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1. Sources

The particulars about the life of Jamāli, who was responsible for causing the first schism in the history of Jaina Church, are recounted mainly in the Vyākhya-prajñāapti or the Bhagavatī Sūtra, the fifth Aṅga of the Jaina canon. The frequent references to his name are found in other scriptures as well where the descriptions of certain events are almost identical with those of Jamāli as narrated in the Bhagavatī. Such references, firstly, point out the process through which a particular person comes to know about the arrival of a Tīrthaṅkara or an Ācārya in his home-town or a place nearby and gets ready for a visit in order to pay obeisance to him and after hearing the religious discourse resolves to enter the ascetic order on obtaining the consent of his parents. Secondly, they describe the order of grand procession, which is piloted through the principal streets and bazaars of the city with great eclat and show, on the auspicious occasion of one’s renunciation. According to the Sthānāṅga Sūtra, the Antakṛddāśā, the eighth Aṅga of the canon contained as its sixth chapter “The Chapter on Jamāli”, but unfortunately that is not extant. Exegetical literature on some scriptures, i.e., the Sthānāṅga, the Uttarādhyayana and the Āvasyaka, etc., also provides information about Jamāli.

It is remarkable that all references in regard to Jamāli are narrated only in Śvetāmbara literature. The scriptures accepted by the Digambara sect of Jainas have not mentioned his name anywhere. It was a natural corollary that the Digambara Ācāryas could not refer to him as nephew or son-in-law of Lord Mahāvīra; they did not believe that Mahāvīra had a sister or that he ever married. What an impartial student of Jaina literature fails to explain is that the name of Jamāli is not mentioned by the Digambara Ācāryas even as one of the disciples and fellow-workers of Mahāvīra who ended by opposing him.

1. Sataka 9, Uddeśaka 33.
2. Nandīsūtra 44.
3. a. Anuttaraupapātikadaśa section 3, Story of Dhaṇṇa.
   b. Niyāyavedi section 5, Chapter 1, Story of Prince Viranga.
4. Jñātādharmakathā part 1, Chapter 8, Story of Malli Kumārī.
5. Sūtra 755.
2. Birth-place, parents and family-circumstances

According to the Bhagavati, Jamali was an aristocratic and supremely gifted prince of Kṣatriya-kunḍagrāma, home-town of Lord Mahāvīra, situated in the western direction of Brāhmaṇa-kunḍagrāma. These towns lay not very far off from each other and were separated by Bahuśāla-caitya, which stood midway. Scholars differ in regard to the exact location of these towns and their proximity to Vaiśāli. It seems that they were either suburbs of Vaiśāli or were situated near this famous historical city, the capital of Videha.

Strangely the Bhagavati does not furnish any information regarding the names of Jamali’s parents, though it is they who took him to Mahāvīra and requested the Lord to initiate him into his fold, when they found that Jamali was very keen on executing his resolve of renouncing the worldly life. According to a commentary on the Kalpasūtra, Jamali was the son of ‘Pravara-narapati’. There is a belief that Jamali had the privilege of being the nephew (sister’s son) of Lord Mahāvīra. Now Mahāvīra had only one sister (of course, elder) named Sudarśanā. Hence it can be concluded that she was the mother of Jamali.

Jamali’s father was a person of great opulence and influence, who enjoyed deferential esteem and courteous regard from all quarters. One thousand healthy and handsome young men, all belonging to his family, offered their services at his command to carry the palanquin in which Jamali went to become the disciple of Lord Mahāvīra. He threw open his vast treasures on this auspicious occasion. The barber was rewarded with one lac of golden coins. Two lacs coins of gold were paid for a rajoharaṇa and a mendicant’s wooden bowl.

3. Early life and marriage

Born in a rich family and being the only son of his parents, Jamali had all chances and facilities for leading a luxurious life in a gay and jovial manner. The account in the Bhagavati evidently shows that he was blissfully ignorant of the vicissitudes of worldly life outside his lofty mansions. It is said that he used to keep himself steeped in mirth and joy.

