canonical Ardhmāgadhi, for doctrinal, dogmatical, and didactical teachings in the sūtra style akin to the Yogasūtra of Patañjali. He apparently came on the scene at the close of the age of the āgamas (Dixit 1971) and indeed soon after the end of the main monastic lines of the eminent early pontiffs. With Umāsvāti also began the era of systematic organization and clearer conceptualization of the knowledge scattered through, and cast in, the archaic modes and moulds of the ancient scared śruta books of Phase III, dating from c. 1st to the 3rd centuries A.D. In the process, for a few aspects, he made improvements on, and advances over, the known knowledge to a measurable degree. This he did by reference to the progress made in other contemporaneous darsanas like the Yoga and the Vaiśeṣika (Sanghvi 1929, and its subsequent editions in Gujarati, Hindi, and English) and thus updated the Nirgrantha position on the fundamental questions about the “universal reals” as well as the “experiential realities” that are inalienably associated with them. The impact of his formulations on the subsequent Nirgrantha writers had been considerable; and for the Southern Nirgrantha Church, which does not possess the ancient canonical texts, i.e. the āgamas, Umāsvāti’s famous work, which it calls the Tattvārtha-sūtra, is among the few and foremost books it recognizes as pivotal and sacred. The commentators of the āgaṃic and epistemological works of the Northern Nirgrantha Church as well time and again invoke that Sūtra’s authority.

As a personage, Umāsvāti is sufficiently ancient but also invisible, to be qualified from historical standpoint as ‘mysterious’ and ‘shadowy.’ The discussions by the writers of this century on Umāsvāti, those concerning his sectarian affiliation, his literary productions, and his date have often spawned controversies of unparalleled magnitude within the narrow world of the Nirgranthist scholarship. Indeed, many a battles royal—some overtly wordy and venomous, some frankly sectarian, hateful and uncordial, resorting at moments to polemics of the meaner level—had been fought in the journals, introductions,
and prefaces of some of the edited exegetical works on the Tattvārtha-
sūtra, and no less in the articles written, papers read, reviews made,
and books written by a few contemporary Nirgrantha writers in Hindi
on Umāsvāti. Often indeed, no holds were barred or spared, and, in
the process, standards of civility and proprieties of manners were
coolly shelved.\textsuperscript{1} To borrow Folkert's (1980) phrase, those acrimonious
exercises generated "more heat than light", this being an inevitable
consequence of the unhealthy debates. As I look back and take stock
of the phenomenal growth of literature revolving round Umāsvāti since
late thirties, the other glaring facts that surface are that, in several
cases, even where the writings are in a sober tone, there is virtually a
total absence of a sound methodology (or what operated was just an
apology for, or an illusion of, methodology) in historical investigations.
A studied disconcert in regard to the vital criteria—objective approach,
critical examination of the evidence, thorough analysis of the data
and their contextual situations, impartial judgement and dispassionate
presentation of the results achieved, implications sensed, determinations done, and answers got on the problems—is much too
transparent in several of those writings. They at best reveal laboured
efforts to prove the presuppositions and biases of a "sect", the real
dimensions and depths of the problems involved had largely been
ignored, neglected, and, as a result, had remained opaque. The
ambivalent attitude and the employment of double standards
(ostensibly apparent in the writings of some learned votaries of the
Nirgrantha-darśana of the past five or six decades) have consequenced
in some curious as well as deplorable distortions of realities. Because,
while almost all who discussed on Umāsvāti unequivocally held him
in high esteem, his most famous work, the Tattvārthādhyāgama-sūtra
(as called in its Bhāṣya’s encomium available only in the Northern
tradition) or the Tattvārtha-sūtra (as had been known in the Southern
tradition), had become the main focus of dispute. The Śvetāmbara
sect, an off-shoot of the ancient Northern Nirgrantha Church, from
the beginning took it for granted that the author belonged to its
historical tradition and continuum. The Diśambara, which in part is
a surviving off-spring of the ancient Southern Nirgrantha Church,
assertively put forward a claim that the work and its author (to some
he is unknown, to others he is either Grdhraśccha, Āryadēva, or
Umāsvāti) were within its own sectarian fold. A third claim had been
advanced in favour of Umāsvāti being a pontiff of the Yāpaniya Saṁgha,
a fillate sect of the Northern Church which had found a congenial

\textsuperscript{1} Luckily, these writings by the scholars (who all are followers of the
Nirgrantha-darśana) had been in Hindi and were published during thirties
and forties and hence not read by the Western Nirgranthologists.
home and comfortable climes and conditions for flourishing particularly in Northern Karnataka since the latter half of the fifth century A.D. The arguments forcefully advanced on behalf of this sect which is extinct since five centuries, are thus put forward by proxy (Premi 1956; Bronkhorst 1985; Patoriya 1988). The work's two varying titles, the Tattvārthādhiyam-sūtra and the Tattvārtha-sūtra, in point of fact represent its two versions, the Southern showing improvements as well as modifications for some sūtras in terms of grammar, language, and structure, and in a few cases also of content; some sūtras concerning cosmography not found in the corpus of the Northern version were also added, supposedly for the sake of completing the unsaid details (Ohira 1982). The protagonists of the Southern version, in the process of establishing the genuineness of their version, had left no efforts to prove the ingenuineness of the Northern version and also vehemently, even sometimes bitingly, had controverted its claim for originality. Some of them also argued that the author of the Northern sūtra-text and of its Bhāṣya is not the same person (Mukhtar 1956; Phoolchandra 1971; Kailashchandra 1975, Patoriya 1988) and that the Northern is an altered version of the Southern which is original. The Prasamaratiprakaraṇa, a work attributed to Umāsvāti in the Northern tradition since at least the eighth century in the recorded evidence, the quotations therefrom being available since the later half of the seventh century, has been kicked around (the work is virtually unknown in the Southern (Church) and Umāsvāti's authorship of that work had been opposed and rejected (Patoriya 1988). To write, therefore, on the historical aspects of Umāsvāti amounts, to follow Settār's now famous dictum, to "inviting death"! In view of the hostility that prevails for some decades in this field of historical research, it would be foolhardy to discuss anything that touches even the periphery of the problem. I shall, therefore, largely confine my observations in placing the evidence from the epigraphical and literary sides in their own context, sequence, and perspective and the implications that flow therefrom will then be indicated without assertive comments.  

2. Excepting for the 25th kārikā therefrom quoted by Svāmi Virasena in his Dhaulalā-ṭikā (816 A.D.) where he does not mention the source or the name of the author. He quotes it by simply saying: atrō paṭyōgi ślokaḥ (Premi 1956: 526).

3. Arising from the title of his recent remarkable book (Settar 1986) used here in a different context and with differing connotation.

