

ISSN 0021-4043

A QUARTERLY
ON
JAINOLOGY

VOL. XXXI

No. 2 OCTOBER

1996

JAIN JOURNAL



॥ जैन भवन ॥

JAIN BHAWAN PUBLICATION

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Thus Spake Lord Mahavira <i>Dr Bhani Ram Verma</i> | 45 |
| Umāsvāti in Epigraphical and Literary Tradition <i>M.A. Dhaky</i> | 47 |
| News on Jainism around the world | 66 |

JAIN JOURNAL

Vol. XXXI

No. 2 October

1996

THUS SPAKE LORD MAHAVIRA

Dr BHANI RAM VERMA

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 Ardhamāgadhī, 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 *āgamic* 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 sectarial 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.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 disconcern 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 *Tattvārthādhigama-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 Digāmbara, 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 Gṛdhrapiccha, Āryadēva, or Umāsvāti) were within its own sectarian fold. A third claim had been advanced in favour of Umāsvāti being a pontiff of the Yāpanīya Saṅgha, a filiate sect of the Northern Church which had found a congenial

-
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 *Tattvārthādhigama-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 *Praśamaratiprakaraṇa*, 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)² 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 Settar's now famous dictum,³ 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.⁴

2. Excepting for the 25th *kārikā* therefrom quoted by Svāmi Virasena in his *Dhavalā-ṭikā* (816 A.D.) where he does not mention the source or the name of the author. He quotes it by simply saying : *atrō payōgī ślōkaḥ* (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 Kaṃṇāṭadēśa. 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

| Inscription No. | Site | Date |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| 156 [47 (127)] | Sravana Belogola (Chandragiri) | 1115 A.D. |
| 135 [43 (117)] | Sravana Belagola (Chandragiri) | 1123 A.D. |
| 173 [50 (140)] | Sravana Belogola (Chandragiri) | 1145 A.D. |
| 71 [40 (64)] | Sravana Belogola (Chandragiri) | 1163 A.D. |
| 73 [42 (66)] | Sravana Belogola (Chandragiri) | 1176 A.D. |
| 360 [105 (254)] | Sravana Belogola (Vindhyagiri) | 1398 A.D. |
| 361 [106 (255)] | Sravana Belogola (Vindhyagiri) | 1409 A.D. |

The verse referring to “Umāsvāti” (which also mentions “Gṛddhapiṅccha” i.e. Gṛdhrapiccha as his *alias*) 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.

*abhūd Umāsvāti munīśvarō
asāv ācārya śabdōttara Ṛddhraphiñchaḥ |
tad anvayē tat sadṛśō (a)sti nānyastāt-
kālik āśēṣa padārtha-vedī || 5 ||*

The verse, moreover, states that Umāsvāti belonged to the spiritual lineage of (*ācārya*) Koṇḍakunda.⁶ The inscription of 1398 A.D. (which is from Vindhyaḡiri), 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 Ṛddhraphiñcha not as Umāsvāti's *alias* but as his disciple's name:

*Śrīmān Umāsvātīr ayaṃ yatīśas Tattvārtha-sūtraṃ prakāṭicakāra |
yan muktimārg ācaraṇō dyatānām pāthēyamarghyam
bhavati prajānām ||
tasyaiva śiṣyō (a)jani Ṛddhraphiñchadvitīyasaṃjñasya
Balākapiñchaḥ ||*

And the inscription of 1409 A.D., also from Vindhyaḡiri, 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 :

*tādīyaṃ vaṃśākarataḥ prasiddhād abhūd adōṣā yatiratnamālā |
babhau yadantar maṇivaḥ munīndraḥ sa Kuṇḍakundōdita
caṇḍa-daṇḍaḥ ||
abhūd Umāsvāti-muniḥ pavitrē vaṃśē tādīyē sakal ārthavēdī |
sūtrīkṛitaṃ yēna jina-praṇītaṃ śāstrārtha-jātaṃ munipuṅgavēna ||
sa praṇī-saṃrakṣaṇa-sāvadhānō babhāra yōgi kīla ḡṛiddhapakṣān |
tadā prabhṛity ēva budhā yamāhur ācārya-śabdōttara
Ṛddhraphiñchaṃ ||
tasmād abhūd yōgi-kula-pradīpō Balākapiñchaḥ sa tapō
maharddhīḥ |*