1. ‘Vaiśāli’, pp. 20 to 26 (by Vijayendrasuri).
2. ‘Subodhika’, p. 89A (by Vinayavijaya).
3. a. Kalpalata commentary on Kalpasutra p. 121A (Samayasundra)
   b. Sthāṇāṅgavṛtti, p. 389B.
5. A cloth to wipe off dust, which is kept by Jaina monks as a symbolic accessory.
day and night. His methods of enjoyment varied from season to season. He took keen delight in thirty-two kinds of dramatic representations to the accompaniment of music and dances performed by beautiful women. Thus there appears to have been nothing extra-ordinary in his early career except that he was a rich, healthy, influential and clever prince, who was brought up in affluence and luxury.

Relying on purely canonical evidence, the marriage of Jamāli to the daughter of Mahāvīra seems to be of somewhat dubious character. It is obvious from the Bhagavatī that he had eight wives. All of them were young girls, born of noble families, refined, elegant, graceful and having practically identical complexion, age, appearance and beauty. But as regards their names and parentage, the account of the Bhagavatī is silent. There is not even a slight hint in this or any other canon, which may justify the general belief that Jamāli was the son-in-law of Mahāvīra. On the other hand, exegetical literature depicting Jamāli as nephew and son-in-law of Mahāvīra does not confirm the view of the Bhagavatī that he had more than one wife.

The Āgamic account concerning Jamāli's life is neither in accord nor in discord with the current belief, which represents him as nephew and son-in-law of Mahāvīra. The commentators of the Kalpasūtra, the Sthānāṅga, the Uttarādhyayana, the Viśeṣāvāsyaka, etc., are unanimous in regarding him as closely related to Mahāvīra. There is some confusion as regards the names of Mahāvīra's sister and daughter. The Acārāṅga (400) and the Kalpasūtra (109) name his sister as Sudarśanā and daughter as Anavadyāngī or Priyadarśanā. But in commentaries, we find the names Anavadyāngī or Jyeṣṭhā or even Sudarśanā.

Now the question arises how far we should regard the popular belief regarding worldly relation of Mahāvīra and Jamāli as authentic in the

1. Kalpalatā p. 121A: तता तद् सुवन्मुखी भगवत:स्वयंदर्शनानान्नी पुली जाता। सा मित्र-मामिनिययस्य जमाल: परिषाविता ।; p. 121B: मनवतो मामिनी सुदर्शना जमाल: माता।

2. Sthānāṅgavrīti p. 389B: तत्र जमालि: शाश्वकुमारी, यो हि अग्राश्व मनवतो महावीरस्य मामिनियो भवस्य: सुदर्शनार्थविनायका माता।

3. Commentary by Sāntyācārya p. 153B: तत्र स्मारिनो श्रेष्ठा मामिनी सुदर्शना नाम, तस्य: पुलो जमालि:; स स्मारिनो श्रेष्ठो विभवित: पक्षविवर्तित् समद तस्य च मार्य स्मारिनो दुहितासनवा नाम मात्र: द्वितीय नाम निपदर्शना।

4. शुद्धिको: [मरणसिंह इस्माबद] p. 935: तत्कथम: श्रीमहावीरस्य मामिनियो जमालिनीम राजपुत्रा आसीत्। तस्य च मानो श्रीममहावीरस्य दुहिता। तस्यांक आष्टेतित बा, सुदर्शनिति च अनन्यार्जाति च गमेति।
absence of any definite canonical evidence. The commentators rely on an old tradition (द्विन्दिनेत्र, त्रिधात्राक्ष). It is difficult to find out the source of this tradition. But one thing is obvious. If we accept the list of names of Mahāvira’s relatives as given in the Kalpasūtra and Ācārāṅga to be reliable, we should admit the accuracy of this tradition. This list bears testimony to the fact that Mahāvira was married, he had a daughter and a grand-daughter (daughter’s daughter) who was named Seṣavatī or Yaśovatī. Thus there is nothing to contradict that Priyadarśanā was married to Jamāli. The absence of any allusion in respect of this notable event in the canon seems to be a merely accidental one.