4. Sobriety, composure, balance and reticence noticeable in the writings of late Pandits Nathooram Premi and Sukhalal Sanghvi, Hiralal Kapadiya, Jagadishchandra Jain and Dalsukh Malwaniya were, regrettably, not always the accompaniments of the pen of several of the other Nirgrantha writers of the past decades on Umāsvāti.
II

Search for Umāsvāti in the domain of inscriptions at the very glance reveals two salient facts. First, in the available epigraphs of the Northern Nirgrantha Church, his name finds no allusion; second, he is for certain mentioned in the inscriptions of the Southern Church: but, in temporal terms, all of these hail exclusively from the medieval period and range in date from early 12th to early 16th centuries. The inscriptions relevant to the present context are eight, and they all come from the medieval Kānṭadēśa. Of these, seven are from Sravana Belagola alone; and the eighth, which is the latest, is available from Humcha. Those from Sravana Belagola are tabulated below according to their chronological order.⁵

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription No.</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>156 [47 (127)]</td>
<td>Sravana Belagola</td>
<td>1115 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Chandragiri)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 [43 (117)]</td>
<td>Sravana Belagola</td>
<td>1123 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Chandragiri)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173 [50 (140)]</td>
<td>Sravana Belagola</td>
<td>1145 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Chandragiri)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 [40 (64)]</td>
<td>Sravana Belagola</td>
<td>1163 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Chandragiri)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 [42 (66)]</td>
<td>Sravana Belagola</td>
<td>1176 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Chandragiri)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360 [105 (254)]</td>
<td>Sravana Belagola</td>
<td>1398 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Vindhyagiri)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361 [106 (255)]</td>
<td>Sravana Belagola</td>
<td>1409 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Vindhyagiri)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The verse referring to “Umāsvāti” (which also mentions “Gr̥ḍḍhapिन्च्छa” i.e. Gr̥ḍṛhapिन्च्छa as his altias) occurring in the earliest inscription of 1115 A.D. verbatim figures in the subsequent four inscriptions tabulated above in their chronological order. The concerned verse in all the five inscriptions reads as follows:

---

5. The numbers follow the relevant numerical arrangement in the Epigraphia Carnatica, Volume 2, Mysore 1973; the numbers as per the earlier (second) edition of the work are shown within the bracket in each case.
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abhūd Umāsvāti munīśvarō
asāv āçārya śabdōttara Grdhṛapiṇcchaḥ 1
tad anuvajē tat sadṛśo (a)sti nānyastāt-
kālik āśeṣa padārtha-vēdi 115 11

The verse, moreover, states that Umāsvāti belonged to the spiritual lineage of (ācārya) Koṇḍakunda.6 The inscription of 1398 A.D. (which is from Vindhyagiri), however, has a different verse which, moreover, specifically attributes the composition of the Tattvārtha-sūtra to Umāsvāti (not done in the afore-cited verse) and looks upon Grdhṛapiṇccha not as Umāsvāti’s alias but as his disciple’s name:

Śrīmān Umāsvātīr āyaṃ yatīsas Tattvārtha-sūtram prakāti-cakāra 1
yan muktimārg ācaraṇōdyatānām pāthēyamarghyān
bhavati prajānāṁ 11
												
tasyaīva śīṣyō (a)jani Grdhṛapiṇcchadhitiyāsāṃjñāsya
Balākapiṇcchaḥ 11

And the inscription of 1409 A.D., also from Vindhyagiri, is the second in order to state that Umāsvāti composed the Tattvārtha-sūtra, its other assertions are in essence identical with those noticed in the former five Chandragiri inscriptions :

tadiyaṃ vaṃsākaraṇaḥ prasiddhād abhūd adōṣā yatiratnamālā 1
babhau yadaṇta manīvaḥ munindrah sa Koṇḍakundōdita
caṇḍa-daṇḍaḥ 11
abhūd Umāsvātī-munīḥ pavitṛe vaṃśe tadiyē sakal ārthavēdi 1
sūtrikṛitiṃ yēna jina praṇitam śastrārtha-jātam munipūrgavēna 11
sa prāṇi-samṛaksana-sāvadhanō babhāra yōgi kla griddhapakṣān 1
		
tadā prabhṛty ēva budhā yamāhur ācārya śabdōttara
Grdhṛapiṇccham 11

tasmād abhūd yōgi-kula-pradipō Balākapiṇcchaḥ sa tapō
maharrdhīṁ 11

(Incidentally, an inscription of 1154 A.D. Yelladahalli enlists Grdhṛapiṇcchācārya after Samantabhadra and Akalaṅka, the two other notable luminaries of the Southern Church (Vijayamurti 1957: 62, Ins. 324). There is, however, no mentioning there of Umāsvāti or the Tattvārtha-sūtra).

The eighth inscription is from the surroundings of the famous Padmāvati temple at Humcha (Vijayamurti 1957: 518, Ins. 667). It

6. There is a difference in the interpretation of the verse : some feel that what is implied here is that Umāsvāti is Kundakunda himself (Gopal 1973, p. lxxvi ff.).
belongs to the late Vijayanagara period on the basis of its paleography as well as the historical allusions to the kings it contains and is datable to c. 1530 A.D. It also ascribes the authorship of the Tattvārtha-sūtra to Umāsvāti and, in addition, qualifies him with the honorific term śrutakēvali-dēśiya not met with in the aforesaid inscriptions.\(^7\)

There is, however, one other epigraph from Humcha (Vijayamurti 1953 : 294, Ins. 213) which, as per its date 1077 A.D., is the earliest among the available and which to some extent is pertinent in the present context; it does refer to the Tattvārtha-sūtra, but ascribes its authorship to some Āryadēva and not to Umāsvāti or Grddhrapiṇccha either.\(^8\) Incidentally, the Malliṣena-praśasti of 1129 A.D. on the Chandragiri at Sravana Belagola refers to Āryadēva and qualifies him as Rāddhānta-kartā, an implied allusion to his authorship of the Tattvārtha-sūtra.\(^9\) The inscription at the same time does not anywhere mention Umāsvāti or Grddhrapiṇcchācārya either in its otherwise long list of the Southern Nirgrantha holymen. Āryadeva, however, is apparently a totally unknown entity in the entire corpus of knowledge on the patriarchs and pontiffs, friars and monks, of all the known sects of the Nirgrantha religion in Karnataka as well as in Northern India.\(^10\) No modern writer predictably therefore has taken these last two insessional notices seriously. Their value is limited to the fact that the first is the earliest epigraphical reference to the Tattvārtha-sūtra, and the second possibly refers to it implicitly. From the inscriptions cited above, it is clear that, in the Southern tradition, ‘Umāsvāti’ was equated with ‘Grddhrapiṇccha’ in early 12th century. In a later 14th century-inscription, Umāsvāti is for the first time clearly mentioned as the author of the Tattvārtha-sūtra. And if we were allowed to read in the phrase aśeṣa-padārtha-vēdī, knower of total “entity-

\(^7\) Tattvārtha-sūtra-kartāram Umāsvāti-muniśvaram / Śrutakēvali-dēśiyam vandē ṭham gunamandiram //
It may be noted in passing that the Nandiguruvāli (c. 13th-14th centuries A.D.) also ascribes the Tattvārtha-sūtra to Umāsvāti, but does not address him as Śrutakēvali-dēśiya :
Tattvārtha-sūtra-kartṛtva prakaṭikṛtata-sanmanāḥ / Umāsvāti padacāryō mithyātva-timirāṃsūman //
Tattvārtha-sūtra-karttrugal enisid Āryadēvar...