(Incidentally, an inscription of 1154 A.D. Yelladahalli enlists Ṛddhraphiñchācārya 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 aforementioned 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 Ḡṛddhrapiṅccha either.⁸ Incidentally, the *Malliṣēṇa-prasasti* 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 Ḡṛddhrapiṅcchācārya 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 inscriptional 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 'Ḡṛddhrapiṅccha' 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 *aśēṣa-padārtha-vēdī*, knower of total "entity-

7. *Tattvārtha-sūtra-karttāram Umāsvāti-muniśvaraṃ / Śrutakēvali-dēśiyaṃ vandē 'haṃ guṇamandiram //*

It may be noted in passing that the *Nandiguruvāvalī* (c. 13th-14th centuries A.D.) also ascribes the *Tattvārtha-sūtra* to Umāsvāti, but does not address him as *Śrutakēvali-dēśiya* :

Tattvārtha-sūtra-kartṛtva prakāṭikṛita-sanmanāḥ / Umāsvāti padācāryō mithyātva-timirāṃsumān //

8. *Tattvārtha-sūtra-kartṛugaḷ enisid Āryadēvar...*

9. *Epigraphia Carnatica* II, 1973 : 51, Ins. No. 77 (67). *Ācāryavaryō yatir-Āryadēvō rāddhānta-karttā dhriyatām...* *Rāddhānta* means *siddhānta* or doctrine. The *Tattvārtha-sūtra* embodies the doctrine of the Nirgrantha in *sūtra* style

10. Though he may perhaps have flourished in Southern India, we virtually know nothing about him. (A Nirgrantha ascetic 'Āryadēva' figures in the inscriptions of Tamilnāḍu; 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 Dēvanandī (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. Dēvanandī, 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.¹¹ The next commentator on the *Tattvārtha-sūtra*, Bhaṭṭa Akalaṅkadēva, in his *Tattvārtha-vārttika* (c. 730-750 A.D.), is likewise silent over the authorship of the *Sūtra*. It was Svāmi Virasēna of the Pañcastūpānvaya who, in his famous *Dhavalā-ṭikā* (comp¹ted 816 A.D.) on the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* of Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali (c. 500 A.D.),¹² while quoting from the *Tattvārtha-sūtra*, for the first time names "Gr̥dhrapicchācārya" 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 upalipsur viviktē parama-ramyē bhavyasata-viśrāmāspadē kvacid āsramapadē muni-pariṣaṇ madhyē saṇniṣaṇṇaṇi mūrttam iva mōkṣamārgam a vāgvisargaṇ vapuṣā nirūpayantaṇ yukty āgama-kuśalaṇ parahita-pratipādanaika-kāryam ārya-niṣēvyam nirgranthācāryavaryam-upasadya savinayam pariprcchati sma | Bhagavan, kiṇ nu khalu ātmanē hitam syād iti | sa āha mōkṣa iti | sa ēva punaḥ pratyāha kiṇ svarūpō (a)au mōkṣaḥ kaśc āsya prāpty upāya iti | ācārya āha-niravaśeṣa-nirākṛta-karma-mala-kalaṅkasya śarīrasy ātmanō acintya svābhāvik ājñānādi-guṇam avyābādha-sukham ātyantikam avasthāntaram mōkṣa iti |* (Phoolchandra 1944: text p.1).