4. The hearing of Lord’s sermon

Jamāli was leading a life of ease and pleasure, when one day he heard a great commotion from his elevated palace. Curiosity arose in his mind. At once, he called his chamberlain (Kaṇeukan) and asked him to inquire into the matter. The chamberlain acquainted him with the actual state of the scene. The Venerable Omniscient Lord Mahāvira was staying in Bahuśāla caitya of Brāhmaṇa-kunḍagrāma. The people of different status and varying ages were rushing to that place to pay their respects to the Lord and hear his discourse.

Jamāli lost no time to make up his mind to visit the holy place. Having executed the formalities and preparations suitable for the occasion, Jamāli, accompanied by his friends and relatives, started towards the Bahuśāla caitya passing through the main roads of his town. Arriving at the spot, he solemnly circumambulated the Lord three times from the left to the right and bowing down saluted him.

He was profoundly impressed by the serenity and majesty of the Lord’s appearance. He heard the discourse patiently and felt an intuition that there was a true solution of the knotty problem of life. The sermon moved him deeply. He realized that it was time for him to renounce the worldly life. After the dispersal of the congregation, Jamāli approached the venerable Lord and manifested to him his desire to become a monk in the following words:

‘Revered Sir, I have verily the faith in the preachings of Nirgranthas (outwardly and inwardly unfettered), I trust those preachings, I like them and am prepared to mould my life according to them. They are indeed so as you have explained them. They are true, correct and devoid of all doubts. I have only to take permission of
my parents. After that I shall become the initiated disciple of you, the Venerable Lord and be a wandering monk instead of a householder.’

The Lord replied, ‘Do not interrupt it, if it please you, O Beloved of gods.’

5. Entering the order of Jaina Asceticism

Jamāli returned home with his thoughts definitely crystallized to the renunciation of worldly ties as the world seemed to him essentially a vale of misery. He greeted his parents and said, “I heard the religious discourse from Lord Mahāvīra. I am moved by it. Hence, my dear mother and father, I feel depressed with the miseries of earthly life. I am afraid of birth, old age and death. Therefore, I desire, with your kind permission to renounce household life and enter the ascetic one being properly initiated by Lord Mahāvīra.”

No sooner had his mother heard these words, than she fainted. It was with great effort on the part of Jamāli and her attendants that she regained consciousness. A long discussion then followed between Jamāli and his parents. They tried in vain to persuade their beloved and only son to desist from adopting the course of a houseless monk. They reminded him of his extreme and vigorous youth, riches, beautiful wives and all the means of worldly enjoyments, which were ever at his command. But a firm resolution could not be altered. He told his parents the fleeting and transitory nature of earthly goods. He explained to them his total abhorrence of worldly pleasures and their non-finality. His parents, then, tried to discourage Jamāli from his resolve by the intolerable hardships and severe sufferings one has to meet in course of a mendicant’s life. Even then, he was unmoved in his rocklike decision. He said that he was in search of undying bliss and wanted to escape from the never-ending cycle of births and deaths with all their concomitant experiences. Hence the privations of an ascetic life would not dissuade him from following the path he had chosen. The parents realized that they could not prevail upon Jamāli to lead the life of a householder. At last they yielded and gave their consent with great reluctance.

1. “समप्पन्न समस्तं महावीरस्तं अंतिकं भमे निसंते जाव अभिष्रयः, तद् गं वहं अम्मा-ताशो। संसार भयविवे भृते बम्बासारामर्तं ते हस्त्रामिं गं अम्मा-ताशो। तुम्मेहि अम्मुवशाद सम्रथे समप्पन्न समस्तं भम्मो महावीरस्तं अंतिकं सुंडे भवित्ता भगाराओ अण्णारिंयं अम्मश्रयः।”
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The preparations were made on a grand scale for Jamāli’s renunciation. The usual formalities were performed and Jamāli was taken to Lord Mahāvira. His parents bowed and saluted the Lord and said thus: ‘In this manner, Sir, the Kṣatriya prince Jamāli is verily our only son, beloved and charming. Whose mere name is scarce to be heard, how difficult is it to have a sight of him? Just as a lotus or a water lily sprouts in the mud, grows in the water but remains perfectly unsoiled with mud-dust or water-drops, in a similar manner, this Kṣatriya prince Jamāli is born and has been brought up in pleasures and sensual enjoyments. Even then, they have no power over him. Nor have friends, kinsmen and near and dear relatives any attraction for him. O You Beloved of gods, He is averse to these worldly objects and afraid of the pains of birth and death. He wishes, after having got himself shaved bald to get himself initiated before you. Therefore, we offer you this gift of him. Please accept, Beloved of gods, the gift of a disciple’.