\(^8\) Epigraphia Carnatica II, 1973 : 51, Ins. No. 77 (67). Ācāryavaryo yatir-Āryadēvo rāddhānta-karttā dhrityatām...Rāddhānta means siddhānta or doctrine. The Tattvārtha-sūtra embodies the doctrine of the Nirgrantha in sūtra style

\(^9\) Though he may perhaps have flourished in Southern India, we virtually know nothing about him. (A Nirgrantha ascetic ‘Āryadēva’ figures in the inscriptions of Tamilnādu; but he is a medieval person).
reals”, for Umāsvāti in the inscription of 1115 A.D. (and the subsequent four which repeat the selfsame verse), a hint toward the Tattvārtha-sūtra, by equating padārtha with tattva, may be sensed and it may be inferred that the early 12th century composer of the verse plausibly had in mind the authorship of the Tattvārtha-sūtra for Umāsvāti even when his phraseology does not directly so specify.

III

The Southern literary tradition on the Tattvārtha-sūtra, is, of course, much older than the Southern epigraphical. It assumably therefore has a stronger bearing on the Umāsvāti problem. The earliest relevant source of the Southern affiliation is the Sarvārthasiddhi of Pūjyapāda Dēvanandi (active c. 635-680 A.D., see Dhaky 1990 : 152-158), which is a famous commentary on the Tattvārtha-sūtra. Before this date, in the Southern Nirgrantha literature, there is no allusion to the Tattvārtha-sūtra, nor is encountered, before the eighth century, a citation from the selfsame work or its obvious influence in any Southern writing. Dēvanandi, on his part, however, professed complete ignorance on who the author of the work he commented upon was, ascribing it as he did to “some Nirgrantha pontiff”, the Sūtra being an exposition in response to the query of some bhavya person.\(^\text{11}\) The next commentator on the Tattvārtha-sūtra, Bhaṭṭa Akalankaḍēva, in his Tattvārtha-vārttika (c. 730-750 A.D.), is likewise silent over the authorship of the Sūtra. It was Svāmi Virasēṇa of the Paṇcaśtūparamvaya who, in his famous Dhaivalā-ṭikā (comp’ ted 816 A.D.) on the Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama of Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali (c. 500 A.D.),\(^\text{12}\) while quoting from the Tattvārtha-sūtra, for the first time names “Grhārprpicchācārya” as its author (Premi 1956: 530ff). Also Vidyānanda, who is believed to have flourished in late eighth and the first quarter of the 9th century (he more correctly lived in the first

11. kaścid bhavyaḥ pratyāsanna-niṣṭhaḥ prajñāvān svahitam upalipurs viivikte parama-rāmyē bhavyasata-viṣrāmaśpadē kvacid āśramapadē muni-pariṣtan madhyē saṃśiṣṭaḥya mūrttam iva mōkṣaṃgaṃ a vāgviśargaṃ vapusā nirūpayantam yukty āgama-kuśalam paraḥita-pratipadanaikakāryām ārya-niśeṣyam nirgranthacāryavaryam-upasadya savinayam pari prácchati sma । Bhagavan, kim nu khalu ātmanē hitam syād iti | sa āha mōkṣa iti | sa ēva punah pratyāha kim svarūpo (a)au mōkṣaḥ kaśc āṣya prápty upāya iti | acārya āha-niravāsesa-nirākṛta-karma-mala-kalankaśya śārīrasy ātmanē acintya svabhāvik ājñānādi-guṇam avyābāda-sukham ātyantikaṃ avasthāntaram mōkṣa iti । (Phoolchandra 1944: text p.1).

12. The editor of the Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama, Hiralal Jain, and those who follow him assign the work to the second century A.D. The external and internal evidence goes against it as I have discussed in “The Date of Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama” as yet unpublished. Its real date is c. 500 A.D.
half of the 10th century), 13 in his Tattvārtha-śloka-vārttika, quotes from the Tattvārtha-sūtra as of Grddhapicchācārya (Kailāshchandra 1945, Part 2: 231). 14 His contemporary, the famous Kannada poet Pampa, too, in his Ādipurāṇa (Kannada, 941 A.D.), mentions Grddhrapinchācārya. 15 And Vādirāja of the Drāviḍa Samgha, in his Pāśvanāthacarita (1025 A.D.), offers salutation to ‘Grddhapiccha’ whom Kailāshchandra (1945:231) takes as the author of the Tattvārtha-sūtra. 16 Kailāshchandra (1945: 232) also notices some Jayasēna mentioning ‘Grddhapicchācārya’, but does not specify which one of the two known Jayasēna-s is meant, nor does he state as to the work in which this particular reference occurs and what its date, firm or plausible, had been.

Some of the manuscripts of the southern version of the Tattvārtha-sūtra contain the following verse which mentions ‘Umāśvāmi’ in lieu of ‘Umāsvāti’:

Tattvārtha-sūtra kartāraṃ Grddhapicchōpalakṣitam ā
vandē gaṇindra-sanjātim Umāsvāmi-muniśvaram

However, as shown by Mukhtar (1956: 106-108), this altered appellation for Umāsvāti for the first time figures in the Tattvārtha-vrittī of Śrutasāgara (c. late 15th-early 16th centuries), and Kailāshchandra therefore conjectures that Śrutasāgara may have based this nomen on a foot of a śloka figuring in the Nītisāra (of Indranandi: late 10 century A.D.) where the author of the Tattvārtha-sūtra is referred to as ‘Śvāmi’:

Tattvārtha-sūtra-vyākhyaūtā Svāmiti parisāṭhyaiē (Kailāshchandra 1945 : 227)

Combining now the Southern literary and the inscriptional

---

13. My paper “The Epigraphical Evidence on the Date of Vidyānanda,” is currently in press, to appear in Dr. H.V. Trivedi Felicitation Volume from Bhopal. Therein I have produced full evidence for changing his date to c. 900-950 A.D.
15. A.N. Upadhye, in his “Introduction” to the The Varāṅgacarita of Jaṭā-Sīṃhanandi, gives the following citation there on p. 15: Āryanuta-Grddharpinĉācārya Jaṭācārya viśruta-kirtyā ē cārya purassaramapp ācārya parampareyam kuḍugam bhavyōtsavamaṇī I-12.
   atucchā-guna-sampātai Grddhapicchaṃ natō’ smi tam ā
   pakṣikurvanti yam bhavyā nirvāṇāyō tviṣṇavaḥ
references to the Tattvārtha-sūtra and its author,17 the following facts unambiguously emerge:

1. Dēvanandī as well as Akalaṅkādeva, both of whom had commented on the Tattvārtha-sūtra, are silent over the identity of the author, his preceptor's name, as well as the monastic sub-order to which he belonged. Thus, in the seventh as well as the eighth century, which in temporal terms represents the earliest phase of the Tattvārtha exegetical literature in the South, Umāsvāti as the Sūtra's author was, for some special reasons, not mentioned or acknowledged.