12. The editor of the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, 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 *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*" 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 Ḡṛddhāpicchācārya (Kailāshchandra 1945, Part 2: 231).¹⁴ His contemporary, the famous Kannada poet Pampa, too, in his *Ādipurāṇa* (Kannaḍa, 941 A.D.), mentions Ḡṛddhāpicchācārya.¹⁵ And Vādirāja of the Drāviḍa Saṃgha, in his *Pārśvanāthacarita* (1025 A.D.), offers salutation to 'Ḡṛddhāpiccha' whom Kailāshchandra (1945:231) takes as the author of the *Tattvārtha-sūtra*.¹⁶ Kailāshchandra (1945: 232) also notices some Jayasēna mentioning 'Ḡṛddhāpicchācārya', 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 'Umāsvāmī' in lieu of 'Umāsvātī' :

*Tattvārtha-sūtra kartāraṃ Ḡṛddhāpicchōpalakṣitam |
vandē gaṇindira-saṃjātam Umāsvāmī-muniśvaram ||*

However, as shown by Mukhtar (1956: 106-108), this altered appellation for Umāsvātī for the first time figures in the *Tattvārtha-vṛtti* 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 *Nitisāra* (of Indranandī: late 10 century A.D.) where the author of the *Tattvārtha-sūtra* is referred to as 'Svāmī':

*Tattvārtha-sūtra-vyākhyātā Svāmīti paripaṭhyatē
(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.

14. *etēna Ḡṛddhāpicchācārya-paryanta muni-sūtrēṇa vyabhicāritā nirastā.*

15. A.N. Upadhye, in his "Introduction" to the *The Varāṅgacarita of Jaṭā-Siṃhanandī*, gives the following citation there on p. 15:
*Āryanuta-Ḡṛddhāpicchācārya Jaṭācārya viśruta-kīrtiyā |
cārya purassaramapp ācārya paraṃpareyaṃ
kuḍugaṃ bhavyōtsavamaṃ || I-12.*

16. Verse 16, quoted in Kailāshchandra 1945:231.

*atuccha-guṇa-sampātāṃ Ḡṛddhāpicchaṃ natō 'smi taṃ |
pakṣīkurvanti yaṃ bhavyā nirvāṇāyōtpatiṣṭhavaḥ ||*

references to the *Tattvārtha-sūtra* and its author,¹⁷ the following facts unambiguously emerge :

1. Dēvanandī as well as Akalaṅkadēva, 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 aforementioned four authors, instead, specify Ṛddhpiccha (either directly or inferentially) as the author of the *Tattvārtha-sūtra*. However, Ṛddhpiccha 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 Akalaṅkadēva, 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 Ṛddhpicchācārya 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 Akalaṅkadēva'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 'Ṛddhpicchācārya'? 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 cognomenic appellation 'Ṛddhpicchācārya' 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 Yāpanīyas 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 Ḡṛddhāpiccha but to Āryadēva, thus coming in conflict with the notices of Virasēna, Vidyānanda, Pampa, 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 'Ḡṛddhāpicchācārya' 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 'Ḡṛddhāpicchācārya'? 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* Ḡṛddhāpiccha'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 Yāpanīya writing (since the term *śruta-kēvali-dēśiya* it uses it typically of Yāpanīya 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 Kaṛṇāṭa. At the same time, that couplet does not equate Umāsvāti with Ḡṛddhāpicch-ācārya. (Like the Śvētāmbara 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 Ḡṛddhāpicchācārya (of the Digambara coinage) as seen in some fairly late manuscripts of the *Tattvārtha-sūtra* which also render Umāsvāti as 'Umāsvāmī' as noticed in the foregoing pages (Kailāshchandra 1945: 227). Incidentally, the *Bhāṣya* was known both to Dēvanandī (Premi 1956) as well as to Akalaṅkadēva (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 Nirgrantha tradition, as earlier observed, no inscription so far known mentions Umāsvāti. 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 Umāsvāti sometimes figures. The earliest such reference is by Jinadatta Sūri of Kharatara-gaccha in his *Gaṇadhara-sārdhā-śataka* (c. very early years of the 12th cent. A.D.);¹⁸ next, the *Prasamarati-prakarana-ṭikā* of Haribhadra sūri (1129 A.D.),¹⁹ the *Amamasvāmi-carita* of Muniratna Sūri of Pūrṇimā-gaccha (1169 A.D.)²⁰ and finally the *Kalpaprādīpa* of Jinaprabha Sūri of Kharatara-gaccha (1333 A.D.)²¹ which reverentially remembers Umāsvāti among the great pontiffs of the Śvētāmbara 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