The formal ceremonies were performed and Jamāli, together with five hundred young men, all in the heyday of their youth, entered the Holy Order. Munī Kalyāṇa Vijaya holds the view that the initiation of Jamāli took place during the second year of Mahāvira’s attainment of Infinite Knowledge, i.e. Omniscience (499-498 B. V.)

6. Ascetic Life

That was a time when asceticism was essentially combined with profound scholarship. The first and foremost duty of a young neophyte was, as usual, to study the eleven Āṅgas. Naturally Jamāli was instructed in these holy scriptures. In due course he attained a position of distinction and influence. Mahāvira then made him head of 500 monks and 1000 nuns who were under the supervision of Priyadarśanā, Jamāli’s wife in worldly relations who also accepted the life of a female ascetic when her husband had renounced the world. It seems that the high rank held by Jamāli was not on account of his exceptional learning but due to his influence on his fellow monks, who had a great regard for him during his household life. The statement that he studied the eleven holy scriptures appears to be a tentative one because he could not claim mastery over them as will be evident from the questions put to him when he was bent on being regarded as Kevalin.

For about ten years he remained with Lord Mahāvira. Definite

1. Śramaṇa Bhāṣavān Mahāvīra, p. 79.
account of his activities during this long period is available. The analysis of subsequent events confirms that he must have struggled hard to gain a high position among the Mahāvīra’s ascetics and even aspired to obtain the coveted rank of a Kevalin.

So far as the observation of rigid rules of ascetic life is concerned he followed a course of extreme self-discipline. From the very start he practised a rigorous form of austerity and used to fast until the fourth or sixth or eighth meal and onward, i.e. for one day or two days or three days and even more. Some times he gave up all food for a fortnight or even a month. Thus he wandered mortifying himself with peculiar penances and constraints. The excellence of his self-restraint and purity of conduct was made known to Gautama by Mahāvīra after Jamāli’s death. Gautama asked the Lord,¹ “Sir, did the houseless monk Jamāli take flavourless, tasteless, left-over, coarse, rough and inferior food? Did he live on such meals? Was he a man who had subdued his passions, lived peacefully and led a solitary as well as holy life?” “Yes, Gautama”, was the reply.

7. Severance of Jamāli from Mahāvīra

One day during the 12th year² i.e. 489-488 B. V. of Mahāvīra’s life as Kevalin, Jamāli approached the Lord and having praised him thus said, “I intend, Sir, being permitted by you to wander over various villages and towns together with five hundred monks.” On hearing this request, Lord Mahāvīra remained perfectly silent.³ The request was repeated for the second and even third time but it failed to bring out any tangible result. The commentator Abhaya Deva Sūri⁴ assumes that Mahāvīra’s silence on the request was due to his indifference to the proposal as it contained in itself the seeds of future disruption.

Then Jamāli, probably taking this silence as a form of approval,⁵

1. “जमाली पं मंते ! अग्नारे, अरसाहरे, विरसाहरे, अंताहरे, पंताहरे, बहाहरे, तुळ्ळाहरे, अरसानी, विरसानी, बाह्र तुळ्ळानी, बाह्रत्तानी, पसंतानी, विचितानी ?”
   “हंता गोयमा!”

2. Śramaṇa Bhavāvan Mahāvīra, p. 119.

3. तदं से समग्रं भगवान महावीरं जमालिस्त अग्नाशस्त्रं एकस्तु यो आदाय गोपरिजायं तुर्सिनितो संचित्नं


5. Malayagiri’s in his commentary on Āvaśyaka (p. 402) says that Jamali took permission of Mahāvīra. Sāntyācārya’s commentary on...उत्तराच्यादि (p. 153B) gives a similar account.
bowed down, saluted the Lord, left the Bahuśāla caitya and began to tour independently along with 500 ascetics.