2. Virasēna, Vidyānanda, Pampa, and Vādirāja, and the Humcha inscription of 1077 A.D. likewise do not mention Umāsvāti; thus up to the last leg of the 11th century, Umāsvāti is nowhere mentioned as the author of the Tattvārtha-sūtra. But the aforesaid four authors, instead, specify Grddhapicchha (either directly or inferentially) as the author of the Tattvārtha-sūtra. However, Grddhapicchha cannot be the author's monastic appellation; it arguably must have been conceived, at some stage, as his cognomen. The source for this cognomen is as yet unknown. Dēvanandī and Akalaṅkādeva, the two earliest Southern commentators on the Tattvārtha-sūtra, apparently were not willing to accord the authorship of the work to Umāsvāti; but they hardly would have had an objection against, or inhibition in, revealing Grddhapicchhācārya as the author of that celebrated work. Why, then, did they suppress not only the name, but also the cognomen of the author, if it were then known? The problem does thus become somewhat complicated. Was it, it may be asked, then, Virasena who, in face of Dēvanandī's and Akalaṅkādeva's silence, felt the need for having the author's identity specified (since the Tattvārtha was a very important doctrinal work) and hence coined for him the epithetic appellation 'Grddhrapicchhācārya'? Was it, it may be suspected, coined for suppressing the name Umāsvāti as the author, since they knew he did not belong to the Digambara sect? It is by all counts certain that this second and cognomeric appellation 'Grddhrapicchhācārya' had gained a wide currency in the Southern (Digambara) Church since the time Virasēna introduced it. It is, of course, totally unknown in the Northern

17. There are also some notices which see Kundakundācārya as the author of the Tattvārtha-sūtra, a supposition for which, however, there is absolutely no evidence and no serious scholar believes in that attribution. Moreover, the date of Kundakundācārya is as late as the latter half of the eighth century as I have elsewhere shown (Dhaky, 1991, pp. 187-206).
tradition, early or late, and this may have been perhaps the case also with the Yāpaniya in Karṇāṭadēśa.

3. The Humcha inscription of 1077 A.D. and the Sravana Belagola epigraph of 1129 A.D. ascribe the Sūtra neither to Umāsvāti nor to Grdhpakpācha but to Āryadeva, thus coming in conflict with the notices of Virasēna, Vidyānanda, Paṃpa, and Vādirāja as well as other inscriptions from Sravana Belagola.

4. The 12th century inscriptions beginning from 1115 A.D., alluded to the foregoing pages, for the first time, and indeed with no past precedent known so far in the Southern (Digambara) Church, mention ‘Umāsvāti’; and ‘Grdhpakpāchārāya’ they note as his alias. This equation, in conjunction with other associations, explicit or implicit, would make Umāsvāti the author of the Tattvārtha-sūtra. But what is the basis for equating ‘Umāsvāti’ with ‘Grdhpakpāchārāya’? From where did the composer of the inscription of 1115 A.D. get this information, particularly when the earlier celebrated commentators on the Tattvārtha beginning from the seventh century and other subsequent but eminent early writers—Southerners all—and indeed of the Digambara persuasion—till 11th century A.D. do not mention Umāsvāti at all? Why, all of a sudden, did Umāsvāti appear in the Southern epigraphical notices?

5. Again, the inscription of 1115 A.D. for the first time mentions Koṇḍakundācārya as Umāsvāti alias Grdhpakpācha’s preceptor, a statement that had been never met with before this date, nor can it be upheld by any sound external or internal evidence.

The direct and most ancient source, the testimony of the author himself, is what is explicitly believed to be his own encomium at the end of the Sūtra-text’s Bhāṣya, the Bhāṣya being available in, and recognized only by, the Northern tradition: and this proclaims the authorship of the Tattvārtha-sūtra (in point of fact the Tattvārthādhigamaśāstra as the author himself therein calls it) positively in his own name, Umāsvāti; and this encomium could hardly have been available to the medieval composers of inscriptions in Karṇāṭa. Nor could they have deduced that it was Umāsvāti who is the author of the Sūtra, at least, not from the earlier writings of their own sect. To all seeming, the Humcha inscription of the 16th century, earlier noted, which quotes a couplet in Anuṣṭubh, palpably from some medieval Yāpaniya writing (since the term śrūta-kēvali-dēsiya it uses it typically of Yāpaniya usage and not known in the vogue either of the Digambara or of the Śvētāmbara sect), may have been the source
for this information, a source which probably was then available to
the Digambara writers in the 12th century Karṇāṭa. At the same
time, that couplet does not equate Umāsvātī with Grddhapicch-ācārya. (Like
the Śvetāmbara sources, it too shows unawareness of that cognomen).
This necessitated replacing the original second foot of the selfsame
verse by a new foot which duly included the epithet Grddhapicchācārya
(of the Digambara coinage) as seen in some fairly late manuscripts of
the Tattvārtha-sūtra which also render Umāsvātī as ‘Umāsvāmi’ as
noticed in the foregoing pages (Kailāshchandra 1945: 227).
Incidentally, the Bhāṣya was known both to Dēvanandi (Premi 1956)
as well as to Akalaṅkādeva (Jagdishchandra 1939). Yet these two
early Southern authors did not mention ‘Umāsvāti’. Their silence, if
it seems intriguing, is also very significant. (Was it perhaps deliberate
or out of necessity ?).

IV

In the Northern Nīrgrantha tradition, as earlier observed, no
inscription so far known mentions Umāsvātī. A somewhat equivalent
of, and virtually coeval with, the Southern inscriptional notices are
the long or short specific eulogies of the varied Northern literary
compositions in which Umāsvātī sometimes figures. The earliest such
reference is by Jinadatta Sūri of Kharatara-gaccha in his Ganadhara-
sārddha-śataka (c. very early years of the 12th cent. A.D.);18 next, the
Prasamaratī-prakaraṇa-ṭikā of Haribhadra sūrī (1129 A.D.),19 the
Amāmasvāmī-carita of Muniratna Sūri of Pūrūmā-gaccha (1169 A.D.)20
and finally the Kalpapradīpa of Jīnaprabha Sūri of Kharatara-gaccha
(1333 A.D.)21 which reverentially remembers Umāsvātī among the great
pontiffs of the Śvetāmbara sect. But all of these are medieval sources
and what can be of real value has to be the more ancient references
and which, to be really significant, must unequivocally attribute, even

   pasamaraipamuna payarana paṅcasayā sakkayā kayā jēhiṇ /
   puvvagayavāyagānaṁ tesiṁ Umāsāi nāṁnaṁ. //

   praśamasthēna yēñeyam kṛtā vatrāgya-paddhatiḥ /
   tasmāt vācakamukhyāya namō bhūtārtha-bhāṣīṇē //

20. Deshai (1933) quotes the following opening verse from the Vṛtti :
   Umāsvātēr vācakasya vācaḥ kasya na cētast /
   dhwanaṁtya adyāpi ghanṭāvata tārātankaṁra sundarāḥ //

   Umāsvātī-vācakaś cā Kaubhīṣanī-ṛtr̥aḥ paṅcaśatasasambṛtam kṛta-prakaraṇa
   prasiddhas tatraiva Tattvārthādhiyamamam sabhāṣyaṁ vyaracayat /
stipulate, the authorship of the Tattvārtha-sūtra (i.e. the Tattvārthādhigama-sūtra) to Umāsvāti.

Before proceeding with that inquiry, it may at this juncture be mentioned that, besides the Tattvārthādhigama-sūtra, its Bhāṣya (which is the earliest available commentary on the text) is looked upon as Umāsvāti's auto-commentary in the Northern tradition. Also recognised as his works are the Praśamarati-prakaraṇa and the Kṣētrasamāsa (alternative title, the Jambūdvīpa-samāsa). Gandhahasti Siddhasēna, in his Tattvārthādhigama-vṛtti (c. 760-770 A.D.), refers to Umāsvāti's another work, the Śauca-prakaraṇa, now unavailable. Also unavailable is his Śrāvaka-prajñāpīti. The Navāṅga-vṛttikāra Abhayadeva Sūri of Candra-gaccha (active c. 1052-1083 A.D.), and before him the Vādivētāla Śānti Sūri of Thārāpadra-gaccha (1040 A.D.) in his Uttarādhyayana-vṛtti, cite from Umāsvāti's other works, now unknown and indeed lost for the past several centuries.

