

RISHIBHASHIT : A STUDY

(AN EXAMINATION OF A 2400 YEARS OLD PHILOSOPHICAL TEXT
AND COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE THOUGHTS OF VEDIC,
BUDDHIST AND JAIN THINKERS OF THAT AGE)

Dr. Sagarmal Jain

PRAKRIT BHARTI ACADEMY, JAIPUR
SHRI JAIN SWE. NAKODA PARSWANATH
TEERTH, MEWANAGAR.
PARSHWANATH VIDYASHRAM SHODH
SANSTHAN, VARANASI.

RISHIBHASHIT : A STUDY

(A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE PERIOD AND VIEWS OF VEDIC,
BUDDHIST, AND JAIN THINKERS DETAILED IN A 2400 YEARS
OLD PHILOSOPHICAL WORK)



By

Dr. Sagarmal Jain



Editor

Mahopadhyay Vinay Sagar



Translated into English by
Surendra Bothara

नम्र सूचन

इस ग्रन्थ के अभ्यास का कार्य पूर्ण होते ही नियत
समयावधि में शीघ्र वापस करने की कृपा करें.
जिससे अन्य वाचकगण इसका उपयोग कर सकें.

Publishers :

- PRAKRIT BHARTI ACADEMY, JAIPUR.
- SHRI JAIN SWE. NAKODA PARSHWANATH TEERTH,
MEWANAGAR.
- PARSHWANATH VIDYASHRAM SHODH SANSTHAN,
VARANASI,

Publisher :

D. R. Mehta,
Secretary,
Prakrit Bharti Academy,
3826, Yati Shyamlalji Ka Upasara,
Rasta Mott Singh Bhomian,
Jaipur-302003

•

Parasmal Bhansali,

President, S. J. S. Nakoda Parshwanath Teerth,
P. O. Mewanagar,
St. Balotra-344025 (Raj.)

•

Bhupendra Nath Jain,

Secretary,
Parshwanath Vidyashram Shodh Sansthan,
I. T. I. Road,
Varanasi-221005

First Edition : October, 1988

□

Price : Rs. 30/-

□

© All rights with the Publisher

□

Printed at :

Popular Printers,
Nawab Saheb Ki Haweli,
Tripolia, Jaipur.

RISHIBHASHIT : A STUDY/Philosophy.
Dr. Sagarmal jain/1988

Publisher's Note

Rishibhashit Sutra has been published as the 46th Book of Prakrit Bharti. It is worth mentioning that this ancient work provides a unique example of assimilation and goodwill within its contents. According to scholars, Rishibhashit was written about 2400 years ago when the first Shrut-skandha of Acharanga was also written. This is probably the first work, not only in Jain but Indian literature, where Rishis and Shramans of all the three traditions, Vedic, Buddhist, and Jain, have been revered without any discrimination. Generally, in every tradition such works are full of critical and derogatory references. But this unique work is an unprecedented amalgam of the principles of the promoter Acharyas of various schools of philosophical thought. In the prevailing chaotic disintegration all around, where absolutism (intolerance) is getting prominence over non-absolutism (tolerance), such assimilation is worth emulating.

Dr. Sagarmal Jain had accepted our request to write the preface to this book. During the writing, he felt it necessary that the preface to such work should be more elaborate and should include a comparative study of the Rishis detailed therein. And so he completed this assignment in a scholarly explorative style.

This book, written as preface to Rishibhashit Sutra, is of immense value for researchers/readers and as such we are pleased to present two independent editions of this book; one in Hindi and the other in English.

We are thankful to Shri Surendra Bothara for the English translation which is as close to the original as possible in a language in which many of the concepts and terms are almost alien. Thanks are also due to Popular Printers for the printing.

Bhupendra Nath Jain

Secretary

Parshwanath Vidyashram
Shodh Sansthan, Varanasi

Parasmal Bhansali

President

S.J.S. Nakoda Parshwanath Teerth
Mewanagar

D. R. Mehta

Secretary

Prakrit Bharti Academy
Jaipur

CONTENTS

Publishers note.

The Place of Rishibhashit in Jain Literature.	1- 2
Style and Period of Rishibhashit	2- 5
The Writing of Rishibhashit.	5- 6
The seperation of Rishibhashit from Prashnavyakaran.	6
Why the Rishis of Rishibhashit were called Pratyek Buddha.	6- 7
Rishibhashit and Principles of Jainism.	7- 9
Question of authenticity of Concepts preached in Rishibhashit	10-12
The historic background of Rishis of Rishibhashit	12-13
The period and tradition of sages of Rishibhashit.	14-15
1. Dev Narad	15-18
2. Vajjiputta (Vatsiputra)	18-21
3. Asit Deval	21-23
4. Angiras Bhardwaj	23-25
5. Pushpshalputra	25-26
6. Valkalchiri	27
7. Kummaputta	28
8. Ketaliputta	29
9. Mahakashyap	29-30
10. Tetaliiputra	30-32
11. Mankhaliputta	32-34
12. Jannavakka (Yajnavalkya)	34-35
13. Meteija Bhayali	35-36
14. Bahuk	36-38
15. Madhurayan	38-39
16. Shauryayana (Soriyayana)	39-40
17. Vidur	40-41
18. Varishena Krishna	42
19. Ariyayan	43

20. Utkat (Bhautikwadi)	43-45
21. Gathapatiputra Tarun	45-46
22. Gardabhal (Dagbhal)	46-48
23. Ramaputta	48-49
24. Harigiri	49-50
25. Ambad Parivrajak	51-52
26. Maatang	52-53
27. Varattaka	53-54
28. Aardrak	54-55
29. Vardhaman	55-57
30. Vayu	57-58
31. Parshwa	58-60
32. Ping	60-62
33. Mahashalputra Arun	62-63
34. Rishigiri	63-64
35. Uddalak	64-65
36. Narayan (Tarayan)	65-66
37. Srigiri	66-67
38. Sariputra (Satiputra)	67-69
39. Sanjay	69-71
40. Dvaipayan (Devayan)	71-72
41. Indranag (Indanag)	72-73
42	
to	
45. Soma, Yama, Varun, and Vaishraman	73-74
Rishibhashit Niryukti and Rishimandal	74-79
The Language of Rishibhashit	80-82
Conclusion	82
Acknowledgements	82-83
Appendix	84-96



RISHI-BHASHIT : A STUDY

RISHI-BHASHIT : A STUDY

The Place of Rishibhashit in Jain Literature :

Rishibhashit is one of the oldest works in *Ardhamagadhi* Jain canonical literature. Under the accepted system of classification of Jain canons, this is classified as *Prakeernaka* (anthology). The *Digambar* tradition has 12 *Angas* & 14 *Angabahyas*, but Rishibhashit is not included in them. The *Terapanthi* and *Sthanakvasi* sects of the *Swetambar* tradition also do not include Rishibhashit in the 32 *Agamas* they recognise. The idol worshiping sect of the *Swetambar* tradition recognises 45 *Agamas* including 11 *Angas*, 12 *Upangas*, 6 *Chhedsutras*, 4 *Moolsutras*, 2 *Chulikasutras* and 10 *Prakeernakas*; Rishibhashita is not included even in these 10 *Prakeernakas*. However, it is included in the list of *Kaliksutras* mentioned in *Nandisutra* and *Pakkhisutra*.¹ The *Angabahya* works listed in *Tattvarthabhashya* of Acharya Umaswati first mention six works including *Samayik* and then *Dashvaikalika*, *Uttaradhyayan*, *Dasha (Achardasha)*, *Kalp*, *Vyavahar*, *Nisheeth* and Rishibhashit². Haribhadra in the *Vritti* of *Avashyak Nirukti* mentions Rishibhashit once with *Uttaradhyayan*³ and at another place with an anthology titled *Devinduthuya*.⁴ The reason for this confusion may be that besides Rishibhashit Haribhadra also came across *Rishimandal Stava* which gets a mention in *Acharanga churni*. His intension must have been to connect Rishibhashit, *Uttaradhyayan*, and *Rishimandal Stava* with *Devinduthuya*. It should be noted that *Rishimandal* not only mentions many of the *Rishis* (ascetics) of Rishibhashit but also refers to chapters and contents therein. This indicates that the author of *Rishimandal* must have been aware of and had studied Rishibhashit. The similarity between these two works is so much that with a little variation in sequence and names almost all *Rishis* of Rishibhashit can be found in *Rishimandal*. The mention of *Rishimandal* in *Acharanga churni* (Isinama-kittanam Isimandalatthan, page 374) conclusively establishes that it predates *Acharanga churni* (7th century A. D.). Scholars should give a serious thought to this fact. It is believed that *Rishimandal* was written by

Note : For foot-notes please refer to the foot notes of original Hindi text,

Dharmaghosh Suri of *Tapagachchha* sect, but I have my doubts as his period is 14th century A. D. In fact, the language and style of *Rishimandal* indicates that it is an ancient work and its author had studied Rishibhashit. In the course of studies of canons for mendicants prescribed by *Acharya Jinaprabh* in his work *Vidhimargprabha* the list of anthologies to be studied has been concluded with the mention of Rishibhashit.⁵ As such, according to the accepted system of classification, Rishibhashit can be classified as an anthological work.

In the ancient Jain tradition it was recognised as an important work. In *Aavashyak Nirukti* Bhadrabahu has expressed his intent to write a *Niryukti* on Rishibhashit.⁶ As no such work is available today, it is difficult to surmise if it was written at all. Of course, *Rishimandal*, which finds a mention in *Acharanga churni*, certainly appears to be a connected work. All this goes to prove that upto a certain period Rishibhashit must have been an important work in Jain tradition. *Sthanang* refers to it as a part of *Prashnavyakarandasha*.⁷ *Samvayang* has mentioned about its fortyfour chapters.⁸ As already mentioned, *Nandisutra*, *Pakkhisutra* etc. include it in the classification *Kaliksutra*. *Aavashyak Nirukti* classifies it as a work of *Dharmakathanuyog*.

Style and Period of Rishibhashit :

According to its language, style, and subject matter this is an extremely old work among the Jain canonical works of *Ardhamagadhi* language. I consider this work being of a period slightly later than that of first Shrutaskandha of *Acharanga* but earlier than that of other ancient works like *Sutrakritang*, *Uttaradhyayan*, and *Dashvaikalika*. Even its present form can under no circumstances be dated later than 3rd or 4th century B.C. As per the information available in *Sthanang* this work was originally a part of *Prashnavyakarandasha*; the ten *Dashas* described in *Sthanang* include Rishibhashit also. *Samvayang* informs that this contains 44 Chapters. As such Rishibhashit certainly pre-dates these works. In *Sutrakritang* there is a mention of ascetics like *Nami*, *Bahuk*, *Ramaputta*, *Asit Deval*, *Dvaipayan*, and *Parashar* as also little indications about their ritual beliefs. They have been addressed as ascetics and great men. These ancient *Rishis* have been recognised by *Sutrakritang*, an exposition by *Arhat*. All these *Rishis* attained liberation inspite of their consumption of seeds and water⁹.

This gives rise to the question as to which work predating *Sutrakritang* has accepted these people in the exalted position ? In my opinion only Rishibhashit is such a work. The term 'Iha-sammata', from

the verse in *Sutrakritang*, appears to be referring to the antiquity of Rishibhashit rather than *Sutrakritang* itself. It should be noted that in both *Sutrakritang* as well as *Rishibhashit*, many Rishis of traditions other than Jain, e.g. Asit Deval, Bahuk etc., have found a revered mention. Although these two are mainly in verse, from the viewpoint of language first *Shrutaskandha* of *Sutrakritang* appears to be of a later period. This is because the language of *Sutrakritang* is nearer to *Maharashtri Prakrit* whereas that of *Rishibhashit* is ancient *Ardhamagadhi*, leaving aside a few later changes. Also, *Sutrakritang* has criticised the thinkers of other traditions but *Rishibhashit* has eulogised them.

This is a firmly established fact that this work was created prior to the institutionalisation of Jain religion and social organisation. Study of this work explicitly indicates that at the time of its writing Jain organisation was completely free of sectarian bias. *Mankhali Goshalak* and his philosophy find mention in Jain canons like *Sutrakritang*¹⁰, *Bhagvati*¹¹, and *Upasakdashang*¹² and Buddhist works like *Suttanipata*, *Deeghnikaya (Sammanjafalasutta)*¹³. Although there is no specific mention of *Mankhali Goshalak* in *Sutrakritang*, *Niyativad* has been commented upon in its chapter titled *Aardrak*. Analysing from the view point of development of sectarian feelings, the portion of *Bhagvati* dealing with *Mankhali Goshalak* clearly appears to be of later period than even *Sutrakritang* and *Upasakdashang*. These two works as well as many works of Pali Tripitaka mention the *Niyativad* of *Mankhali Goshalak* and then counter it. Still, unlike Jain Canonical works, the *Suttanipata* has recognised the influential personality and value of the works of *Mankhali Goshalak* by including his name in the list of six Teerthankaras contemporary to Buddha¹⁴. *Rishibhashit* has gone a step further and eulogised him as Arhat Rishi.

As such from the viewpoint of religious tolerance, the period of *Rishibhashit* is earlier than that of Pali-Tripitak. This is because the growth of sectarianism sets in only after a religion becomes properly organised. *Rishibhashit* indicates that it had been written much earlier than the beginning of sectarianism in the Jain tradition. Except the first *Shrutaskandha* of *Acharanga* all the other Jain canonical works reflect sectarian views in varying degrees. This proves that, leaving aside first *Shrutaskandha* of *Acharanga*, *Rishibhashit* is the oldest of all Jain canonical works. Even the language and style indicate it to be a work of a period some-where between first *Shrutaskandha* of *Acharanga* and first *Shrutaskandha* of *Sutrakritang*.

The oldest work of Buddhist *Tripitak* literature is *Suttanipata*¹⁵, but even that is not as tolerant as Rishibhashit. The *Tripitak* literature refers to some of the *Rishis* of Rishibhashit, namely—*Narad*¹⁶, *Asit Deva*¹⁷, *Ping*,¹⁸ *Mankhaliputta*¹⁹, *Sanjaya (Velatthiputta)*²⁰, *Vardhaman (Nigganth Naataputra)*²¹, *Kumaputta*²² etc; but they have been considered at a lower level than Buddha. In other words these Buddhist works were also not free of sectarian bias, and as such they should be of a later period.

Many excerpts of the chapters in Rishibhashit are found, with similarity in content, language, and composition, in *Sutrakritang*, *Uttaradhyayan*, and *Dashvaikalik* of Jain tradition and *Suttanipata* and *Dhammapada* of Buddhist tradition. As such in terms of style of these works Rishibhashit proves to be of an earlier period. It may be argued that the ideas and verses may have gone from Buddhist *Tripitak* literature and Jain *Uttaradhyayan* and *Dashvaikalik* to Rishibhashit. But this is not true because the language and style of Rishibhashit is older as compared to that of these works; also it is much nearer to the language and style of the first *Shrutaskandhas of Acharanga* and *Sutrakritang*, and *Suttanipata*. Moreover, Rishibhashit has mentioned the ideas as general principles propagated by different *Rishis*, but Buddhist *Tripitak* literature and later Jain works have tried to include these ideas as belonging to their own respective traditions. For example philosophical cultivation has been dealt with in Rishibhashit²³ twice and once in *Suttanipata*²⁴. Whereas in *Suttanipata* Buddha says that he does this type of philosophical cultivation, in Rishibhashit the *Rishi* says that whoever does this type of cultivation gets liberated irrespective of his cast and creed. Thus Rishibhashit is conclusively proved to be of an earlier period than that of Jain or Buddhist works except first *Shrutaskandha of Acharanga*.

Considering from the view point of language we find that Rishibhashit has, to a larger extent, maintained the most ancient form of *Ardhamagadhi Prakrit*. For example in Rishibhashit *Atma* has been mentioned as *Ata* but in Jain *Anga* literature *Atta*, *Appa*, *Aada*, *Aaya*, and other words have been used which are variations belonging to later periods. The free use of the consonant *Ta* conclusively puts this work in an earlier period than *Uttaradhyayan* as in *Uttaradhyayan* there is a tendency of avoiding this consonant. Rishibhashit also abundantly uses word-forms like, *Janati*, *Paritappati*, *Gachchhati*, *Vijjati*, *Vattati*, *Pavattati*. This also confirms the antiquity of this work in context to both, subject and language.

The story of the serpent of *Agandhan* clan is found in *Uttara-*

*dhyayan*²⁵, *Dashvaikalik*²⁶ as well as Rishibhashit²⁷. But examining all the three, it becomes evident that its mention in Rishibhashit is much older than the other two. Reason being that in Rishibhashit it has been quoted just as an example so that the mendicant does not stray from his path; but in *Dashvaikalik* and *Uttaradhyayan* it has been included as an incident in the life of Rajimati and Rathnemi.

As such Rishibhashit is older than *Suttanipata*, *Uttaradhyayan* and *Dashvaikalik*. That means it is of a period later than that of first *Shrutaskandha* of *Acharanga* but an earlier work than all other *Ardhamagadhi* canonical literature. Also being earlier to *Suttanipat* it becomes earlier to all *Pali Tripitak*.

As regards deciding its period on the basis of the historical *Rishis* mentioned in Rishibhashit, besides *Vajjiyaputta* all other *Rishis* were either contemporary to Mahavir and Buddha or earlier to them. According to *Pali Tripitak* *Vajjiyaputta* was also a young contemporary of Buddha; he was nearer to Anand in age. The *Vajjiyaputtiya* sect also came into existence within a hundred years of Buddha's *Nirvana*, which establishes that he was a young contemporary of Buddha. Accordingly, from historical viewpoint Rishibhashit must have been written in the first century after *Nirvana* of Buddha or Mahavir; later changes in the text cannot be ruled out. In my opinion the period of its writing is not earlier than fifth century B. C. and certainly not later than third century B. C. I have not come across any evidence, within and outside the text, that may point toward its writing being outside this period.

From the angle of philosophical developments we find that it does not contain the finely developed forms of Jain or Buddhist principles. Only five fundamentals and eight *Karma* have been mentioned. It is also possible that these concepts were popular with the followers of Parshwa and trickled into Mahavir's tradition from there only. Concepts like *Parishah* and *Kashaya* are certainly ancient. Even the expositions of *Vatsiyaputra*, *Mahakashyap*, *Sariputra* and other Buddhist *Rishi*, in Rishibhashit also contain the ancient Buddhist principles like *Santativad*, *Kshanikvad* only. As such, from Buddhist angle also, Rishibhashit is older than *Pali Tripitak*.

The Writing of Rishibhasit :

Regarding the creation of Rishibhasit, Prof. Schubring and other scholars maintain that it must have been originally written in the tradition of Parshwa, as the influence of that tradition is clearly seen in the first

chapter where celibacy and non-possessiveness have been combined, as in the *Chaturyam* system²⁹. The detailed chapter of Parshwa further confirms this inference.

Another basis of considering it to be a work of Parshwa's tradition is that that tradition was comparatively more tolerant; it was also much closer in conduct to other sects of ascetics and *Shramans*. With the assimilation of the followers of Parshwa's tradition into Mahavir's tradition this work also came along and was included as a part of *Prashnavyakaran Dasha* by Mahavir's followers.

The Separation of Rishibhashit from Prashnavyakaran :

It now becomes obvious to ask why it was first included in *Prashnavyakaran Dasha* and then separated from it. As it is purely a compilation of philosophical exposition, I feel, the earlier monks of Mahavir's tradition did not find any objection in including Rishibhashit in their own literature. But when the Jains formed an organised society with an independent tradition, it must have become difficult to include the monks of other tradition into their own ranks. In my opinion the separation of Rishibhashit from *Prashnavyakaran* was not accidental but with a purpose. It was not possible to preserve their exposition at one end and at the other criticise and demean *Mankhaligoshalak* in *Sutrakritang*, *Bhagvati*³⁰ and *Upasakdashang*³¹; and Narad in *Jnatadharma*.³² By first century A. D., to keep Jain faith intact had become the primary task. It became difficult to accept the works of Narad, Mankhali Goshalak, Yajnavalkya, Sariputra etc. as the canonical expositions of *Teerthankars*; still, credit goes to Jain *Acharyas* for safe keeping of Rishibhashit as a work of anthology inspite of its being excluded from *Prashnavyakaran*. Also, in order to maintain its authenticity it was accepted as expositions by omniscients out of Jain tradition. The sectarian system, however, propogated that the persons named as Parshwa, Vardhaman, Mankhaliputra, etc. in Rishibhashit were not the same as their name sakes in Jain *Agams*.

Why the Rishis of Rishibhashit were called Pratyekbuddha ?

In the original text of Rishibhashit Ketaliputra has been referred to as *Rishi*; Ambad (25) as *Parivrajak*, Ping (32), Rishigiri (34) and Shrigiri as *Brahmin (Mahan) Parivrajak Arhat Rishi*; Sariputra as *Buddha Arhat Rishi*; and all others as *Arhat Rishi*. In the chapter titled *Utkat (Utkal)* the name of the expounder has not been mentioned at all, as such there is no need of an adjective. Although the appendix at the end of Rishibhashit³³ and *Rishimandal*³⁴ has referred to all these persons as *Pratyekbuddha*, and twenty of them as contemporary to Arishtanemi, fifteen as contem-

porary to Parshwanath and remaining as contemporary to Mahavir; this appears to be a later addition to the text. In the original text there is no mention of them as *Pratyekbuddha*.

In *Samvayang*, however, while detailing the subject matter of *Prashnavyakaran* it has been mentioned that it is a compilation of discourses of contemporary and other *Pratyekbuddhas*. As Rishibhashit had been a part of *Prashnavyakaran*, indirectly *Samvayang* provides the first acceptance of the *Rishis* of Rishibhashit as *Pratyekbuddhas*³⁵. It is obvious that as majority of the *Rishis* of Rishibhashit were not of Jain tradition, in order to accept their discourses, they were believed to be *Pratyekbuddhas*. In Jain as well as Buddhist tradition, *Pratyekbuddha* is a person who attains ultimate knowledge through his solitary practices commenced by his own inspiration; he neither becomes a disciple of someone nor makes disciples to form an organisation. As Such a *Pratyekbuddha* is not confined within a tradition or institutional organisation, but he is a respected person in society and his preachings are considered to be authentic.

Rishibhashit and Principles of Jainism :

A comprehensive study of Rishibhashit forces us to consider whether it propogates the beliefs of *Rishis* of other traditions or it is just a propogation of Jain beliefs in their name. A cursory glance makes one believe that only Jain beliefs have been propogated in their name. Prof. Schubring and, with his reference, Prof. Lallan Gopal have infered that the compiler lacks authenticity in quoting the discourses of *Rishis* and has presented them in his own way; the basis for this inference is the similarity of beginning as well as end of each discourse. This conclusion appears to be true looking at the Jain traditional terms like *Panch Mahavrat*, *Kashaya*, *Parishah* etc.

For example, in the chapter of Narad there is a mention of four ways of cleansing which is nothing but propogation of the *Chaturyam* conception of Jains. In the chapter of Vajjiyaputta the *Karma* principles have been propogated. This Chapter confirms that life is directed by *Karma*, and attachment is the cause of sorrow. It also explains that the transition of *Karma* in attachment and vice versa is cyclic like seed and plant. The cycle of *Karma* is terminated by wiping out attachment first as destruction of roots destroys leaves, flowers, and fruits of a tree. This concept of *Karma* can also be found in chapters 13, 15, 24, and 30 of Rishibhashit. Similar details are also available in Jain tradition in the thirty second chapter of *Uttaradhyayan*.

Similarly, the third chapter of Asit Deval in Rishibhashit contains

the concept of sin being same as adhesive; this concept is popular in Jain tradition having a particular mention in *Acharanga*. This chapter also contains the mention of *Panch Mahavrat*, four *Kashaya* as well as eighteen sins from *Himsa* to *Mithyadarshan Shalya*. Also included is the form and details of *Moksha* which is *Shiv, Atul, Amal, Avyaghat, Apurnabhava, Apunaravrata* and *Shashvat*. Similar description of *Moksha* is available elsewhere in Jain canonical literature. The mention of *Panch Mahavrat* and four *Kashaya* can be found in many chapters of Rishibhashit.

The ninth chapter of Mahakashyap contains details of *Punya, Papa, Samvar*, and *Nirjara*. This chapter mentions *Kashaya* also. In the ninth chapter, while discussing inflow of *Karma*, the causes have been named as *Mithyatva Drishti, Pramad, Kashaya*, and *Yoga*; which is similar to that in the Jain tradition. It also contains many Jain traditional words like *Upkram, Baddha, Sprishtha, Nikachit, Nirjirna, Siddhi, Shaileshi Avastha, Predashodaya, Vipakodaya*, etc. The concept of the soul being eternal and transitory, the form of *Siddha* stage and the process of bondage and shedding of *Karma*, mentioned in this chapter are same as those in Jain philosophy.

Similarly the concepts of *Dravya, Kshetra, Kala*, and *Bhava* are also found in many chapters. The twelfth chapter of Yajnavalkya talks about process of *Gochri* and *Shuddhaishana* which are same as in Jain tradition. "Soul is the doer of *Karma* and sufferer of consequences bad or good," has been mentioned in the fifteenth chapter of Madhurayan. The seventeenth chapter of Vidur contains mention of *Savadyayog Virati* and *Samabhava*. Ninteenth chapter of Aariyayana refers to *Arya Jnana, Arya Darshan*, and *Arya Charitra* which are akin to *Samyak Jnana, Samyak Darshan* and *Samyak Charitra*. The twenty second chapter emphasises the predominance of male in the field of religion and demeans female which is same as in the Itthiparinna chapter or *Sutrakritang*.

In the twentythird chapter of Ramaputta, just like *Uttaradhyayan* (28-35), topics about seeing through *Darshan*, detachment, three disciplines, and dissolution of eight types of *Karma* through *Tapa* have been discussed. The concept of eight types of *Karma* is a speciality of Jainism. Again, there is mention of *Jnana, Darshan*, and *Charitra* in the twenty fourth chapter. The same chapter also includes the four *Gatis* namely, *Deva, human, Tiryanch* and *Narak*. The twentyfifth chapter titled *Ambad* discusses four *Kashaya*, four *Vikatha*, five *Mahavrata*, three *Gupti*, discipline of five senses, six life forms, seven fears, eight prides, nine *Brahmacharyas* and ten places of meditation. This chapter also discusses the six reasons for eating which are also found in *Sthanang* (Stha-6). It may

be noted that although Ambad has been mentioned in Jain canons as a *Parivrajak*, it has been said that he respected Mahavir³⁶; that is the reason that this chapter contains maximum number of Jain concepts.

In the twenty-sixth chapter of Rishibhashit the description of *Brahmin* has been included just like that in twenty-fifth chapter of *Uttaradhyayan*. Same chapter also mentions *Kashaya*, *Nirjara*, six life forms and compassion towards all living. In the thirty-first chapter of Parshwa we again come across *Chaturyam*, *Ashtavidh-Karm Granthi*, *Char Gati*, *Panchastikaya* and *Moksha Sthana*. This chapter, like Jain concepts, conveys that living being moves upwards and matter downwards. However, the presence of Jain concepts in this chapter is not out of place because Parshwa has been accepted as one belonging to Jain tradition.

Lately, scholars have started believing that the knowledge of Jains has been inherited from the tradition of Parshwa. Schubring has also recognised the influence of Parshwa tradition on Rishibhashit. Again the thirty-second chapter of Ping propogates the liberation of four *Varnas* just like the Jain belief. The thirty-fourth chapter also contains discourses about *Parishah* and *Upasarg*. This chapter also discusses the liberation of monk indulging in five *Mahavrata*, free of *Kashaya*, free of attachment and inflow of *Karma*. Thirty-fifth chapter of Uddalak, once again, contains mention of three *Gupti*, three *Danda*, three *Ralya*, four *Kashaya*, four *Vikatha*, five *Samiti*, *Panchendriyasanyam*, *Yogasandhan*, *Navakoti Parishuddha*, details of different clans free of ten *Dosha*, acceptance of eatables prepared for others, cold and lifeless. The same chapter also mentions *Sangya* and 22 *Parishaha*.