After wandering from village to village for about a period of three years, he arrived on a certain day at a town Śrāvastī by name, and resorted to Kośṭhaka sanctuary of that place. It is here that an event, which proved to be a turning-point in his life took place. During his stay one day he took very tasteless, inferior, rough, stale and musty food which was brought after the time of taking meal was over, and was taken regardless of the quantity thereof. This resulted in his falling ill seriously. The disease took an acute form in no time and he felt that his whole body was burning due to bilious fever. He called his fellow monks and asked them to spread a bedding for him. They faithfully obeyed the order and engaged themselves with the work so that he might have a complete rest. But it could not be carried on expeditiously as he had wished and the severity of pain was increasing every moment. He called them again and said, "Has the bed been spread or is it being spread?" They replied, "O beloved of gods, it is not spread yet, but is being spread." Now doubt crept in Jamāli's mind. He said to himself, "Lord Mahāvīra has said and explained thus: what is moving is called 'moved', what is rising or maturing is known 'risen' or 'matured', what is partially destroyed is said to be 'partially destroyed', etc. This statement is false. It is obviously seen that so long as the bedding is being spread, it is not spoken of as spread. Hence how can the above doctrine of Lord Mahāvīra be said to be held true?" Then he gathered together other monks and proclaimed the falsity of Mahāvīra's preaching. Some of them expressed their faith in his conclusions, while others disliked it, and left his company and joined Lord Mahāvīra, who was at Pūrṇabhadra sanctuary of Campā City.

After some time, when Jamāli was completely cured of the disease, he also left Śrāvastī and wandering from village to village reached Campā. He kept himself standing neither near nor far from the Lord and spoke

1. सेवा संभारां में कि कहे कज्ज़र !
2. गो खड़ देवदुधिवार्यें सेवासंभारे कहे, कज्ज़र !
3. According to Śāntyācārya (p. 153B) reply was negative one as it is found in the Bhagavatī. But Acārya Malayagiri (commentary on Āvaśyaka, p. 402B), Abhayadeva (Śthānāṅgavṛtti, p. 390) and Maladhāri Hemacandra (Videśavāsyaka Vṛtti, p. 936) held that the monks replied that the bed was stretched although it was as yet being stretched or was only half-stretched.
thus, “I do not abide like a ‘Chadmastha’ (a person possessing imperfect knowledge i.e. who has not gained omniscience) as many of your ‘Chadmastha’ houseless disciples do. I do tourings like an ‘Arhat’ or ‘Jina’ or ‘Kevalin’ who has attained infinite knowledge and infinite intuition’. It shows that Jamāli, in emulation of other Kevalins, had an ambition to be venerated as Kevalin. But for lack of ability and profound scholarship, his ambition could not be fulfilled. On his bold assertion, Gautama said to him, “If you regard yourself as Kevalin, please answer two questions: (i) Is the world eternal or non-eternal? (ii) Is the soul eternal or non-eternal?” Jamāli was perplexed and could not reply. Mahāvīra said to him, “O Jamāli, many of my monk-disciples are in a state of ‘Chadmastha’; Even then, like me, they are capable of answering these questions. But they do not speak in the terms you have just spoken i.e. I am ‘Jina’ or ‘Kevalin’.” Mahāvīra, then, explained to Jamāli the nature of the world and the soul in answer to these questions. Thus, it was known that many other monks in the Holy Order were more advanced in their studies and knowledge than Jamāli.

Jamāli listened to Mahāvīra but could not repose faith in him. He left again, leading the life of an ascetic for a number of years. He misled himself and others by expounding a false doctrine under the influence of wrong belief. But he failed totally to gather followers and all his fellow-monks deserted him. Observing a fortnight’s ‘fast unto death’ (‘samlekhana’), he emaciated his body and died without expiating his sins. Then, he was born in Lāntaka heaven as a ‘low inferior god’ (Kilbiṣīka god).2

After his death, Gautama asked Lord Mahāvīra some questions regarding Jamāli and the Kilbiṣīka gods. One of the questions was: ‘Where would Jamāli be born after completing his duration of life as a god in the heaven?’ The Lord said, ‘O Gautama, having wandered for four or five cycles of births and deaths in sub-human, human, heavenly and hellish lives, he would become ‘Emancipated’ and thus end all misery.’