On the Sa-bhāṣya Tattvārthādhigama-sūtra of Umāsvāti, Yākinīśūnu Haribhadra Sūri wrote his commentary up to about 6½ chapters (c. 785 A.D.). His slightly senior contemporary, Gandhahasti Siddhasēna, earlier referred to, wrote a full commentary (c. 760-770 A.D.) on the selfsame work; and both of them regard the Sūtra as well as its Bhāṣya as of Umāsvāti. Haribhadra profusely quotes from the Tattvārthādhigama-sūtra in several of his other earlier commentarial works, particularly those on the āgamas, all composed between c. 745 and 760 A.D. The commentators on other works whose writings predate Siddhasena's and Haribhadra's, such as Kōtyācārīya (in his commentary, c. 700-725 A.D.) on the Viśeṣa Āvaśya-ka-bhāṣya of Jinabhadragāni Kṣamāśramaṇa, c. 585 A.D., also Koṭṭārya vādi gaṇi (in his commentary, c. 700 A.D., which is a supplementary extension for completing the incomplete auto-commentary of Jinabhadra), and Śimhasūra Kṣamāśramaṇa (in his Dvādaśāra-naya-cakra-vṛtti, c. 680-690 A.D.), also quote from the Tattvārthādhigama-sūtra. (The last noted author also cites from the Bhāṣya). Not only that, several cūmi-commentaries on the āgamas which were composed between c. 650-700 A.D., quote from the Sūtra. Among the still earlier such works, the Āvaśya-cūmi (c. 600-650 A.D.), which plausibly was composed a few decades before Dēvanandi's Sarvārthasiddhi, cites from the Tattvārthādhigama. The most important of them all are the four

22. Since the point is not very significant, I forego citation.
citations, two from the Sūtra-text and two from the Bhāṣya done directly in the name of Umāsvāti, figuring as they do in the cūṇī by Agastyaśimha (c. 575-600 A.D.) (see Punya Vijaya, 1973: 85) on the Daśavaikālikā-sūtra (c. 4th-2nd centuries B.C.). These being the earliest very clear references to Umāsvāti (and his two compositions, the Sūtra and the Bhāṣya), I cite them below in extenso:

sарvāsara-bhāṣya-dvāra-pratyapāya-darsanārthaṃ bhagavad
Omāsvātinābhihitam-
“hiṃśādiśvahāmūtra câpāyāvadya darsanaṃ”
[Tattvā 7.4],
“duḥkham iva vā” [Tattvā 7.5],
“vyādhīpratikāratvāt kanḍūparigatavaccābramha...”
[Tattvā 7.5 Sūtrabhāṣyē],
“parigrahēśvaprapāptanāśtu kāṅkṣā-sākau prāptēśu
cā raksanām upahōgē cāpyatṛptēḥ”
[Tattvā 7.5 Sūtrabhāṣyē]

Although he does not mention Umāsvāti or the Tattvārthādhiṣṭhā-sūtra and its Bhāṣya, the great Śvetāmbara dialectician, Mallavādi Kṣamāśramaṇa, the author contemporaneous to Agastyaśimha,24 quotes a phrase, yathārthābhidhānāṃ sabdāḥ, (Jambuvijaya 1976: 596) which is a definition of the term sabda that has been traced inside the Bhāṣya (Jambuvijaya, 1966: 23). And earlier than Mallavādi, Siddhasēna Divākara (active c. 400-444 A.D.)25 seems familiar with the Tattvārthādhiṣṭhā-sūtra as well as its Bhāṣya and possibly also with the Praśamaratī-prakaraṇa.26 This unambiguously proves the antiquity of the Sūtra text as well as of the Bhāṣya, and places Umāsvāti’s date before the fifth century A.D. The most direct, just as the earliest, evidence on the authorship of the Tattvārthādhiṣṭhā-sūtra (as well as its Bhāṣya) is of course the grantha-prāṣasti at the end of the Bhāṣya as had been lucidly shown by Sanghvi, Jagadishchandra, as well as Premi.27 I cite below this encomium (with which epigraphers and non-Nirgrantha historians in India in general are unfamiliar), followed by its translation in English:

24. I, as well as Jitendra Shah (n.d.), date Mallavādi to the latter half of the sixth century and not to the fourth century A.D. as has been done by most Śvetāmbara Jaina scholars.
25. I am discussing the date of Siddhasēna Divākara elsewhere.
26. The opening verse of his Dvātrīṃśikā 19 which is an echo of the sūtra 1 of the Tattvārthādhiṣṭhā-sūtra; and the opening verse of his Dvātrīṃśikā 20 which reflects awareness of the kārikā 204 of the Praśamaratī-prakaraṇa. (In the former connection Cf. Upadhye 1971:162, 164).
27. In a long paper I am discussing their views with all citations and observations thereof.
vācaka-mukhyaśya Śivahśriyaḥ prakāśa-yāsasah praśīṣyena
śiṣyēna Ghośanandi-kṣamanasy aikādaśāṅga-vidaḥ
Āryā vācanayā ca mahāvācaka kṣamaṇa Munḍapādaśīṣyasya
śiṣyēna vācakācārya Mūlanāmaḥ prathita-kārtēḥ
Nyagrōdhikā-prasūtēṇa viharatā puravarē Kusuma-nāmni
Kaubhiśaṇīṇī Śvāti-tanayēṇa Vāṭsi-sūṭēṇ ārghyam
Arhad-vacanaṃ samyag guruśramēṇ āgatam samupadhārya
duḥkhārtam ca durāgama-vihatamatiṃ lōkam avaśākya
idam Uccairnāgara-vācakēṇa sauttvānukampayā ċārdham
Tattvārthādhigamākhyāṃ spaṭam Umāsvātinā sāstraṃ
The praśasti is cast in an archaic mould as well as in highly
compressed form; it is divisively distributed for meeting the metrical
requirements and is by disposition somewhat involved: hence strophe
by strophe literal translation would only end in a jigsaw puzzle.
I have therefore preferred rearranging the writing, otherwise faithfully
following the sense and intent of Umāsvāti.28 (He,) vācaka Umāsvāti
of the Uccairnāgara sub-order (of the Northern Nirgrantha friars),
born at Nyagrōdhikā, of Kaubhiśaṇī clan (gōtra) (and) son of Śvāti
and of Vāṭsi, grand disciple of the illustrious chief preceptor (vācaka-
mukhya) Śivasaṇī and disciple of kṣamaṇa Ghośanandi; he, who received
his knowledge of the holy scripture (vācanā) from Mūla, the disciple
of mahāvācaka Munḍapāda: receiving thoughtfully as he did the
Word of Arhat (which flowed) through the succession of right
(authentic) teachers, and sensing as he did people’s suffering from
sorrow,—their intellect dulled by the evil doctrinal treatises,—out of
compassion, composed in clearer terms (spaṭam, i.e. with the
commentary) (this Tattvārthādhigama-sāstra while sojourning, during
his itinerary, in Kusumapura (Pāṭaliputra)."29