18. Ch. Gandhi 1967: 93.

*pasamaraipamuha payaraṇa paṁcasayā sakkayā kayā jēhim /
puvvagayavāyagāṇaṁ tesim Umāsāi nāmāṇaṁ //*

19. Cf. Deshai 1933: 101.

*prasamasthēna yēnēyaṁ kṛtā vairāgya-paddhatī /
tasmai vācakamukhyāya namō bhūtārtha-bhāṣiṇē //*

20. Deshai (1933) quotes the following opening verse from the *Vṛiti* :

*Umāsvātēr vācakasya vācaḥ kasya na cētasi /
dhvanamty adyāpi ghaṇṭāvat tāraṇkāra sundarāḥ //*

21. Jina Vijaya 1934:69, *Pāṭaliputrakalpa*.

*Umāsvāti-vācakaś ca Kaubhiṣaṇi-gōtraḥ pañcaśatasamskṛta-prakarana
prasiddhas tatraiva Tattvārthādhigamam 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 *Prasamarati-prakaraṇa* and the *Kṣētrasamāsa* (alternative title, the *Jāmbūdvīpa-samāsa*). Gandhahasti Siddhasēna, in his *Tattvārthādhigama-vṛtti* (c. 760-770 A.D.), refers to Umāsvāti's another work, the *Śauca-prakaraṇa*,²² now unavailable. Also unavailable is his *Śrāvaka-prajñapti*. 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.²³

On the *Sa-bhāṣya Tattvārthādhigama-sūtra* of Umāsvāti, Yākinisūnu 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 Kōṭyācārya (in his commentary, c. 700-725 A.D.) on the *Vīṣeṣa Āvaśyaka-bhāṣya* of Jinabhadraṅgaṇi Kṣamāśramaṇa, c. 585 A.D., also Kōṭṭārya vādi ṅaṇi (in his commentary, c. 700 A.D., which is a supplementary extension for completing the incomplete auto-commentary of Jinabhadra), and Siṃhaśūra 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 *cūṃi*-commentaries on the *āgamas* which were composed between c. 650-700 A.D., quote from the *Sūtra*. Among the still earlier such works, the *Āvaśyaka-cūṃi* (c. 600-650 A.D.), which plausibly was composed a few decades before Dēvanandī'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.

23. Kapadia collected several such quotations and grouped them into the *Tattvārthādhigama-sūtra*, pt. I, chaps. I.V., Bombay 1926, "Introduction (in Sanskrit)", pp. 20-22. Some of these definitely reflect Umāsvāti's style.

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 *Agastyaśiṃha* (c. 575-600 A.D.) (see *Punya Vijaya*, 1973: 85) on the *Daśavaikālika-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 :

*sarvāsrava-dvāra-pratyapāya-darśanārthaṃ bhagavad
Omāsvātnābhīhitaṃ
“hiṃsādiṣṭhāmūtra cāpāyāvadya darśanaṃ”*
[Tattvā 7.4],

“*duḥkham ēva vā*” [Tattvā 7.5],

“*vyādhipratīkāravāt kaṇḍūparigatavaccābrahma...*”

[Tattvā 7.5 Sūtrabhāṣyē],

“*parigrahēṣvaprāptanaṣṭeṣu kāṅkṣā-śōkau prāptēsu
ca rakṣaṇam upabhōgē cāpyatṛptih*”

[Tattvā 7.5 Sūtrabhāṣyē]

