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Up to the period of the niryuktis (c. A.D. 525\textsuperscript{1}), the Śvetāmbara Jaina canon noticed only seven nihnavas (heretics), each of whom had differed on one singular point from, or one aspect or interpretation of, one or the other early doctrine of the Nirgrantha religion\textsuperscript{2}. Partly basing his exposition on the immediately preceding, rather succinct, exegetical notices and partly on the then current elucidatory traditions on such and similar old records, Jinabhadra gāṇi kṣamāśramaṇa in the Viśeṣāvāśyaka-bhāṣya (c. A.D. 585\textsuperscript{3}), presents an historical as well as quasi-historical account of these traditional seven, plus an additional or the eighth heretic, Śivabhūti. While the preceding more ancient seven nihnavas ultimately had been proven inconsequential, the eighth one,—the heresiarch Śivabhūti,—by his separation from the main ecclesiastical stream, brought about a major schism which eventually grew into a definite, viable, and an important sect with a school of thinking and practice that was branded "Boṭika drṣṭi (Boḍīa diṭṭhi)" by the post-āgamic Śvetāmbara commentators.

The term "Boṭika" ("Boḍiya" or "Boḍīyaṇa" in Jaina Mahārāṣṭrī and "Bodiga" or "Boḍiā" in late Ardha-Māgadhī) has been taken to mean "Digambara" by current Śvetāmbara writers,\textsuperscript{4} a misinterpretation that has been perpetrated presumably from the time of the late medieval Śvetāmbara writings onward, and had of late attracted unwarranted attacks on Jinabhadra gāṇi kṣamāśramaṇa by some pundits of the Digambara sect who did not suspect that the interpretation of the term and hence the ascription of the sect was wrong\textsuperscript{5}. Indeed, Walther Schubring was aware that the term did not originally imply the way it was later thought to be.\textsuperscript{6} Schubring, however, suggested no alternative interpretation. It was Muni Jambuvijaya who made a right guess that the appellation "Boṭika" had meant 'Yāpaniya'.\textsuperscript{7}

Let it at the outset be clarified that, before Jinabhadra gāṇi, the term "Boḍiya" is mentioned in the Bāṣya (c. A.D. 550-575) on the Āvāṣyaka-sūtra;\textsuperscript{8} the bhāṣya-gāthā, moreover, reports the date of the origination of "Boḍiya diṭṭhi" to be V. N. S. 609/A.D. 132\textsuperscript{9}. The still earlier Mūla-bhāṣya (c. A.D. 550) briefly alludes to a question asked by Śivabhūti to Ārya Kṛṣṇa at Rathavirapura (the place of schism, unidentified, perhaps somewhere in M. P. or U. P.,\textsuperscript{10}) which
apparently was a prelude to the discussion between the two pontiffs which ultimately led to the schisms (as the commentators including Jinabhadra gaṇi report). The latter gāthā also figures in the Uttarādhyayana-nirṇyukti (c. A. D. 525) 11. The gāthā, as found in the mūlabhāṣya of the Āvaśyaka-sūtra, may have been taken from the Uttarādhyayana-nirṇyukti or, equally, it may have drifted to the selfsame nirṇyukti from the mūlabhāṣya. At any rate the gāthā in question is not posterior to c. A. D. 550. The Nirṇyuktis do sometimes briefly allude occasionally with one word or a few catch words, to the anecdotes purporting to some historical events or happenings besides legends, parables, etc., which are not long afterwards commented upon by the Prākṛta bhāṣyas and the cūrṇis and next by the Saṁskṛta vṛttis in fuller perspective. At the same time, there are instances where the Nirṇyukti-gāthās are partly (or wholly and sometimes inextricably) mixed up with those of bhāṣyas12. At any rate, the mūla-bhāṣya on the Āvaśyaka which alludes to Śivabhūti, is definitely anterior to the Viśeṣ = Āvaśyaka-bhāṣya. (This exonerates Jinabhadra gaṇi !)