Thus, we observe that Rishibhashit contains many Jain concepts. It is natural to question if the Jain *Acharyas* have compiled their own concepts in the name of the *Rishis* of Rishibhashit or the concepts were originally of these *Rishis* and percolated into Jain tradition. It is evident that leaving aside Parshwa and Mahavir, all other *Rishis* of Rishibhashit were either independent ascetics or belonged to traditions other than Jain. Some of them, however, can be found in *Uttaradhyayan* and *Sutra-kritang*. If we conclude that the concepts do not belong to the *Rishis* named, the authenticity of the work and its compiler becomes doubtful. On the other hand, to accept that all these concepts came to Jains from other traditions is also not satisfactory. So we proceed first to examine if the concepts mentioned in Rishibhashit are of the *Rishis* named or of Jain *Acharyas*.

Question of Authenticity of Concepts preached in Rishibhashit :

Although all the concepts and related literature of all the *Rishis* of Rishibhashit are not available in traditions other than Jain, still, concepts and thoughts of many are available in other traditions, even today. Yajna-*valkya* is mentioned in *Upnishads*, *Vajjiyaputta*, *Mahakashyap*, and *Sari-putta* can be found in Buddhist *Tripitak* literature. Similarly, *Vidur*, *Narayan*, *Asit Deval* etc. find place in *Mahabharat* and other works of Hindu tradition. By comparing their ideas mentioned in Rishibhashit with other sources we can evaluate their authenticity.

In eleventh chapter of Rishibhashit, the discourse of *Mankhali Goshalak* are compiled. *Bhagwati Sutra* and *Upasakdashang* of Jains; *Suttanipata* and *Samanja Mahafal Sutta* in *Deeghnikaya* of Buddhists; and 177th chapter of *Shantiparva* in *Mahabharat* of Hindus are other works where *Mankhali Goshalak* or *Mankhirishi* has been mentioned. All the three sources tell him to be a supporter of *Niyativad*. His discourses in Rishibhashit also contain indirect references to *Niyativad*. It is stated in this chapter that he who trembles, feels pain, is irritated, hurt, moved, inspired by seeing the transformation in matter is not detached. A detached one does not have all these effects on seeing the transformation of matter. This is an indirect confirmation of *Niyativad* in relation to the transformation of matter. The world has its own movement and parameters according to which it continues to move. A mendicant should look at and understand this movement, but should not be influenced by that.

The basic philosophical teaching of *Niyativad* ought to be that one should only remain as a witness in the eventful movement of this world. In this manner this chapter reflects only the basic philosophical teachings of *Goshalak*. On the other hand the description of the principle of *Mankhali Goshalak* in Jain and Buddhist literature is in fact a distorted inference. The author of Rishibhashit is, in fact, much more authentic than the authors of *Tripitak* and later Jain canons.

The preachings of *Mankhi Rishi* of 177th Chapter of *Shantiparva* in *Mahabharat* confirms *Niyativad* on one hand and preachings of detachment on the other. This chapter mainly preaches spectator's uninvolved attitude and detachment from the world. It preaches detachment through *Niyativad* only. The world has its own system of movement and man cannot convert it to suit his needs, as such he should become detached by maintaining an attitude of uninvolved witness. The uniqueness of this chapter of *Mahabharat* is that accepting *Mankhi Rishi* as supporter

of *Niyativad*, he has been believed to be proceeding towards detachment through his *Niyativad*.

On this basis it can be concluded that the preachings of Mankhaliputra available in Rishibhashit are authentic.

Similarly preachings of Mahakashyap are compiled in 9th chapter and Sariputta in 38th chapter; both are connected with Buddhist tradition. When we contemplate the ideas expressed in these chapters the presence of basic tenets of Buddhism becomes clearly evident. The discourses of Mahakashyap first of all deals with the sorrows of the world. At the root of all sorrows is *Karma* and at the root of *Karma* is birth itself. This is just a form of *Pratitya Samutpad* of Buddhism.

Another speciality in this chapter is the mention of *Santanvad* while propagating the *Karma* principle; *Santanvad* is one of the basic principles of Buddhism. In order to explain the concept of *Nirvana* the metaphor of lamp (*Deepak*) has been used; this is a popular and basic metaphor from Buddhism. The whole discourse preaches detachment through *Santanvad* and *Karmasamskar*. This makes us conclude that this chapter contains seedlings of Buddhism.

Similarly, 38th chapter of Sariputta contains basic tenets of Buddhism in the form of *Madhyam Marg*. Alongwith is mentioned the *Prajnavad* of Buddha. It has been mentioned in this chapter that a monk can meditate conveniently with the availability of desired living quarters, bed and eatables. Still the wise should not crave for mundane things. Same is the discipline of Buddha and so this chapter too presents the preachings of Buddha with authenticity.

Same is the story about the 12th chapter, where the original preachings of Yajnavalkya have been included. Besides Rishibhashit, Yajnavalkya finds mention in *Upanishads* and *Mahabharat*⁸⁷. In *Upanishad*, alongwith the dialogue between Yajnavalkya and Maitreyi is mentioned their desire towards *Sanyas*. In Rishibhashit also Yajnavalkya preaches getting rid of wordly desires and desire for wealth, he also mentions that both of these are intertwined and inseperable. As such, knowing these both one should tread the *Gopath* not *Mahapath*. It appears that *Gopath* is the path of detachment and *Mahapath* is the path of attachment; Yajnavalkya seems to be preaching the path of detachment.

It is worth pondering if the development of the *Hinayan* and *Mahayan* concepts of Buddhism is not merely the evolved form of this

concept of *Gopath* and *Mahapath*. *Mahayan* word is also found in *Acharanga*. In the chapters 310 to 318 of *Shantiparva* in *Mahabharat* are compiled the preachings of Yajnavalkya. This mainly expounds the *San-khya* and Yoga concepts. This chapter of Rishibhashit also talks about the procedure of collecting alms by a monk, which is similar to the Jain method. Still this can be said that the author of Rishibhashit has not distorted the basic preachings of Yajnavalkya.

In the twentieth chapter of *Utkata, Bhautikavad* or *Charvak Darshan* has been propagated. Although there is no mention of the author of this chapter it is certain that the ideas of *Charvak* have been propounded with complete authenticity. The preachings of Vardhaman available in Rishibhashit are found in almost exact similarity in the chapter titled *Bhavana* of second *Shrutaskandha* of *Acharanga* and 32nd chapter of *Uttaradhyayan*.

On the aforesaid evidences we may conclude that generally the preachings of various *Rishis* have been presented authentically. However, mainly it contains only the meditational and moral aspects without any emphasis on philosophical background. This is also true that its presentation and writing has been done by Jain *Acharyas*; and so it is natural that some concepts of Jains reflect predominantly in this work. Also there is enough evidence that what we today consider as Jain concepts, could originally have been concepts belonging to other traditions creeping in later into Jainism. As such the authenticity and originality of the preachings of *Rishis* of Rishibhashit cannot totally be set aside. At the most we may deduce that there is an indirect influence of Jain tradition over them.

The historic background of Rishis of Rishibhashit :

It is clearly established that most of the *Rishis* of Rishibhashit were not connected with Jain tradition. The adjectives like *Brahmin Parivrajak* indicate that they were from non-Jain traditions. Also, some names like Dev Narad, Asit deval, Angiras Bhardwaj, Yajnavalkya, Bahuk, Vidur, Tharishen Krishna, Dvaipayana, Aruni, Uddalak, Narayan have been popular in Vedic tradition and their teachings are intact in *Upanishads, Mahabharat, and Puranas* even today. The names of Dev Narad, Angiras Bharadvaj, Dvaipayana also find their mention in *Sutrakritanga, Aupapatik, Antkri-tasha* besides Rishibhashit in Jain tradition as also in Buddhist Tripitak literature.

Similarly, Vajjiyaputra, Mahakashyap, and Sariputra are famous personalities of Buddhist tradition and are mentioned in *Tripitak* literature.

Mankhaliputra, Ramputta, Ambad (Ambashta), Sanjaya (Velatthiputra) are names which belong to independent *Sraman* traditions and their mention can be found both in Jain and Buddhist traditions. Prof. C. S. Upasak, in his article "*Isibhasiyam and Pali Buddhist Texts : A Study*" has discussed in details those *Rishis* of Rishibhashit who have been mentioned in Buddhist literature. This article is being published in *Pt Dalsukh Malvania Abhinandan Granth*. Parshwa and Vardhaman are the famous, twenty third and twenty fourth *Teerthankars* in Jain tradition. Ardrak is found in *Sutrakritanga* besides Rishibhashit. Besides these, Valkalchiri, Kurmaputra, Ketaliputra, Tetaliputra, Bhayali, Indranaag are names most of whom are mentioned in Isimandal and other Jain works. Valkalchiri and Kurmaputra etc. are also mentioned in Buddhist tradition. However, even those who are neither mentioned in Jain nor Buddhist tradition, cannot be termed as fictitious.

On looking at the complete list of *Rishis* of Rishibhashit we find that only Soma, Yama, Varuna, Vayu, and Viashraman are such names which may be said to be fictitious because they have been accepted only as *Lokpals* in the Jain, Vedic, and Buddhist traditions. But even out of these Vayu has been mentioned as a *Rishi* in Mahabharat. Yama has been said to be the father of Yamadagni Rishi in *Aavashyak Churni*. The possibility of Yama being a *Rishi* cannot completely be ruled out, although even Upanishads have described Yama as *Lokpal*. This is certain that he was a preacher, as the dialogue between Yama and Nachiketa is well known in *Upanishadic* tradition. Varuna and Vaishraman have also been accepted as preachers of *Mantras* in Vedic tradition. It is possible that till the writing of Rishibhashit Soma, Yama, Varuna, and Vaishramana were recognised as preachers and that is why their discourses were included in Rishibhashit.

Thus, we may conclude that excepting four or five monks all the other *Rishis* of Rishibhashit actually existed during prehistoric and historic periods, and are not just fictitious characters.

I would only like to conclude that Rishibhashit is a valuable work not only of Jain tradition but also of the Indian tradition as a whole. The religious tolerance of Indian thought is truly reflected in this work. It also has a historical importance because it provides valuable and authentic information about many known and some unknown *Rishis* and their preachings. The Jain *Acharyas* have done a valuable service to Indian literature and culture by preserving this work. In fact this work is an undeniable proof of historical existence of many Indian *Rishis* of the period between 10th and 5th century B. C.

THE PERIOD AND TRADITIONS OF SAGES OF RISHIBHASHIT

According to the Jain tradition, out of these 45 sages, twenty are believed to be contemporaries of Arishtnemi, fifteen that of Parshwa and remaining ten that of Mahavir³⁸. *Isimandal* also confirms this fact. However, this division does not follow the order that the first twenty belong to the period of Arishtnemi, the following fifteen belong to the period of Parshwa and the last ten belong to the period of Mahavir. If they are considered to be in that order then the 29th sage, Vardhaman will have to be accepted as contemporary to Parshwa and the 40th sage Dvaipayana will have to be accepted as contemporary to Mahavir. On the contrary, the truth is that Dvaipayana was contemporary to Arishtnemi and Vardhaman was Mahavir himself. As such it would not be correct to believe that the list of sages can be divided into the periods of Arishtnemi, Parshwa, and Mahavir in the same order as mentioned in Rishibhashit; which sage belongs to what period has to be re-evaluated. Schubring himself has not given any clear indication in this context.

Schubring has made an effort to evaluate the traditions of the sages in his preface to *Isibhasiyam*³⁹. According to him Yajnavalkya, Bahuk (Nala), Arun Mahashalputra or Aruni, and Uddalak clearly appear to be of *Upanishadic* tradition. at the same time Ping, Rishigiri, and Shrigiri have been titled *Brahmin Parivrajak* and Ambad as *Parivrajak*. As such, these four are also connected with *Brahmin* tradition. Yogandharayan, who had dialogue with Ambad, also appears to be a sage of Brahmin tradition. Similarly Madhurayan, Aryayan, Tarayan (Narayan) also seem to be belonging to *Brahmin* tradition. Angiras and Varishen Krishna are also believed to be from *Brahmin* tradition. According to Schubring, Mahakashyap, Sariputta, and Vajjiyaputra are connected with Buddhist tradition. I feel that he is correct. Schubring has expressed his inability to attach any tradition to Pushpshalputra, Ketaliputra, Vidu, Gathapatiputra, Tarun, Harigiri, Matang and Vayu, in absence of any evidence.

If we examine Schubring's views on the basis of available evidence, Narad, Asit Deval, Angiras Bhardwaj, Yajnavalkya, Uddalak, Ping and Narayan can be conclusively accepted as sages of Vedic or Upanishadic tradition. Similarly, I have no objection in accepting Mahakashyap, Sariputta and Vajjiputta as belonging to the Buddhist tradition. Parshwa and Vardhaman are conclusively from Jain tradition. The remaining names need to be studied from a variety of angles.

Although it is difficult to ascertain the historical existence and tradition of Pushpshalputra, Valkalchiri, Kummaputra, Ketaliputta, Bhayali, Madhurayan, Saurayan, Aryayan, Gardabhali, Gathapatiputra, Tarun, Varatraya, Aardrak, Vayu, Sanjaya, Indranaga, Som, Yama, Varun, Vaishraman etc., if we analyse their historical existence on the basis of their mention available in the Jain, Buddhist, and Vedic traditions we may arrive at some conclusion.

Prof. C. M. Upasak has given such an evaluation in his article titled "Isibhasiyam and Pali Buddhist text.," but he has limited this study only to Buddhist Tripitak literature. In this preface I am trying to go a step ahead of the efforts of Schubring and Upasak, with authenticity based on comparative and critical analysis. As such I now take up a more serious study of each individual sage of Rishibhashit one by one.

1. DEV NARAD

The first chapter of Rishibhashit is about *Arhat Rishi* Dev Narad. Mentions about Narad are found in Jain, Buddhist, as well as Hindu traditions. In Jain tradition, Narad finds place, besides Rishibhashit⁴⁰, in *Samvayang*⁴¹, *Jnatadharmakatha*⁴², *Aupapatik*⁴³, *Rishimandal*⁴⁴, and *Avashyak-churni*⁴⁵. *Samvayang* states that Narad shall be re-incarnated as the twenty first *Teerthankar* Vimal in the coming time-cycle (ascending). As such Rishibhashit and *Samvayang* both have referred to Narad with reverence. He has been accepted as *Pratyekbuddha* indirectly in *Samvayang* and directly in Rishibhashit. But we shall have to recall that there are differences in the concepts of *Arhat Rishi*, *Pratyekbuddha* and *Teerthankara*.

According to Jain tradition *Arhat* and *Pratyekbuddha* get liberated in the same life, whereas future *Teerthankara* gets liberated after two rebirths. As per Jain tradition there is no scope of *Arhat* or *Pratyekbuddha* becoming a future *Teerthankara*. This proves that the concepts of *Pratyekbuddha* and future *Teerthankara* evolved only after the writing of Rishibhashit. Although, from one point of view, both these concepts are efforts towards eulogising a person, future *Teerthankara* is acceptable to Jain tradition but *Pratyekbuddha* is not. In this process of rejecting, most of the *Rishis* of Rishibhashit have been termed as *Pratyekbuddha* and in process of accepting, some of them have been termed as future *Teerthankaras*.

The Dev Narad of Rishibhashit has been mentioned as Kalchhul Narad in *Jnatadharmakatha* and *Isimandal (Rishimandal)*, but this is just

another name of the same person. This is because, in the appendix of Rishibhashit he has been shown as contemporary of Arishtanemi and the Narad of *Jnatadharmakatha* was also contemporary of Krishna and Arishtanemi. In *Jnatadharmakatha* he has been described as sober and a scholar of many subjects at one place and as evil and quarrelsome at another. In *Aupapatik* Narad has been mentioned as *Brahmin Parivrajak*. *Aupapatik* and *Jnatadharmakatha* both describe him as scholar of four Vedas and many subjects as also propagator of Purgationism (*Shauch-Dharma*). In Rishibhashit also his preachings abound in Purgationism but the emphasis is on inner purity. In *Avashyak-churni* also the available details about Narad convey that he was son of Brahmin Yajnadatta and Som-yash of Shoripur

In Rishimandal he is presented as the author of first chapter titled—'Truth is purgation'. This indicates that this information has been taken from Rishibhashit only. All this goes to show that Narad of Rishibhashit, *Samvayang*, *Jnatadharmakatha*, *Aupapatik* and *Rishimandal* are not different persons but one. This is certain that the exalted position given to him as *Arhat Rishi* and future *Teerthankara* in Rishibhashit and *Samvayang* has not been given by later canonical and other literature of the Jains. This is a proof of the total absence of sectarian dogma in Rishibhashit.

As regards the preachings of Narad in Rishibhashit, the five great vows of Jain tradition have been converted into four purgations and he has been shown as the propagator of these. Celibacy and non-possessiveness have been combined in this. Rishibhashit and other Jain canons have accepted him as the propagator of Purgationism. Whereas other Jain canons believe that he emphasized on outward purgation or physical purity, Rishibhashit states that he was propagator of inner purity through virtues.

In the first chapter of Rishibhashit *Arhat Rishi*, Dev Narad stating that purgation is worth listening about and the basis of liberation from all sorrows, has mentioned the four types of purgations :

1. Purgation of violence;
2. Purgation of lie;
3. Purgation of stealing/grabbing;
4. Purgation of lust and possessiveness.

With these this chapter directs to embrace total apathy and mentions that a mendicant should, in all circumstances, be equanimous. He who

practices purgation is apathetic and equanimous achieves liberation soon. He is not reborn.

Schubring believes that the compiler of this work was clearly influenced by the *Chaturyam* (four dimensional) of Parshwa. That is the reason that celibacy and non-possessiveness have been put in one category. Accepting ahimsa and truth as the basis of purgation or purity indicates that Narad propagated inner purity as well, besides physical purity. Narad has been mentioned as preacher of apathy, detachment and liberation also. At the end of this chapter there are directions for a mendicant to be truthful, light eater, and celibate. It is worth speculating if it is not the three dimensional (*Triyam*) concept mentioned in Acharanga.

Generally speaking, the concepts of ahimsa, truthfulness, non-stealing, celibacy, non-possesiveness, inner purity, and apathy have been common to almost all schools of Indian thought. As such there should be no objection in accepting that these preachings of Narad were his independent thoughts.

This should also be kept in mind that in Jain tradition Narad was such an influential personality that in later periods with the conception of nine *Baldevs* and nine *Vasudevs*, nine Narads were also conceived. In *Aupaparik* there is a mention of separate tradition of *Naradiya Parivrajaks*.

In Buddhist tradition also we find mention of many Narads. First is that out of the supposed twenty four Buddhas the ninth Buddha has been named Narad⁴⁶. Besides this, in the *Atthakatha* of *Thergatha* there is a Brahman named Narad, who is contemporary of the *Padmottar Buddha*. Similarly, there is another Brahman Narad contemporary of Arthadarshi Buddha in the same book⁴⁸. Also in Buddhist literature the name of a minister of King Brahmadatta of Varanasi is Narad⁴⁹. A ruler of Mithila is also named Narad⁵⁰. But in my opinion there is no connection of all these Narads with the Narad of Rishibhashit.

In Buddhist literature there is a mention of Narad belonging to *Kashyap* clan⁵¹. He has also been stated as *Brahman Rishi* Narad Dev. At some places he has been called as Narad Deval. But, to me, it appears that Narad and Deval are two separate individuals. In Mahabharat there is a mention of dialogue between Narad and Deval. As such it can be inferred that Narad and Deval were contemporaries. In my opinion Narad Dev of Buddhist literature and Dev Narad of Rishibhashit must have been the same person.

In Vedic and Hindu tradition Devarshi Narad finds a wide mention. The author of some parts of *Rigveda*⁵² was Kanva Narad and author of some parts of *Atharvaved*⁵³ was Kanva Narada. Similarly, Narad also finds mention in the tradition of *Samveda*⁵⁴. In *Chhandogyopanishad* Narad is said to be a versatile scholar⁵⁵. In the same *Upanishad* a dialogue between Narad and Sanat Kumar is also narrated. Like *Chhandogyopanishad*, Jain canons *Jnatadharmakatha* and *Aupapatika* also believe that he was proficient scholar of all the four Vedas and many other subjects. *Chhandogyopanishad* states that inspite of being knower of many subjects he was scholar of *Mantras* not soul. As such, it appears that earlier Narad indulged in physical rituals, purgation, and a variety of mundane and exhibitionistic subjects, but later on his interest must have become inclined toward *Shraman* tradition from Vedic tradition and consequently attained a revered place in that tradition also. The dialogue between Narad and Sanat Kumar confirms this. Besides *Chhandogyopanishad* Narad finds mention in *Naradaparivrajakopanishad*⁵⁶, *Naradopanishad*⁵⁷ and many other *Upanishads*.

According to Gita⁵⁸, Narad is supposed to be a divine entity. In *Mahabharat*⁵⁹ one comes accross dialogue between Narad and Asit Deval. *Bhagwat*⁶⁰ also mentions about Narad. In a list of divine incarnations (*Avatara*) he is the third incarnation of Vishnu in the creation of Rishis. Whereas Hindu tradition believes him to be incarnation of Vishnu, Buddhist tradition believes him to be an earlier Buddha predecessor of Gautam Buddha and Jain tradition believes him to be a future *Teerthankara*. On studying details about Narad available in all these three traditions, the first thing which stands out is that there was an independent tradition of Narads. The Jain canon *Aupapatika* conveys that a particular tradition of *Naradiya parivrajaks* prevailed for many centuries. Dev Narad of Rishibhashit can be accepted as one of this tradition of Narads, who must certainly have existed earlier to Buddha, Mahavir, and Parshwa during the period of Arishtanemi.

In this chapter the five great vows accepted in Jain tradition have been turned into four purgations. The peculiarity is that celibacy and non-possessiveness have been combined. This indicates that the compiler of this work was influenced by the *Chaturyam* concept (four diemensional concept) of the tradition of Parshwa. This is because in the *Chaturyam* of Parshwa also, celibacy and non-possessiveness have been put in one category.

2. VAJJIPUTTA (Vatsiputra)

In Jain tradition, Vajjiputta has been mentioned in Rishibhashit alone⁶¹. But in Buddhist tradition Vajjiaputta *Ther* finds mention at many

places⁶². Schubring and Upasak both believe Vajjiputta to be connected with Buddhist tradition⁶³. In Buddhist tradition there was a separate sect of Vajjiputtaks who maintained a difference of opinion with general Buddhist monks on certain points. However, Prof. C. S. Upasak has put forward a doubt in accepting Vajjiputta as connected with Buddhist tradition. According to him the sect of Vajjiputta was formed at a latter period than the writing of Rishibhashit. But his doubt appears to be ill-founded, because the *Vajjiputtiya* sect mentioned in Buddhist tradition had already come into existence in the 4th-5th century B. C. Also, Vajjiputta was, in fact, contemporary of Buddha.

The emergence of *Vajjiputtiya* sect within the Buddhist organisation signifies that Vajjiputta must have been an influential monk in the Buddhist tradition and his disciples must have been large in number to have formed a sect under his own following. Buddhist literature also reveals that Vajjiputta was contemporary of Buddha and Mahavir. In *Theragatha Atthakatha* he has been shown as a *Lichchhavi* prince from Vaishali, who became so impressed with Buddha that he accepted Buddhism; and becoming a monk, started meditation in forests around Vaishali. The reason for his inclusion in Jain tradition, specially in Rishibhashit, may be that he belonged to the same clan, *Lichchhavi*, to which Mahavir belonged.

The *Vajjiputtiya* monks have been considered as moderates in the Buddhist tradition. They had demanded for some moderations in the disciplines for the monks, viz.. snacks after meals, keeping gold coins etc. There is also a mention in Buddhist literature and inscriptions, of some sub-sects of *Vajjiyaputtiya* sect. The sub-sects are as follows :—

1. *Dharmottariya Nikaya* : Although it was quite popular and had good following, there is no information about its principles.
2. *Bhadrayanik Nikaya* : Details can be seen in works like *Mahavansha*, *Deepvansha* etc.
3. *Chhannagarika Nikaya* : The literal meaning of *Chhannagarika* is those who live in covered abodes. The followers of this sect were those who practiced meditation in institutionalised buildings and not under trees or inside caves.

The Vajjiputta mentioned in Rishibhashit is the Vajjiputta of Buddhist tradition. He belonged to the *Lichchhavi* clan and was a contemporary of Buddha and Mahavir. He was still alive after Buddha's

Nirvana. Also, his preachings compiled in Rishibhashit have no contradiction with Buddhist philosophy.

As regards the preachings of Vajjiputta compiled in Rishibhashit, they mainly clarify the Karma principle. According to him the sequence of life and death continues like that of seed and sapling. At the root of karma he postulates attachment. This theory about karma is generally accepted both in Jain and Buddhist traditions. Preachings similar to those of Vajjiputta can be found in the thirtieth chapter of *Uttaradhyayan*. The discussion about *Karma-santati*, which shows the influence of *Santativad* of Buddhism, provides the basis of authenticity of ideas put forth in this chapter. This chapter also indicates that Vajjiputta emphasizes more on knowledge rather than conduct. *Vajjiputtiya* (*Vatsiputriya*) sect of Buddhists also emphasizes on the path of knowledge and purity of soul as against the stagnant rules of conduct. In my opinion he is none else but Vajjiputta *Ther* of Buddhists.

In the Vedic tradition there is a mention of Vatsiputra which is the Sanskrit form of Prakrit Vajjiputta. In the last clan list of *Vrihadaranyaka Upanishad*, Vatsiputra can be found. He was a disciple of Parasharputra according to Kanva branch and that of Mandaviputra according to Madhyamdin branch.

Although there is nothing more but his name in the Vedic tradition, but still it can be deduced that he was some sage belonging to the Upanishad period. All this naturally gives rise to the question that Vajjiputta of Rishibhashit, Buddhist Vajjiputta, and Vatsiputra of the *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad* are three different persons or just one. As no philosophy or thought of Vatsiputra are available in the Vedic tradition, it is difficult to establish his sameness with Vajjiputta of Rishibhashit. Whereas due to similarity of thoughts the proximity of Vajjiputta of Rishibhashit and Vajjiputta of Buddhists is established. The existence of a sect of *Vajjiputtiyas* in Buddhism also proves that he must have originally belonged to the Buddhist tradition.

The question that who was Vatsiputra of *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad* still remains to be answered. As no other Buddhist monk has been mentioned in the Upanishads, it is difficult to say that Vatsiputra of *Brihadaranyaka* and Vajjiputta of Buddhist tradition were same. Had he been a common *Ther* of Buddhist tradition it would have been possible that he had been accepted in Buddhist tradition like Narad and others. But in Buddhist tradition his place is as the leader of a sect and not an ordinary monk. However, one cannot deny the possibility that earlier he

was connected with the tradition of Upanishadic sages and, being influenced by Buddha, had joined the ranks of Buddhist monks at a later date. Being a Buddhist and still living in jungle is certainly an evidence of his diverseness. Also, the fact that first voice of decent within the Buddhist organisation came from his disciples indicates that roots of his tradition were a little different. The absence of any information other than his name in the tradition of Upanishadic sages also indicates that he shifted to some other tradition in the later part of his life.

3. ASIT DEVAL

The mention of Asit Deval can be found in all the three streams of Indian thought—Vedic, Jain, and Buddhist. The religious canon of Deval was popular during the ancient period and its quotes can be seen even today in works of later periods. On this basis we can definitely infer that Asit Deval was not simply a mythological name but a historic person.

In Jain tradition Asit Deval finds mention in Rishibhashit⁶⁴ and *Sutrakritang*⁶⁵. Rishibhashit addresses him as *Arhat Rishi*. His preachings compiled in Rishibhashit convey the following postulations :—

“Abandoning the four directional world, every individual should strive for the unfathomable, endless and eternal abode that is *Moksha*. Discussing the means towards this goal, it has been conveyed that by being apathetic toward all desires, passions, attachments, and activities, as well as anger, conceit, illusion and greed, and with the help of detachment, apathy, and discipline one can save himself from all adhesions or binding karmas, to attain liberation. After that, eleven stages explain the activities resulting in bondage of evil *Karma*. In the end it has been said that ordinary fire can be extinguished with the help of water but the fire of attachment is difficult to extinguish. He who understands this reality can rid himself of the cycles of life and death and liberate himself.”

These details indicate that Asit Deval was a preacher of the path of detachment. The adjective *Arhat Rishi* also confirms the same fact. *Sutrakritang* has mentioned that Asit Deval attained liberation inspite of consuming seeds, vegetables, and plain water. This proves that he did not originally belong to the Jain tradition, but still enjoyed a coveted place. This was because the monks belonging to Jain tradition were supporting the trend of seeking conveniences by giving examples of *Rishis* like Asit Deval, Nami, etc.