Although he does not mention Umāsvāti or the *Tattvārthādhigama-sūtra* and its *Bhāṣya*, the great Śvetāmbara dialectician, *Mallavādi Kṣamāśramaṇa*, the author contemporaneous to *Agastyaśiṃha*,²⁴ quotes a phrase, *yathārthābhīdhānaṃ śabdaḥ*, (*Jambuvijaya* 1976: 596) which is a definition of the term *śabda* 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 *Tattvārthādhigama-sūtra* as well as its *Bhāṣya* and possibly also with the *Prāsamārati-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 *Tattvārthādhigama-sūtra* (as well as its *Bhāṣya*) is of course the *grantha-prāśasti* 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 *Dvātriṃśikā* 19 which is an echo of the sūtra 1 of the *Tattvārthādhigama-sūtra*; and the opening verse of his *Dvātriṃśikā* 20 which reflects awareness of the *kārikā* 204 of the *Prāsamārati-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-mukhyasya Śivaśrīyaḥ prakāsa-yaśasaḥ praśiṣyēṇa |
śiṣyēṇa Ghoṣanandi-kṣamaṇasy aikādaśāṅga-vidah | | 1 | | Āryā
vācanayā ca mahāvācaka kṣamaṇa Muṇḍapādaśiṣyasya |
śiṣyēṇa vācakācārya Mūlanāmnah prathita-kirtēḥ | | 2 | |
Nyagrōdhikā-prasūtēna viharatā puravarē Kusuma-nāmnī |
Kaubhīṣaṇinā Svāti-tanayēna Vātsi-sutēn ārghyam | | 3 | |
Arhad-vacanaṃ samyag gurukramēn āgataṃ samupadhārya |
duḥkhārtam ca durāgama-vihatamatim lōkam avalōkya | | 4 | |
idam Uccairnāgara-vācakēna sattvānukampayā dṛbdham |
Tattvārthādhigamākhyam spaṣṭam Umāsvatīnā sāstraṃ | | 5 | |

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 Kaubhīṣaṇī clan (*gōtra*) (and) son of Svāti and of Vātsi, grand disciple of the illustrious chief preceptor (*vācaka-mukhya*) Śivaśrī and disciple of *kṣamaṇa* Ghōṣanandi; he, who received his knowledge of the holy scripture (*vācanā*) from Mūla, the disciple of *mahāvācaka* Muṇḍapāda: 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 (*spaṣṭam*, i.e. with the commentary) (this *Tattvārthādhigama-śāstra* 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 *Prāsamārati-prakarāṇa* 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 '*kṣapanaka*' 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 *Sūtra*-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 Siddhasēnagaṇi and Haribhadra Sūri in the eighth century could not have ascribed the *Sūtra* 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 *Tattvārthādhigama-Sūtra* 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 *Daśavaikālika-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 *Sūtra* was ascribed by the relevant writers to 'Gr̥ddhapicchācārya' 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 aforementioned Sravana Belagola inscription of 1115 A.D. for the first time equates 'Gr̥ddhapicchācārya' 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 'Gr̥ddhapicchācārya' at all. Indeed the many works beginning from the late sixth to the 12th centuries, which mention the author or cite from the *Sūtra* as an authority, irrespective of whether they specifically noted Umāsvāti or not, provide not a single instance of an allusion there to 'Gr̥ddhapicchācārya' (or to Āryadēva either). There was neither ambiguity nor were conflicting claims about the name of the author of the *Tattvārthādhigama-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 Umāsvāti-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 *Yāpanīya* (Premi 1956 1956; Upadhye 1971). Alternatively according to some, the *Sūtra* was composed by a *Yāpanīya* 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 *Uccairnāgara-śākhā*, to which he belonged, was not a filiate of the Southern (Digambara) Church, nor of the *Yāpanīya Saṃgha*. 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 *Uccairnāgara-śākhā*, as met with particularly in the *Bhāṣya*, apparently had differed at places from the *āgamas* of the *Vajri-śākhā* 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 *caityavāsī* or abbatial sect and for long had so continued to remain a sect.