Posterior to the Viśeṣ = Āvaśyaka-bhāṣya, the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi (c. A. D. 600-650), while explaining the relevant older bhāṣya-gāthās, narrates the Śivabhūti episode at some length, and, at one other place, classes the monks of the five sects, —the Ājivaka, Tāpasa, Parivrājaka, Tatkaśānika (Buddhist), and ‘Boṭiya’—as avandya, unworthy of paying obeisance.13 A verse, plausibly an interpolation, in the Ogha-nirṇyukti (main text c. early 6th cent. A. D.) interprets a visual encounter on one's way with a Cakracala14, Pāṇḍuraṅga (Śvaitē monk) and Boṭika as auguring unpropitious, the worst of them all being Boṭika, meeting whom would consequence in death15 ! This interpolation, however, could be of a date as early as the seventh or the eighth century; for contempt toward the Boṭika is also noticeable in the Sūtra-kṛṣṭa-cūrṇi (c. last quarter of the 7th cent. A. D.)16, and what is more, still earlier in the cūrṇi by Agastyasimha on the Daśavaikālikā-sūtra (c. A.D. 650)17. Incidentally, Bāṇa-bhaṭṭa, in the Harṣa-carita (c. early 7th cent., A. D.), explicitly refers to an episode of visual encounter of a nāgṇāṭaka to prince Harṣavardhana at one place and prince’s looked upon as inauspicious, even prognosticative of death18 ! It is then clear that, aside from the Śvetāmbaras, the brahmanists of the period also believed that the visual confrontation with a nude Jaina monk (kṣapana) is unpropitious.

Among the early literary notices on Boṭika, the last is perhaps by Haribhadra sūri. In his Boṭika-pratiśedha19 which may perhaps be the same as his Boṭikā-nirṇāsa20 also gives the characteristics of Boṭika21 not applicable to the Digambara but to the Yāpaniya sect.22

None of these sources, however, define or explain what ‘Boṭikā’ means. The term may mean “polluted” or “corrupt”. The verb ‘boṭavun’ in the current
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Gujarāti means ‘to pollute’. The Sārtha Gujarāti Joḍapikoṣa\textsuperscript{23} derives the word from the deśya ‘boṭṭa’\textsuperscript{24} whereas the Prākṛta is “Boṭiā” and not “Boṭṭiā”. So Professor Harivallabhb Bhayan suggested another current Gujarāti word “boḍavun” to shave as a source-word and “Boṭiā” and its Sanskritized form “Boṭika” simply meaning “shaven” or by extension, nude.\textsuperscript{25}

But the meaning of the term glossed above does not go far in explaining the characteristic features and doctrinal positions of the Boṭika sect. A statement in the Ācārāṇga-cūrṇi (c. late 3rd quarter of the 7th cent. A. D.), cited by Muni Jambuvijaya, somewhat illumines the problem.\textsuperscript{26} According to this commentary, the Boḍiyas are those whose only possession is their body (śarira-parigrahā)\textsuperscript{27} meaning thereby that the Boṭika monks practised nudity, and they received in and ate food from their folded palms (pāṇi-puṭa-bhojī), which, by implication, meant the rejection of begging bowl, the use of which the monastic practice of the proto-Śvetāmbara friars allowed. However, the definition of the term Boṭika, if this feature alone is considered, can equally apply to the Digambara monks. That the Čurni’s succinct but pointed description applies to the friars of the Yāpaniya order is clear from the Yāpaniya work Ārādhana of Śivārya (c. 6th cent. A. D.), the author specifically declaring himself to be ‘pāṇi-tala-bhoji’.\textsuperscript{28} The early Yāpaniyas, it seems, were particular in stressing this specific feature of their practice since the Northern Yāpaniya monks, unlike their Digambara counterpart, often bore the epithet ‘ārya’ (as in Śivārya’s lineage) or vācaka, kṣamāśramaṇa, etc. as their early Gupta inscriptions (c. A. D. 370) from Vidiśā would tend to suggest.\textsuperscript{29} There the friar concerned is expressly called “pāṇi-pāṭrika”, the one who uses palms as bowl. The Yāpaniyas and the Digambaras shared two monastic features in common; strict nudity, and almost absolute non-possession for friars. But the Yāpaniyas recognized the same early āgamas which are the part of the Śvetāmbara canon; and hence there was no doctrinal difference between the Śvetāmbaras and the Yāpaniyas unlike Digambaras and these two sects.

However, the secessionist Śivabhūti, the originator of the Yāpaniya sect, was not Digambara but Śvetāmbara. Śvetāmbaras for long did not know about the existence of the Digambara sect and their different doctrinal views. Hence by the term Boṭika they could not have meant Digambara but Yāpaniya. According to the earlier part of the Sthavirāvali (hagiological list) of the Paryuṣaṇa-kalpa,\textsuperscript{30} he was the disciple of Ārya Dhanagiri and grand disciple of Ārya Phalgumitra in the line of the illustrious of Ārya Vajra; and, according to the later additional part (c. A. D. 503/516)\textsuperscript{31} of the selfsame sthavirāvali, Śivabhūti had a confrère Ajja Kaṇha, Ārya Kṛṣṇa.\textsuperscript{32} There is, however, no hint there about Śivabhūti’s secession from the main stream. In point of fact, his disciple—Ārya Śaṇḍila—onwards the line of pontiffs continues till it ends with Ārya Śaṇḍila (or Skandila) who had presided over the Mathurā Synod (c. A. D. 363):
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(Ārya Kṛṣṇa (ob. before K. E. 95)