Sheelanka, the commentator of *Sutrakritang* imagined of two persons—Asit and Deval, based on the word 'Asite-Devile', but according to Rishibhashit it is proved that Asit Deval is one person, not two. *Isimandal*⁶⁶ has referred to him as a person devoid of lust. *Isimandal Vritti*, a work of 13th—14th century A. D., has given the full life history of Asit Deval. It mentions that he became infatuated with his own daughter, but with the help of true knowledge he got rid of his lust. This also proves that he was basically connected with ascetic tradition.

Buddhist *Tripitak* literature also refers to him as a *Rishi*. *Aslayana Sutta*⁶⁷ of *Majjhim Nikaya* gives us some details about him. The story narrated is that once seven Brahman scholars lived in a jungle. They believed that Brahman is the highest cast and they are the true progeny of Brahma. When Asit Deval opposed the belief the Brahmans cursed him. When the spell of the curse did not effect Asit Deval the Brahmans considered their practices to be useless and sought clarification of their doubts from Asit Deval. Asit answered their questions and in the end they became his followers.

Buddhaghosh has referred to Asit Deval as *Bodhisattva* in *Mahavansh* (ii-705). Besides this, *Indriya Jatak*⁶⁸ also mentions Deval as Kala-Deval. In this *Jatak* tale Narad is younger brother of Asit Deval and there is a mention of Asit Deval as a *Sanyasi* who also tries to free his younger brother Narad from the worldly ties.

In the Hindu tradition we find mention of Asit Deval in *Mahabharat* and *Gita*. In *Mahabharat* Asit Deval has been mentioned in *Adiparva*⁶⁹ *Sabhaparva*,⁷⁰ *Shalyaparva*⁷¹, *Shantiparva*⁷² and *Anushasanparva*⁷³. In *Shalyaparva* Asit Deval has been shown as a house-holder practicing religious asceticism, this is also confirmed by Jain sources. It is also stated here that Asit Deval was equanimous and highly advanced ascetic. This chapter also relates the dialogue between Asit Deval and Jegishavya. The most important fact related in this chapter is that he left the duties of a house-holder and became *sanyasi* through the influence of Jegishavya's preachings.

Shantiparva has also presented Jegishavya preaching equanimity to Asit Deval. These facts indicate that in the beginning Asit Deval was practicing as a house-holder and latter, becoming *sanyasi*, practiced equanimity. In another chapter of *Shanti-parva* (275) is mentioned the dialogue between Narad and Asit Deval. In this chapter Deval establishes, five fundamentals, time, existence and void; the eight eternal basics; and proposes the origin of creation from these basics. In this chapter he

also preaches the discipline of senses to Narad. As such, the attempt to connect Narad and Asit Deval by Buddhist tradition certainly appears to be partly true.

Besides this, *Gita*,⁷⁴ *Maathar Vritti*,⁷⁵ *Brahmasutra Bhashya* and *Yajnavalkya Smriti (Aparaditya Commentary)* also contain mentions of Deval. Although, in *Mahabharat* at some places Deval has been presented as a mythic figure, his mention in all the three traditions confirms that Deval was a historic person. However, the question that how ancient a sage Deval was, still remains unanswered.

In this context there are two three points worth considering. *Mahabharat* and *Gita* have presented him as contemporary of Narad. In Jataka tales of Buddhist tradition too he is supposed to be the preacher of Narad. In Rishibhashit the chapter of Asit Deval follows those of Dev Narad and Vajjiputta. All this goes to prove that Asit Deval too was a Rishi of the *Mahabharat* period. In the *Jatak* tales it is related that he was present during the period of Gautam-Buddha in his later incarnation. This proves his antiquity as compared to Buddha. However, it is difficult to pin-point his exact period on the basis of all this information. It is certain that he preceded Mahavir and was a *Rishi* present during the *Mahabharat* period. He must have been popular for quite some time and possibly left a tradition after himself, otherwise we could not find his mention in Jain and Buddhist canons.

4. ANGIRAS BHARDWAJ

The fourth chapter of Rishibhashit contains the preachings of Angiras Bhardwaj. Besides Rishibhashit, the mention of Angiras is also available in *Avashyak Niryukti*,⁷⁶ *Avashyak Bhashya*,⁷⁷ *Avashyak Churni*⁷⁸ and *Rishimandal (Isimandal)*.⁷⁹ Here he is said to be an ascetic disciple of Upadhyaya Kaushik. As compared to other chapters, this chapter of Rishibhashit is adequately elaborate. Besides the prose part, this contains 24 couplets. In this chapter, first of all the illusive nature of human life has been described. It has been related that to know the human mind is very difficult because there are contradictions in his thought, speech, and actions. Also, that man himself knows what is good or bad for him. He who observes his attitudes, curbs the evil consequences. Analysing the duality of the inner and outer world, it has been said that often a person indulged in benevolent or good work, outwardly appears to be an evil doer and vice versa. Under many circumstances people praise a thief and criticise a monk. On the basis of apparent observations calling a

person thief or a monk does not make him so. In fact the person himself alone knows if he is a good or bad.

As such, this whole chapter mainly elaborates the dualities of the inner and outer world. This duality is much difficult to understand. The basis of goodness and evil nature of a person is not the apparent praise or criticism but his inherent attitude.

In Buddhist tradition Angiras Bharadwaj has been mentioned at many places as a *Vedic Rishi*. Majjhimnikaya⁸⁰ mentions, a pratyekbuddha named Angiras Bharadwaj. Angiras Bhardwaj is also one of the eleven mendicants attaining *Brahmluk* as mentioned in *Jataka* 4/99. Besides this, *Suttanipata*⁸¹ has a mention of Krishi Bhardwaj and Sundarik Bhardwaj. But Bhardwaj being the name of a clan, inspite of the same clan name these two should be considered as different from Angiras Bhardwaj on the basis of difference in first name. In the *Basetthasutta* of Suttanipata also there is the dialogue between Vasishtha and Bhardwaj on the question that a person is considered *Brahmin* on the basis of his birth. When we compare this dialogue from *Basetthasutta* with the preachings of Angiras Bhardwaj from Rishibhashit, an important fact is revealed. Both appear to emphasize on the inner purity of individual and not on birth or apparant conduct. As such, giving preference to feelings and soul on the path of religion and meditation is found predominantly in both.

Detailed description about Angiras is availabe in *Atthakatha* of Thergatha⁸². First of all in the *Choolpanthak Thergatha*, Angiras has been shown as ascetic of the calibre of Aditya. In the *Veni Thergatha* he has been addressed as Mahamuni (great ascetic) and compared with *Chandrama* (moon). In the Buddhist tradition the most important information from historical view point is that while discussing Angiras there is a mention of Champanagar. In Jain tradition in *Isimandal Vritti* and *Avashyak Churni* it has been stated that he was a disciple of Kaushik Upadhyaya of Champanagar.

In complete pali literature one finds mention of seven persons named as Angiras. It is worth giving a thought that which one of these is the Angiras mentioned in Rishibhashit. Most probably the Angiras mentioned with ten *Rishis* in *Suttanipata* is the Angiras of Rishibhashit. In my opinion, of the persons mentioned as Angiras in *Chhandogyopanishad*, *Suttanipata*, and *Rishibhashit*, *Avashyak Niryukti* and *Avashyak Churni* are one and the same. All the three traditions have presented his story in

their own typical styles. Pandit Kailash Chandra has tried to establish that Angiras, the preacher of Devakiputra, of *Chhandogyopanishad* was Arishtanemi. But in my opinion this is a farfetched imagination. This much, however, is true that Angiras was a contemporary of Krishna and Arishtanemi and a *Rishi* of the *Upanishadic* period of the *Shraman* tradition predating Buddha, Mahavir, and Parshwa.

In the *Vedic* tradition the first mention of Angiras is found in *Rigveda*⁸³. After that he has been mentioned in *Chhandogyopanishad*⁸⁴ as Ghor Angiras and he has been shown as teacher of Devakiputra Krishna. Besides *Chhandogya*, *Mahabharat* mentions a *Rishi* named Angira, one of whose sons was named Ghor. This indicates that the Ghor Angiras of *Chhandogya* must have been Ghor, the son of Angira *Rishi* of *Mahabharat*⁸⁵. This is because the mention of father's name with son is an age old tradition in India. Also, Angiras too means son of Angira.

As such we may conclude that Angiras Bhardwaj of Rishibhashit, Ghor Angiras of *Chhandogyopanishad* and Angiras Bhardwaj of *Suttanipata* is one and the same person. He has been well known as *Rishi* and all the three traditions have accepted him in their own way.

5. PUSHPSHALPUTRA

The fifth chapter of Rishibhashit is the collection of the preachings of Pushpshalputra. Besides Rishibhashit⁸⁶, Pushpshalputra has been mentioned in *Avashyak-niryukti*⁸⁷, *Visheshavashyak-Bhashya*⁸⁸ and *Avashyak-churni*⁸⁹. The *Acharanga* commentary by Sheelank⁹⁰ also has a mention of Pushpashala. In *Avashyak-churni* Pushpshal has been mentioned at two places. One Pushpshal was a resident of Gobar village and the other of Vasantapur. The Pushpashal of Vasantapur has no connection with Pushpshalputra of Rishibhashit, as he has been stated to be a musician. But the Pushpashalputra of Gobar village is same as that of Rishibhashit. The reason for this is also that in *Avashyak-churni* Pushpashal of Gobar village has been stated as a person devoted to public welfare. In Rishibhashit also he appears to emphasize on humility. As such they can be the same person.

The only contradiction is that Pushpshalputra of Gobar Village is supposed to be a contemporary of Mahavir, whereas the appendix to Rishibhashit shows him as a disciple of Arishtanemi. But this appendix does not appear to be correct as far as the periods are concerned. This is because here Mankhaliputra Goshalak has been mentioned as a

disciple of Arishtanemi, but he was actually a contemporary of Mahavir and Buddha. On the basis of the preachings in Rishibhashit and description in *Avashyak-churni* we can only infer that Pushpshalputra was a thinker giving primary importance to humility.

During the period of Mahavir and Buddha there was a tradition preaching humility. In my opinion Pushpshalaputra must have been a prominent *Acharya* of that tradition. In his preachings in Rishibhashit the direction are mainly about abandoning evil deeds like violence, libido, possessiveness, falsehood and anger, conceit etc. He says that the being who is free of evil attitudes like anger, conceit etc. and follows the conduct specified in canons gains knowledge about soul. As such in his preaching importance appears to have been given to riddance from evil and humility in conduct.

Besides Jain tradition, in Buddhist tradition also we find mention of Pushpsthavir (Fussather). In *Atthakatha* of *Thergatha*⁹¹ and *Apadan* his preachings have been given in details. In his preachings, available in Pali literature, mostly the evil attitudes of the future monks and nuns have been detailed. As such he appears to be giving more stress on following the canonical conduct. The same can also be seen in Rishibhashit in simple terms. Still we can not conclusively say that Pushpshalputra of Rishibhashit is same as Pushpsthavir of Pali literature.

One indication from Buddhist literature is that he was a *Pandar* monk. Information about *Pandar* monks comes from Jain as well as Buddhist sources. It is possible that Pushpshalputra might have been from the tradition of *Pandar* monks and that tradition might have been the tradition preaching humility.

His preaching in Rishibhashit commences with "Palms joined he put his forehead on the ground and abandoned all activities including eating." A strong possibility is that he was a monk belonging to some tradition other than the *Nirgranth*. In the end he must have fasted unto death. But in absence of detailed information it is not possible to infer much.

We have not been able to get information about him from Vedic sources.

6. VALKALCHIRI

The sixth chapter of Rishibhashit⁹² contains the preachings of Valkalchiri. Besides Rishibhashit mention of Valkalchiri is also available in *Aupapatik*⁹³, *Bhagvatisutra*⁹⁴ *Avashyak-churni*⁹⁵ and *Rishimandal*⁹⁶. The story of Valkalchiri is a famous story in Jain tradition and is available in *Avashyak-churni* and *Rishimandal Vritti*. According to *Avashyak-churni* this story is also mentioned in *Vasudev-hindi*⁹⁷.

According to the story available in *Avashyak-churni* and other works, Valkalchiri was son of King Soma Chandra and brother of Prasanna Chandra of Potanpur. Being the brother of Prasanna Chandra Rajrishi, it is obvious that he was a contemporary of Mahavir. The story of Prasanna Chandra Rajrishi is a popular story in Jain tradition; *Avashyak-churni* carries this story also. All these sources convey that his father indulged in *Dishaprosnak* ascetic practices. The *Dishaprosnak* ascetics have also been mentioned in other Jain works like *Aupapapatik*.

As Valkalchiri was brought up by his father in jungle, he was incapable of discriminating between man and woman, horse and deer etc. He was educated while looking after the meditational aids of his father.

From the preachings of Valkalchiri in Rishibhashit it appears that he was particularly apathetic towards women. Emphasis on practice of celibacy forms the base of his teachings. He says, "O ! man do not become your own enemy by getting infatuated with woman, fight lust as far as possible, because you will attain as much calmness as distant you are from women."

From these details it is evident that Valkalchiri was a sage who specially emphasized on practice of celibacy. The adjective '*Bhagwan*' preceding his name, in Jain tradition, confirms his importance. The name Valkalchiri indicates the fact that he must be wearing dress made of *Valkal* (skin of tree).

Besides Jain tradition we find mentions of Valkalchiri in Buddhist⁹⁸ tradition also. There he is mentioned as *Valkalither*, and a *Brahman* scholar of three *Vedas* from Shravasti city. According to details available in *Pali* literature, he was inducted in Buddhism but later expelled from the monk organisation. There are mentions of his meditation on Gridhakoot hills. Buddha is said to have praised his devotion. There is no mention of him available in the Vedic tradition. Although the Buddhist tradition has tried to own him, in my opinion he must have been a sage of the *Tapas* tradition.

7. KUMMAPUTTA

Seventh chapter of Rishibhashit⁹⁹ contains the preachings of Kummaputta (Kurmaputra). In Jain tradition, alongwith Rishibhashit, mention of Kummaputta can also be found in *Visheshavashyak-bhashya*¹⁰⁰ *Avashyak-churni*¹⁰¹, commentry of *Aupapatik*¹⁰² and *Visheshanvati*¹⁰³ of Haribhadra. *Isimanda*¹⁰⁴ (*Rishimandal*) also mentions him. But in all these works his detailed life history is not available. That is available in the *vritti* of *Rishimandal* and *Kummaputtachariyam*, but both these works are of a period later than the twelfth century. In the ancient Jain Literature he has been shown as a dwarf and his height was said to be about three feet. He is supposed to have attained omniscience while he was a house-holder. These details confirm that he was a *Rishi* of the ancient *Sraman* tradition.

In Rishibhashit he preaches desirelessness or non attachment. The most important part of his preachings is that he considers desire to be the cause of sorrow. He stipulates that if a lethargic person can be happy by becoming desireless there can be nothing against an intelligent and deligent ascetic deriving happiness through being desireless. In fact this preaching of his is parallel to *Anasakta-yoga* of *Gita*.

Besides Jain tradition we also find mention of Kummaputta *Ther* in Buddhist tradition. In *Thergatha*¹⁰⁵ and *Atthakatha* of *Apadan*¹⁰⁶ the story of Kummaputta can be found in detail. In his previous birth he had given oil for massage on feet to Vipassi Buddha. As a result of this good deed he was born in the family of a house-holder in *Velutkantaka* city of *Avanti*. His mother's name was Kumma, that is why he was called Kumma-putta (the son Kumma). He accepted monkhood on hearing preachings of Sariputta. While meditating about *Karmasthan* he attained *Arhat-hood* through *Vipashyana* (a yogic practice).

A mention of Kummaputta *Sayather* is also available in *Thergatha*. This person was, infact, an assistant of Kummaputta, or a monk near to him. As such he is different from Kummaputta. Both Jain and Buddhist traditions are concomitant on the fact that his name was Kummaputta because of his mother's name. At the same time it is true that the essence of his preachings is detachment and purity of thought. It is possible that he was either of an earlier period or a contemporary of Mahavir and Buddha. As regards vedic tradition, no reference could be found about Kummaputta.

8. KETALIPUTTA

The preachings of Ketaliputta have been compiled in the eighth chapter of Rishibhashit¹⁰⁷. Besides Rishibhashit no other source provides any information about him. Other Jain canons or later works of fiction do not have any mention of Ketaliputta. Buddhist and *Vedic* traditions are also silent about him. As such it is difficult to say who he was. Even in Rishibhashit no more than his short discourse is available. The tenth chapter of Rishibhashit is about Tettaliputta. Tettaliputta is also mentioned in *Jnata*, *Anuttaropapatik*, *Avashyak-churni*, *Isimandal* and its *Vritti*.

There is a possibility that due to variation in pronunciation, two names of the same person were in use and on this basis the two names were later accepted as two different persons. However, in absence of conclusive evidences nothing more can be said about this.

In Rishibhashit Ketaliputta preaches that in the mundane life (*Aram*) an individual has two attributes and in the liberated state (*Param*) only one. As such, like a silk worm, one should break all the ties and attain liberation. The use of the terms *Aram* for this world and *Param* for liberation can also be found in *Acharanga* and *Sutrakritang*. This proves antiquity of these preachings.

The statement, 'life has two attributes and liberation one', can be explained and elaborated in many ways. Some examples are : Life has knowledge and activity and in liberation only knowledge is there. Life has attachment and aversion but liberation has only detachment. This discourse of Ketaliputta indicates that he must have been some mystical ascetic of that period. In absence of any concrete information about him, it is difficult to comment about his historical details as well.

9. MAHAKASHYAP

The ninth chapter of Rishibhashit¹⁰⁸ has the discourse of Mahakashyap. In India *Kashyap* is a well known clan name. Even Mahavir and Rishabha are supposed to be of *Kashyap* clan. *Sutrakritang*¹⁰⁹ has even mentioned Mahavir as "*Virena-kasaven Mahesina*." Similarly in *Bhagavati Sutra*¹¹⁰ also there is a mention of a monk named Kashyap belonging to the tradition of Parshwa. As such it is difficult to decide who is this Mahakashyap. In *Uttaradhyayan-churni*¹¹¹, the father of Kapil Brahman is said to be Kashyap, Also in *Antakritadasha*¹¹² we find a mention of Kashyap Gathapati. But in my opinion non of these have any

connection with Mahakashyap of Rishibhashit. The adjective *Maha* (great) prefixed to *Kashyap* indicates that he must have been some prominent person.

In Buddhist¹¹³ tradition we find mention of Mahakashyap as an extraordinary monk. He is said to be a very close disciple of Buddha. As such it is probable that Mahakashyap of Rishibhashit is non other but Mahakashyap of Buddhist tradition. This presumption gets support from the fact that two other monks of Buddhist tradition, Vajjiputta and Sariputta, are also included in Rishibhashit. As such this can be accepted that Mahakashyap of Buddhist tradition is the Mahakashyap of Rishibhashit,

The preachings of Mahakashyap compiled in Rishibhashit confirm that he was a *Rishi* connected to the Buddhist tradition. This is because his preachings contain discourse about *Santativad* and stability of *Deapak* (candle flame) has been mentioned as a metaphor for *Nirvana*. Both these are established and popular concepts of Buddhist tradition.

In *Mahabharat*¹¹⁴ is found a mention of a famous chanter of *Mantras*, named Kashyap who is coming to save King Parikshit. But he cannot be taken as Kashyap of Rishibhashit because one belongs to the period of *Mahabharat* whereas the other to the period of Mahavir and Buddha. Similarly Kashyap is mentioned in *Shatpath Brahman*¹¹⁵ and *Taittiriya Aranyak*¹¹⁶ also, but there it is used as a clan name, and cannot have any relation with Kashyap of Rishibhashit, As such in my opinion Mahakashyap of Rishibhashit is the Mahakashyap from Buddhist tradition.

10. TETALIPUTRA

The tenth chapter of Rishibhashit contains collection of preachings of Tetaliputra.¹¹⁷ In the ancient Jain literature Tetaliputra has been mentioned in *Jnata-dharma-katha*,¹¹⁸ *Vipaksutra*,¹¹⁹ *Visheshaveshyak-bhashya*¹²⁰ and *Sutrakritang-churni*¹²¹ besides Rishibhashit. In the fourteenth chapter of *Jnata-dharma-katha* detailed information about Tetaliputra is available.

According to the *Jnata* he was a minister of the ruler of Tetalipur named Kanakrath. He married Pattila, daughter of a goldsmith. Due to the fear that his own progeny might dethrone him, he used to mutilate his sons. The queen put this problem before Tetaliputra. Coincidentally the queen and Tetaliputra's wife concieved and gave birth to children at the same time. Tetaliputra's wife gave birth to a still daughter and the

queen to a son. Tetaliputra exchanged the newly born and celebrated the birth of the son.

Some how Tetaliputra becomes apathetic towards Pottila. A Jain nun Arya Suvrata comes to the city with her disciples. Some nuns come to Tetaliputra's house for alms. Pottila seeks advice from the nuns to attract the husband. The nuns reply that giving of such advice is prohibited for them; they could only give religious discourses. Pottila listens to the discourse and accepts nunhood.

After the death of Kanakrath the king's son, brought up by Tetaliputra, ascends the throne and honours Tetaliputra profusely for his help. According to the story Pottila is reborn as god and wants to convert the husband of her previous birth. She instigates the King against him. Not getting due respect from king Tetaliputra is disconcerted and attempts suicide. In spite of repeated attempts he fails to commit suicide. As such his life becomes full of disbelief and skepticism. Finding an opportunity, Pottila, turned into a god, preaches Tetaliputra, who becomes a monk. Meditating hard he attains liberation. The same story is also available in Rishibhashit in brief. In order to compare both narratives we give parts of both texts here (See original in Hindi).

On doing a comparative study of these two texts we find that : (1) As compared to Rishibhashit the description about Tetaliputra in *Jnata-dharma-katha* is more elaborate and includes much more supernatural incidents; (2) The language of Rishibhashit uses the syllable 'T' much more frequently, it is nearer to *Ardhamagadhi* and so, ancient as well; on the other hand, the language of *Jnata* uses the syllable 'Y' more frequently, contains influence of *Maharashtri* Prakrit and comparatively recent.

As regards the basic teachings contained in the chapter are concerned, they are vague. In fact the preaching content in this chapter is very low, and Tetaliputra narrates the experiences of his life. He says, "In spite of having relatives friends, sons, I feel helpless; in spite of having wealth I am poor. Hopelessness led me to suicide but there also I failed; consequently, my life is full of doubt; where other *Sraman* Brahmins talk of faith, I alone preach skepticism. This lack of faith and skepticism was the cause of his detachment.

Besides, *Jnata* and Rishibhashit, *Sthanang*¹²² also contains information about Tetaliputra. It mentions that the title of the eighth chapter (*Dasha*) of *Anuttaraupapatik* was Tetali. But the version of *Anuttarau-*

papatik available today does not contain the chapter. It may have been deleted from there because the same details had already come into *Jnata*. In absence of any information it is difficult to surmise what was the subject matter dealt in this missing chapter.

Besides Jain literature both Vedic and Buddhist literature do not contain any mention of Tetaliputra. As such it appears that Tetaliputra was basically connected with *Nirgranth* (Jain) tradition only.

11. MANKHALIPUTTA

The eleventh chapter of Rishibhashit¹²³ is about Mankhaliputta. It is natural to ask who this Mankhaliputta was. In Jain and Buddhist traditions mentions of Mankhali Goshal or Makkhali Goshal are available. The fifteenth *Shatak* of *Bhagavatisutra*¹²⁴ presents details of the life and philosophical beliefs of Mankhali Goshal. In the Jain tradition details about Mankhali Goshal can be found in *Upasakdasha*,¹²⁵ *Avashyak-niryukti*,¹²⁶ *Visheshavashyak-Bhashya*,¹²⁷ *Avashyak-churni*²⁸ and many other works besides *Bhagavati* sutra. According to the available details he was called Mankhaliputta because he was son of a *Mankha* named Mankhali, and Goshal because he was born in a *goshala* (cow hut). According to Jain tradition he met Mahavir during the second monsoon after Mahavir accepted monkhood, and remained with him for almost six years, Later they had a difference of opinion on the question of *Niyativad*. According to *Bhagwati-sutra* 24 years after Mahavir accepted monkhood Mankhaliputta Goshal declared himself to be a Jin or *Teerthankar*. Details on this episode are available in *Bhagvati-sutra*. But in my opinion this description is one sided and exaggerated. The only conclusion we may draw from these narratives is that Mankhaliputta Goshal established his own school independent of Mahavir, and it had a wide influence over the society, This sect founded by him later became famous as *Ajivak* sect.

In the Buddhist *Tripitak*¹²⁹ literature also Makkhali Goshal has been recognised as one of the six teerthankars contemporary of Buddha. Besides this, in *Thergatha*¹³⁰ also there is a mention of Makkhali Goshal. However, in the *Atthakatha* he has been said to have been born in the state of Magadha. Although other details in Jain and Buddhist description are not similar, both the traditions equivocally convey that Mankhaliputta Goshal was the founder of *Niyativad* and a prominent Acharya of his age. *Pali Tripitak* and Jain canonical literature contain detailed comments about his philosophical thoughts. Both accept him as follower of *Niyativad*.

Niyativad is that school of thought which emphasizes on an preordained system of the world as against the human endeavour. I would not like to go into a detailed discussion on this matter but would certainly like to express that the details available about Mankhaligoshal in Jain and Buddhist traditions are biased and critical. They present the personality and philosophical beliefs of Mankhaligoshal in a distorted manner. Probably Rishibhashit is the only work that presents Mankhaliputta as a revered Arhat Rishi and his preachings as valid.

It is true that ideas of *Niyativad* can also be found in the preachings of Mankhaligoshal available in Rishibhashit; but here the *Niyativad* of Mankhaliputta is a means to win over creator's ego in a person and give him a detached view point. He explicitly states that the ascetic who wavers, who is influenced, who is disturbed, who is hurt by seeing the transformation of things (matter), can not become protector of self due to the reactions so evoked.

The preachings of Mankhaliputta convey that activities of the world continue in their own regulated order. Even against the wishes of a person, adverse circumstances do prevail. He alone can save himself and others from the four life-consequences (*Chaturgati*) of this world, who remains unaffected, undisturbed, and unhurt in adverse circumstances, considering them to be nothing but mere transformations of matter. This preaching clarifies that the central theme of his *Niyativad* is for leading detached life. Same idea is propagated in *Bhagavadgita*. There also, the preaching of *Niyativad* is directed toward ending the reward oriented thinking of human beings.

In *Mahabharat*¹³¹ we find preachings of Manki Rishi under the title Manki Gita, I believe that this Manki Rishi of *Mahabharat* is non else but Mankhaliputta of Rishibhashit. This is because Manki Gita clearly propagates *Niyativad*. It says that whatever happens is not due to human effort but due to divine will. Luck is every thing. Insisting doggedly on human effort when one fails, the divine will could be traced as the cause of failure.

On this basis it can be inferred that Mankhaliputta of Rishibhashit, Mankhaligoshal mentioned in Jain canons like *Bhagvati-sutra*, Mankhaligoshal of *Pali Tripitak* literature, and Manki Rishi of *Mahabharat* are one person. In fact with the establishment of sectarian organisation in Jain and Buddhist traditions, efforts were made to distort the life history and preachings of Mankhaliputta-goshal. Literature and inscriptions also prove that Mankhaliputta was a prominent sage of *Sraman* tradition in

his age. His *Ajivak* sect continued to exist even one thousand years after his death. Mankhaliputta of Rishibhashit was the learned *acharya* Mankhaligoshal of the *Ajivak* tradition. The 15th chapter of Bhagvati-sutra also mentions other *Acharyas* of this tradition.

12. JANNAVAKKA (YAJNAVALKYA)

The twelfth chapter of Rishibhashit is related to Jannavakka (Yajnavalkya). Besides Rishibhashit¹³² no other work of Jains provides any information about Yajnavalkya. In the appendix to Rishibhashit it has been mentioned that he was a *Pratyek-buddha* contemporary of Arishtanemi. For detailed information about him we have to depend on sources other than Jain. Buddhist sources also do not provide detailed information about him.

In the *Vedic* works mention of Yajnavalkya is found in *Shatpath Brahman*,¹³³ *Shankhayan Aranyak*,¹³⁴ *Brihadaranyak Upanishad*,¹³⁵ and *Mahabharat*¹³⁶. There is the famous Yajnavalkya *Smriti* also in his name. The text available in *Shankhayan Aranyak* is almost same as that in *Shatpath Brahman*. Leaving aside *Mahabharat* and Yajnavalkya *Smriti*, *Brihadaranyak Upanishad* is the only *Vedic* work which provides detailed information about Yajnavalkya. On the basis of the story in *Brihadaranyak Upanishad*, Oldenberg, Waber and other scholars have deduced that he was a citizen of *Videh* because of his connection with Janak.