the Śvētāmbara 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 Ḡṛddhapiñcha 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 Nāgābhinandanam* volume, I noticed to have missed a reference to a specific mention by the Yāpaniya pontiff Pālayakīrti Śakaṭāyana in his grammar; therein, he refers to the ten (chapters) of Umāsvāti (*dasakā Umāsvātiyā*) and thereby to the *Tattvārthādhigama Sūtra*. (Cf. *Śakaṭāyana-Vyākaraṇa*, ed. by Pt. Sambhunātha Tripāṭhī, BJMJG, Skt. series no-39, New Delhi 1944, II, 4; 182). Śakaṭāyana may have been the source from which the composer of the Śravana-Belagola inscription of A.D. 1115 got and included this specific information.

References

- | | | |
|----------------------|------|---|
| Bronkhurst, Johannes | 1985 | On the Chronology of the Tattvārtha-sūtra and some early commentaries, <i>Archiv Für Indische Philosophie, Wiener Zeitschrift Für Die Kunde Südasiens, Sonderdruck Aus Band XXIX</i> , 155-184. |
| Dhaky, M.A. | 1990 | The Jaina “Jinendrabuddhi” and incidental questions, <i>Indian History and Epigraphy</i> , Dr. G.S. Gai Felicitation Volume, Delhi: 152-158. |
| Dhaky, M.A. | 1991 | The Date of Kundakundācārya in M.A. Dhaky & Sagarmal Jain (eds.), |

Aspects of Jainology, Vol. III, Pt. Dalsukhbhai Malvania Felicitation Volume I, Varanasi, pp. 187-206.

- Deshai, Mohanlal
Dalichand 1933 *Jaina Sāhityano Saṃkṣipta Itihāsa*. (Gujarati), Bombay.
- Dixit, K.K. 1971 *Jaina Ontology*, LDS No. 31, Ahmedabad.
- Folkert, Kendall, W. 1980 *Jain Religious Life at Mathura : The Heritage of Late Victorian Interpretation*, (cyclostyled paper), read at the Seminar "Mathura : The Cultural Heritage," held in Mathura.
- Gandhi, L.B. (ed.) 1967 *The Three Apabhraṃśa Works of Jinadatta Sūri with commentaries*, G.O.S. No. 37 (reprint), Baroda.
- Ghatage, A.M. 1935 *The Text of the Tattvārthādhigama-Sūtrāṇi*, *Journal of the University of Bombay*, 4 (Nov. 1935).
- Gopal, B.R. 1973 "Introduction" in *Epigraphia Carnatica*, Vol. II, Mysore.
- Jagadish chandra Jain 1939 *Tattvārthādhigama bhāṣya aur Akalaṅka* (Hindi), *Anekānta* 3/4, V.N.S. 2066.
- Jambuvijaya, Muni (ed.) 1966 *Dvādaśāranayacakram*, (with introduction in Sanskrit), Bhavanagar.
1976 *Ibid.*, Part II.
- Jina Vijaya (ed.) 1934 *Vividhatīrthakalpa*, SJS Vol. X, Santiniketan.
- Jitendra B. Shah n.d. "Mallavādi-no Samaya", to be published in the *Nirgrantha*. Ahmedabad (in press).
- Kailāsh chandra Shastri 1945 *Jaina Sāhitya kā Itihāsa*, (Hindi), second part. Varanasi V.N. 2502.
- Kapadia, Hiralal (ed.) 1926 *Tattvārthādhigama-sūtra*, (with Introduction in Sanskrit) Part I, Bombay.
- Mukhtar, Jugalkishore 1956 *Umāsvāti yā Umāsvāmī ?*, *Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihāsa par Viśada Prakāśa* (Hindi), Calcutta, pp. 106-108.
- Ohira, Suzuko 1982 *A Study of Tattvārtha-sūtra with*