The commentators on the Bhagavati raise an interesting question2 and

1. “किसिंद्रिक अंतस्वस्तानीया:” तत्त्वार्थमन्य 4.4. Haribhadra says in his commentary on this Bhāṣya: “अन्तस्वस्त: चतुरात्रयः.”

2. अव श्रीवीरेण सत्त्ववषस्तुदुः तद्यथातिकर्ष आनतापि किसिंद्रिरी प्रभाजितः? उक्ताते अवबधश्वभक्षार्नां महानुभूममापिन्यमोहांविनिम्नक्षयस्वादं हत्मेव वा गुणविशेषद्रव्यादु भगवतोडद्रोद्वते न निध्यवृद्धजनं किसिंद्रु प्रभृतितः हति। Bhagavati-sūtra-वृत्तिः by Dānāśekhara Sūri, p. 164 A.
try to answer it. 'Why was he (Jamâli) initiated by Lord Mahâvîra, who knew beforehand the future events as he was in possession of infinite knowledge?' In answer to this question, they state that even great persons are probably unable to turn the course of events, which are destined to take place. Or, the Lord regarded it, i.e., initiation of Jamâli, advantageous in a way. The Venerable Tirthaṅkaras never engage in frivolous activities.

8. The significance of the controversy between Mahâvîra & Jamâli

According to the Bhagavatî, having bid farewell for ever to Lord Mahâvîra, Jamâli preached many wrong tenets on account of his wrong faith. However, we do not come across any other adverse view except one stated before. The one and only controversial point between them as related in the canons was that Mahâvîra believed in the theory of 'क्रे माणे क्रे' while Jamâli pinned his faith in 'क्रे क्रे'. Naturally, one may ask why did a unique personality like Lord Mahâvîra, regarded Omniscient, patient, a man of unequalled calm and of a quiet nature, the foremost expounder of the doctrine of Non-Absolution, oppose Jamâli on such an apparently insignificant matter and thus allow the monastic order to be split into two, may be for a short period only? Did it not behove Mahâvîra to ignore the opposition of Jamâli and let him go his own way? Or, did the Lord consider Jamâli's view detrimental to the holy order and the common people? Can the outstanding difference between them be cemented? These problems have been elaborately dealt with by the renowned scholar Pt. Sukhlalji, in one of his articles¹ and we may briefly note here his views on these points.

Lord Mahâvîra judged every thing from a Non-Absolutistic view. He said that the knowledge of an object remained incomplete or imperfect unless it was gained from various standpoints relative to one another. This principle should be applied to metaphysical or philosophical theories as well as to the everyday problems one has to face in life. Broadly we can divide the various standpoints about a particular thing into two—empirical or practical, transcendental or real. The former is based on direct experience while the latter on indirect one. The former contains variety of experience and the latter has unity of experience. The empirical standpoint takes into account the distinction lying between ends and means but the transcendental one makes no such distinction. Before we

proceed to form our opinion about any principle or action, we must keep in mind both of these standpoints. The process of understanding the true nature of an object or an activity is possible only if we follow the practical without ignoring even for a moment the real. This is the background which made Mahāvira oppose Jamāli.

Mahāvira knew well that human nature in general lacks patience and perseverance. Every individual has a keen desire to have speedy and maximum result with the minimum of labour. It is not also unoften that a man is just near the point of enjoying the fruit of his labour when all of a sudden he comes across an obstacle or difficulty and being disappointed gives up the undertaking. He attributes the responsibility of his failure to extreme causes without having any idea of his own drawbacks like impatience and lack of sufficient effort, needed for the purpose. Many social and political activities remain only half-done owing to this significant fact about human nature.