However, Shri Suryakant, in Vedic Kosh, has expressed his doubts on his being a citizen of Videh, based on his connection with Uddalak of *Kuruanchal*. In my opinion his connection with Uddalak does not provide proper ground for doubting his citizenship of *Videh* because the Rishis keep traveling. Uddalak is also mentioned in Rishibhashit.

According to me, on the basis of the details from *Brihadaranyak Upanishad*, we may only infer that although during his early life he may have been a supporter of the *Yajna* tradition, in the end he shifted to the detachment oriented Sraman tradition due to the influence of *Atmavad* of Janak. In *Brihadaranyak Upanishad* he says that getting knowledge of *Atma* (soul) a Brahman abandons desires for son, wealth, and the world, and moves around taking alms. This is because the desire for son is same as the desire for wealth and the desire for wealth is same as the desire for the world.

On comparing these preachings from *Brihadaranyak Upanishad* with those of Yajnavalkya in Rishibhashit¹³⁷ we find astonishing similarity. In

Rishibhashit he says that as long as the desire for the world is there, the desire for wealth also remains, and vice-versa. As such a mendicant should abandon both, the desire for the world and the desire for wealth, and proceed on *Gopath* not *Mahapath*. Probably, *Gopath* here means that as the cows wander grazing in bits, the mendicant should wander taking alms and not giving trouble to anyone. Here *Mahapath* may have been used in the sense of normal worldly life or possession oriented tradition. This proves that in the end Yajnavalkya became a preacher of the path of detachment¹³⁸.

In the vedic tradition, besides *Brihadaranyak Upanishad*, mentions about Yajnavalkya are also available in *Mahabharat*. In *Shanti-parva* he has been presented as giving discourse to Janak. This indicates that he must have been a *Rishi* contemporary of Janak.

The information according to the Jain tradition that he was a *Rishi* of the period of Arishtanemi does not appear to be correct. He was probably a *Rishi* of a much older period. However, on the basis of the comparative study of the preachings of Yajnavalkya, available in *Brihadaranyak Upanishad* and Rishibhashit, we can certainly infer that Jannavakka (Yajnavalkya) of Rishibhashit was none else but the Yajnavalkya of *Upanishads*.

13. METEJJA BHAYALI

The thirteenth chapter of Rishibhashit¹³⁹ is about Metejsa Bhayali. In Jain literature, besides Rishibhashit, Bhayali is mentioned in *Samvayang*¹⁴⁰. According to *Samvayang* he is going to be the nineteenth *Teerthankar* (named Samvar) in the coming cycle of time (ascending), Two other Prakrit forms of the word Bhayali are available—Bhagali and Bhaggai. The seventh chapter of *Antakritdasha* in *Sthanang-Sutra*¹⁴¹ is supposed to be about Bhagali. Although this chapter is missing from the available editions, I am sure, in the ancient edition of *Antakritdasha*, this chapter must have existed and contained the life story or preachings of Bhagali. In *Aupapatik* there is a mention of a *Kshatriya* ascetic Bhaggai and his followers. It is possible that the followers of Bhayali or Bhagali were known as Bhaggai.

The main theme of Bhayali's preachings in Rishibhashit is liberation of soul. He states that only he, who is desirous of fruits, waters a plant. One, not wanting fruit does not water a plant. Only by fostering a plant fruit is available. If the plant is destroyed the fruit is automatically destroyed. As such he wants to convey that in order to get liberated from

the wordly life, the fundamental cause of wordly life will have to be destroyed. Besides this, from philosophical angle Bhayali propagates that neither *Sat* (the existant reality) nor *Asat* (non-existant reality) has any cause. The *Asat* (non existant reality) does not enter the chain of cyclic rebirth.

Thus in his preachings we find that basic premise of *Upanishad*, *Gita*, and *Sankhya*, according to which it is believed that *Sat* is never destroyed and *Asat* never comes to existance. The same hypothesis has been stated in this chapter in a different way.

As regards the first name Meteja is concerned, the tenth *Ganadhar* (principle disciple) of Mahavir was also named Meteja. But in my opinion this was a different person. Besides this there is a mention of another Meteja Sraman who was living in Rajasthan and sacrificed himself adhering to the vow of Ahimsa. This person is also mentioned in *Avashyak-Niryukti*,¹⁴² *Visheshavashyak-Bhashya*,¹⁴³ *Avashyak-churni*,¹⁴⁴ *Sthanang*,¹⁴⁵ and the *Abhaya Dev Commentary of Sthanang*.¹⁴⁶ Although this person and Meteja Bhayali of Rishibhashit appear to be the same person but in absence of any conclusive evidence nothing more can be said.

In Buddhist tradition mention is available about one Mettai Ther¹⁴⁷ who was connected to a *Brahman* family of Magadh. On becoming adult he became a forest dwelling monk. Later he met Buddha, had a discussion and joined the *Sangha* (Monk organisation); he became *Arhat* in the end. Besides him is also available in Buddhist tradition a mention of Mettagu Ther, a disciple or Bavari. However, it is difficult to say if Mettai and Mattagu Ther had any connection with Meteja Bhayali.

Besides this, another mention of one Mettiya Ther is also available. This Mettiya Ther was also supposed to be the leader of the *Chhabbagiya* monks. Buddhist tradition also mentions about a Metteya who is believed to be the Ajit Buddha of the future fifth *Kalpa*. He has been mentioned in the *Anagat-vamsh* of *Mahavamsh. Suttanipata*¹⁴⁸ also has one Arhat Metteya who was a friend of Tissa. But it is difficult to state as to what connection Meteja Bhayali of Rishibhashit had with Metteya of Buddhist tradition. Buddhist tradition also mentions one Bhaddali Ther. Although there is literal similarity between Bhagali and Bhaddali, it is difficult to establish any similarity between the two.

14. BAHUK

The fourteenth chapter of Rishibhashit¹⁴⁹ contains compilation of the preachings of Bahuk. Besides Rishibhashit Bahuk has also been

mentioned in *Sutrakritang*;¹⁵⁰ *Sutrakritang-churni*,¹⁵¹ and commentary on *Sutrakritang* written by Sheelankacharya.¹⁵² However, we do not get any information about the life history of Bahuk in all these works. *Sutrakritang* mentions Bahuk alongwith other Rishis like Nami, Narayan, Asit-deval, Dvaipayana, and Parashar. It says that, recognised in preachings of Arhat, this Bahuk Rishi attained liberation inspite of drinking water infested with living organisms. *Sutrakritang-churni* clearly states that his mention is found in Rishibhashit and that he attained liberation inspite of living in jungles and consuming vegetables, seeds, and cold water. This confirms that the Bahuks mentioned in Rishibhashit and *Sutrakritang* are same. But non of these works detail his life history.

Rishimandal-vritti is also silent about his life, as such nothing much can be said about his life history. According to *Sthanang-sutra*, the tenth chapter of *Prashnavyakaran-dasha* was about Bahu. Although the available editions of *Prashnavyakaran-dasha* do not contain these chapters; I have explained in one of my articles elsewhere that this chapter must have been a part of the oldest edition of *Prashnavyakaran* and it must have contained the preachings of Bahuk.

The central theme of the preachings of Bahuk in Rishibhashit is that if correct information is presented with incorrect thoughts, it is not authentic; infact the meaning of this statement is that if view point or thought process is impure, the evident activity, even though it appears ethical, would be considered as unethical. In this chapter, emphasizing detachmant, it has been shown that the detached practices alone lead to liberation. All ascetic practices done with attachment lead to hell. As such Bahuk appears to be a propagater of the path of detachment.

The name of Bahuk does not appear anywhere in the Buddhist tradition,¹⁵³ however there are mentions of Bahik and Bahi. It is difficult to surmise if these Bahi & Bahik are same as Bahuk of Rishibhashit. In the Buddhist tradition the only information available is that they were disciples of Buddha; as such it is all the more difficult to give any conclusive comment about them.

As regards *Vedic* tradition¹⁵⁴ a *Rishi* named Bahuvrakta is mentioned. He is believed to have written some aphorisms in *Rigveda*. But it is hard to find some connection with Bahuk of Rishibhashit. *Mahabharat*¹⁵⁵ also mentions Bahuk. There he has been stated to be a warrior of the *Vrishni* clan. Also in *Mahabharat*, the name of the father of king Sagar is mentioned as Bahuk. King Nala was also known by the

name Bahuk. But none of these mentions indicate that these names had any connection with the Bahuk mentioned in Rishibhashit. This matter is subject to further investigation and scholars should do some efforts in this direction.

15. MADHURAYAN

Madhurayan Arhat Rishi is the preacher of the 15th chapter of Rishibhashit.¹⁵⁶ He has not been mentioned anywhere else in Jain or Buddhist traditions. As such it is difficult to give any comment about his life and personality.

In this chapter many words have been used in some special context and meaning. As long as those words are not clearly understood the preachings of Madhurayan cannot be properly apprehended. In the context of the meaning of this chapter neither the Sanskrit commentators are clear nor the Hindi translation, based on these, by Manohar Muni is any clearer. The Hindi and English translations in this edition are also not without doubts. Although Schubring in his notes and Manohar Muni in his explanations have done efforts to clarify the meanings, they have also accepted that the subject in the chapter is not clear.

In my view some particular words will have to be understood in order to elaborate the subject of this chapter. The three words that require an elaborate explanation are '*Sata-dukkha*', '*Asata-Dukkha*' and '*Santam*'. As far as '*Sata-dukkha*' is concerned, everyone including the Sanskrit commentator, has accepted that it means woe (*dukkha*) born out of pleasure (*sukha*). Here *sukha* should mean the desire for pleasure. So the meaning of *Sata-dukkha* is the woe born out of the desire for pleasure. A person who has craving for mundane pleasures can be termed as the one plagued with *Sata-dukkha*. In other words the craving for pleasure itself is *Sata-dukkha*.

Asata-dukkha is opposite of this, that is the suffering which naturally comes because of being desireless. With this meaning of *Sata-dukkha* the answer to the first question of the chapter becomes clear. The question is who attracts *dukkha* (affliction, which here means the bondage of Karma); the one who is plagued with woes born out of the desire for worldly pleasures, or he who suffers sorrows desirelessly. The answer is : He who is mad after the lust for worldly pleasures attracts affliction. One who remains desireless, even inspite of being surrounded with natural sufferings does not attract afflictions or does not enter into bondage of *Karma*. In fact, the desire for pleasure is the invitation to woe.

A person who suffers because of desire for pleasure ends up in the bondage of *Karma*. He who suffers due to painful circumstances does not attract *Karma* bondage. Thus Madhurayana finds the roots of afflictions in the mundane desires.

The word *Santam* does not mean peaceful (*Shant*) here; it has been used to mean existence. '*Santam dukkhi*' here means being woeful. And being woeful here only means to be full of desires. Thus the meaning of "*Santam dukkhi dukkham udeerej*" would be that by being woeful alone afflictions are invited. That means only a person with desires triggers woes. Similarly, '*No, asantam dukkhi dukkham uderai*', means that by not being woeful by pain, afflictions are not invited. That means a person without desires does not trigger woes.

After this, this chapter mainly propagates that sin is the chief cause of non-liberation and continued rebirth. On the basis of this, it has been deduced that as sprouting of a plant is natural consequence of the existence of seed, woes are natural consequence of existence of sin. In the end it has been established that soul is the doer of all deeds and sufferer of all consequences. As such, a mendicant should abandon the path of sin for the benefit of his own soul. As a snake charmer destroys the poison pouch of a snake, a mendicant should destroy roots of woes. In Madhurayan's view the root of woe is the desire for pleasure (mundane pleasures) and as such a mendicant should be free of desire for mundane pleasures.

On a comparative study we find that the subject matter of this chapter is in line with the subject matter of other chapters of Rishibhashit. This 15th chapter is similar to the 9th chapter in subject matter. This fact has also been accepted by the author of this work by stating "*Navam ajjhayanagamarannam vaneyavvam.*"

In absence of any information about him elsewhere in Buddhist and Vedic traditions it is not possible to present a comparative study about Madhurayana.

16. SHAURYAYANA (SORIYAYANA)

The 16th chapter of Rishibhashit¹⁵⁷ is about the Arhat Rishi named Shauryayan, (Soriyayana). Besides Rishibhashit Soriya has been mentioned in *Sthanang*¹⁵⁸ and *Vipak-Sutra*¹⁵⁹.

In *Vipak-Sutra* he has been mentioned as Soriyadatta. According to *Sthanang*, the title of the seventh chapter of *Karmavipak-dasha* is Soriya,

but in the available edition of *Vipak-Sutra* mention of Soriyadatta is found in the eighth chapter. In this chapter he is said to be the son of a fisherman, Samudradatta, of Soriyapur town. As the story goes, once a fish bone stuck into his throat. All efforts to take it out were in vain and he had to suffer extreme agony.

Some relation between Soriyadatta of this chapter of *Vipak-Sutra* with Soriyayana of Rishibhashit can be established on the basis that Soriyayana, in his preachings, has mainly preached not to indulge in pleasures of the senses. Same thing has been stated in the *Vipak-Sutra* in a little different way, that involving himself in fulfilment of needs of the senses, a being suffers anguish.

In this chapter, clarifying the influence of physical senses, it has been stated that getting the means of satiation of the five senses (sound, sight, smell, taste and touch) one should not become attached, desirous, or greedy. These unsatiable physical senses are the cause of continued rebirth. One should neither get attached to the desired things nor get vexed at the undesired things. He who gets attached to the desired things or gets vexed at undesired things, enters bondage of evil *Karma*.

In the Buddhist tradition¹⁶⁰ Soriya has been referred to as Soreyya. There he is said to be a merchant's son. However, there hardly appears to be anything common between Soriya of Jain tradition and Soreyya of Buddhist tradition. In the *Vedic* tradition¹⁶¹ we find a Shauri, son of Shoorsen, in *Dron-parva* 144/7. He is said to be related to Vasudev, who is said to be the father of Krishna. Still it is difficult to say that Soriyayana of Rishibhashit, Soreyya of Pali literature and Shauri of *Mahabharat* are one person, or different persons. On the basis of their names it can be accepted that they may have been connected with the geographic area-Shoorsen. In the list of *Acharyas* in *Brihadaranyak-opanishad*¹⁶² a disciple of Kashayan is mentioned as Sokarayan. It is possible that this transformed to Soriyayan in prakrit.

17. VIDUR

The seventeenth chapter of Rishibhashit¹⁶³ contains discourse of Vidu (Vidur). Rishibhashit has mentioned him as Arhat Rishi. In Jain literature mention of Vidur is also available in *Jnata-dharma-katha*.¹⁶⁴ There only his name has been listed along with Arjun, Bhimsen, Nakul, Sahdev, Duryodhan, Gangeya and others. Besides this there is no other mention of Vidur in the canonical literature.

In this chapter, regarding his preachings, the first thing stated is that the knowledge that provides deliverence from all sorrows alone can be termed as the best knowledge or the supreme knowledge. Subsequently it has been stated that the knowledge that makes one comprehend about the reincarnations, past and future; bondage and liberation; and revelation of the self is the knowledge that liberates from sorrows. This statement of Vidur is akin to the *Upanishadic* statement- "*Sa vidya ya Vimuktaye*", "that is knowledge which liberates."

It has also been stated that as all knowledge about disease, its diagnosis, and medicine is essential for its treatment; knowledge is essential for liberation. With all this, particular emphasis has been given on study and meditation in this chapter. Also that an ascetic with disciplined senses should, after a around comprehension of mundane life and indulgence in studies and meditation, abandon attachment and indulge in detached activities. All activities, considering them to be characterless activities, should be abandoned. One who acts thus becomes all pervading, omniscient, and liberated.

Thus this chapter mainly stresses first on study, meditation, and right knowledge and then steers towards Ahimsa-attitude and conduct, getting away from attachment.

Besides Jain tradition Buddhist tradition¹⁶⁵ also mentions Vidhur (Vidur). However, there is no similarity between the Buddhist story of Vidhur with those of Vidur in Jain and Vedic traditions. In the Buddhist tradition he is believed to be one of the two prominent disciples of Kakusandha Buddha. According to *Milindaprashna* Vidhur was a name of *Bodhisatva* in one of his reincarnations. As such it is difficult to find any similarity to the Vidur of Jain tradition, in these stories about Vidhur from Buddhist tradition.

In Vedic tradition and specially in the *Mahabharat* Vidur has been mentioned in details. He is said to be son of Vyas and a maid named Ambika. As such he was a son of a *Brahman* from a *Shudra* mother. Details about him are mentioned in *Adiparva* and *Sabhparva* of *Mahabharat*. His preachings have been compiled in the *Streeparva* of *Mahabharat*¹⁶⁶. On properly studying these preachings it becomes evident that although there is no literal similarity in ideas these are very similar to the preachings in Rishibhashit. On this basis we can infer that Vidur of *Mahabharat* and Vidur of Rishibhashit must have been the same person.

18. VAIRISHENA KRISHNA

The 18th chapter of Rishibhashit¹⁶⁷ is about the discourse of Varishena Krishna (Varisava Kanha). Besides Rishibhashit Varishen has also been mentioned in *Sthanang*¹⁶⁸. In *Samvayang*¹⁶⁹ the four *Jin* idols mentioned are Rishabha, Mahavir, Chandranan, and Varishena; Chandranan and Varishena are said to be the first and last *Teerthankars* of *Airavata* sector. Besides this, in *Sthanang* a branch of the *Kashyap* clan has been named as '*Variskanha*'. In *Antkritdasha*¹⁷⁰ Varishen is said to be a *Antkrit Rishi* and son of Vasudev.

All this at least confirms that he was a Rishi contemporary to Krishna and Arishtanemi. The second syllable '*Kanha*' (*Krishna*) of his name in Rishibhashit calls for a further study. Being the son of Vasudev is he not Krishna himself ?

In this chapter it is stated that one who indulges in the prohibited or evil activities, from violence to possessiveness and passions to illusions, begets amputation of limbs. He who does not indulge in these begets omniscience. (The imputation of limbs is also referred to in 9th and 15th chapter of Rishibhashit.) In conclusion it is stated that as bird pierces a fruit, enemy divides the state, and lotus leaf is unaffected by water, the seeker should pierce and destroy the fruit of *karma* and remain unaffected by evil *karma*;

In the *Bhishmparva* of *Mahabharat*¹⁷¹ one of names of Krishna is said to be Varshneya. He is called Varshneya because he belonged to the *Vrishni* clan. In *Upanishads* and *Brahmans*¹⁷² as well, people belonging to the *Vrishni* clan have been mentioned as *varshneya* or *varshnya*. The Prakrit form of *vrishni* is *vanhi* and that of *Varishen* is *Varisava* and there is a possibility that the Sanskrit form of *varis* may be *vrishni*.

However, all this confirms that he was an ascetic contemporary of Arishtanemi. In Pali literature, *Ambatthasutta* of *Deeghnikaya* mentions one Krishna *Rishi* suggesting that Ambattha was a follower of his tradition. Similarly in *Aupapatic sutra* a branch of Brahman mendicants is named Kanha. It is possible that Varisava Kanha was the founder of this branch. In *Aupapatic* another branch of Brahman mendicants is named Deevayan Kanha (Dvaipayana Krishna). As such the former must have been connected with Varisava Kanha only.

19. ARIYAYAN

The nineteenth chapter of Rishibhashit¹⁷³ is about the *Arhat Rishi* named Ariyayan. Besides Rishibhashit Ariyayan has not been mentioned anywhere else. Buddhist and Vedic traditions are also silent about him. As such nothing conclusive can be said about his personality and history.

This chapter states that in the beginning only *Aryas* existed. Consequently, as preachings, it states that *non-Aryan* thought, activities and friends should be curbed, because indulging in them leads to continued rebirths in this world. As against this, one who has *Arya* thoughts, activities, and friends attains *Aryatva (Aryahood)*. In the end it states that *Arya*-perception, *Arya*-knowledge, and *Arya*-conduct are right and should be followed.

Besides this brief discourse, nothing more is available about Ariyayan.

20. UTKAT (BHOUTIKWADI)

The title of the twentieth chapter of Rishibhashit¹⁷⁴ is *Utkal* or *Utkat*. There is no mention about any author of this chapter. Although, at the end of the chapter, like other chapters in the book, the stock phrase, has been mentioned; it has hardly any relevance to the preceding statements. The stock statement has been given in persuance with the style of all other chapters. In fact as this chapter contains the propagation of *Bhautikvadi* (materialistic) principles there is no mention of any *Rishi* as its preacher.

This chapter classifies five types of *Utkat*: *Dandotkat*, *Rajjootkat*, *Stenotkat*, *Deshotkat* and *Sarvotkat*. In this context, first of all the meaning of the word *utkat* should be understood. Although the word *utkat* has a variety of meanings, it would be best here to take the meaning as agitated or confused. One of the meanings of *utkat* is intoxication also. Infact the materialistic lifestyle was opposed to the spiritual life style and as such it was called *utkat*. This is also possible that the spiritualists gave the name 'agitated' (*utkat*) to the believers of materialism. The materialists consumed wines etc. and did not consider that to be wrong, that may also be one of the reasons. Another possibility is that the original Prakrit word *ukkal* may be the *utkul* of Sanskrit; which means a degraded or despicable family. If we take it as *utkool* it means that which flows beyond bank or breaking the banks, this indicates that

those people who propagated ideas opposing to the spiritual thinking were called *utkool*.

In this translation the use of the form *utkal* does not appear to be appropriate to me, it should have been *utkat*, *utkul*, or *utkool*. The five types of *utkal* referred to in this chapter are in fact the view points that used to propagate the materialistic doctrines through typical examples. *Dandotkat* are those who use *dand* (staff) as an example and propagate that as the beginning, middle, and end parts of a staff can not remain in separate existence, it is a united whole, there is no entity of soul separate from body.

Rajjootkat are those who use *Rajju* (fibre) as an example and propagate that as a rope is a conflagration of many different fibres, a living being too is a conflagration of five fundamentals and disintegrates with the disintegration of these constituents.

Stenotkat are those who re-interpret the examples of other scriptures and confirm their own beliefs. They are intolerant of other doctrines and continue to deny them by misinterpretation. May be, at some later period, *Anekantvad* (non-absolutism) developed in the *Nirgranth* (Jain) tradition as an opposition to this *Stenotkatvad*. This is because those who maintain that their statement is the only truth are said to be the antithesis of compassion towards others.

Deshotkat are those who accept the existence of soul but maintain it not to be the doer. In fact, this non-activity of soul eliminates the basis of defining concepts like good or bad deeds, bondage etc. Due to this partial acceptance of materialism they are called *Deshotkat*.

Similarly *Sarvotkat* are those who deny the existence of fundamentals and through vacuum accept the origin of all creation. They believe that there is no fundamental that continues to exist everywhere at all times. Thus they propagate nihilism and that is why they are called *Sarvotkat*. This must have been the basis of non-existentialism.

Detailing these five types of *utkat* or materialists and giving brief details of principles of materialism the soul as an entity separate from body has been denied. It has been stated that after destruction the body is not created again; that is, there is no rebirth. This life is the only life, there is no other world, there is no fruit of good or bad deeds, there is no rebirth and there is nothing like good or evil deed. The body between

head and toe is the living being or soul. As burnt seeds do not sprout, a destroyed body is not created again.

Thus this chapter presents pure materialistic theory which is also known as the Charvak philosophy in Indian philosophies. Mention of this type of materialistic doctrines is available in details in ancient Jain, Buddhist, and Vedic literature. The thoughts propagated in this chapter are available in *Sutrakritang*¹⁷⁵ and *Rajprashniya*¹⁷⁶ also. Similarly Buddhist tradition also has parallel theories in *Payasi-sutta*.¹⁷⁷ As such, this chapter can be taken as representative of prevalent materialistic ideas of that period. *Samvayang*¹⁷⁸ mentions about 44 chapters of Rishibhashit. If it is possible that this chapter may be a later addition to Rishibhashit, because this is the only chapter out of place with the other 44 chapters uniformly propagating spiritualistic ideas. The use of the term *utkat* for materialists is its originality. Also the five classifications : *Dandotkat*, *Rajjootkat*, *Snetotkat*, *Deshotkat* and *Sarvotkat*, are not available anywhere else, making it a speciality of Rishibhashit. The classifications like *dehatmavadi*, *paramatmavadi*, *manoatmavadi* etc, available in various works of Indian philosophy are different than those of Rishibhashit.

21. GATHAPATIPUTRA TARUN

The 21st chapter of Rishibhashit¹⁷⁹ contains the discourses of Gathapatiputra Tarun. Besides Rishibhashit, his mention can not be found anywhere else in Jain, Vedic, or Buddhist traditions. His basic teaching in Rishibhashit is propagation of the path of knowledge. According to him ignorance is the ultimate anguish.

That again is the cause of fear. This world is the end product of this void of knowledge, in other words the living continues to be reborn in this world because of absence of knowledge, or ignorance. He states about himself, "Earlier I did not know, perceive, or comprehend due to ignorance; but now, due to knowledge, I know 'perceive', and comprehend, in the past, due to ignorance, I indulged in many immoral and unethical deeds under influence of passions; but now, having knowledge, I shall bring all the sorrows to an end and obtain the permanent and eternal abode, which is liberation.

Giving examples it has been shown in this chapter that because of ignorance how deer, bird, or elephant are caught in trap, how the fish swallow a bait, and how the moth burn themselves kissing a flame. Because of ignorance alone an aged lion jumps in water to fight its reflection, and ends its own life. Similarly mother Subhadra consumes her own son Supriya due to ignorance.

Showing the sad consequences of ignorance the discourse guides towards the path of knowledge and states that it is because of knowledge that the arts such as tracing, refining and formulating medicines are made possible. These statements indicate that Gathapatiputra Tarun must have been a Rishi of the tradition of the path of knowledge. However, in absence of any information about him in Jain, Vedic, or Buddhist traditions, nothing much can be said about him. The story of the old lion and his reflection in water is also available in *Panchtantra*,¹⁸⁰ this confirms the antiquity of both *Panchtantra* and Rishibhashit.

22. GARDABHAL (DAGBHAL)

The 22nd chapter of Rishibhashit¹⁸¹ is concerning Gardabhal Rishi. Regarding his personality, we find a mention in *Uttaradhyayan Sutra*¹⁸² also, besides Rishibhashit. Here he has been mentioned as teacher or *Acharya* of Sanjay and also as *Bhagvan* and *Vidya-Charan-Paraga*; this shows his importance. *Uttardhyayan-sutra* thus confirms that Sanjay and Gardabhal of Rishibhashit were historical persons. In Jain tradition there is also mention of a king Gardabhill of Avanti who was a contemporary of Acharya Kalak and who kidnapped Kalak's sister, Saraswati (a nun). But this Gardabhill is a different person, not the Gardabhal of Rishibhashit. There is not a trace of doubt that *Rishi* Gardabhal of Rishibhashit and *Acharya* Gardabhal of *Uttaradhyayan* are one and the same person.

As regards his preachings detailed in Rishibhashit are concerned, he first states that *karma* are infested with *himsa* (violence), but the enlightened are free of *himsa*, and as such, like a lotus leaf in pond, they are not infested with *Karma* particles. After this the complete chapter is full of prominence of male and condemnation of female. Supporting the prominence of male it has been stated that all religions (*Dharma*) begin with man, and have man as supreme, elder, supporter, illuminater, coordinator, and focus. As an ulcer is dependent on body, ant-hill on earth, lotus on water, and fire on wood, religion is dependent on man.

It is worth mentioning that the Sanskrit Commentator of Rishibhashit, Schubring as well as this translation of Rishibhashit have indicated the meaning of *Dharma*, here, as *Gramya Dharma*, which means religion of mundane passions. But in my opinion, *Dharma* here carries its popular meaning of religious traditions, religious sects or religion. In Jainism, of the ten *Kalpa* (religious texts), *purush* (man) is the senior *kalpa* which maintains that in context of religious organisation man is all

important and a nun with a seniority of one hundred years has to bow before a freshly inducted monk. Thus it has propagated seniority of man over woman. This system of male superiority was also accepted by Buddha in his organisation. As such the word Dharma here should be understood to mean religion or religious organisation and not the mundane duties, on the style of *Acharanga*.