- Bhāṣya*, LDS No. 86, Ahmedabad.
- Patoriya, Kusum 1988 *Yāpanīya aur Unkā Sāhitya*, (Hindi) Varanasi.
- Phoolchandra, 1971 *Sarvārthasiddhi*, Delhi-Varanasi.
Siddhantashastri Pandit (ed.)
- Premi, Nathooram 1956 *Umāsvātikā Sabhāṣya Tattvārtha, Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihāsa*, (Hindi), Bombay.
- Punyavijaya, Muni (ed.) 1973 *Dasavekāliyasuttam*, Ahmedabad.
Sanghvi, Sukhlal 1929- *Tattvārtha-sūtra*, First edition, 30 Ahmedabad.
- Settar, S. 1986 *Inviting Death*, Dharwad.
- Upadhye, A.N. (ed.) 1971 *Siddhasena's Nyāyāvatāra and other Works*, Bombay.
- Vijayamurti, Pandit 1953 *Jaina-Śīlālekhasaṅgraha*, Part II, Bombay (V.S. 2009).
1957 *Ibid.* Part III (V.S. 2013).
- Williams, R. 1963 *Jaina Yoga*, London Oriental Series, Vol. 14, London.
- Zydenbos, Robert J. 1983 *Mokṣa in Jainism according to Umāsvāti*, Wiesbaden.*

* This is a revised version of the author's previous article.

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 Yakṣi 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 Acharya 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 Padmāvati.

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 Acharya 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 Acharya returned to the temple bringing back with him eight idols from the nearby Shiv Mandir which was also installed in the temple.

Shri Kulpak Tirtha Pratishthā 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 Tirthankara 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 'pīḍa' in the 'dhyāna' pose—placing both palms on the lap. A 'prabhā' with tongues of flames is seen raised above the shoulders of the 'Jina'. Above the head, a 'tricakra' has been beautifully chiselled but has been damaged by the ravages of time. The face of the 'Jina' is square. A long raised pillow supports the 'Jina'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 Śrīmad Vijaya Kalapūrṇa Śrī Sūrīśwaraji 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 navkarsi had organised from May 13 to 24. The main idol measuring 41 inches is of Sri Sambavanatha Bhagavān, the 3rd Tīrthaṅkara. Twelve more idols will be installed in the temple, which has been built on two levels.

Ācārya Śrīmad Kalpūrṇa Suriswaraji Mahārāj performed the Anjansalaka and Prathista mahotsava. The Anjansalaka depicting the various facets of life of the Tīrthaṅkaras 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 Tīrthaṅkara), 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 Ajantan or post-Ajantan 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 *ardhamanḍapa* 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 'sallekhanam 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 Kudavayil Balasubramaniam, 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 Tirthaṅkaras of the present age in Jainism. The first Tirthaṅkara is Ṛṣabhadeva, who is mentioned in all the Jaina Purāṇas as well as in the Ṛgveda. Bharata, son of Ṛṣabha, was the first Cakravartī 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 Chattarī. 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 Pāthśāla 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—

1. *Jambūdvīpa Parīśilana* (Hindi), Dig. Jaina Institute of Cosmographic Research, Hastinapur, 1982.
2. *Mahāvīrācārya—Ek Samikṣātmaka Adhyayana* (Hindi), Co-author Prof. Suresh Chandra Agrawal, D.J.I.C.R., Hastinapur, 1985.
3. *Philosopher Mathematicians* (English), Co-author Prof. L.C. Jain, D.J.I.C.R., Hstinapur, 1985.

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 Jñānapīṭha (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 ‘*Garita Bhārati*’, 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 Jainācāryās*’ 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 'Śrutāsri' by Upādhyāya Muni Sri Jñānasāgara Ji at Saharanpur.

Dr (Mrs) Padma Vathamma.

BOYD SMITHS PVT. LTD.

**B-3/5 GILLANDER HOUSE
8 NETAJI SUBHAS ROAD
CALCUTTA-700 001**

**PHONE : 220 8105/2139,
RESI : 244 0629/0319**

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