I am aware that some scholars (Ghatage 1935) held that the
encomium is an addition of a later date. But its form and style are
fairly archaic, and agree with the general style and modal nuances
not only of the opening 31 and closing 32 kārikās of the Sūtra, but
also with those of the Praśamarati-prakaraṇa as well as of some of the
citations from the lost works of Umāsvāti. Moreover, the
ecclesiastical status ‘vācaka’ is nowhere met with after the Gupta
period. And the term ‘kṣamaṇa’, too, is nowhere applied after the fifth
century in the Northern Nirgrantha tradition, although the term
‘kṣapāṇaka’ is used in the Saṃskṛta plays and elsewhere in post-
Gupta times. Likewise, the convention of mentioning the gōtra of a

28. The encomium verses have been cited from Kapadia 1926:19.
29. I have made small alterations and rearrangement with a view to improving
upon the translation presented by Dixit, and recently by Zydenbos.
pontiff goes out of vogue after the fifth and early sixth centuries A.D. There is thus nothing to doubt about the antiquity as also its contemporaneity as well as its connection with the Śūtra-text and the Bhāṣya and hence the authenticity of its content. Had it not been so known or understood or interpreted even in earlier times, Agastyasimha in the sixth century and Siddhasēnagani and Haribhadra Sūri in the eighth century could not have ascribed the Śūtra as well as the Bhāṣya to Umāsvāti.

V

In the Northern tradition, Umāsvāti is thus known by name and also as the author of the Tattvārthādhiṣṭhigama-Śūtra from the evidence of the encomium of the work, which is the earliest, positive, and direct reference, and this must be from c. 350-375 A.D., which is the probable date of its composition. 30 The other evidence, direct but outside the original work, earlier noted, is of the Daśavakālika-cūrṇi of Agastyasimha; this is of the late sixth century or over half of millenium anterior in date to the Sravana Belagola inscription of 1115 A.D. The evidence on Umāsvāti from the literary notices on Umāsvāti in the Southern Nirgrantha Church is definitely negative till we come to late medieval period when, however, Umāsvāti is called ‘Umāsvāmi’; and in early ninth and tenth centuries, the Śūtra was ascribed by the relevant writers to ‘Grddhapicchācārya’ and not to ‘Umāsvāti’. As already noted, it was as well ascribed to Āryadēva in some quarters in Karṇāṭa in the late 11th and early 12th centuries A.D. The aforenoted Śravana Belagola inscription of 1115 A.D. for the first time equates ‘Grddhapicchācārya’ with ‘Umāsvāti’, but without, as it today may seem, the support of its own earlier literary tradition which either did not know, or for some reasons avoided mentioning, Umāsvāti as the author of the Tattvārtha-sūtra. The Northern tradition, on the other hand, does not mention or know ‘Grddhapicchācārya’ at all. Indeed the many works beginning from the late sixth to the 12th centuries, which mention the author or cite from the Śūtra as an authority, irrespective of whether they specifically noted Umāsvāti or not, provide not a single instance of an allusion there to ‘Grddhapicchācārya’ (or to Āryadēva either). There was neither ambiguity nor were conflicting claims about the name of the author of the Tattvārthādhiṣṭhigama-sūtra. He was, from the beginning to the end and unequivocally, Umāsvāti.

30. Umāsvāti’s date has been a matter of controversy. Some place him in the fifth, some to the eighth. Since he flourished before Siddhasēna Divākara—his style, too, is archaic—I have preferred the bracket c. 350-375 A.D. for his active years.
As I survey the writings on Umāsvāti of this century, the following divergent trends with regard to this vexed issue are met with:

1. Several scholars regard the Sūtra and the Bhāṣya as of Umāsvāti. This is the view largely of the Nirgrantha-Śvetāmbara scholars, of Jagadishchandra Jain as well as of several Western scholars, particularly the German Nirgranthologists.

2. At least one scholar felt that the encomium naming Umāsvāti at the Bhāṣya applies to the Sūtra alone (Ghatage 1935). But most Digambara scholars, and few Western scholars (Williams 1963; Zydenbos 1983) regard the Sūtra as of the Nirgrantha-Digambara sect and the Bhāṣya alone is ascribed by them to a Śvetāmbara Umāsvāti, or, alternatively, for some the name of the Bhāṣyakāra must be looked upon as unknown. And one scholar held that there were two Umāsvātī-s, the author of the Sūtra, an earlier Umāsvāti who was Digambara and the second later, a Śvetāmbara Umāsvāti who altered the original text and composed the Bhāṣya (Phoolchandra 1971).

3. In the opinion of still others, both the above-cited claims are unjustified and the author of the Sūtra as well as of the Bhāṣya, doubtless Umāsvāti, was a Yāpaniya (Premi 1956 1956; Upadhye 1971). Alternatively according to some, the Sūtra was composed by a Yāpaniya but the Bhāṣya’s author was a Śvetāmbara (Bronkhorst 1985; Patoriya 1988).

I shall offer no comments on these views,—all as mutually conflicting as are diverse—for it is a subject of a separate paper or a series of papers for clearing the mess they have created. The conclusions I have reached as the result of my own researches is that Umāsvāti possibly was a pre-Śvetāmbara or non-Śvetāmbara, and hence non-abbatial Northern Nirgrantha holyman.31 Uccairnāgarāsākhā, to which he belonged, was not a filiate of the Southern (Digambara) Church, nor of the Yāpaniya Samgha. It was within the ambit of the early Northern Nirgrantha main stream tradition. The readings and content as well as some details of the version of the āgamas followed by the Uccairnāgarā-śakha, as met with particularly in the Bhāṣya, apparently had differed at places from the āgamas of the Vajri-śakha that are currently available with, and inherited by, ...

31. The Śvetāmbara sect has been for the first time referred to in the literary and epigraphical notices of the later part of the fifth century. At the beginning it apparently was a caityavāsi or abbatial sect and for long had so continued to remain a sect.
the Śvetāmbara sect. They likewise differ for some matters and details from those of the Digambara as well, as has been shown by some previous writers (Premi 1956, Ohira 1982). Umāsvāti arguably had before him a version of āgamas followed by his own branch, the Uccairnāgara-śākhā which apparently had differed from the version of the Vajri-śākhā for some details.

Post Script

While completing this paper, I had missed an important article by A.V. Narasimhamurti, namely the "Epigraphical References to Umāsvāti," in Svasti Śrī (Dr. B.Ch.Chhabra Felicitation Volume), Delhi, 1984, pp. 57-60. Narasimhamurti, on the authority of P.B. Desai, has noted an inscription of 1098 A.D. in the Jaina basadi at Hunasi Hadagali, which refers to Çṛddhapiṇcha but not to Umāsvāti. (Cf. P.B. Desai, Jainism in South India and Jaina Epigraphs, Sholapur 1957, p. 241). Thus, till the very end of the 11th century, Umāsvāti does not figure in the epigraphical tradition of Southern India.