In the initial couplets of this chapter the condemnation of woman also indicates that supremacy of male over female, in context of religious organisation, was an established fact. Condemning woman, it has been stated that those villages and towns which are ruled by women should be deprecated. Similarly those individuals who are governed by women should be lampooned. Woman is like a golden cave inhabited by lion, a poisonous garland, and a river full of whirlpools. She is like a wine that intoxicates. The Villages and towns, where women dominate and are free like untethered horse, are despicable like dancing in a condolence meeting.

This confirms that Gardabhil Rishi was a propagater of male prominence and dominance. However, there is an isolated couplet in this chapter which praises woman. It conveys that woman is like a panegyric of a good family, sweet water, a fully blossomed lotus flower, a *malati* creeper with a snake, But even here she has been condemned in the end with the statement : '*malati* creeper with snake'.

Towards the end of this chapter detailing the causes of bondage, the path of meditation has been recommended. He states at the end that as body thrives due to mind, as a tree thrives due to roots, all the mendicants thrive on meditation. The decorations endowed on Gardabhil in *Uttaradhyayan* confirm his being connected with meditational tradition. He has been called as *Tapodhan* (proficient in ascetic practices), an adherent to religious practices comprising of studies and meditation.

On a comparative study we find that Gardabhill has not been mentioned anywhere in Buddhist tradition. But in Vedic tradition we find a mention of an *acharya* named Gardabhi or Vibhit, contemporary of Janak, in *Brihadaranyak Upanishad*.¹⁸³ However in absence of any conclusive proof it is difficult to confirm if Gardabhi-Vibhit of *Brihadaranyak Upanishad* and Dagbhal-Gaddabhal of Rishibhashit are same.

In the *Anushasanparva* of *Mahabharat*¹⁸⁴ there is a mention of a *Brahmavadi* (believer in *Brahma*) son of Vishwamitra, named Gaardabhi. Here he has been mentioned as a *Brahmavadi* and great *Rishi*. This

indicates that he was a prominent *Rishi* of that age. To me, his being son of Vishwamitra appears to be wrong. Because not only him but Gargi, Yajnavalkya, Narad, Kapil etc. also are said to be Vishwamitra's sons, which does not appear to be true. The only possibility is that he was one of the line of Vishwamitra's disciples. However, one thing can certainly be inferred, or Gardabhill or Gardabhi was a historic Rishi and possibly of the *Upanishadic* period.

23. RAMAPUTTA

The 23rd chapter of Rishibhashit¹⁸⁵ contains the compilation of the preachings of Ramaputta. His mention is also available in *Sutrakritang*,¹⁸⁶ *Sthanang*,¹⁸⁷ and *Anuttaropapatik*.¹⁸⁸ In *Sutrakritang*¹⁸⁹ he has been mentioned alongwith Asit Deval, Nami, Narayana, Bahuk, Dvaipayana, Parashar, etc. He has been said to be accepted in the discourses of *Nirgranth*s (*Iha sammata*) and is supposed to have attained liberation inspite of eating food etc. It should be known that in some printed editions of *Sutrakritang* and commentary by Sheelank, his name has been mentioned as Ramagutta, which is not correct. Rama-utte, mentioned in *Sutrakritang-churni* is correct and its Sanskrit transliteration is Ramaputra. The proof of this has been mentioned in details in an article by me and Prof. M. A. Dhaki in the Pt. Bechardas Doshi memorial publication.

Besides *Sutrakritang*, according to the information available in *Sthanang* also, there was a chapter titled Ramputta in ancient editions of *Antakritdasha*, which is not available in the current editions of *Antakritdasha*. It is possible that this chapter contained life and works of Ramaputta. Also the sixth chapter of third part of *Anuttaropapatik* is about Ramaputta. Here he is said to be a contemporary of Mahavir and inhabitant of Saket. Besides these two facts, authenticity of other information in this source is not impeccable. *Sutrakritang* and Rishibhashit both conclusively indicate that Ramaputta did not originally belong to the *Nirgranth* tradition, still he was given a respectable place there.

We find mention of Ramaputta in Buddhist tradition also. According to the information available in *Pali Tripatak*¹⁹⁰ his full name was Uddak Ramaputta and he was older than Buddha. In the begining Buddha took training of meditational practices from Ramaputta, and when he attained omniscience he wanted to go and preach him; knowing his potential. But it was too late, as Ramaputta had died by then. Thus he was an elder

contemporary of Buddha and Mahavir. *Pali Tripitak* also conveys that he had his own peculiar style of yoga practices as well as a respectable number of followers. Buddha respected him.

The preachings of Ramaputta in this chapter are in prose. First of all it mentions about two types of death, one is the pleasant death (death within meditation) and the other is the unpleasant death (death out of meditation). It has also been explained here that in order to get liberation from the mundane bondages one should practice *Jnana* (knowledge), *Darshan* (perception), and *Charitra* (conduct). A mendicant should comprehend through *Jnana*, perceive through *Darshan*, and discipline through conduct, and disintegrate the microparticles of Karma through ascetic practices.

A developed form of this school of thought can be seen in an ancient canon like *Uttaradhyayan* sutra. In the fifth chapter of *Uttaradhyayan* the two types of death have been explained in details. The 28th chapter states about knowing through *Jnana*, believing through *Darshan*, accepting through conduct, and cleaning through ascetic practices. *Uttardhyayan* also says about shedding of Karmic particles through ascetic practices. But still the text of Rishibhashit is older than *Uttaradhyayan*. This is because the language and style of Rishibhashit is older than *Uttardhyayan*. For '*Dasanena Saddahe*' it mentions '*Dasanaina pasitta*' which is of older style; because the transformation of meaning of *Darshan* from perception to faith is a much later incident in Jain tradition. Also it appears that the prevailing conception of eight classifications of Karma must have had its origin in theories of Ramaputta. All this goes to prove that Ramaputta was a revered Acharya of *Sraman* tradition, senior to Mahavir and Buddha. Also, that Ramaputta of Rishibhashit, *Sutrakritang* and *Pali Tripitak* are one person. He has also been named as Uddak Ramaputta.

24. HARIGIRI

The twentyfourth chapter of Rishibhashit¹⁹¹ contains the preachings of Harigiri. We do not find any information about Harigiri from any source other than Rishibhashit. As such it is difficult to say much about his personality. As regards his preachings, the first thing he says is that earlier all was *Bhavya* (decided or preordained) but now every thing is *Abhavya* (undecided or not pre-ordained). The meaning of this statement is that as long as an individual is ignorant (illusioned) his present is dependent on bondage of the earlier (previous life) karma or decided or

pre-ordained. But on getting knowledge he becomes the maker of his destiny and so his future depends on his endeavour or is undecided or not pre-ordained. Or in other words, past is the maker of our present but we ourselves are also the makers of our future. As such the past is *Bhavya* (pre-ordained) and future is *Abhavya* (not pre-ordained). Infact, his preaching is that the present is dependent on the past and pre-ordained but the future can be made through endeavour and knowledge. As such the future of a proficient mendicant is not pre-ordained or is *Abhavya*. In fact this matter of pre-ordained and not pre-ordained is connected with the Karma principle. According to the Karma principle our present is result of our Karma in the past, but we can become the moulders of our future. This capacity of being or not the moulder of the future has been discussed in this chapter.

The Karma principle and its importance has been detailed in this chapter. Which is similar to other chapters. After detailing the Karma principle, attachment or ignorance have been discussed as the root causes of bondage of karma. It has been explained that how under the influence of attachment a person enters the bondage of Karma. In this context it has also been explained that an individual enters the bondage and can come out of it on his own. As such an ascetic should properly understand the complex nature of cycle of Karma and transcend through meditation in order to be free from the bondage of Karma.

Thus we see that the thoughts of Harigiri compiled in Rishibhashit deal elaborately with the consequences of attachment with reference to proper and organised human endeavour and Karma principle. But all these facts have been explained in the preachings of other *Rishis* in a similar fashion. As such, it is difficult to say that Harigiri had some original line of thinking. We can only state that he presented the Karma principle as an assimilation of *Niyativad* and *Purusharthvad*.

There is a mention of Harit-ther in the Buddhist tradition.¹⁹² But it is difficult to conclude that this Harit-ther and Harigiri of Rishibhashit are same. Although he has been said to be an Arhat and a proficient ascetic, in absence of details, nothing can be said conclusively. Besides Buddhist tradition, the lineage of *Acharyas* given in *Brihadaranyak-upanishad*¹⁹³ mentions one Harit Kashyap, a disciple of Kashyap. I feel that there is a probability of Harit Rishi of *Brihadaranyak-Upanishad* being Harigiri of Rishibhashit. But in absence of conclusive proof it is difficult to accept this statement also.

25. AMBAD PARIVRAJAK

The twentyfifth chapter of Rishibhashit¹⁹⁴ is about Ambad Parivrajak. In Jain canonical literature his mention can be found, besides Rishibhashit, in *Samvayang*,¹⁹⁵ *Bhagwati*,¹⁹⁶ *Aupapatik*,¹⁹⁷ and *Sthanang*,¹⁹⁸ also. In *Samvayang* he is believed to be a future *teerthankar* in the next time cycle (ascending). According to *Bhagwati-sutra* he was a *parivrajak* living in Sravasti town. The incident of Ambad Sanyasi accepting *Sravak Dharma* (Jain religion) after a dialogue with Mahavir is narrated in *Bhagwati* and *Aupapatik sutras*. This indicates that inspite of having faith in Mahavir's religion he maintained his independent tradition.

Aupapatik also conveys that a branch of *Brahman Parivrajaks* carried his name. This branch probably continued till the present edition of *Aupapatik* was concluded, which was around 4th-5th century A. D. Similarly according to *Sthanang* the tenth chapter of *Antakritdasha* was about Ambad Parivrajak. However, this chapter is not found in the present edition of *Antakritdasha*. *Aupapatik* has also described in details the system of conduct of Ambad and other *Brahman Parivrajaks*. However, complete analysis of all that is not possible here, due to lack of space.

Aupapatik narrates in details the incident of how Ambad Parivrajak and his disciples courted death, accepting the vow of *Sallekhana* (fast till death) in a forest on the banks of the Ganges while they were on their way to Purimtaal town. It was during summer, on sand, and was done following their discipline of not taking water without being offered by someone. For a comparative study this narration is important and presents a vivid picture of the conduct followed by the tradition of Amdad Parivrajak. In the Jain canonical literature Ambad has been mentioned everywhere with due reverence.

In Buddhist tradition¹⁹⁹ we find a mention of Ambatth Manavak. According to the Buddhist tradition Ambatth was a disciple of Brahman Poshkar Saati. He had a debate with Bhagvan Buddha on the subject of superiority of Brahmans. Whereas Ambatth accused the *Shakyas* of belonging to lower caste, other people demeaned Ambatth by calling him son of a slave woman. In conclusion of this discussion Buddha asserts the importance of conduct in the formulation of the caste system. In this narration the point worth considering is that Ambatth has been addressed as *Krishnayan* or belonging to the lineage of Krishna Rishi. As is known, a school of *Brahman Parivrajaks* is named Kanha according to *Aupapatik*. It is a possibility that the Krishna Rishi mentioned in *Ambatth-sutta* was Varişaya Kanha of Rishibhashit.

As far as the Vedic tradition²⁰⁰ is concerned, the term Ambashtha has been mentioned as a particular clan-name which originated with Brahman father and *Vaishya* mother. In Buddhist tradition this name is used for the clan originating from *Kshatriya* father and *Shoodra* mother. As regards the mention of Ambad or Ambashtha as a *Rishi*, both Vedic and Buddhist traditions do not provide any information.

The chapter of Rishibhashit titled Ambad also mentions Yogandharayan Rishi. In the Jain tradition, besides Rishibhashit *Avashyak-churni*,²⁰¹ also provides details about him. *Avashyak-churni* states him to be a minister of king Udayan. As such Ambad and Yogandharayan were certainly contemporaries of Mahavir.

26. MAATANG

The twenty-sixth chapter of Rishibhashit²⁰² contains the collection of preachings of the *Arhat-rishi* named Maatang. In Jain tradition besides Rishibhashit there is no mention of Maatang anywhere. Although *Avashyak* mentions about a Maatang *Yaksha*, it is difficult to connect him with Maatang of Rishibhashit in any way. In this chapter of Rishibhashit first of all the attributes of a true *Brahman* have been stated. These attributes are similar to those mentioned in the twenty-fifth chapter of *Uttaradhyayan*²⁰³, as well as the *Brahman* section of *Dhammapad*.²⁰⁴ However, here these attributes have been briefly mentioned only in six couplets, whereas in *Dhammapad* and *Uttaradhyayan* comparatively more detail is available. Even then, besides a difference in language there is hardly any difference in the subject matter.

Besides this, this chapter also discusses spiritual-cultivation (*Adhyatmic Krishi*). This subject is also available in the thirty-second chapter of Rishibhashit, titled *Pingiya*, and the *Kasi-Bhardwaj-sutta* of the Buddhist work *Suttanipat*.²⁰⁵ At the end of this chapter it has been mentioned that he who indulges in such cultivation that involves compassion towards all beings, attains purity; be he *Brahman*, *Kshatriya*, *Vaishya*, or a *Shudra*. It should be recalled that the fourth couplet of thirty-second chapter titled *Pingiya* is same, verbatim.

Besides Jain tradition Buddhist tradition also mentions Maatang. In Buddhist literature Maatang has been stated as a *Pratyeka Buddha* and resident of Rajgriha. According to *Maatang Jatak*²⁰⁶ he was born in a *chandal* (a lower cast Hindu) family and he stripped the *Brahmans* of their bloated pride. The true image of a *Brahman* conveyed in his preachings in Rishibhashit also indicates that he rejected the supremacy

of *Brahman* caste on the basis of birth. The word *Maatang* indicates chandal caste. It is worth mentioning that the *Maatang Jatak tale* of Buddhist tradition is similar to the 12th chapter of *Uttaradhyayan*²⁰⁷ titled Harkeshi.

In Brahman tradition we find mentions of Maatang Rishi in *Mahabharat*²⁰⁸ also. The preachings of Maatang Muni in *Mahabharat* basically convey that a brave person should always continue his endeavours. He should not bow before any one, because to work is the duty of man. The brave may perish under blows of adverse predicament but they would never bow down. When we compare this message of Maatang with the preachings in Rishibhashit, one similarity becomes evident that both direct an individual to follow the conduct as per his family tradition. In Rishibhashit Maatang expresses astonishment at *Brahmans* becoming warriors, and rulers and traders indulging in religious rituals. He considers such acts to be blind acts. This chapter mainly conveys that *Brahman* should neither wear a bow nor ride a chariot or carry other armaments. True *Brahman* should neither resort to falsehood nor stealing.

All this information leads us to the conclusion that Maatang was an important pre-Mahavir and Buddha Rishi, born in lower caste and propagated spiritualism. His preachings were accepted with reverence by all the three traditions, Jain, Buddhist and Vedic.

27. VARATTAKA

The 27th chapter of Rishibhashit²⁰⁹ compiles the preachings of Arhat Rishi named Varattaka. In Jain tradition, besides Rishibhashit, *Avashyakchurni*,²¹⁰ *Nisheeth-Bhashya*,²¹¹ *Vrihatkalp-bhashya*,²¹² *Haribhadra* commentary of *Avashyak*²¹³ etc. also mention him. The ninth chapter of the sixth section of the available edition of *Antkritdasha* is about Varattaka. Here he is said to be a trader of Rajagriha city who accepted monkhood through Mahavir and got Nirvana on Vipul mountain. But in *Avashyak-churni*, *Nisheeth-bhashya*, and *Vrihatkalpa-bhashya* he is said to be a minister of king Abhayasen of Varattapur town. According to *Avashyak-churni* he was inducted into monkhood by Acharya Dharmaghosh.

Besides *Avashyak-churni* the story of Varattak is also available in *Rishimandal-vritti*. According to this story, during his monk life he did a forecast which resulted in the victory of king Dhundhumar of Sunsumar city, over Chanda Pradyot. Knowing the cause of Dhundhumar's victory,

Chanda Pradyot addressed Varattaka as *Naimitik-Muni* (a forecasting monk). Knowing the folly of his unbridled utterings, Varattaka devoted himself to repentful meditation and attained *moksha*. How true is this story is hard to tell, but these details about Varattaka indicate that he must have been an important Rishi.

This chapter contains, in form of preachings of Varattaka Rishi, an outline of what an ideal *sraman* should be like. According to this a monk should be averse to the contacts with worldly people or householders. At the same time, leaving ties of affection, he should pursue the path of liberation by keeping away from mental aberrations and indulging in studies. Entertainment of house-holders by reading dreams, predictions, satisfying vain curiosities etc., accepting and utlising charity ; joining the marriage and other ceremonial rituals of disciples ; accompanying rulers in war; all such acts, done for mundane pleasures and attracting disciples and followers, are against the conduct of a monk. A *sraman* who tolerates pleasure and pain by becoming poor and religious and does not abandon his goal, becomes victor of senses, detached and is not reborn.

These preachings of Varattaka, with slight verbal variations, are found also in the *Sabhikshu* and *Paap-sraman* chapters of *Uttaradhyayan*. However, there the names of the preachers are not clear. In Buddhist tradition there is a mention of a Varana—ther²¹⁴ who became a monk influenced by the preachings of some jungle dwelling monk. However, it is difficult to connect him in any way to Varattaka. We do not find any reference of Varattaka in Vedic tradition. As such it is difficult to infer any thing about him on the basis of sources other than Jain and Buddhist.

28. AARDRAK

The twentyeighth chapter of Rishibhashit²¹⁵ is about Aardrak. Available Prakrit forms of Aardrak are *Adda-a* and *Addag*. However, we should remember that Rishibhashit contains details of two monks with similar names-Aardrak and Uddalak. In Prakrit Uddalak is called Uddalava; as such a note should be taken of the variation in the Sanskrit forms of these two names.

Besides Rishibhashit, we find mention of Aardrak also in *Sutrakritang*,²¹⁶ *Sutrakritang-niryukti*²¹⁷ and *Sutrakritang-churni*²¹⁸. In *Avashyak*²¹⁹ also, he has been mentioned as Aardrak Kumar. According to *Sutrakritang* when he goes to become a monk, he meets monks from

other *Sraman* traditions like *Ajivak*, Buddhist, and *Hasti-tapas* etc. and they present the special attributes of their respective traditions.

Sutrakritang-churni also gives stories of his present and past births. According to the story he was the son of the king of Aardrakpur. Abhay Kumar had presented him an idol of Rishabh. Which inspired him to abandon the mundane life. In the Basantpur town a girl playfully took him as her husband and ultimately he had to marry her. But a few days later he once again moves out to become a monk and meets various monks as stated earlier. It is difficult to adjudge the authenticity of this story but one thing is certain, that he was some historical monk of the period of Buddha and Mahavir. The details of his discussions with monks of various traditions, narrated in *Sutrakritang*, confirm that he was either influenced by or belonged to the *Nirgranth* (Jain) tradition.

As regards his preachings in Rishibhashit are concerned, he preaches to be away from the lusty pleasures of the mundane world. According to him sexual desires are ailments and are the root cause of degradation. The people afflicted with sexual desires are sufferers of woes. Sexual desire is a sharp knife, it is poison. As long as a being does not destroy this knife or poison of sex he can not be liberated from the cycles of birth. The intellectual and scholar should try to remove his tarnishments every moment. When a single good deed of one moment is enormously beneficial, why would the efforts towards liberation not result in infinite benefits.

This discourse does not contain anything special or original. Many couplets of this chapter can be found in *Uttaradhyayan* and *Dash-vaikalik* with little verbal variations. The mention of Aardrak in an old work like *Sutrakritang* proves that he must have been a historical person. Besides Jain tradition, Aardrak does not find any mention in Buddhist and Vedic tradition, as such it is difficult to present comparative study of his life and works. Absence of his name in other traditions indicates that he was connected with *Nirgranth* (Jain) tradition also.

29. VARDHAMAN

In the 29th chapter of Rishibhashit²²⁰ are collected the preachings of *Arhat-rishi* named Vardhaman, According to the traditional belief of Jains he is said to be a *Pratyek-Buddha* or *Arhat Rishi* of the sect of *Teerthankar* Parshwa, but in my opinion this Vardhaman is none else but Bhagwan Mahavir himself. The family name of Mahavir, according to Jain tradition, is Vardhaman. *Kalp sutra* and *Chaturvinshat-stav* refer

to Mahavir by this name. As regards the story of Vardhaman's life is concerned, we find detailed description of his personality and philosophy in many ancient canonical works like *Acharanga*,²²¹ *Sutrakritang*,²²² *Bhagwati*,²²³ *Kalp-sutra*²²⁴ etc. In my opinion, there is no scope of any doubt in accepting that the Vardhaman of Rishibhashit is Bhagwan Mahavir recognised as the twentyfourth *Teerthankar* by Jains. Another proof of this is that there is complete similarity in the preaching of Vardhaman in Rishibhashit and Mahavir in the 32nd chapter of *Uttaradhyayan* and the '*Bhavana*'²²⁵ chapter of the second *Srutaskandha* of *Acharanga*.

In the beginning of this chapter he says :

There is influx from all around, why do you not stop this influx ? How this influx is blocked ? When the five senses are awake the soul sleeps and when these five sleep soul is awake. Through these five the particles (Karmic-particles) are ingested and through these five only the ingestion is blocked. The subjects, like words etc., of the five senses like hearing etc. are pleasant and unpleasant. One should not be attached to the pleasant ones and should not be averse towards the unpleasant. His influx is blocked, who is alert and unrevolting. That pure soul, who conquers his mind and its passions and indulges in right penance shines like the flame of a *yajna*. In this manner, this chapter emphasizes on the discipline of mind and the five senses.

This theme of this chapter, with slight verbal variations, is also available in the second *shrutaskandha* of *Acharanga* in the chapter titled *Bhavana* and in *Uttaradhyayan* in the 32nd chapter titled *Pramad-Sthan*. This proves that this must have been the original discourse of Vardhaman Mahavir. The sentence '*Deva Vi Tam Namasanti*' is also available in the first chapter of *Dash-vaikalik*.²²⁶

This was his original discourse and its language also is accordingly. Another proof of this inference is that in the *Pali-Tripitak*,²²⁷ in the discourse of Nigghanthanataputta (Nirgranth Jnata-Putra or Vardhaman) a part of a sentence is '*Savva Vari Varito.*' In Rishibhashit in this chapter there is a similar sentence : '*Savva Varihim Variye.*' It should be recalled that Pt. Rahul Sankratyayan has interpreted '*Vari*' as water, which is not correct. Here *Vari* means that which should be abandoned or washed, or the evil deeds; *Sutrakritang*²²⁸ also mentions in preachings of Mahavir : '*Se variya itthi sarayabhattam.*'

Besides Jain literature the mention of Mahavir Vardhaman is also available in Pali Buddhist literature. Here he has been mentioned as

Nigganth Nataputta and believed to be a senior contemporary of Buddha. According to the *Nirvana* years of Buddha and Mahavir, Buddha appears to be approximately 30 years younger to Mahavir. He has been recognised as one of the six *Teerthankar* contemporaries of Buddha. The references about him in the Pali literature have been thoroughly researched by Indian as well as Western scholars, As such I do not feel the need to discuss much about the subject here.

I would only like to discuss one point from *Thergatha Atthakatha*,²²⁹ that has been neglected by scholars. In the *Atthakatha* of *Thergatha*, Vaddhaman-ther has been mentioned as a *Lichchhavi* prince of Vaishali. This is the information which relates him to Vardhaman Mahavir. After a comparative study I have arrived at the conclusion that not all the *Thers* of *Thergatha* belonged to the Buddhist tradition. Thoughts of many famous pre-Buddha *Sramans* have been included in it. However, due to sectarian polarisation, efforts have been made in *Atthkatha* to connect them to Buddhist tradition.

As Rishibhashit and *Uttaradhyayan* of Jains have compiled thoughts of Rishis of other *Sraman* traditions, *Thergatha* also has compiled thoughts of *Rishi's* of other *Sraman* traditions. On this basis, I believe that Vaddhaman of Rishibhashit and Vaddhaman of *Thergatha* are same. At the same time Nigganth Nataputta of *Pali Tripitak* and Vardhaman Mahavir of Jains are same as Vaddhaman of *Thergatha* and Rishibhashit. On this basis the historicity of Vardhaman is also clearly established. In *Thergatha* also Vardhaman-ther has talked of abandoning attachment just like in *Aacharanga* and *Uttaradhyayan*.

30. VAYU

The thirtieth chapter of Rishibhashit²³⁰ is about the *Rishi* named Vayu. Besides Rishibhashit nowhere else in Jain canonical literature can one find a mention of Vayu Rishi. Although the third out of eleven chief disciples (*Ganadhar*) of Mahavir was named Vayubhati,²³¹ it is difficult to say that he was same as Vayu Rishi, Because, on this issue no evidence is available within or without the tradition, In Buddhist tradition Vayu has been mentioned only as a god.

In Vedic sources also, Vayu has been accepted only as a god. Only *Shantiparva* of *Mahabharat* mentions an ancient Rishi Vayu who visited Bhishm while he was on the arrow-bed. Similarly *Shalyaparva* of *Mahabharat* mentions about Vayu-chakra, Vayu-jwal, Vayubal, Vayu-

mandal, Vayureta, and Vayuveg Rishis. But first of all they appear to be *Pauranic* (pre-historic) not historical, and secondly there is no apparant similarity with Vayu Rishi. Besides this, another Rishi named Vayubhaksha has been mentioned; he was present in the assembly of Yudhishtar²³² and also met Krishna on the way. Vayubhakshi ascetics have also been mentioned in *Aupapatik*.

As regards the preachings of Vayu Rishi are concerned, he chiefly propagates the *Karma* principle. He says that as one sows so he reaps, good deeds bring good results and bad deeds bad. No act goes in vain. How the fruition of *Karma* takes place after death has been asserted by stating that it is the roots that are watered but fruits grow on branches, which means that fruit is displaced by time and space from the act of watering. Similarly, the effect of the deeds takes place at a different place at different time. Besides this simple propagation of *Karma* principle, no other original thought is found in this chapter.

31. PARSHWA

The thirty first chapter of Rishibhashit²³³ contains the philosophical thoughts of Arhat Parshwa. Although the traditional belief of Jains is that this Arhat Parshwa was a *Pratyek Buddha* contemporary and not Teerthankar Parshwa himself. But all scholars unanimously accept that he is Parshwa himself. The Propagation of *Chaturyam* (four dimensional religion) in his preachings is a conclusive evidence of this theory²³⁴. Although the Buddhist and Vedic sources do not provide any information about Parshwa, the propagation of *Chaturyam sanyam* by Nirgranth Jnata putra in Buddhist tradition is in fact the *Chaturyam* of Parshava.

Similarly, Buddhist literature contains information about Buddha's uncle, Vappashakya, being a follower of Nirgrantha tradition. Vappa also must have been from the tradition of Parshwa, because Mahavir's tradition was only at the developing stage during that period. The historicity of Parshwa is established by various evidences and many Eastern and Western scholars have accepted this. In this context I have dealt in my book 'Arhat Parshwa and His Tradition'²³⁵; readers may consult it for further details.

In Jain canonical literature details about Parshwa and his tradition are available in Acharanga²³⁶, Sutrakritang²³⁷, Samvayang²³⁸, Bhagwati²³⁹, Aupapatic²⁴⁰, Rajprashniya²⁴¹, Niryalika²⁴², Kalpa-sutra²⁴³, Avashyak-churni²⁴⁴ etc. Besides this, many story books contain story of Parshwa's life partly and fully. Uttaradhyayan, Sutrakritang and Bhagwati have

explained the difference between traditions of Parshwa and Mahavir²⁴⁵. Main points of contradiction were Chaturyam and Panch Mahavrata (five major vows) and cladness and uncladness. But besides these there were other points of contradiction like form of discourse regarding Pratikraman (re-evaluation) and Ahimsa; information about Samayik, discipline, blockage of Karma influx, morals and penance; these have been discussed in Sutrakritang and Bhagwati. According to Bhagwati Sutra, Kalasya-Vaishik putra, an ascetic follower of Parshwa, while being inducted to Mahavir's monk organisation, accepted five vows and Sapratikraman dharma (rites of daily re-evaluation of activities), and also as discipline, uncladness, head shaving, non-bathing, not brushing teeth, uncovered head and feet, sleeping, on floor, sleeping on sheet, sleeping on wood, plucking hair, continence, entering others house for alms²⁴⁶, equanimity for available and non available. This shows that these disciplines did not prevail in the tradition of Parshwa.