Having in view the above datum, Mahāvira proclaimed that an action whose process has been set on roll can be said to have been done from one standpoint. When our effort continues, it goes on achieving its end to the proportion in which it stands as accomplished. The result in view as a whole is attainable at the end of a long and continuous effort. But the amount of labour put in during the whole process cannot be regarded in vain as each and every part of that labour had its own role to play and the final result is nothing but the sum total of all those individual parts. If this fundamental truth is ignored no attempt either in spiritual matters or in worldly dealings can be carried on efficiently and steadily. Mahāvira's doctrine inspires a man to proceed on his way and not to regard the utter futility of his effort or activity however slight it may be in quantity.1 It promises him fruition of his undertaking at every step. It discourages him from running away from the responsibility thinking that the obstructions or a long period of time would defeat his purpose and not allow him to taste the sweet fruit of his arduous labour. He feels satisfaction at every moment during the performance of a particular action that he has been crowned with success so far.

1. नेत्रभणितमनाशोषरित प्रत्यावयी न विचारे। स्वभावस्मर्यमय्य व्रज्जयस्म जायते महतो मया।। The Bhagawatgītā II. 40. "In this path, no effort is ever lost and no obstacle prevails; even a little of this righteousness saves from great fear." Sir S. Radhakrishnan explains it in the following words:—"No step is lost, every moment is a gain. Every effort in the struggle will be counted as a merit." p. 118.
That is why the Lord preached the doctrine of ‘कोण गमणे करे’. It means that an action which is still going on or is not completed yet or whose final result seems to be far off, can be said to have been done or completed or to have attained its objective. It does not recognize any difference between the act and its result. The result or fruit is not same thing which is quite apart from the effort and is gained at the last moment of it but the whole series of an action from the commencement to the end is its fruit. Jamāli on the other hand held the theory of ‘करे करे’. He meant thereby that the activity which is still going on cannot in any respect be said to have been completed unless its final result becomes obvious. The effort and the result are not identical but are altogether different. The long process of an effort as a whole is a means to an end which is attainable only at the last moment.

It can be seen that Mahāvīra could reconcile Jamāli’s view from a practical point of view. But Jamāli refused to accept the transcendental standpoint underlying Mahāvīra’s preaching and emphasised only the practical one. Deeper speculation and greater insight shows that Mahāvīra was justified in disowning Jamāli’s absolute stand on the point as it was unfit for, perhaps even dangerous to, ordinary human minds who were apt to meet failures in their lives had they put their faith in Jamāli’s propaganda.

9. **Ultimate Fate of Bahuratavāda**

Jamāli and his followers called Bahuratāḥ (आवरताः निःनिः 779; रहस्त: निःनिः 165). The reason for this is that they believed that an object which happens to be produced takes a long time before it is completed. According to them a thing is not produced the very first moment to which the activity is attributed, but it requires many moments for its completion and production.

Jamāli failed to attract any adherents to his new school and in the long run he was the solitary votary of his doctrine. But in the beginning many a monk put his trust in him. Particularly Sudarśanā or Priyadarśanā, Jamāli’s wife and Mahāvīra’s daughter in worldly relations, with her one thousand nuns could not keep apart from him and even used to induce others to adhere to the teachings of Jamāli.

At the time of the rift she was staying at the house of the Jaina layman Dhaṅka, a potter by caste. She tried to convince him of the signific-
ance of Behuratavāda. But he was a man of firm conviction. He hit upon a plan to reconvert the dissenters to the True Path.

One day she was engaged in her usual studies and Dhaṅka was busy with his professional work. Suddenly he took a burning coal from his kiln and threw it upon her upper garment with the result that a small portion of it caught fire. She at once said, “O layman votary! You have burnt my upper garment.” (Viśeṣāvaśyaka Bhāṣya 2324). He gave a quick reply, “The proposition, what is burning is burnt, is against your doctrine.”

A minor discussion followed but the dialectics of Dhaṅka had the desirable effect upon her and others who were still under the influence of Jamāli. All of them uttered with one voice, “Oh noble man, we intend to follow your exhortation which is full of truth.” Then they headed by Dhaṅka came to the Lord and rejoined him. Thus Jamāli was left all alone and died without any follower.

The Jaina philosophical school remained intact.