After sending the material to the editors of Śrī Nāgābhīnandanaṃ volume, I noticed I had missed a reference to a specific mention by the Yāpanīya pontiff Pālayakīrtī Śaṅkāyana in his grammar; therein, he refers to the ten (chapters) of Umāsvāti (dasakā Umāsvātiya) and thereby to the Tattvārthādīgama Sūtra. (Cf. Śaṅkāyana-Vyākaraṇa, ed. by Pt. Sambhunātha Tripāṭhi, BJMJG, Skt. series no-39, New Delhi 1944, II, 4: 182). Śaṅkāyana may have been the source from which the composer of the Śravana-Belagola inscription of A.D. 1115 got and included this specific information.
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NEWS ON JAINISM AROUND THE WORLD

The bas relief panel of Lord Mahāvīra at Satyamangalam

The Archaeological Survey of India, which is supposed to maintain the magnificent bas relief panel of the Jain Saint Mahāvīra, atop the monolithic boulder at Satyamangalam, 6 km from Kulithalai, seems to have forgotten its existence. The panel, measuring 6 feet in length and 5 feet in height, on a single piece of rock, popularly called ‘Gundankallu’, is over 1,000 years old, and depicts Lord Mahāvīra in sitting posture flanked by a Yakṣa and Yakṣī on either side. The typical three-umbrella motif of Jains is seen just above the head of Mahāvīra. Fortunately, despite the elements, the panel is in a very good condition.

A song sequence of a popular film was shot at the site recently, and a large portion of the rock just right of the panel was painted in gaudy colours, to give effect to the dance scene. When the shooting was over, all connected with the shooting left the area without bothering to clean it up. The local villagers, however, with great difficulty managed to remove the paints. There seems to have been a board at the site, put up by the ASI declaring the bas relief panel as a protected monument. But now the board is not there, and only a long iron rod, where the board existed once upon a time, is the proof that the ASI was incharge of the monument.

From The Hindu, October 2, 1995.

Jain Ācarya brings life to sleepy village

Kolanpak, a sleepy village in Nalgonda district, about 80 km from Hyderabad, came alive on one Friday with people from neighbouring areas thronging it to have “darshan” of the Jain Ācarya Sri Rajyesh Surishwarji who had come 1,200 km from Durg (Madhya Pradesh) on foot to be present at the installation of eight idols in a 200-year-old Jain temple there on Jan. 26.

The temple is being renovated for the big day. Men from Jaipur have been working since 1990 on white marble and coloured stones brought from the Pink City for use in the temple. The consecration ceremonies in the temple—stated to be about 200-year-old—begin on Jan. 18.
The idols, prepared in Jaipur and to be installed in the temple, are those of Jinadatta Surishwarji, Manidhar Chandra Suri, Kushal Surishwarji, Chandra Surishwarji, Seemandhar Swami, Pundarik Swami, Gautam Swami and Mātā Padmāvatī.

In an event of social importance to the community, Reshma Surendra Saha of Bharaundha (Gujarat) became a “sādhvī” on Jan. 25.

The Andhra Pradesh Home Minister, Mr. A. Madhava Reddy, received the Achārya when he reached the village. The “pratipada” of the Jains—who stayed in the village until Jan. 26 giving daily “pravacana”—was taken round in a “shobhā yātrā” along with the Minister, a large number of school children and community people from different parts of the country. The Achārya returned to the temple bringing back with him eight idols from the nearby Shiv Mandir which was also installed in the temple.

Shri Kulapak Tirtha Pratishtthā Mahotsava Samiti, the organisers of the installation function, held a community lunch (“anna prasād”) for thousands of people of five adjoining villages. The samiti office-bearers are distributing a kg of jaggery, a steel plate and a tumbler, besides notebooks and ballpen in each house in Kolanpak to mark the occasion.

In his address to the gathering, the Ācārya called upon the people to offer sacrifices for the benefit of others (“tyāga”), to help others (“poropakāra”) and try not to harm fellow humans. This should be the motto of people, as was enshrined in the Vedas and propagated in the country’s cultural ethics.

Mr Madhava Reddy hailed the Jain community for its contribution in providing health, medicare and education facilities to the needy in interior areas of the State, complementing the efforts of the Government.

The Jīva Rakṣā Pracāraka Maṇḍali put up an exhibition near the temple to impress upon the people the need to eschew cruelty against animals and saving them for the welfare of community. Ms. Amala, wife of the Telugu film star Nagarjuna, who heads Blue Cross, an animal welfare organisation, was slated to visit Kolanpak during the consecration ceremonies.

The Samiti leaders announced that an eye hospital would be set up at Kolanpak to be run by either the L.V. Prasad Eye Institute or
Medi Citi Hospitals. The building would be put up at a cost of over Rs. 20 lakhs. The equipment would be brought from foreign countries. The hospital would benefit people from 40 villages in the district, they said.

From The Hindu 13.1.1996.

Stone sculpture piece found in Polur

A 10th century A.D. stone relief of a Jain Tīrthaṅkara was discovered recently at a Adi-Dravida colony at Vellur village near Sandhavasal, Polur taluk in Tiruvannamalai Sambuvarayar district.

According to Mr. M. Gandhi, curator of the Government Museum, Vellore, the figure is seated on a long 'pida' in the 'dhyāna' pose—placing both palms on the lap. A 'prabhā' with tongues of flames is seen raised above the shoulders of the 'Jīna'. Above the head, a 'tricakra' has been beautifully chiselled but has been damaged by the ravages of time. The face of the 'Jīna' is square. A long raised pillow supports the 'Jīna's back. From the top of the 'tricakra', flowers and buds with stalks fall on both sides.

The figure is four feet tall and three feet wide. Inscribed beams and parts of the temple were found scattered in front of the piece. According to the local residents, the pieces were brought from the Ammayappisvara Temple of Padavedu, built during Sambuvarayars rule.

From The Hindu 7.2.1996.

Vepery Jain temple 'pratiṣṭhā' on May 23

The 'pratiṣṭhā' (kumbhābhiṣekam) of Sri Sambhavanatha, a Jain temple on EVK Sampath Road, Vepery, was performed on May 23. The 37th Jain temple in the City under the auspices of 1008 Ācārya Śrimad Vijaya Kalapūrṇa Śrī Śūriśwarajī Mahārāj Saheb has been built of pure white marble. No iron materials have been used in the construction of the temple.

A striking feature of the temple, the height of which is 55-ft long and width of 30 ft., is the exquisite carving on pillars and walls in the sanctum sanctourim. About 12,000 cubic feet of white marble stone
has been used, and it has taken about 13 years to complete the temple, the foundation for which was laid in 1983 under the auspices of Ācārya Navin Sri Surishwarji Maharaj Saheb. Acharya Vikaram Suriswarji Maharaj, Acharya Padmasagar Suriswaraji Maharaj and Acharya Rajesh Suriswaraji Maharaj have been the guidance forces.

To commemorate the 'pratiṣṭhā', various pūjās, bhaktis and navkarsī had organised from May 13 to 24. The main idol measuring 41 inches is of Sri Sambavanatha Bhagavān, the 3rd Thirthaṅkara. Twelve more idols will be installed in the temple, which has been built on two levels.

Ācārya Śrimad Kalpūrṇa Suriswaraji Mahārāj performed the Anjansalaka and Prathista mahotsava. The Anjansalaka depicting the various facets of life of the Tirthaṅkaras were portrayed through dramas and cultural shows from may 17 to 23.

A traditional procession of the Lord decorated in a silver chariot was taken out on May 22.

From Indian Express, May 12, 1997.

**Sittannavasal paintings endangered**

The famous Jain cave temple, Arivarkovil (the temple of the Tirthaṅkara), at Sittannavasal, 14 kms off Pudukottai, is fast losing its pristine glory and charm due to bureaucratic apathy.