The rules about keeping umbrella, shoes, leather bags, and cutting of nails, mentioned in the *Chhed* sutras, were adopted in Mahavir's school through the influence of the Parshwa followers. This is also true that due to the luxurious inclinations of *Parshwite* monks, *Pasath (Parshwath)* became a synonym of laxness in conduct. *Jnata* and *Avashyak-churni* contain mentions of laxness of many monks and nuns belonging to the tradition of Parshwa²⁴⁷. All this indicates that Parshwa was a historical *Rishi* whose tradition, which was comparatively easy going, prevailed during Mahavir's period and many *Parshwite* monks were shifting to Mahavir's school.

As regards the philosophy of Parshwa described in Rishibhashit, it is the most ancient and authentic form of religious and philosophic beliefs of Parshwa available. Rishibhashit contains both philosophical and religious thoughts of Parshwa. It should be noted that Rishibhashit also contains that variation of Parshwa chapter which was included in the book titled *Gativyakaran*²⁴⁸. From philosophical view point it contains form of the Universe; movent of matter and soul; *Karma*, its precipitation, fruition, and various consequences. Also discussed are *panchastikaya* (five fundamentals) and form of *Moksha*. From view point of conduct it contains discussion about Chaturyam, passions, the eighteen evil activities from killing to misconception, sterile food etc.

First of all it conveys that the Universe and five fundamentals are eternal. But with the acceptance that the Universe is eternal, it has also been stated that it is transient; the fact that Parshwa believed the

Universe to be eternal is also mentioned in Bhagwati sutra. Again, soul and matter both are said to be dynamic and soul tends to move upwards and matter downwards. Originally four movements, *Dravyagati* (movement of matter), *Bhavagati* (movement of thought or feeling), *Kshetragati* (Movement of space) and *Kaalgati* (movement of time) have been discussed. but in text variation *Prayogagati* (movement inspired by others) and *Visrasagati* (self inspired movement), have also been discussed. Also narrated is the discussion about eight types of *Karmic* bondages and four categories of life forms. Text variation also details *Audayik* and *Parinamikgati*. (self evolved and consequentially evolved life forms). Along with is mentioned that a being suffers the consequences of evil and good deeds done by him. In the end presenting the moral thoughts it has been said that one who follows *Chaturyam*, is devoid of passions, and eats sterile food, does not enter the eight types of *Karmic* bondages, and ultimately gets liberated²⁴⁹.

32. PING

In Rishibhashit²⁵⁰ Ping has been mentioned as *Brahman Parivrajak Arhat Rishi*. The adjective *Brahman Parivrajak* clearly indicates that he was a Rishi of Brahman tradition. His discourse in Rishibhashit mainly propagates details about spiritual cultivation. An unknown Rishi asks Ping, "Which is your farm (working area) ? What is irrigation ?" The reply given is "Soul is the farm or working area, penance is the seed, discipline is irrigation and Ahimsa and attitude are the oxen. This is spiritual cultivation. For a dispassionate monk only this cultivation is proper, and it begets happiness in the next life. Being compassionate towards all beings, if one indulges in this cultivation; be he *Brahman*, *Kshatriya*, *Vaishya* or *Shudra*; he attains omniscience²⁵¹. This is the description of spiritual cultivation, which on one side explains the spiritual cultivation and on the other hand clarifies that practicing such cultivation leads to liberation irrespective of caste and creed. The most important information that this chapter provides is that a *Brahman Parivrajak* propagates the concept of liberation for all the four castes.

In Rishibhashit itself this type of spiritual cultivation has been described with a little variation in the 26th chapter of Maatang. This chapter of Ping has only four verses on this topic whereas in the Maatang chapter eight verses describe the same topic. Thus this chapter contains just a brief version of the spiritual cultivation detailed in the 26th chapter titled Maatang.

In Jain tradition I have not come across this type of spiritual cultivation, but in Buddhist tradition *Suttanipat* and *Sanyutta Nikaya* describe

this spiritual cultivation. In the fourth chapter, Kasi Bhardwaj, of *Suttanipat* we find its details. There, Buddha himself is presented as a farmer. He says, "Faith is seed, penance is rain, knowledge is yoke, humility is the stud of yoke, memory is my plough. I am disciplined about food and speech. I un-weed the truth. The endeavour towards *nirvana* are the oxen drawing my plough. They perpetually move in the direction leading to the place where there is no pathos. Such cultivation gives nectar as fruit. Doing such cultivation man becomes free of all sorrows."

Sanyutta Nikaya also provides almost same description. The description about spiritual cultivation conveys that in society at some point there was an aversion towards *sramans* seeking alms. These *sramans* were told that instead of begging alms they should indulge in cultivation. In reply to such suggestion the *sramans* presented the details of spiritual cultivation.

Besides Rishibhashit, details about Ping are found in Buddhist²⁵² tradition as well. In *Anguttar Nikaya* of Buddhist tradition there is a mention of a Brahman named Pingiyani, who lived in Vaishali and was a follower of Buddha. *Sanyutta Nikaya* also mentions a Pingi Bhikshuk who attained *Arhathood*. *Suttanipat* also mentions Maharshi Pingi. In the *Parayan Vagga* of *Suttanipat*, initially Maharshi Pingi is said to be a disciple of Bavari. Maharshi Pingi is one of the sixteen disciples of Bavari. He has been addressed with adjectives like—*Lok Vishrut* (famous), *Dhyani* (mendicant), having refined past life *Karma*, *Gani* (leader). In the *Pingi Manavak Puccha Sutta* of *Parayan Vagga* the dialogue between Buddha and Pingi has been narrated. Here Pingi describes his old age to Buddha and says that he is delapidated, weak, bad complexioned; his eyes and ears are not fully functioning. Stating thus he seeks discourse from Buddha so that he may be rid of life and death and does not, in process, beget death with attachment.

Buddha preaches Pingi to be alert and end desires. These details from *Suttanipat* clearly indicate that Ping was contemporary of Buddha but senior to him in age. The information about his being a disciple of Buddha, available in *Suttanipat*, is for the purpose of glorifying Buddha's field of influence. As such the description available in *Suttanipat*, cannot be accepted verbatim. Prof. C.M. Upasak²⁵³ has conveyed the possibility of Pingi or Pingiyani of *Pali* literature being a different person and not the Ping of Rishibhashit. According to him, Ping of Rishibhashit was an ancient *Rishi* who started the tradition of Pingi or Pingiyani monks.

I have no objection agreeing to the inference drawn by Prof. Upasak. It is a possibility that some *Pingiyani* of the tradition of Ping

Rishi may have been converted into Buddhism. But, probably, Prof. Upasak has not noticed the above mentioned narration from *Suttanipat*. He is probably referring to the *Pingiyani* of *Anguttar-Nikaya* and *Samyutta-Nikaya*. *Suttanipat* has mentioned that he was a disciple of Bavari, as such here Ping indicates person not sect. Also the adjectives like leader of the people, famous in the land, mendicant and others have been given to his name as an individual. He was certainly elder to Buddha.

It is a matter of doubt, if Pingi of *Suttanipat* should be taken as Ping of Rishibhashit or his disciple, but all this goes to prove the historicity of the *Arhat Rishi* of Rishibhashit named Ping. In the *Atthakatha* of *Suttanipata* Pingi has been addressed as *Arhat*²⁵⁴. As such there is a possibility of Ping of *Suttanipat* being non else but Ping of Rishibhashit.

Mahabharat²⁵⁵ mentions one *Rishi* named Pingal. But it is difficult to connect him with Ping of Rishibhashit on basis of their period and other facts.

33. MAHASHALPUTRA ARUN

The thirtythird chapter of Rishibhashit is about the preachings of Mahashalputra Arun. Besides Rishibhashit mention of Arun is not found anywhere in canonical and other Jain literature. Rishibhashit calls him Mahashalputra Arun²⁵⁶. Question is that who is this Arun Rishi ? In fact Arun is a *Upanishadic Rishi*. Schubring equates Arun with the *Upanishadic Rishi Aaruni*²⁵⁷, which is incorrect because Aaruni's other name is Uddalak and Rishibhashit contains an independent chapter on Uddalak. The word Aaruni itself indicates that he was either a descendent or disciple of Arun. As such Mahashal Arun was either father or teacher of Aaruni Uddalak. In the *Vedic* encyclopidia and names appendix of *Mahabharat*²⁵⁸ Aaruni-Uddalak is one person and Arun is his father. According to *Shatpath Brahman* and *Brihadaranyakopanishad* his full name was "Arun Aupaveshi Gautam". He was called Aupaveshi as he was a disciple of Upaveshi and Gautam as he belonged to the Gautam clan²⁵⁹.

Now the question is that what is the reason behind adding Mahashalputra before his name mentioned in Rishibhashit ? According to Chhandogyopanishad the *Brahmans* trained by Ashwapati were called Mahashal²⁶⁰; as Arun was also trained by Ashwapati, he may have been called Mahashalputra. Thus it is proved that Mahashalputra Arun of Rishibhashit is the *Upanishadic Rishi* Arun Aupaveshi Gautam and father and teacher of Aaruni Uddalak. The name of Sanjaya, the ruler of Mithila,

has also been used in this chapter. We shall discuss about this while discussing the 39th chapter titled Sanjaya.

As regards the preachings of Arun Rishi stated in Rishibhashit, he says a person's wisdom and foolishness can be judged only on the basis of his language, behaviour, and conduct. Rustic language, evil deeds, and lack of morality about his conduct are signs of foolishness. On the other hand civilized language, good deeds, and morality in conduct are signs of wisdom. With this it has been revealed that the company one keeps has the maximum influence on a person. This fact has been elaborated with many examples. In conclusion it has been stated that a wise and disciplined ascetic should completely understand equanimity and Ahimsa and keep company of inspiring freinds.²⁶¹

Although Buddhist tradition mentions five persons named Arun,²⁶² none can be connected with Arun of Rishibhashit on the basis of available details. As such the conclusion remains that Mahashal putra Arun of Rishibhashit is Arun Aupaveshi Gautam of *Upanishads*.

34. RISHI GIRI

The thirty fourth chapter of Rishibhashit contains the discourse of Brahman Parivrajak named Rishigiri. He has not been mentioned anywhere else besides Rishibhashit. Although mentions of Rishidatta, Rishi-gupta etc. are available, it is difficult to establish any connection with Rishigiri. Similarly there is no mention of *Brahman Parivrajak* named Rishigiri in Buddhist and *Vedic* traditions. As such it is difficult to provide any information about his personality.

His preachings²⁶³ advise to tolerate with equanimity the pains inflicted by evil and foolish people. He states that if some one criticizes in absentia one should be equanimous by thinking that he is not criticizing in your presence. If someone criticizes in your presence you should think that he is inflicting by words and not physically. If some one gives physical pain you should think that he is not using a weapon to disfigure. If he disfigures, you should think that he is not killing. And if he kills you should think that he is not depriving you of your *Dharma* (duty or religion). "An ignorant is foolish by nature, he is not aware of good or bad consequences", thinking thus you should be equanimous towards him.

It should be noted that same details are also available in *Pali* literature. Here Buddha asks a monk, "If some one criticizes you, what shall

you do ?” The monk replies, “I will think that he is only criticizing me, he is not beating me.” In this manner complete discourse is repeated. The only difference is that in Buddhist tradition it is in the form of a dialogue between Buddha and a monk, whereas in Rishibhashit it is in the form of preaching of Rishigiri.

Besides this the chapter directs to become practitioner of five great vows, devoid of passions, and disciplined in thought and senses, by knowing the form of the universe. A weak person deeply involved in passions and pleasures sometimes wishes for death and sometimes for life, ultimately destroying himself. But the one who is not allured by lust begets liberation, that is without bondage and attachment. This discourse of Rishigiri is also available elsewhere in simple terms. As such on the basis of these preachings we do not get any inkling of any speciality in his concepts.

35. UDDALAK

The 35th chapter of Rishibhashit contains the discourse of Uddalak (Uddala-a). In the Jain canonical and other literature Uddalak has not been mentioned anywhere else besides Rishibhashit. In fact Uddalak is a *Upanishadic Rishi*. He was son of Arun Aupaveshik Gautam. His famous name was Uddalak-Aaruni. He has been called Aaruni because of being son of Arun. His mention is found in *Shatpath Brahman, Kausheetaki Brahman, Etereya Brahman, Brihadaranyak Upanishad, Chhandogyopanishad*,²⁶⁴ etc. He was a disciple of his father Arun, Patanchal Kapyra of Madra (a geographical area). His son was Shwetaketu. Although he is also said to be the father of Nachiketa, Shri Suryakant has expressed his doubt in Vedic encyclopedia.²⁶⁵

In Uddalak *Jatak* of Pali literature we find mention of Uddalak²⁶⁶. According to this he was son of the state priest of Benaras, born to a slave mother. He went to Takshashila for education and after completing his education he became leader of a group of monks. He traveled back to Varanasi and earned ample respect of masses. But the state priest, knowing of the ambiguity of his conduct, forced him to abandon monkhood and made priest under himself. Shwetaketu has also been mentioned in this context. In Vedic tradition Shwetaketu is said to be Uddalak's son. All these references indicate that this story has been presented in the Buddhist tradition after distorting it.

On these grounds we may infer that Uddalak mentioned in Rishibhashit, *Jatak Katha* and *Upanishads* is same person.

Coming to his preachings in Rishibhashit,¹⁶⁷ he has first of all prohibited the four *Kashayas* (passions). He who indulges in these, wanders (in cycles of birth) in this world. And who does not indulge in these, is without anger, vanity, illusion, and greed, three vices in three media (mind, speech, and body), ego, four *Vikathas*, and with five *Samitis* (attitudes), isolated from five senses. He accepts food, bed, and seat that are totally pure, without the faults of their origin, obtained from various sources, made by others, without heat and smoke, without any implement but cured by implements, specifically and only for survival and development. After that, is stated the discussion on problem of activities for self and others and the directions for purification of soul. His view is that only a seeker of soul can become an instrument of welfare in true sense. How can he indulge in welfare of all, who cannot even control his own passions and lust. Without development of soul even the welfare becomes cause of bondage. Because only a pure soul imparts peace to self and others.

In this chapter five senses, ambitions, medias of expression, ego and twenty two types of pain, have been mentioned as thieves; because these commit theft of the wealth of inner peace. As such the mendicant has been advised to be alert always.

The uniqueness of this chapter is that here only the terminology of traditional Jain conduct has been used. As such a natural doubt arises that if the ideas propagated belong to Uddalak or the compiler, put forward in the name of Uddalak. In absence of any evidence, for or against, nothing conclusive can be derived on this issue. Still the possibility that the ideas have been accepted according to the then prevailing Jain beliefs can not be ignored.

36. NARAYAN (TARAYAN)

The thirty sixth chapter of Rishibhashit is about the discourse of Tarayan (Narayan) Rishi. In Jain literature, besides Rishibhashit, Narayan Rishi has been mentioned in *Sutrakritang*²⁶⁸ and *Sutrakritang-churni*.²⁶⁹ In Rishibhashit a prefix 'Vitta', has been added to his name; what it indicates is not clear. *Sutrakritang* and Rishibhashit both indicate that he was an outsider for Jain tradition, but due regards were being given to him.

The central theme of the preachings of Narayan Rishi is the irrepressible nature of anger.²⁷⁰ It has been stated that fire can be quenched by water but the fire of anger is difficult to quench. Fire destroys only this life but anger destroys many future incarnations. Man

inflicted with anger suffers agony and disturbance recurrently. Simple darkness can be removed by light but the darkness of anger is difficult to remove. Also, anger burns self as well as others. Because of anger all the three good attributes of *Dharma* (religion), *Artha* (wealth), and *Karma* (vitality) are destroyed. As such, anger should be curbed.

Although the eighth Vasudev in Jain tradition is also named Narayan, who has also been referred to as Laxman; but he is some one else, not Narayan (Tarayan) of Rishibhashit. He may be recognised as Narayan Rishi of the *Vedic* tradition. In *Vedic* or Hindu tradition Narayan is the name of the God himself; but Narayan Rishi, who is believed to be a reincarnation of God, is also mentioned there. Generally he is known as one of the pair of Rishis named Nara-Narayan;²⁷¹ They are believed to have done penance for thousands of years at Badrikashram.²⁷² There is a mention of their dialogue with Narad in *Shantiparva*²⁷³. The tenth section of *Taittiriya Aranyak* is popularly known as *Narayanopnishad*.²⁷⁴

There is no information about Narayan Rishi in Buddhist tradition. Details available from other sources help coming to the conclusion that Narayan (Tarayan) mentioned in *Sutrakritang* and Rishibhashit is the Narayan Rishi of Hindu tradition.

37. SRIGIRI

The thirty seventh chapter of Rishibhashit is about the *Brahman Parivrajak* named Srigiri. Like Tetaliputra (10), Bahuk (14), Utkatvadi (20), Parshwa (31), chapters this is also fully in prose. Besides Rishibhashit, mention of Srigiri is not available anywhere in *Vedic*, Buddhist, or Jain literature. As such no information about the personality of Srigiri is available from any source.

In the first part of this chapter²⁷⁵, three principles about creation have been stated. It says : (1) First of all there only was water, an egg appeared in it, then the universe was born and it became full of life. This universe was not created by Varun (god of water); thus Srigiri negates the concept of the universe being created out of an egg. This is well known that this concept about creation was present in the *Upanishadic* thoughts. In *Sutrakritang*²⁷⁶ also this concept has been mentioned and negated. (2) The second concept about creation is of *Maya* (illusion); the universe is said to be born out of illusion. But Srigiri opposes this hypothesis and says that this world is not an illusion. Thus negating both these theories he presents his third theory of eternalism as : (3) It is not that this world did not exist some time in the past, does not exist at the present moment,

and will not exist some time in the future. Thus the universe has been accepted as eternal here. The same concept was given by Parshwa also and confirmed by Mahavir in *Bhagwati-sutra*. In Vedic tradition the *Mimansa* philosophy is similar to this concept. *Upanishads* also mention this.

The preachings of Srigiri regarding conduct indicate that he supported the *Vedic* rituals; still the *Agnihotra (Yajna)* presented by him does not contain procedure about animal sacrifice. He says, "At dawn and at dusk; collecting milk, butter, honey, salts, conchshell and wood; I shall live, keeping the Yajna-fire alive offering all these. That is why I say this; hearing this, the mendicant should move with the sun; stop where night falls; when the sun rises, start moving again, properly and looking up to four yards in all directions, East and West and South and North." This information about movement with sun is also available in varied forms in *Kappa (Dashashrut Skandha 5/6-8)*, *Nisiha (Nisheeth-10/31/34)* and *Dasa-veyaliya (Dashvaikalika-8/28)*²⁷⁷ of Jain tradition. Generally, this concept was popular with all the *Sraman Brahman Parivrajaks*. As such inspite of comparative study, we only get authentic information about Srigiri's ideas, but nothing about his personality.

38. SARIPUTRA (Satiputta)

The thirty eighth chapter of Rishibhashit is about the preachings of Sariputra (Satiputta) Arhat Buddha. This Satiputta is certainly the Sariputra of Buddhist tradition. Mention of the word 'Buddha' with his name and similarity of his ideas with Buddhist tradition are important evidences of this. Besides Rishibhashit Sariputra has been mentioned in *Avashyak-Churni*²⁷⁸. There, he has been shown as a follower of Buddha. Similarly, *Sheelank-commentary of Acharanga*²⁷⁹ also mentions him. Besides, there is also a mention of Saidatta (Swatidatta) Brahman who was a citizen of Champa. Mahavir had spent four months of a monsoon in his yard²⁸⁰. But it is difficult to establish his connection with Satiputta or Sariputra.

Detailed information about Sariputra is available in Buddhist tradition. Dictionary of Pali Proper Names has devoted ten pages to his details compiled from Pali literature²⁸¹. Due to lack of space so much details cannot be included here; I will only deal with some important facts. Buddhist tradition has expressed its reverence toward him by accepting him to be one of the two front-line disciple of Buddha.

He is said to be the son of Brahman Vanganta, his mother's name was Roopsari. He got his name Sariputra from his mother Sari. Buddha

called him *Dharma Senapati* (religious commander) and *Mahaprajnawan* (extremely wise). Before joining the Buddhist religious organisation he was a disciple of Sanjaya. Sanjaya has also been mentioned in Rishibhashit as *Arhat Rishi*²⁸². Barua has accepted this Sanjaya as Sanjaya Velatthiputta²⁸³, one of the six *Teerthankar* contemporaries of Buddha. I am also of the opinion that this Sanjaya was the initial teacher of Sariputra, who refused request of Sariputra to meet Buddha. In Pali literature, preachings and philosophical thoughts of Sariputra are available in details. A comparative study of these with Rishibhashit is naturally expected.

In Rishibhashit the main theme of Sariputra's preachings is to avoid extremes and follow the middle path²⁸⁴. This preaching is the central theme of Buddhism. He says, the pleasure that results in bliss is the only real pleasure, but the pleasure that results in anguish should not be indulged in. This statement conveys that not the pain-giving pleasure, but the bliss-giving pleasure is cherishable. Pleasure begets bliss. Pain does not beget bliss. He further states, that eating good food, sleeping in a comfortable bed, and living in a cozy abode, a monk may concentrate in meditation whereas with unlikeable food, bed, and abode he meditates with discomfort. Here the opposition of the practice of abusing the body is clearly evident. This does not mean that Sariputra was a supporter of lustful indulgences. In the following verse he has preached about discipline of the senses. He says, an alert and intelligent mendicant should not be attracted towards the pleasures of the senses; indulgence in them should be abandoned. Because the sleeping senses of an alert mendicant cause minimal sorrows.

Further, giving transcendence from pleasure and pain as the purpose of meditation, it has been stated that as sweet or bitter medicine is taken for cure of a disease as per the directions of a doctor, similarly stringent or simple practices are done for the cure of the ailment of attachment as per the direction of the wise. As the purpose of treatment is riddance from disease not pleasure or pain; similarly the purpose of meditational practices is riddance from attachment not pleasure or pain, although pleasure and pain are inevitable in the process. Thus a practicing mendicant has been asked to remain aloof from pleasure and pain. The *Samveg* (fear of the evil) of common man and *Nirved* (detachment) of good person are signs of humility if they are desireless. Embracing the middle path in context of living in abode or jungle, Sariputra states that for a brave, who has won over the senses, there is no difference between jungle or a church. For a soul indulging in itself, jungle and

village are same. Such soul can attain purity irrespective of being a monk or a citizen.

In this manner Sariputra emphasizes on purity of attitude and not the means; which is a peculiarity of the Buddhist religious philosophy. The above mentioned details also indicate that this Sariputra is the Sariputra of Buddhist tradition. The basis of this inference is that the initial verses of this chapter have been used with some verbal variations in the *Sutrakritanga* commentary by Sheelank and the commentary of *Shatdarshan Samuchchaya* to clarify the Buddhist view point. According to the traditional belief, he is supposed to be an *Arhat Rishi* or *Pratyek Buddha* of the period of Mahavir. Being a contemporary of Buddha, he is automatically proved to be a contemporary of Mahavir as well.

39. SANJAY

The thirty-ninth chapter of Rishibhashit is about the *Arhat Rishi* named Sanjay. Besides Rishibhashit, Sanjay finds a mention in *Uttaradhyayan*²⁸⁵ also. Although there are many persons named Sanjay, mentioned in Jain tradition, they are not connected, in any way, with Sanjay of Rishibhashit. However, there is no scope of any doubt that the Sanjay mentioned in 18th chapter of *Uttaradhyayan* is same as the Sanjay of Rishibhashit.

According to *Uttaradhyayan* he was the King of Kampilpur. Once he went for hunting in Keshar park and shot a deer. Finding the deer near the feet of meditating Acharya Gardabhill, he got afraid of the monk's curse and begged his pardon. Impressed by the *Acharya's* discourse about goodwill and Ahimsa, he abdicated the throne and became a monk disciple of Gardabhill. The incident of this deer hunt has been accepted by him in the fifth couplet of this chapter, where he says, "I am not concerned with the tasty meals and gorgeous abodes for which Sanjay goes into the jungles to kill deer".²⁸⁶ No further proofs are needed to show that Sanjaya of Rishibhashit and *Uttaradhyayan* is one person.

The chapter of *Uttardhyayan* under reference is titled "*Sanyatiya*", which is not correct; it should be titled '*Sanjayiya*'. According to *Uttardhyayan*, he was a disciple of Gardabhill. In the thirtythird chapter of Rishibhashit it has been mentioned that due to the company of benevolent friends, Sanjay, the king of Mithila, attained godhood. (33/16). But this Sanjay is the King of Mithila whereas Sanjay of *Uttaradhyayan* is the King of Kampilpur; as such they cannot be taken as

same. In my opinion Sanjay of 33rd chapter and the preacher of 39th chapter are different.

In Buddhist tradition seven persons having the name Sanjay are mentioned.²⁸⁷ Besides the earlier teacher of Sariputra and the one well known by the name Sanjay Velatthiputta, no other Sanjay can in any way be connected with Sanjay of Rishibhashit. Buddhist scholars have little dispute in accepting Sanjay Velatthiputta and the earlier teacher of Sariputra as one. He is believed to be one of the six *Teerthankar* contemporaries of Buddha; so at least the period is same. His joining the Buddhist organisation with Sariputra, Moggalayan, and two hundred and fifty disciples also confirms that he was a prominent Acharya of his age. As such it is an undisputed fact that the earlier teacher of Sariputra and Sanjay Velatthiputta are the same person.

Now the question is that this Sanjay Velatthiptta and the Sanjay of Rishibhashit are also one or not. If we accept the traditional belief that Sanjay of Rishibhashit was a contemporary of Mahavir, then connecting him with Sanjay Velatthiputta, the earlier teacher of Sariputta, who was contemporary of Buddha, has no periodic hurdle. Because when Rishibhashit can compile the discourse of Mankhali Goshal, a contemporary of Mahavir, there can be no objection to compiling the thoughts of Sanjay Velatthiputta.

In the Buddhist tradition Sanjay has been termed as skeptic or indicsive, because he did not give final or conclusive answer to philosophical questions. In modern terms he must be visualising various possible alternatives to the solution of a philosophical problem, and consequently did not use a conclusive terminology. This view point of his is evident in the following words mentioned in Rishibhashit : 'To understand the evil *Karma* comprehensively is a matter of doubt.²⁸⁸ Because the decision about a *Karma* being good or evil is possible only on pondering properly from angles of matter, space, time, attitude, and effort' The term '*Rahasse*' used in Rishibhashit, is worth a special thought. Also, here "*Sammam Janitta*" would be more appropriate in place of "*Samajjinitta*" (refer to the prose part after the fourth couplet). In Rishibhashit the discourse of Sanjay is very brief. It states that evil deed should neither be done nor made to be done; if done by force of circumstances, it should not be repeated again but criticized instead.

In conclusion, it can be said that Sanjay Rishi mentioned in Rishibhashit and *Uttaradhyayan* are same. It is a strong possibility that he

was also the earlier teacher of Sariputta and one of the six *Teerthankar* contemporaries of Buddha, Sanjay Velatthiputta. In Vedic tradition we find the mention of Sanjay, a minister of Dhritarashtra;²⁸⁹ but from periodic and other angles he is a different person than the Sanjay of Rishibhashit.

40. DVAIPAYAN (Devayan)

The fortieth chapter of Rishibhashit contains the collection of preachings of Dvaipayana Rishi. Besides Rishibhashit, Dvaipayana (Deevayan) has also been mentioned in *Sutrakritang*²⁹⁰, *Samvayang*,²⁹¹ *Aupapatik*,²⁹², *Antakritadasha*²⁹³, *Dashvaikalik-churni*²⁹⁴, and *Sutrakritang-churni*²⁹⁵. He has uniformly been said to be a *Rishis* from outside the *Nirgranth* tradition. *Sutrakritang* has mentioned him with *Rishis* like Nami, Bahuk, Asit Deval, Narayan Parashar etc, and that he attained omniscience inspite of consuming unboiled water, fruits etc. According to *Samvayang* he shall be a *Teerthankar* in next ascending time cycle. In *Aupapatik* he has been mentioned as the founder of a particular tradition of *Brahman Parivrajaks*. *Antakritadash*, *Dashvaikalik-churni* etc. state that *Yadavs* disturbed his meditational practices and he decided to destroy them; as a result he was born Agnikumar Dev (a god) and destroyed Dvarka. Efforts have not been made to concieve a composit picture of his personality based on the variety of stories available about him in these canons, but in my opinion all these stories are concerning only one Dvaipayana. The traditional belief that he was a contemporary of Mahavir is incorrect. According to the aforesaid reference he must have been a *Pre-upanishadic Rishi* of the *Mahabharat* period.