Ārya Bhadra

Ārya Śaṇḍila (or Skandila)

(c. A. D. 363)

From the sthavirāvalī it is clear that Ārya Śivabhūti was a senior confrere of Ārya Kṛṣṇa as against the impression carried in Jinabhadra gaṇi’s narration, which makes Ārya Kṛṣṇa “guru” and Śivabhūti “śiṣya”, a mistake in fact had been made by the earlier bhāṣya. Significantly, while the Śvetāmbara commentators denigrate Śivabhūti, the Digambara Jaina work Bhāvapāhuḍa (Bhāvaprābhṛta, c. late 8th cent. A.D. or later),³³ ascribed to Kundakundācārya, extolls Śivabhūti for his bhāvaviśuddhi by tusa-bhāṣa.³⁴ Since no Digambara pontiff with the appellation of Śivabhūti is known, it is very likely that Bhāvapāhuḍa’s Śivabhūti is probably identical with the separatist Śivabhūti of the Śvetāmbara sources, who was most welcome to the Digambara sect since he had insisted on nudity and absolute non-possession.

As for the date of Ārya Śivabhūti, since he is fifth after Ārya Vajra (c. 1st cent. A.D.) in the succession list, he may be ascribed to c. 2nd-3rd cent. A. D. The Mathurā Śilāpatṭa (stone plaque) dated to the 95th year of the Kuśāṇa Era very reverentially depicts “Kaṇha samana (Kṛṣṇa Śramaṇa or Ārya Kṛṣṇa)”.³⁶ The date of the śilāpatṭa in terms of Christian Era variously can be A.D. 200-205, or 223, or 238, depending on the year from which the Era of Kaniṣka is reckoned or
computed. In any case, the traditional date of V.N.S. 609/A.D. 132 for the Boṭika schism given by the bhāsyā and maintained by Jinabhadra gaṇi does not seem accurate.

The Mathurā kilāpaṭṭa of Ārya Kṛṣṇa represents the guru-mūrti, and the presence inside the depiction of Nāgarāja shows that some years had already elapsed after the demise of the pontiff Ārya Kṛṣṇa. Under the circumstances, the Śivabhūti schism ultimately may have taken place some time late in the last quarter of the second century A.D. at the latest.

We may note, in passing, the date given by Devasena in his Darśanasāra for the origination of the Yāpaniya sect: According to which it was founded by Śrikalaśa, a Śvetāmbara pontiff, in V.S. 675 (A.D. 619), or, as the alternate reading says, in V.S. 205/A.D. 159, at Kalyāṇa. Kalyāṇa was the capital of the Cālukyas from the days of Āhavamalla Someśvara I who was enthroned in A.D. 1044. Nothing, however, is known from the historical records about that town before the days of the Cālukyas. And the date, at least A.D. 619 is much farther afield from the truth. Devasena for certain was in darkness about the origin of the Yāpaniya sect. For all sects (excepting for his own), he not only conjures up an historical wrong perspective but, the worst of all, a highly sectarian and venomous standpoint also of which Śrutasāgara (15th cent. A.D.) and Ratnandandi (16th-17th cent. A.D.) were heirs. There are no parallels in pre-medieval Śvetāmbara literature to the writings of the last two authors.

Notes and References

1. The available niryuktis have been ascribed by late Muni Puṇyatīvaśaya to (the so-called) Bhadrabāhu II, brother of the astronomer Varahmihira (c. early 6th cent. A.D.), according to the Jaina writers of the Solaṇki period. While the existence of Bhadrabāhu II cannot be proven, nor is there any real ground to so suppose, the niryuktis can of course be ascribed to c. A.D. 525, or inside years not long after the Yalabhi Synod II (c. A.D. 503/516), with the qualification that they partly draw on the one hand from the floating samgrahaṇis compiled between the third and the fifth century A.D., and on the other hand also contain verses which may have been interpolated between the sixth and the eighth century A.D.