The Sittannavasal paintings carry on the tradition of the well-known Ajanta frescoes of the first seven centuries A.D., the Ceylon Sigiriya frescoes of the fifth century and Gwalior's Bagh frescoes of the sixth and seventh centuries A.D. Sittannavasal paintings are an early example of the Ajanta or post-Ajanta period and in merit are comparable to Ajanta and Sigiriya. Such a marvellous paintings and the cave temple are on the verge of decay owing to the indiscriminate granite quarrying around the cave temple.

This rock-cut temple is believed to have been done by Pallava king Mahendravarman-I circa 640-670 AD. Though the king was responsible for many more cave temples, this is the only Jain temple, with all others having been dedicated to Hindu gods.

The whole cave, consisting of the walls, ceilings, cornice, beams and pillars was originally covered with plasters and paintings and
the sculptures were also covered with painted stucco. Now the paintings on the walls have perished and some paintings on the ceiling beams and some on the upper parts of the pillars alone remain intact. After the cave had been declared a national monument the entire area was fenced by ASI and a big iron gate was also fixed.

The paintings above the three images in the sanctum, those on the ceiling, the images in the ardhāmāndapa and the ones on the corbels, beam and cornice now give a faded and defaced picture.

But, unless some drastic action is taken to contain the ongoing granite quarrying works in the hill region, these rare pieces of art will collapse very soon.

On the southern part of the cave temple, the death bed (resting place) of the Jain saints is situated on a hillock about 200 feet height from the ground level. It is said that the Jain saints, during their final days, preferred an isolated place like natural caverns in order to observe ‘sallekhana’ fast unto death. One such place is in Sittannavasal but is being ignored by officials.

There are 15 such beds on this hillock and the place has been protected with an iron gate. In the absence of any watchman to look after these structures exclusively, the quarry workers around the area used to scale the iron gate and damage the beautifully carved stone beds, sometimes even with the help of chisels!

Moreover, owing to the free usage of explosives to blow rocks, the upper portions of the beds have developed cracks and may collapse at any moment. The impact of explosions is so devastating that the paintings, along with the plaster, vanish into thin air, pointed out Kudavyil Balasubramaniyam, a noted Historian from Thanjavur.

Hence, unless the Government imposes a total ban on quarrying in Pudukottai district as the district has the maximum number of protected monuments, the rarest of art forms, sculptures and caves would be lost for ever.

From The Indian Express, 9.9.1996.

A Modern Jaina Mathematician

There are 24 Tīrthaṅkaras of the present age in Jainism. The first Tīrthaṅkara is Rṣabhadeva, who is mentioned in all the Jaina Purāṇas as well as in the Ṛgveda. Bharata, son of Rṣabha, was the first Cakravarti and our country got the name ‘BHĀRATAVARṢA’ from him.
The well-known and world famous Bāhubali is another son of Rṣabha. The last Tīrthaṅkara is Mahāvīra, who was a contemporary of Buddha.

Mahāvīra visited different parts of India for thirty years and explained to the people the various problems of life and their solutions. The influence of the great principles preached by Mahāvīra is seen in India even outside Jainism. He left behind a legacy of systematic religion and philosophy and also a well-knit social order of ascetics and lay followers who earnestly followed and practised his preachings.

Mahāvīra stressed the dignity of man as man and preached to the masses in their own language regarding high moral ideals which advanced the individual on the spiritual plane and further contributed to social solidarity.

It is really a pleasant surprise that even in the 20th century also there are some persons who are playing a significant role in spreading and upholding the high spiritual values of Jainism and studying Jaina Āgamās as well as the mathematical contents contained in Jaina literature. The object of this article is to introduce one such person Dr Anupam Jain and give a biographical sketch of his life and works.

Anupam Jain was born on 17th June 1958 in his grand father (Nānā) Sri Sumeru Chand Jain Shastri's house in Bahraich (Uttar Pradesh). His father is Sri Trilok Chand Jain and mother is Mrs. Indira Jain. His father was a resident of village Chattārī. For the sake of business his father left this village and started living in Firozabad from 1960.

Anupam Jain had his primary education at Sri Digambara Jaina Pāthsāla at Bahraich. He studied VI standard in P.D. Jain Inter College, Firozabad, and then he was a student of Rajakiya Inter College, Bahraich, during his study of VII to XII standards. He obtained both his B.Sc. (1977) and M.Sc. (1979) degrees with distinction from the C.L. Jain Degree College, Firozabad, which is affiliated to Agra University. For further studies he went to Meerut. Staying in Jain Boarding House at Meerut, he obtained his degree of Master of Philosophy (M. Phil.) in 1980 with 1st division from the Meerut University, Meerut. Under the guidance of Professor Suresh Chandra Agrawal he was awarded Ph.D. degree in History of Mathematics for his thesis entitled “Gaṇita ke Vikāsa main Jaina Ācāryon kā Yogdāna” from the Meerut University, Meerut, in the year 1992.

Anupam Jain wedded to Nisha Jain on 6th May 1984 at Firozabad. Nisha Jain is a simple and kind-hearted lady, Ambuj, Anuj and Ayush are the three sons of this couple.
Anupam Jain’s three books entitled—


have been published and more than 32 research articles of him have also been published in various national and international Journals. He has successfully edited two felicitation volumes, two proceedings and many books. He writes continuously in many national and international magazines. He is the editor of “Arhat Vacana”, which is a quarterly research Journal published from Kundakunda Jñānaśītha (Research Centre) at Indore. He is not only active in social field, but is also equally active in his own subject—Mathematics. He is the youngest member among the International Editorial Board of the International Research Journal ‘Ganita Bhāratī’, a publication from Indian Society for History of Mathematics, New Delhi.

Anupam Jain is a member of Indian Science Congress and Mathematical association of India. He is the founder member of National Group of History and Pedagogy of Mathematical Sciences, New Delhi.

He delivered a lecture on ‘Indian Contributions on Mathematics with Special References of Jainacāryās’ in the International Symposium on History of Mathematics and Mathematical Education held at Gumma University, Japan, during 7-10 August 1987.

In the world conference on Ahimsā held at New Delhi during 31.10.1980 to 4.11.1980, he presented the paper ‘Ahimsā and Ecological Balance’.

**Motivation from His Study of Jaina Mathematics**

On being asked his interest in Jaina Mathematics, he said—‘When I was 14 years old, Prof. Manohar Ray’s book was the text book for us in the 10th standard and it was mentioned in that book : “In the past few days a book by name Dhavalā has been found and in this book there are a number of formulae in Algebra”. This fact was firmly rooted in his mind which evolved when he was doing his M. Phil, degree, as
a consequence, he started writing research papers on Jaina Mathematics.'

Using the explanations of the mathematical terms contained in (i) Jainendra Siddhānta Kośa, (ii) Varnī Abhinandana Grantha, (iii) Nāthurāma Premī Abhinandana Grantha, and (iv) the materials published in Jaina Siddhānta Bhāskara as source material he started writing dissertation which resulted an M.Phil. and Ph.D. degrees upon him.

Awards and Titles

He was honoured with the title 'Jñānavāridhi' in the year 1992, in 1993. In 1995, he was given the title ’Śrutasṛi’ by Upādhyāya Muni Sri Jñānasāgara Ji at Saharanpur.
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