In the Buddhist tradition there is a mention of two persons having the name Kanha Deepayana.²⁹⁶ The story narrated in the Krishna Dvaipayana (Kanha Deepayana) *Jatak* about Kanha Deepayana does not have any relations with Dvaipayana (Deevayana) of Rishibhashit and Jain tradition. But in *Jataks* there is another story of Kanha Deepayana where he has been shown as instrumental to the destruction of Dvarika (Dvaravati) and the clan of Vasudev (*Yadav* clan). With slight variation, this story is available in all the three Jain, Buddhist, and *Vedic* traditions.

In the *Vedic* tradition Krishna Dvaipayana or Dvaipayana has been mentioned in details in *Mahabharat*.²⁹⁷ In the *Vedic* tradition his popular name is Vyas or Vedavyas. He is said to be the son of Maharshi Parashar and the author of *Mahabharat*. He fathered three sons Dhritrashtra, Pandu, and Vidur from Vichitravirya's wives on request of Bhishma.

Shukdev is also said to be his son. Vaishampayan was his chief disciple. *Mahabharat* contains detailed description of his life and preachings; however, it contains more of pre-history and less of history. On the basis of the details in the three traditions, Jain, Buddhist, and Vedic, it may be inferred that he was some historic person of the pre-historic period. But the absence of his name in the ancient *Upanishadic* literature is worth a consideration. Of course, his father Parashar and Parashar's sons have been mentioned there.²⁹⁸

His preachings compiled in Rishibhashit direct towards changing desire into desirelessness.²⁹⁹ In other words it is a message of sublimating ambition. He says that it is because of desires that man gets sorrows. Under the influence of desires he neglects every one including parents, teacher, king, and gods, Desire is at the root of loss of wealth, bondage, separation from king, life, and death. As such desires should be conquered; because desirelessness is the basis of bliss. The second and third verses of this chapter are also available in the thirty sixth chapter of Rishibhashit with little verbal variations. Similarly the statement, '*Jaha Thamam Jaha Balam Jadha Viriyam*' can also be found in *Dashvaikalik*.

41. INDRANAG

The forty first chapter of Rishibhashit is about the Arhat Rishi named Indranag. Besides Rishibhashit Indranag's mention is also available in *Avashyak-niryukti*,³⁰⁰ *Visheshavashyak-bhashya*,³⁰¹ *Avashyak-churni*,³⁰² *Haribhadra Vritti of Avashyak*,³⁰³ and *Sheelank commentary of Acharang*.³⁰⁴ He was famous as a child ascetic. Ganadhar Gautam contacted him. He is said to be an inhabitant of Jeernapur (Jinnapur). I have not been able to find any thing about him from Buddhist and *Vedic* traditions. Jain sources also confirm that he was a contemporary of Mahavir; this also has traditional acceptance.

As regards the preachings of Indranag in Rishibhashit are concerned, he first of all states that the penance or good deed done for livelihood is meaningless. A man indulging in mundane passion destroys himself. Monkhood should not be made a profession. A monk should also not earn his living through teaching, magical spells, massage carrying prophecizing etc. Thus the theme of his discourse is to practice discipline, rising above the mundane desires. Generally speaking this preaching can be found at many places. The thirteenth verse of this chapter is available verbatim in *Uttaradhyayan* and *Dhammapad*. Similarly the sixteenth verse is also available in the twelfth chapter of Rishibhashit.

titled Jannavakk (Yajnavalkya), and with little verbal variation in *Dash-vaikalik* also.

42-45, SOMA, YAMA, VARUNA AND VAISHRAMAN

The last four chapters of Rishibhashit are about Soma, Yama, Varuna, and Vaishraman respectively. Although they have been stated to be *Arhat Rishis* in these chapters and according to the appendix, all these four *Pratyek Buddhas* are believed to have lived during the period of Mahavir, no information about their historicity is available from any source. However, in Jain literature there is mention of a *Brahman* named Som who was inducted into the tradition of Parshwa. It is also believed that after death he was reborn as Shukra.³⁰⁵ Similarly Varun has been stated as a follower of *Sraman* tradition, who died in *Rath-Musal* war, and was reborn as a god. He believed that if one dies in a war he goes to heaven.³⁰⁶

Similarly we find the mention of Yama as father of Yamadagni,³⁰⁷ although it is not clear that the same person is the Yama Rishi of Rishibhashit. Buddhist tradition also mentions some persons named Soma, Varun, etc. but to connect them with these Rishis of Rishibhashit is difficult. Infact in all the three traditions, Jain, Buddhist, and *Vedic*, they have been accepted as *Lokpal* (Sector Guardians). Whereas in Jain tradition the four *Lokpals* are Soma, Yama, Varun, and Vaishraman;³⁰⁸ in the *Vedic* traditions the four *Lokpals* are Indra, Agni, Yama, and Varun.³⁰⁹ They are believed to be the preachers of religion. In *Upanishads* the dialogue between Yama and Nachiketa is very popular. Still all the four are mythological figures not historical persons. The belief that *Lokpal*, are preachers of religion must have been the cause of including them in Rishibhashit. However, the adjective *Arhat Rishi*, attached to their names is worth a consideration.

As regards the preachings of these four *Rishis*, the preachings of the first three, Soma, Yama, and Varun are simply in one verse each. Only the preachings of Vaishraman are in detail and in fifty three verses.

Soma preaches that a mendicant, irrespective of being senior, middle, or junior in grade, should endeavor to achieve more than just a little.³¹⁰

Yama preaches that he is best among men, who is not happy by gains and not vexed by losses.³¹¹

Varun says that only he can arrive at right conclusion who is unaffected by attachment and aversion.³¹²

As regards Vaishraman's preachings, he initially states simple preachings about containment of lust and not indulging in evil deeds. With this he conveys the importance of Ahimsa and directs towards observing Ahimsa by presenting the ideal of equality of all life with the self.³¹³ This chapter contains examples like serpents of *Agandhan* variety³¹⁴, pot of oil³¹⁵, and comparison of good and evil *Karma* with gold and iron shackles.³¹⁶ These examples have further evolved in *Uttaradhyan*, *Dashvaikalik*, *Avashyak-churni*, *Kalpa-Sutra* commentary, and *Samayasara* of Kundkund.

It is clearly evident that there is no facet of Jain religion and philosophy that does not have its basic root available in Rishibhashit. In fact, the need of the day is that a detailed, and comparative study of the personalities of Rishibhashit and their preachings is seriously undertaken. A valuable achievement of such a study would be that the proximity of various religious traditions in India will be revealed as also the sources of thoughts and ideas that have been absorbed by the Jain tradition.

RISHIBHASHIT NIRYUKTI AND RISHI MANDAL

It also seems necessary to discuss here about Rishibhashit *Niryukti* and *Rishi Mandal*. In the *Niryukti* works of Acharya Bhadrabahu, Rishibhashit has been mentioned in *Avashyak-Niryukti* and *Sutrakritang-Niryukti*. In *Avashyak-Niryukti*, promising to write a *Niryukti* on Rishibhashit, he writes the following verse.

आवस्सगस्स दसकालिअस्स तह उत्तरज्झमायारे ।
 सूयगडे निज्जुति वुच्छामि तथा दसाणं च ॥
 कप्पस य निज्जुति, ववहारस्सेव परमणिउणस्स ।
 सूरिअपणत्तीए, वुच्छं इसिभसिआणं च ॥

—आवश्यक निर्युक्ति-84-85

After this, in the *Sutrakritang Niryukti*, explaining the importance and style of Rishibhashit he says :

तह वि य कोई अत्थो उप्पज्जइ तम्मि समयम्मि ।
 पुद्वभणिओ अणमओ य होइ इसिभासिएसु जहा ॥

—सूत्रकृतांगनिर्युक्ति-181

This means, if special meanings of statements are seen in some principles of other traditions, it is considered acceptable and of earlier origin like Rishibhashit. This is an indication that Rishibhashit is authentic and of earlier origin. If the term "work of earlier origin" has been used for the literature of the tradition of Parshwa, which is acceptable to Mahavir's tradition, than Rishibhashit will have to be taken as a work of Parshwa tradition. Schubring, in his preface, has accepted it to be connected with the tradition of Parshwa.

In the *Avashyak-niryukti* of Bhadrabahu we find information that Rishibhashit-*Niryukti* was written. But Rishibhashit-*Niryukti* is not available now. As a result scholars are not in agreement if Bhadrabahu had written this *Niryukti* or not. The general belief is that he had promised to write a *Niryukti* on Rishibhashit, but he could not write it. There may be two reasons for his not writing Rishibhashit-*Niryukti*. One is that he might have died before commencing the work. Second may be that, as Rishibhashit contained the thoughts of *Rishis* of other traditions, he might have intentionally dropped the idea of writing the *Niryukti*. But looking at the '*Isimandalatthu*', mentioned in *Acharanga-churni*, and the available *Rishimandal-stava (Isimandal)*, I feel that Rishibhashit-*Niryukti* must have been written; it does not matter if it is not available today. In its present form *Isimandal* can not be accepted as the *Niryukti* of Rishibhashit; however, my belief is that some verses of Rishibhashit *Niryukti*, in their original or changed form, have certainly been included in it. There is some basis of this belief, on which scholars should express their reaction after serious deliberations.

First of all we have to adjudge the similarity between the styles of Rishibhashit and a *Niryukti*. The peculiarity of the style of a *Niryukti* is that it contains the etymological explanation of some important words used, as well as a brief description of the subject matter dealt in the part or chapter of the original work, on which the *Niryukti* is being written. In *Isimandal* we find the following two verses briefly detailing the subject matter of *Isibhasiyaim* (Rishibhashit) :

नारयरिसिपामुक्त्वे, वीसं सिरिनेमिनाहृतित्थम्मि ।
 पन्नरस पासत्तित्थे, दस सिरिवीरस्स तित्थम्मि ॥
 पत्तेयबुद्ध साहू, नमिमो जे भासिउं सिवं पत्ता ।
 पणया वीसं इसिभासियाइं अज्झयण पवराइं ॥

—इसिमण्डल-४४, ४५

These verses can certainly be the initial verses of some *Niryukti* or an explanatory work on *Isibhasiyaim* (Rishibhashit). However, these two verses are also believed to be the beginning verses of the appendix of Rishibhashit.

Similarly, the following two verses from *Rishimandal* about *Narad* also appear to be a brief detail of the *Narad* chapter of Rishibhashit :—

मुच्चा जिणिदवयणं, सच्चं सोयं ति पभणिओ हरिणा ।
कि सच्चं ति पवत्तो चिन्ततो जायजाइसरो ॥
संबुद्धो जो पढमं, अज्भयणं सच्चमेव पन्नवई ।
कुच्छुल्लानारयरिसि, तं वंदे सुगइमणुपत्तं ॥

इसिमण्डल ४२, ४३

If we compare these two verses with the following verse of *Sutrakritang-Niryukti*, the similarity in style would be self evident. The verse under reference from *Sutrakritang-Niryukti* is as follows :

अदपुरे अदसुतो नामेणं अदओ ति अणगारो ।
ततो समुट्ठियमिणं अज्भयणं अदइज्जं ति ॥

—सूत्रकृतांग निर्युक्ति-१८७

Similarly the following verses of *Rishimandal* and *Sutrakritang-Niryukti* convey the similarity of language and style, on comparing :—

नालंदाए अद्धत्तेरस-कुलकोडिकय निवासाए ।
पुच्छिअ गोअमसामि, सावयवपच्चक्खाणविहि ॥
जो चरमजिणसमीवे, पडिवन्नो पंचजामियं धम्मं ।
पेढालपुत्तमुदयं, तं वंदे मुणियसयलनयं ॥

—इसिमण्डल १०२, १०३

Comparable with ;

नालंदाए समीवे मणोहरे भासि इन्दभूइणा उ ।
अज्भयणं उदगस्स उ एयं नालन्दइज्जं तु ॥
पासावचिज्जो पुच्छियाइयो अज्जगोयंम उदगो ।
सावगपुच्छा धम्मं सोउं कहियम्मि उवसन्ता ॥

—सूत्रकृतांगनिर्युक्ति २०४, २०५

Although, from the view point of antiquity and rhyming, the verses of *Rishimandal* appear to be of later period as compared to the verses of *Sutrakritang-Niryukti*, still both have the similarity of style.

The said comparative similarity leads to the inference that some *Niryukti* on Rishibhashit must have been written. The verses of this *Niryukti* must have been included in original or varied form, first in *Isimandal* and later in *Rishimandal Prakaran (Isimandal)*, believed to have been written by Dharmaghosh. The mention of majority of the *Rishis* of Rishibhashit in *Rishimandal* confirms the belief that even if the available edition of *Isimandal* is not accepted as the *Niryukti* of Rishibhashit or the *Isimandalatthu* mentioned in *Acharanga-Churni*, one thing is clear that it contains many verses of those works.

Today there are many works, available, having the name *Rishimandal*. Some of these are in Sanskrit and others in Prakrit. We get information about these from the catalogues of libraries of manuscripts in Khambhat, and Jaisalmer and also in the book-*Jinaratna-Kosh*. But in this analysis we are concerned with the Prakrit work *Isimandal (Rishimandal)* popularly supposed to have been written by Dharmaghosh-suri. Generally speaking the *Rishimandal*, written in Prakrit language, is believed to be a work by Dharmaghosh-suri belonging to the *Tapagachhiya* sect. His period is the early fourteenth century; but this has not been accepted conclusively. There are many reasons for this :

1. *Khartargachha, Tapagachha, Achalgachha and Upkeshgachha* all have *Acharyas* named Dharmaghosh-suri in the chronological list of their *Acharyas*. In the last verse of *Rishimandal* only 'Siridhammaghosam' is mentioned. As such it is difficult to ascertain to what sub-sect (*gachha*) this Dharmaghosh belonged and what was his period.

2. In the collection of Jaisalmer and Khambhat, ancient manuscripts of *Isimandal Prakaran* are available. Of these, the oldest palm leaf copy of *Vritti* of *Rishimandal Prakaran* is available in Jaisalmer. The date of transcribing of this copy is 1380 Vikram, so the period of writing should be still earlier. According to the *Tapagachha* list of *Acharyas*, the period of Dharmaghosh of *Tapagachha* is Vikram 1302 to 1357. If it is a work of later part of his life, it does not seem plausible that the work of writing it and getting copied could be done during 23 years. On this basis, in the preface to *Shri Rishimandal Prakaran (with-Vritti)* printed at Nirnaya Sager press, Vijayobhang Suri has expressed the possibility of antiquity of the commentator as against the original author, if it is accepted as a work of Dharmaghosh-suri of *Tapagachha*. According to him this seems to be a work done by Dharmaghosh-suri the disciple of *Vidhipaksha Anchalgachha Nayak Jayasingh Suri*. His period was Vikram 1208 to 1268.

3. The most important point against accepting *Rishimandal* (*Isimandal*) as a work by Dharmaghosh-suri is that there is a mention of '*Isimandalatthu*' in *Acharanga-churni*. This ascertains that some work of this name was certainly seen by the author of the *churni* of *Acharanga*. The author of *Acharanga-churni* is believed to be Jindasgani Mahattar. Scholars have deduced his period to be Vikaram 650 to 750. *Nandichurni* mentions its writing period as Shaka 598 which is Vikram 733. Which means that *Acharanga-churni* must also be of the same period. This proves that '*Isimandalatthu*' must be a work of a period earlier to this or of the sixth century, at least Scholars have accepted the period of Bhadrabahu (second), the author of *Niryuktis* as same. Here the other possibility is that Bhadrabahu promised of writing Rishibhashit *Niryukti*, but later, he himself wrote *Isimandalatthu* instead. What was the actual content of '*Isimandalatthu*', is difficult to say today.

4. Another problem in accepting *Rishimandal* to be a work by Dharmaghosh-suri is that all the copies of *Rishimandal* do not contain the last verses in which the name of Dharmaghosh-suri as its author is mentioned. The *Rishimandal vritti* with Gujarati translation, published by Jain Vidyashala, Ahmedabad, also does not contain this verse. In the copies believed to be written by Dharmaghosh-suri, as mentioned in the catalogues of Jaisalmer and Khambhat collections, there is difference in total number of verses. Some copies mention 208 and 210 verses and others 225 and 233 verses.

Not only this, there is also a clearly evident difference in number of verses available in the published editions of *Rishimandal* stava. For example :

a) *Rishimandal Vritti*—with *Vritti* by Shubh Vardhan-suri, published by Jain Vidyashala, Doshiwada Pole, Ahmedabad in 1925, has 205 verses. Here the author is not mentioned as Dharmaghosh-suri.

b) *Jain Stotra Sandoh*—published by Prachin Jain Sahityoddhar Granthavali, Sarabhai Manilal Navan, Ahmedabad, in 1832, has 209 verses. Here the author is mentioned as Dharmaghosh Sraman.

c) *Rishimandal Prakaran*—with *Vritti* by Padmanandi, published by Seth Pushpachandra Kshemchandra, Valad via Ahmedabad in 1939, has 217 verses, the author is mentioned to be Dharmaghosh Saman.

All this conveys that the *Rishimandal*, believed to be written by Dharmaghosh-Suri has differences in the available editions. Also, there

is a difference in the sequence of verses as well. As such the possibility that the available edition of *Rishimandal Prakaran* contains verses from the *Isimandalatthu* or *Rishibhashit-Niryukti*, mentioned in *Acharanga churni*, can not be ruled out. Thus it is doubtful that the *Rishimandal-Prakaran* supposed to be written by Dharmaghosh-suri is totally his creation.

5. On analysing the last verses of *Rishimandal Prakaran*, I feel that the last three or four verses are later additions into the original. Earlier editions of *Rishimandal Prakaran* must have concluded with the salutation of Devardhigani Kshama Sramana. This is because in the lists of *Sthavirs* (a category of monks) in *Nandisutra* and *Kalpasutra* also, there are salutations to *Acharyas* upto Devardhigani Kshama Sraman. Had *Rishimandal Prakaran* been actually the work of Dharmaghosh-suri, it would have contained mention of some prominent *Acharyas*, of post Devardhigani period, like Siddhasen, Jindas, Haribhadra, Siddharshi, Abhaya Dev, and Hemchandra.

In one of the four verses after the verse of salutation of Devardhigani Kshama Sraman there is salutation to a monk named Duh-prasaha, a nun named Falgusri, and house-holders named Nagil and Satyasri; all supposed to come to existence during the end of the fifth section of the present time cycle (*Avasarpini*). In whole of *Rishimandal* this is the only verse where salutations have been offered to householders. Also, the mention of these monk, nun, and house-holders, of the fifth section of the time cycle, first came in *Teerthodgalic* and *Vyavahar-Bhashya*, and these works are of a period certainly not earlier than the sixth century A. D.

The next verse has salutations to the past and present *Rishis* of the areas named Bharat, Airavat, and Videh. The verse after this has salutations for Brahmi, Sundari, Rajimati, Chandana and others. The salutations to nuns is found only in these verses. In the last verse the name of Dharmaghosh-suri has been mentioned as the author of the work. Here also the author has written his name as Sri-Dharmaghosh (Siri Dhammaghosh). The use of *Sri* before his own name by an author is worth a thought. I feel that these verses were added to the old *Isimandalatthu*, only after some corrections and additions. Even if this is considered to be an independent work, there should be no objection in accepting that it was written on the basis of *Isimandalatthu* mentioned in *Acharanga-churni*. Scholars are expected to make a serious investigation on this matter.

THE LANGUAGE OF RISHIBHASHIT

Prof. Schubring has done a detailed analysis, in his preface, about the form of language and style of verses of Rishibhashit. He has also discussed the text variations available in the existing manuscripts, as such neither an elaborate commentary on this matter is necessary nor do I consider myself an authority on that subject. Still I feel the need of re-editing of the original text edited by Prof. Schubring, from the view point of language.

As far as the language of Rishibhashit is concerned, it is the ancient form of *Ardhamagadhi*, the similarity of which with Sanskrit is evident at places. According to the antiquity of language, it can be placed somewhere between first *Shruta-skandha* of *Acharanga* and *Sutrakritang/Uttaradhyayan*. Whereas, an influence of Maharashtri Prakrit can be seen in *Sutrakritang* and *Uttaradhyayan*, Rishibhashit can be said to be generally free from the influence of Maharashtri Prakrit. Although, at some places, word forms appear to be influenced by Maharashtri Prakrit, proper study reveals that this influence must have come only through the mistakes of transcribers.

For example, out of the fortyfive chapters in Rishibhashit forty three contain the word *Buiyam*, or *Buitam*. Out of these forty three, thirty six mention *Buitam* and only seven mention *Buiyam*. Certainly, the word form *Buiyam* conveys the influence of Maharashtri. But it is not logical that the original author would use the form *Buitam* in thirty six chapters and *Buiyam* in seven chapters. It is clear that the form *Buiyam* must have inadvertently come due to the carelessness of the transcribers and influence of Maharashtri on them. Same is the case of *Jadha* and *Jaha*, *Mossikar* and *Moosiyar*, *Tati* and *Tai*, *Dhaota* and *Dhooyam*, *Loye* and *Loge*. At the end of fortieth chapter *Jaha* and *Jadha* have been used in same line (*Jaha Balam Jadha Veerayam*). Certainly, such use would not be to the liking of the author; this variation must have come due to passage of time.

Also, whereas in the third, twentyfifth, and fortyfifth chapters, use of only the *Jadha* form is seen, in the ninth, twelfth, twentysecond and twentyeighth chapters the word *Jaha* has been used. As such the question worth a consideration is that, was the original form in different chapters retained during compilation ? Or these variations are due to later influences. Generally speaking, Rishibhashit contains the use of first person like *Pabhasati*, *Jayati*, *Meghati*, *Hinsari*, *Jevati*, *Vindaṭi*,

Vijjati, Chindati, Seedati, Visujjhati, Vassati, Sinchati, Luppatti etc., and the tendency of omitting the last consonant, like in Maharashtri Prakrit is not seen. In the whole Rishibhashit the omission of the last consonant is not seen except at eight or ten places.

Similarly the use of the sound 'Ya' instead of 'Ta' is negligible. Generally, complete Rishibhashit predominantly uses the sound 'Ta'. For *Atma*, leaving aside one or two instances, everywhere the word '*Aata*' has been used. In the tenth chapter the word *Tetaliputta* has been used at places, and not *Teyaliputta* as in *Jnatadharma-Katha*. Similarly in the same chapter *Moosikaridhoota* word has been used for his wife. However, at one place *Dhooyam* word has also been used. It is clear that these exceptions from later Maharashtri forms must have crept into the editions of original text due to later influence. It is possible that when palm leave copies of this work were done, these changes must have come due to the influence of the language of that period through the scribes.

Although this influence of Maharashtri Prakrit on Rishibhashit is not more than two percent, the same influence on the *Ardha Magadhi* canons like *Acharanga, Sutrakritang, Uttaradhyayan* and *Dashvaikalika*, supposed to be ancient, is approximately fifteen to twenty five percent. However, one reason for this may be that whereas *Uttaradhyayan* and *Dashvaikalika* were in more popular use, Rishibhashit was not much in use. As a result, the effect of changed pronunciations must have been less on Rishibhashit, and because of others being more in use, this effect on them must already have set in even before the palm leave copies were made, after the last vocal rendering. Unfortunately, at the time of editing of the canons these facts were not considered and efforts to retain the oldest form of language was not made.

I feel that the old manuscripts of ancient *Ardhamagadhi* works like *Acharanga, Sutrakritang, Rishibhashit, Uttaradhyayan, Kalpasutra*, and others should be collected and if any manuscript contains old text form, it should be preserved. Not only this, where there are variations like *Aata* and *Aaya, Jadha* and *Jaha. Loye* and *Loge* in the same line, only the old forms should be accepted. It is a matter of contentment that some scholars like professors Madhusudan Dhaki and K. R. Chandra and others have drawn attention in this direction. I am hopeful that in the future editions of the canons, these facts will be attended to. As the lingual form of a book is very much helpful in determining its period, this is the responsibility of scholars that oldest form of the language of the work is retained,

On a comparative study we find that many words and parts of verses and prose of *Acharanga*, *Sutrakritang*, *Uttardhyayan*, *Dashvaikalik* and *Jnatadharmakatha* are also available in Rishibhashit. But the comparative study of the language forms of these reveals that from the view point of language the text of Rishibhashit is older. For example, a comparative study of Tetaliputta chapter of Rishibhashit and Teyaliputta chapter of *Jnata* reveals that the language of Rishibhashit has predominance of the sound 'Ta' and is older. Similarly in *Acharanga*, *Sutrakritang*, *Uttardhyayan*, and *Dashvaikalika*, whereas 'Aaya' word has been used for *Atma*, in Rishibhashit, except one or two places, the 'Aata' form has been used. This confirms its antiquity.

CONCLUSION

Thus we observe that according to its language and subject matter, Rishibhashit is proved to be the oldest work of Prakrit literature. As we have proved earlier, this work is the oldest in the whole Pali and Prakrit literature, leaving aside, the first *Shrut-Skandha* of *Acharanga*, and belongs to the 5th century B. C. It is not only that this work is important because it is old, but also because the mentions of the ancient sages and their beliefs are historically valuable. It contains details about some such sages about whom no further information is available. Uniqueness of this work lies in its being free of sectarian prejudice.

Its writing in the Jain tradition is a sign of the tolerance and openness of Jainism on one hand and on the other that the stream of Indian spiritualism is one at its source, irrespective of getting divided later into *Upanishadic*, Buddhist, Jain, *Ajivak*, and other rivulets. Rishibhashit is the only work that compiles at one place the discourses of *Upanishadic Rishis*, *Brahman Parivrajaks*, *Ajivaks*, *Sramans*, Buddhist monks and Jain ascetics. This work is a clear proof of the assimilative and tolerant nature of Indian thought. Today when we are deeply bogged into communal seperatism and strife this great work could be an enlightening guide. I hope that widespread propagation of this work would release us from the communal blindness.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

At the outset, I am grateful to Shri D. R. Mehta, secretary of Prakrit Bharati Academy, and M. Vinay Sagar whose persistant persuasion made this detailed preface a work of research. Although a lot more serious contemplation is still needed, I hope the young scholars would

fulfil this need. The publication of this book was delayed because of me. For which I apologise before the publishers as well as the readers.

I also express my gratitude towards Prof. Schubring and other scholars who have done explorative analysis and contemplation of this important work and whose writings have helped my working. Similarly, I am grateful to the authors of Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, *Vedic Kosh*, *Mahabharat Namanukramika* and others which provided easy references to me. In the end I express my gratitude toward Prof. Madhu Sudan Dhaki and my research assistants and associates Dr. Arun Pratap Singh, Dr. Shiv Parasad Singh, Dr. Ashok Kumar Singh and others who have helped me complete this preface.

Sagarmal Jain

Professor and Head, Philosophy Deptt.
M. L. B. Arts and Commerce College,
Gwalior.

Translated into English by

Surendra Bothara,
Jaipur.