2. The Sthānāṅga-sūtra (c. 3rd quarter of the 4th cent. A.D.), the Aupapātika-sūtra (c. 3rd cent. A.D.), and the Āvaśyaka-niryukti (c. A.D. 525) in particular take notice of the seven nihnavas. The subsequent exegesis elaborate upon the original succinctly stated information in the aforesaid works.
3. Jinabhadra gaṇi kṣamāśramana apparently had passed away in c. A.D. 594. He had written the commentary in Sanskrit on his Viśeṣ-Āvaśyakabhāṣya which he had left unfinished before death. Also the Viśesāṅavaṭi and the Jitakalpabhāṣya were compiled before the Viśeṣ-Āvaśyakabhāṣya. So the plausible date of composition of the Viśeṣ-Āvaśyakabhāṣya could be c. A.D. 585 or at most a few years later on average computation.

4. This is the stock view reflected in most of the current Śvetāmbara Jaina writings. The writers were under double delusion in that they mistook the Yāpaniya like the Ārādhana of Śivārya (c. 5th-6th cent. A.D.) and the Mūlacāra of Vaṭṭakare (c. 6th-7th cent. A.D.) as of Digambara affiliation (as did most, and still do many, Digambara writers themselves despite late A.N. Upadhye as well as late Pt. Nathuram Premi’s investigations). The current historical investigations on the major early schisms in the Nirgrantha Church had, therefore, gone completely astray, the conclusions reached were absolutely erroneous, and all these writings have only served to mislead both old and new generations of scholars including Western and the Japanese. For the latest, among those who took “Boṭika” as “Digambara”, cf. Jagadish Chandra Jain and Mohanlal Mehta, Jaina Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihāsa (Hindi), Pt. 2, Varanasi 1966, p. 205.

5. One other factor that arose their anger was Jinabhadra’s defence on the āgamic position of the sequential occurrence of perception and cognition for omniscient.

6. The Doctrines of the Jainas, first edition, reprint, Delhi 1978, p. 50: “The Śvetāmbara report (Av. nijj 418 a) on the heresy committed by Boṭiya Śivabhūti in the year 609 after MV, who wanted the Jina-kappa (Jina-kalpa) to be made generally acknowledged and who himself accepted it notwithstanding the warnings of his guru. Originally, however, this was nothing to do with the Digambaras and was related to them only later”.


8. The first of these verses gives the date of the Boṭika schism at Rathavirapur and the next verse ascribes it to Boṭika Śivabhūti the Heretic, and reports that this heresy came into being at Rathavirapur. In the next verses figure a hint as to a dialogue between Śivabhūti and Ārya Kṛṣṇa at Rathavirapur and to Kauṇḍinya and Koṭṭivira, two supporters and disciples of Śivaonati.
It seems that all four verses apparently are quotes from the earlier bhāṣya-commentaries. The last two at least have been called “bhāṣya-gāthās” or “śaṅgraha-gāthās” by commentators. The basic verses are followed by a long narrative by Jinabhadra gaṇi (up to vs. 3093) on how it all eventualized.

9. Cf. above vs. 3032. The A.D. conversion is based on Harmann Jacobi’s reckoning B.C. 477 as the year of Vīra-nirvāṇa.

10. This is just a guess; it may not be right.


12. For instance the niryakti and the bhāṣya of the Brhat-kalpa sūtra and of the Niśthā-sūtra.

13. ति च, इति च पंच व बंदिलन्य समयन्द्रवि सति, जहाँ ज्ञाति तथा तथा तत्त्वाय तत्त्वाय चोड्या समया त्रिपलि त्रिपलि या इम्य साधनो बन्धित्वा, ते य ते अवतिष्ठे य य ततित्वे जे वि सतित्वे न प्रतिष्ठा-

मण्डलायन्ति ते वि पंच पास्यादी य बंदिलन्य ।

(For discussion, cf. Mohanlal Mehta, Jaina Sāhitya kā Brhad Itihāsa (Hindi), Pt. 3, Pārśvanātha Vidyāśrama Śodha Saṅsthānā, Varanasi 1967, p. 302.)

14. The meaning of the term is unclear to us. It may perhaps mean a monk of a sect whose practice was to progress circularly on his way.