APPENDIX

Foot Notes :

1. (अ) से कि कालियं ? कालियं अणेगविहं पणत्तं ।
तं जहा उत्तरज्झयणाइं 1, दसाओ 2, कप्पो 3, ववहारो 4, निसीहं 5, महानिसीहं 6, इसिभासियाइं 7, जंबुद्दीवपण्णत्ती 8, दीवसागरपण्णत्ती ।
—नन्दिसूत्र ८४ ।
—(महावीर विद्यालय, बम्बई 1968)
- (ब) नमो तेसिं खमासमणाणं जेहिं इमं वाइअं अंगबाहिरं कालिअं भगवंतं ।
तं जहा—
1. उत्तरज्झयणाइं, 2. दसाओ, 3. कप्पो, 4. ववहारो,
5. इसिभासियाइं, 6. निसीहं 7. महानिसीहं..... ।
(ज्ञातव्य है कि पक्खियसुत्त में अंग-बाह्य ग्रन्थों की सूची में 28 उत्कालिक और 36 कालिक कुल 64 ग्रन्थों के नाम हैं । इनमें 6 आवश्यक और 12 अंग मिलाने से कुल ८२ की संख्या होती है, लगभग यही सूची विधिमार्गप्रपा में भी उपलब्ध होती है ।)
—पक्खियसुत्त (पृ० 79)
(देवचन्द लालभाई पुस्तकोद्धार फण्ड सीरिज क्रमांक ६६)
2. अंगबाह्यमनेकविधम् । तद्यथा—सामायिकं, चतुर्विंशति स्तवः, वन्दनं, प्रतिक्रमणं, काय-व्युत्सर्गः, प्रत्याख्यानं, दशवैकालिकं, उत्तराध्यायाः, दशाः, कल्पव्यवहारौ, निशीथं, ऋषि-भाषितानीत्येवमादि ।
—तत्त्वार्थाधिगमसूत्रम् (स्वोपज्ञभाष्य) 1/20
(देवचन्द लालभाई पुस्तकोद्धार फण्ड, क्रम संख्या 56)
3. तथा ऋषिभाषितानि उत्तराध्ययनादीनि.... ।
—आवश्यक निर्युक्तिः, हारिभद्रीयवृत्ति पृ० 206
4. ऋषिभाषितानां च देवेन्द्रस्तवादीनां निर्युक्तिं..... ।
—आवश्यक निर्युक्ति, हारिभद्रीय वृत्ति पृ० 41
5. इसिभासियाइं पणयालीसं अज्झयणाइं कालियाइं, तेसु दिण 45 निव्विएहिं अणागाढ-जोगो । अण्णे भणंति उत्तरज्झयणेसु चैव एयाइं अंतम्भवन्ति ।
विधिमार्गप्रपा पृ० 58
देविदत्थयमाई पइण्णगा होंति इमिगनिविएण ।
इसिभासिय अज्झयणा आयांबिलकालतिगसज्झा ॥ 61 ॥
केसिं चि मए अंतम्भवन्ति एयाइं उत्तरज्झयणे ।
पणयालीस दिणोहिं केसिं वि जोगो अणागाढो ॥ 62 ॥
विधिमार्गप्रपा पृ० 62

(जातव्य है कि प्रकीर्णकों की संख्या के सम्बन्ध में विधिमार्गप्रपा में भी मतैक्य नहीं है । 'सज्भायपट्ठवण विही' पृ० 54 पर 11 अंग, 12 उपांग, 6 छेद, 4 मूल एवं 2 चूलिका सूत्र के घटाने पर लगभग 21 प्रकीर्णकों के नाम मिलते हैं । जबकि पृ० 57-58 पर ऋषिभाषित सहित 15 प्रकीर्णकों का उल्लेख है ।)

6. (अ) कालियसुयं च इसिभासियाइं तइओ य सूरपण्णत्ती ।
सव्वो य दिट्ठिवाओ चउत्थओ होई अणुओगो ॥ 124 ॥ (मू० भा०)
तथा ऋषिभाषितानि उत्तराध्ययनादीनि 'तृतीयश्च' कालानुयोगः,
—आवश्यक हारिभद्रीय वृत्ति : पृ० 206

(ब) आवस्सगस्स दसकालिअस्स तह उत्तरज्झमायारे ।
सूयगडे निज्जुत्ति वुच्छामि तहा दसाणं च ॥
कप्पस्स य निज्जुत्ति ववहारस्सेव परमणिउणस्म ।
सूरिअपण्णत्तीए वुच्छं इसिभासिआणं च ॥
—आवश्यकनिर्युक्ति 84-85

7. पण्हावागरणदसाणं दस अज्झयणा पन्नता, तंजहा-उवमा, संखा, इसिभासियाइं, आय-रियभासिताइं, महावीरभासिताइं, खोमपसिणाइं, कोमलपसिणाइं अद्दागपसिणाइं, अंगुट्टपसिणाइं, बाहुपसिणाइं ।
—ठाणंगसुत्ते, दसमं अज्झयणं दसट्ठाणं
(महावीर जैन विद्यालय संस्करण पृ० 311)

8. चोत्तालीसं अज्झयणा इसिभासिया दियलोगचुताभासिया पण्णत्ता ।
—समवायंगसुत्त-44

9. आहंसु महापुरिसा पुब्बं तत्ततवोधणा ।
उदएण सिद्धिमावन्ना तत्थ मंदो विसीयति ॥ 1 ॥
अभुंजिया नमी विदेही, रामपुत्ते य भुंजिआ ।
बाहुए उदगं भोच्चा तहा नारायणे रिसी ॥ 2 ॥
आसिते दबिले चव दीवायण महारिसी ।
पारासरे दगं भोच्चा बीयाणि हरियाणि य ॥ 3 ॥
एते पुब्बं महापुरिसा आहिता इह सम्मता ।
भोच्चा बीओदगं सिद्धा इति मेयमणुस्सुअं ॥ 4 ॥
—सूत्रकृतांग 1/3/4/1-4

10. Suttrakritang-2/6/1-3,7,9.
11. Bhagwati, shatak-15
12. Upasakdashang chapter 6 and 7
13. (a) Suttanipat-32 Sabhiya-sutta
(b) Deeghnikaya, Samanjafal-sutta

14. ये ते समणब्राह्मणा संगिनो गगिनो गणाचरिया आता यसस्सिनो तित्थकरा साधु सम्मता बहुजनस्स, सेप्यथीदं-पूरणो कस्सपो, मक्खलि गोसालो, अजितो केसकम्बली, पकुधो कच्चायनो, संजयो बेलट्ठिपुत्ता, निग्गण्ठो नातपुत्तो ।
—सुत्तनिपात, 32-सभियसुत्त
15. (अ) पालिसाहित्य का इतिहास (भरतसिंह उपाध्याय) पृ० 102-104
(ब) It is.....the oldest of the poetic books of the Buddhist Scriptures.
—The Suttanipata (sister Vayira) Introduction for P. 2
16. उभो नारद पवता ।
—सुत्तनिपात 32, सभियसुत्त 34,
17. असितो इसि अद्दस दिवाविहारे ।
—सुत्तनिपात 37, नालक सुत्त 1
18. जिण्णेऽहमस्मि अबलो वीतवण्णे (इच्चायस्मा पिगियो) ।
—सुत्तनिपात 71 पिगियमाणवपुच्छा
19. Suttanipat-32, Sabhiya-Sutta
20. Ibid.
21. Ibid.
22. Ther Gatha 36; Dictionary of Pali Proper Names.
23. (अ) 'आता छेत्तं, तवो बीयं, संजमो जुअणंगलं ।
भाणं फालो निसित्तो य, संवरो य बीयं दढं ॥ 8 ॥
अकूडत्तं च कुडेसु, विणए णियमणे ठिते ।
तित्तिक्खा य हलीसा तु, दया गुत्ती य पग्गहा ॥ 9 ॥
सम्मत्तं गोत्थणवो, समिती उ समिला तथा ।
धित्तोज्जोत्तमुसंबद्धा सव्वण्णुवयणे रया ॥ 10 ॥
पंचेव इंदियाणि तु खन्ता दन्ता य णिज्जिता ।
माहणेसु तु ते गोणा गंभीर कसते किंसि ॥ 11 ॥
तवो बीयं अवंभं से, अहिंसा णिहणं परं ।
ववसातो घणं तस्स, जुत्ता गोणा य संगहो ॥ 12 ॥
धित्ती खलं वसुयिकं, सद्धा मेढी य णिच्चला ।
भावणा उ वती तस्स, इरिया दारं सुसंवुडं ॥ 13 ॥
कसाया मलणं तस्स, कित्तिवातो व तक्खमा ।
णिज्जरा तु लवामीसा इति दुक्खाण णिक्खति ॥ 14 ॥
एतं किंसि कसित्ताणं सव्वसत्तदयावहं ।
माहणे वत्तिए वेस्से मुद्दे वापि विमुज्झती ॥ 15 ॥
—इसिभासियाइं 26/8-15

- (ब) कतो छेत्तं, कतो बीयं, कतो ते जुगणंगले ?
 गोणा वि ते ण पस्सामि, अज्जो, का णाम ते किसी ? ॥ 1 ॥
 आता छेत्तं, तवो बीयं, संजमो जुगणंगलं ।
 अहिंसा समिती जोज्जा, एसा धम्मन्तरा किसी ॥ 2 ॥
 एसा किसी सोभतरा अलुद्धस्स वियाहिता ।
 एसा बहुसई होई परलोकसुहावहा ॥ 3 ॥
 एयं किसि कसित्ताणं सब्बसत्तदयावहं ।
 माहणे खत्तिए वेस्से मुद्दे वावि य सिज्भती ॥ 4 ॥

—इसिभासियाइं 32/1-4

24. सद्धा बीजं तपो वुट्ठि पञ्चा मे युगनंगलं ।
 हिरि ईसा मनो योत्तं सति मे फालपाचनं ॥ 2 ॥
 कायगुत्तो वचोगुत्तो आहारे उदरे यतो ।
 सच्चं करोमि निदानं सोरच्चं मेपमाचनं ॥ 3 ॥
 रिरियं मे धुरघोरम्हं योगक्खेमाधिवाहनं ।
 गच्छति अनिवत्तन्तं यत्थ गत्त्वा न सोचति ॥ 4 ॥
 एवमेसा कसी कट्ठा सा होति अमतप्फला ।
 एतं कसि कसित्वान सब्बदुक्खा पमुच्चतीति ॥ 5 ॥

—सुत्तनिपात, 4-कसिभारद्वाजसुत्त

25. अहं च भोयरायस्स तं च सि अन्धगवण्हणो ।
 मा कुले गन्धणा होमो संजमं निहुओ चर ॥

—उत्तराध्वयन 22/44

26. पक्खंदे जलियं जोई, धूमकेउं दुरासयं ।
 नेच्छति वंतयं भोत्तुं, कुले जाया अगंधणे ॥

—दसवैकालिक 2/6

27. अगन्धणे कुले जातो जधा णागो महाविसो ।
 मुंचित्ता सविसं भूतो पियन्तो जाती लाघवं ॥

—इसिभासियाइं 45/20

29. See-Introduction of Isibhasiyaim by Walther Schubring, Ahmedabad—1974.

30. Bhagwati, shatak-15.

31. Upasakdashang, chapter-3 and 7.

32. Jnatadharm Katha, Dropadi chapter.

33. पत्तेयबुद्धमिसिणो बीसं तित्थे अरिट्ठणेमिस्स ।
 पासस्स य पण्ण दस बीरस्स विलीणमोहस्स ॥

—इसिभासियाइं, पृ० 205

34. नारयरिसिपामुक्त्रे, बीसं सिरिनेमिनाहतित्थम्मि ।
 पन्नरस पासतित्थे, दस सिरिवीरस्स तित्थम्मि ॥ 44 ॥
 पत्तेयबुद्धसाहू, नमिमो जे भासिउं सिवं पत्ता ।
 पणयालीसं इसिभासियाइं अज्झयणपवराइं ॥ 45 ॥
 —ऋषिमण्डल प्रकरणम् 'आत्मवल्लभ ग्रन्थमाला ग्रन्थांक
 31, बालापुर, गाथा 44, 45
35. पण्हावागरणदसासु णं ससमय-पर-समय पणवय पत्तेयबुद्ध-विविहत्थभासाभासियाणं
 —समवायांग सूत्र 546
36. Bhagwati.
37. Brihadaranyak Upanishad, Chapter, 2 Brahman-4.
38. Rishimandal-43.
39. Introduction page 3-7. ISIBHASIYAIM. L. D. Institute of Indology
 Ahmedabad-9, 1974.
40. Rishibhashit chapter-1
41. Samvayang Sutra, Prakeernasamvaya 252/3, Jain Vishwa Bharti
 (Ladnu).
42. Jnatadharma Katha, chapter 16/139-142.
43. Aupapatik Sutra-38.
44. Rishimandal Vritti, First Part, verse.-35
45. Avashyak-churni, Part-2, Page 194 (Rishibhdev Keshrimal, Ratlam,
 1928).
46. Buddhavansha, Attha Katha 10/9.
47. Thergatha Atthakatha, Part-1, Page-268.
48. Ibid, Page 269.
49. Jatak Katha, Third part (Sarvajatak group), page-306.
50. Ibid-Part four, page 567.
51. Ibid-Part five, page-476.
52. Rigved.
53. Atharvaved.
54. Samved.
55. Chhandogyopanishad-7/1/1.
56. Naradparivrajakopanished, 2,6,14,33,37.
57. Naradopanishad-9.
58. Devarshi Naradastatha-Gita 10/13, 10/26.

59. Shantiparva-275/3 (Gita press).
60. Bhagwat 1/3/8, 1/5/38,39.
61. Isibhasiyaim, chapter-2,
62. Thergatha Attha Katha, Part-1 Page 206, 348.
63. Isibhasiyaim, Introduction-page-4 (L. D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad, 1974.)
64. Rishibhashit, chapter-3.
65. Sutrakritang-1/1/3/4-3,
66. मविग्रव्वं खलु भो सव्व-कामविरएण एग्रमज्झयणं ।
भासित्तु देवलाखुग्र-रायरिसी सिवयं पत्तो ॥ ऋषिमण्डल गाथा 124
67. Majjhimnikaya Part-2, Page-154 (Pali Text Society).
68. Indriyajatak, Page 463.
69. Aadiparva 1/107, 53/8 (Gita Press)
70. Sabhaparva 53/10, 78/15 (Gita Press).
71. Shalyaparva 50 (Gita Press)
72. Shantiparva 229/5, 275/4-39 (Gita Press).
73. Anushasanparva 18/17-18 (Gita Press).
74. Gita (Gorkhpur edition) 10/13.
75. Mathar vritti-71. See Sankhya darshan Aur Vijnan Bhikshu by Dr. Urmila Chaturvedi, Page-25.
76. Avashyak Niryukti, Verse 1288 (Vijayadan Suri Jain Series, Surat).
77. Avashyak Bhashya, Page 782 (Vijayadan Suri Jain Series, Surat).
78. Avashyak-churni, Part 2, Page 79 and 193.
79. Rishimandal, Verse 123. See Vritti page 190.
(Jain Vidyashala, Dosivada pole, Ahmedabad. 192).
80. Majjhiya Nikaya, Part 2, Page 169,200 (Pali Text Society)
81. Suttanipat, First part, 196 (P.T.S).
82. Thergatha Atthakatha, Part-1, Page 503 (P.T.S.).
83. Rigved, 1/45/3, 2/139, 3/11/7.
84. Chhandogyopanishad, 1/2/10.
85. Aadiparva 122/51.
86. Rishibhashit, chapter-5
87. Avashyak Niryukti, Page 398 (Agamodaya Samiti, Bombay, 1916-17).
88. Visheshvashyak Bhashya Page 787 (Rishabhdev Kesharimal, Ratlam. 1936).

89. Avashyak Churni, Part-1, Page 529-30 (Rishabhadev Kesharimal, Ratlam, 1936).
90. Acharanga, Sheelank Vritti, Page 154 (Agamodaya Samiti, Bombay 1916).
91. Thergatha Atthakatha, Part-2, Page 82.
92. Rishibhashit, chapter 6.
93. Aupapatik, Verse 38 (Agamodaya Samiti, Bombay, 1916).
94. Bhagwati Sutra, Verse 418 (Agam Sudhasindhu, 1977).
95. Avashyak Churni Part-1, Page 455-460.
96. Rishimandal Vritti 64.
97. एवमादि जहा वसुदेवहिंडीए एत्थ पुण वक्कलचीरिणो अहिगारो.... ।
आवश्यक चूर्ण भाग 1, पृ. 460
पिउतावसउवगरणं पमज्जयंतस्स केवल नाणं ।
उप्पन्न जस्स कए वक्कलचीरिस्स तस्स नमो ।
98. Thergatha Atthakatha, Part-1 P. 420 (P.T.S.).
99. Rishibhashit, chapter-7.
100. Visheshavashyak Bhashya. Verse-3169.
101. Avashyak-Churni Part-1, Page 583.
102. Aupapatik Vritti, Page-114.
103. Visheshanavati of Haribhadra, Verse 38,41-44.
104. Rishimandal, second part-Page-193.
105. Thergatha Atthakatha, Part-1, Page 100 (P.T.S.).
106. Apadan Attha Katha, Part-2, Page 456.
107. Rishibhashit, chapter-8.
108. Ibid chapter-9.
109. Suttrakritang 1/2/27.
110. Bhagwati Sutra 550.
111. Uttaradhyayan Churni, Page-168.
112. Antakritdasha, Sutra-12.
113. Anguttarnikaya, Part-1, Page-23 (P.T.S.).
114. Adi Parva 42/33.
115. Shatpath Brahman 7/5/1/5.
116. Taittiriya Brahman 2/18, 10/1,8
117. Rishibhashit chapter-10.

118. Jnatadharm Katha 1/14.
119. Vipaksutra, Sutra 32.
120. Visheshavashyak Bhashya Verse-3332.
121. Sutrakritang-Churni, Page-28.
122. Sthanang Sutra 755.
123. Rishibhashit chapter-11.
124. Bhagwati Sutra 540.
125. Upasakdasha 6/20,21,23,28, 7/8,11, 42-45 (Ladnu).
126. Avashyak-Niryukti, Verse 474.
127. Visheshavashyak-Bhashya, Verse-1928.
128. Avashyak-Churni, Page-282.
129. Deeghnikaya Part-1, P. 53 (P.T.S.).
130. Thergatha-23.
131. Shantiparva-177.
132. Rishibhashit, Chapter-12
133. Shatpath Brahman 9/7, See Vedic Kosh (V.H.U. 1932) Page 428
134. Shankhayan Aranyak 13/1; See Vedic Kosh (V.H.U. 1932) Page 428.
135. Brihadarnyak Upanishad 2/4/1; 3/5/1; See Vedic Kosh (V.H.U. 1932) Page-428.
136. Mahabharat Sabhparva 4/12,33/35, Shantiparva 310-318.
137. एतं वै तमात्मानं विदित्वा ब्राह्मणः पुत्रैषणायाश्च वित्तैषणायाश्च लौकैषणायाश्च व्युत्थायाथ भिक्षाचर्याचरन्ति या ह्येव पुत्रैषणा सा वित्तैषणा या वित्तैषणा सा लौकैषणोभे ह्येते एषणे एवं भवतः ।

—बृहदारण्यकोपनिषद् 3/5/1

तुलनीय—

जाव ताव लोएसणा ताव ताव वित्तैसणा, ताव ताव वित्तैसणा ताव लोएसणा । से लोएसणं च वित्तैसणं परिन्नाए गोपहेण गच्छेजा णो महापहेण.... ।

—ऋषिभाषित 12

138. Mahabharat, Shantiparva, chapter 310-318,
139. Rishibhashit Chapter-13.
140. Samvayang 11/4.
141. Sthanang Sutra, 157, 236.
142. Avashyak-Niryukti, Verse 866,870,871.
143. Visheshavashyak-Bhashya, Verse, 3332,3338,3339.

144. Sthanang, Sutra 157,236.
146. Sthanang-Abhayadeva commentary, Page 182,474.
147. Thergatha-84.
148. Suttanipata. Verse-814.
149. Rishibhashit, chapter-14.
150. Suttrakritang 1/3/4/2.
151. Suttrakritang-Churni, Page-121.
152. Suttrakritang Sheelank Commentary, P-15.
153. Pali Proper Names. Part-2, Page 281-83.
154. Vedic Kosh, Page-334. (K.H.V.V. 1933).
155. Mahabharat Ki Namanukramanika Page-216.
156. Rishibhashit, chapter-15.
157. Ibid-chapter-16.
158. Sthanang Sutra-755.
159. Vipaka Sutra 29.
160. Dhammapad Atthakatha, Part-1, Page-324 foot note.
161. Mahabharat. Dronparva, 144/7.
162. Brihadaranyakopanished-4/6/2.
163. Rishibhashit, chapter-17.
164. Jnatadharma-katha. Verse-117.
165. Dictionary of Pali Proper Names (Malal Shekhar) Part-2, Page-882, 883.
166. Mahabharat, Streeparva, Chapter 2 to 7.
167. Rishibhashit, chapter-18.
168. Sthanang Sutra 643.
169. Samvayang Sutra-159.
170. Antakritdasha 8.
171. Bhishma Parva 27/36.
172. Shatpath Brahman 3,1,1,4.
173. Rishibhashit, Chapter 19.
174. Ibid Capter-20.
175. Suttrakritang-1/1/1/12.
176. Rajprashniya 167-180.
177. Deeghnikaya Part-2, Payasirajanna sutta (Pali Publication Board-1958)

178. Samavayang, Samvaya-44.
179. Rishibhashit, Chapter-21.
180. Panchtantra Page-97-105 (Chokhamba Vidya Bhavan. Varanasi-1985).
181. Rishibhashit Chapter 22.
182. Uttaradhyayan 18/19,22.
183. Brihadaranya kopanishad 4/1/5.
184. Mahabharat, Anushashanparva 4/1.
185. Rishibhashit Chpater 23.
186. Sutrakritang 1/3/4/2,3.
187. Sthanang 755.
188. Anuttaraupapatik 3/6.
189. सूत्रकृताङ्ग शीलाङ्क वृत्ति खण्ड 2. पृ. 73 (म. जै. ज्ञानोदय सोसा. राजकोट) ।
 अमुंजिया नमी विदेही, रामगुत्ते य मुंजिआ ।
 बाहुए उदगं भोच्चा, तहा नारायणे रिसी ।
 असित्ते देविले चेव दीवायण महारिसि ।
 पारासरे दगं भोच्चा, बीयाणि हरियाणि य ॥
190. (a) Jatak Part-1, Page 66-81 (Edited by Fausball).
 (b) For other references from Pali Tripitak see Dictionary of Pali Proper Names by J. P. Malal Shekhar, 1937, Vol-I, Page-382-83.
191. Rishibhashit, chapter-24.
192. Dictionary of Pali Proper Part Names II Page, 1323-1324.
193. Brihadarnyakopanishad 61/41/33.
194. Rishibhashit chapter 25.
195. Samvayang-159.
196. Bhagvāti Sutra, 529-530.
197. Aupapatik Sutra 38-40.
198. Sthanang Sutra-692.
199. Deeghnikaya, Part I, Page-87 (P.T.S.).
200. Etereya Brahman 8,21.
201. (a) Avashyak-churni, Part-1, Page 13.
 (b) Prakrit Proper Name, Vol-I Page 56.
202. Rishibhashit, chapter-26.
203. Uttaradhyayan-Sutra, 25/19-29.
204. Dhammapada, Brahman Section, 405-410.
205. Suttanipat, Urug section, Kasibhardwaj Sutta.
206. (a) Jatak Vol-4, 375-90 (Ed. Fausball).
 (b) Dictionary of Pali proper Name Vol. II. Page 599.
207. Uttaradhyayan Sutra, chapter-12.
208. Mahabharat, Udyog parva 129/19-21.
209. Rishibhashit, chapter-27.

210. Avashyak-Churni Part-2, Page 199.
211. Nisheeth Bhashya, Verse-5890.
212. Brihadkalp-Bhashya, Verse-4066.
213. Avashyak Vritti of Haribhadra, Page-711-712.
214. Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, Vol. II Page-854.
215. Rishibhashit, chapter-28
216. Suttrakritang 2/6.
217. Suttrakritang Niryukti, Verse 187-200.
218. Suttrakritang Churni, Page 413-17.
219. (a) Avashyak Sutra P. 27.
(b) Prakrit Proper Names, Vol. I, Page, 44.
220. Rishibhashit, chapter-29.
221. Acharanga 2/176.
222. Suttrakritang 1/6 (Viratthui).
223. Bhagwati Sutra, Shatak 9215.
224. Kalpa Sutra 4-145.
225. Uttaradhyayan 32/21-100.
226. Dashvaikalik 1/1,
227. Deeghnikaya, Samanjafala Sutta and Majjhimnikaya, Upali Sutta.
228. Suttrakritang 1/6/28.
229. (a) Thergath Atthakatha, Part-1, Page-153.
(b) Dictionary of Pali Proper Names Vol. II, Page-820.
230. Rishibhashit, chapter 30.
231. (a) Bhagwati Sutra 128, 132.
(b) Visheshavashyak Bhashya, 2435
232. Mahabharat Namanukramanika, Page-303.
233. Rishibhashit, chapter-31.
234. (a) Ibid.
(b) Uttaradhyayan 23/12.
(c) Avashyak Niryukti-236.
(d) Suttrakritang 2/7/81.
235. Arhat Parshwa Aur Unki Parampara, Prof. Sagarmal Jain, Page-1-7.
236. Acharanga 2/15/25.
237. Suttrakritang 2/7/8.
238. Samvayang 8/89/4;16/4;23/3.
239. Bhagwati 1/9/423.
240. Aupapatik 2/5/95.
241. Rajprashniya 213 (Madhukar Muni).
242. Nirayavalika 3/1.
243. Kalpa Sutra, 149/159.
244. Avashyak-Churni, Part-I Page 285-241, 248,

245. Uttaradhyayan 23/12-13; Suttrakritang 2/7/38.
246. Bhagwati 1/9/432-433.
247. Arhat Parshwa Aur Unki Parampara, Page-36-38.
248. Rishibhashit, Chapter-31.
249. Ibid.
250. Ibid, chapter 32.
251. Ibid.
252. For details about Pingin Buddhist tradition see Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, Vol. II. Page, 198-200.
253. Dalsukh Malvania Abhinandan Granth (Parshwanath Vidhyashram, Varanasi).
254. (a) Suttanipat Atthakatha, Vol. 2, Page-603.
(b) Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, Vol. II, Page-199.
255. Mahabharat Namanukramanika, Page-197.
256. Rishibhashit, chapter-33.
257. Isibhasiyaim, Introduction, Page-4.
258. (a) Vedic Kosh, Page-56.
(b) Mahabharat Namanukramanika, Page 31 and 42.
259. Vedic Kosh, Page-23.
260. Ibid, Page-373.
261. Rishibhashit, chapter-33.
262. Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, Vol. I, Page 182-184.
263. Rishibhashit, chapter-34.
264. Vedic Kosh Page-56.
265. Ibid.
266. (a) Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, Vol. I, P. 383.
(b) Jatak-487.
267. Rishibhashit, chapter-35.
268. Suttrakritang 1/3/4/2.
269. Suttrakritang, Churni Page-120.
270. Rishibhashit, chapter-36.
271. Mahabharat Namanukramanika Page-175.
272. Mahabharat, Vanparva 72/339.
273. Mahabharat, Shantiparva 33-13-15.
274. Vedic Kosh, Page-244.
275. Rishibhashit. chapter-37.
276. Suttrakritang 1/1.
277. Isibhasiyaim (Schubring), Page-118.
278. Avashyak Churni, I, Page-82.
279. Acharanga Commentary by Sheelanka, Page-135.
280. (a) Avashyak Churni, I, Page-316-320.
(b) Visheshavashyak Bhashya, Verse 1979.

281. Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, II, Page 1108-1118.
 282. Rishibhashit, chapter-39.
 283. Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, II, Page-1000.
 284. Rishibhashit, chapter-38.
 285. Uttaradhyayan-18.
 286. जत्थ मिए काणणोसिते उवशामेति बहाए संजए । —ऋषिभाषित ३६/५
 287. Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, II Page 998-1000.
 288. रहस्से खलु भो पावकम्मं.... । —ऋषिभाषित 39
 289. Mahabharat Namanukramanika, Page 364-365.
 290. Sutrakritang 1/3/4/3.
 291. Samvayang Sutra, 159 (Prakeernaka Samvaya).
 292. Aupapatik Sutra 38.
 293. Antakritdasha, Section-2.
 294. Dashvaikalik Churni Page-41.
 295. Sutrakritang Churni Page-120.
 296. Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, I, Page 501-502.
 297. Mahabharat Namanukramanika, Page 87-162.
 298. Brihadaranyakopanishad 6/5/1.
 299. Rishibhashit Chapter-40.
 300. Avashyak Nirukti, 847.
 301. Visheshavashyak Bhashya, 3290.
 302. Avashyak Churni I, Page 12,134,139 and 466.
 303. Avashyak Haribhadriya Vritti, Page 347.
 304. Acharanga Commentary by Sheelanka, Page-179.
 305. Prakrit Proper Names, Vol. II, Page-864.
 306. Ibid, Page 677-678.
 307. Avashyak Churni, I, Page-519.
 308. (a) Prakrit Proper Names, Vol. II, Page 65-7.
 (b) Bhagwati Sutra, 417-418.
 309. Mahabharat Namanukramanika, P.-291.
 310. Rishibhashit, chapter-41.
 311. Ibid, Chapter-42.
 312. Ibid, Chapter-43.
 313. Ibid, Chapter-45.
 314. Ibid, Chapter 45/40; compare Uttaradhyayan 22/41.
 315. Ibid, Chapter 45/22.
 316. Ibid, Chapter 45/50.