15. For discussion see Jain & Mehta, Brhad., Pt. 2, p. 205.

16. “तत्त्वात्तिति अत्ति अत्तिति पंचेंद्र रोमाण, य य य स्वयं, संवत्ता भासन्ति परिभासति, अज्ञातक्रमाव: अन्याविकिति:, चुतं अष्टात्तोभासित्वं च कावण बोधिता ।

and:

ते इति अज्ञात्क्रमाव: बोधिते ये नौरनिमिश्यानिन: पालण्डः ।

also:

18
17. पूणे विशेषतः जिज्ञासुसूति, दोषिग विष्णुपदियसम्बंधीगृहः \[\text{(Ed. Muni Śrī Puṇyavijayaji, Sayagadaṅgasutta, Prakrit Text Society Series No. 19, Ahmedabad 1975, pp. 90, 92, and 219.)}\]

18. \textit{Cf.} Harṣacarita V; also see V. S. Agrawal, \textit{Harṣacarita: Eka Sāṃskṛti ka Adhyayana} (Hindi), Patna 1964, pp. 90. 109. Agrawal identifies the \textit{nagnātaka} of Bāna bhaṭṭa with Yāpaniya monk. Earlier than Bāna, in Viśākhadatta’s Saṃskṛta play, the \textit{Mudrārākṣa}, similar hateful attitude toward the \textit{kṣapātaka} (nude Jaina monk) is evinced as noted by Agrawal: (For the text, \textit{cf.} Kane, fifth edition, Motilal Banarasidas, Varanasi 1965, p. 20.)

19. As the name suggests, the work deals with the refutation of the Boṭhika (monastic) practices.

20. This is the view of Pt. Dalsukh Malvania he expressed during a discussion with the first author. We have not seen this work.

21. For details see in this volume the article in Hindi on this subject by Pt. Malvania.


25. During a personal discussion with the first author.

26. “आह—जह एवं अपबंधणुपुलच्छेदणच्छेदणद्वाराद्वादारातो परिमोहो सरीर भवति तेन जे हे सरीर भवति तेन जे इमे भवति तेन जे [\text{[5]]}परिमोहो सरीर भवति तेन जे हे सरीर भवति तेन जे [\text{[5]}]…”

27. \textit{Ibid.}


31. १८—वेरस्प म अज्ञातविरिस वासित्सुषुक्तस्य अज्ञातविरिस मुढे वेरे अतेवासी कुञ्जस्वदने।
   १९—वेरस्प म अज्ञातविषयुक्तस्य कुञ्जस्वदने अज्ञातविश्वे वेरे अतेवासी कामस्वदने।
   and:
   कन्ठाम गणपुमां च, गौयं मण्डिरिः ज वासित्तुः।
   कुञ्जर सिवभूमिः स्थिं, कौसिय दुष्कं जतं कहे॥१९॥

32. This goes against the *Āvaśyaka* literature’s statement that Ārya Śivabhūti was a disciple of Ārya Kṛṣṇa. The *Sihavirāvali* being about five centuries earlier, for is certainly more reliable on this point.


34. तुमांसं गोर्मानसं भाविस्वुद्वं महाभाषीयो यः।
   नामेण य तिष्ठमुः केवलज्ञानोऽविष्ठ जाजी॥—भावपादः ५३

35. *Cf.* Vincent A. Smith, *The Jain Stūpa and Other Antiquities of Mathurā,* Allahabad 1901, Plate XVII, Fig. 2.

36. It is now more or less certain that the Kuṣāṇa Era is not identical with the Śaka Era and hence did not commence in A.D. 78. The latest computation by G. V. Mitterwallner favours A. D. 143 for K. E. to begin.

37. It would be nearer the truth if the V. N. S. date is later than B. C. 477. Recent researches on the Buddha Nirvāṇa date favour a century later than the traditional B. C. 483. If this can be established, V. N. S., too, will come down by a century, in which case the Boṭika schism may have to be dated to c. A. D. 232. The Kanha-Samantapaṇḍita plaque of K. E. 95, on Mitterwallner reckoning, is to be dated to A. D. 238. (The latter two dates are close enough!)


39. कल्याणेऽवग्नाय नान्दे व उत्तरे जादे।
   नान्दे कल्याणेऽवग्नाय सत्त्ववादीयो हि स्वर्गवादी॥२९॥

40. For a rejoinder, *cf.* Muni Kalyanavijaya *Śramaṇa Bhagavāna Mahāvīra* (Hindi), Jadūr V. S. 1998 (A.D. 1948), pp. 307-318. Muni Kalyanavijaya, as most others had, confused Boṭika with the Digambaras, and to that extent (and also due to a few other historical errors) his rejoinder suffers.

41. The existence of the Digambara sect as such was unknown to the Śvetāmbaras, who otherwise knew Boṭika (Yāpaniya) against whom of course they were bitter. Since Yāpaniya sect had for long disappeared in North, the later Śvetāmbara writers confused “Boṭika” with “Digambara” because of the nāganya (nudity) and their being *pāṇi-tala-bhōjī* or using palms as a begging bowl.