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FOREWORD

The L. D. Institute of Indology has great pleasure in publishing A study of the Tattvārthasūtra with Bhāṣya with special reference to the Authorship and Date by Dr. Suzuko Ohira. The work embodies results of her deep and strenuous research which she carried out successfully for her Doctorate.

Tattvārthādhigamasūtra is accepted as an authoritative text in the Śvetāmbara as well as Digambara tradition. And both the traditions agree that its author is Vācaka Umasvāti(mi). But the Śvetāmbaras maintain that he belonged to their tradition while the Digambaras maintain that he belonged to theirs. Again the Śvetāmbaras contend that he himself is the author of the Bhāṣya while the Digambaras strongly uphold that the Bhāṣya is not his work. Moreover, Śvetāmbara and Digambara scholars assign him to different periods of time. Hence the problem of the authorship and date of Tattvārthasūtra with Bhāṣya needed serious study and research which Dr. Suzuko Ohira undertook and accomplished very successfully. To arrive at almost correct conclusions she has explored, analysed and studied all the necessary sources, viz. the praśasti of the Bhāṣya, inscriptions, pāṭāvalis, commentaries of Śvetāmbara canonical texts, Digambara texts, especially the Sarvārthasiddhi, and the works of modern scholars. She has traced the development of certain concepts in order to assign the Tattvārthasūtra with Bhāṣya to a particular period of time. The historical evaluation of the Tattvārthasūtra deserves special attention of scholars. In this connection she has competently dealt with the topics of the Migration of Jaina Communities and the Great Schism in the Gupta Age. Dr. Ohira rightly deserves our congratulations for the present study. We extend our heart-felt thanks to her for allowing us to publish her research work in our L. D. Series.

I am sure this publication will prove useful to all those interested in Jaina Studies.

L. D. Institute of Indology
Ahmedabad-9
30-3-82

Nagin J. Shāh
Director
INTRODUCTION

The Tattvārthādhigamamsūtra (abbreviated hereafter as T. S.) of Umāsvāti holds a unique position in the literary history of the Jainas. Since when it gained an authoritative position in the two traditions, it has occupied the heart of the Jainas, lay or clerical, as the Bible of their religion and as the essential work of their doctrinal axioms. The T. S. is a compendium of the theoretical contents of the canon expressed in terms of seven tattvas, having mokṣamārga as its guiding theme. This prakaraṇa in some 330 sūtras (the Śvetāmbara Version counts 344 and the Digambara Version 357) along with its Bhāṣya was composed by Umāsvāti sometime in the late middle of the 5th century A. D. at Pātaliputra, imbibing the current philosophical problems of the non-Jaina systems of thought. The Gupta period to which the author belonged was one of the darkest ages for the Jainas, wherein the then socio-economic impact forced them to migrate from the North to the West and the South, which caused, together with the fatally accidental calamity of a long famine and the consequent call of the Canonical Convention at Valabhī, the division of the Jaina church into the present day Śvetāmbara and Digambara. The T. S. that was carried down by the emigrants to the South met a necessary revision thereby, and established itself as a pro-canonical text of the Digambaras. The present problem of the authorship of the T. S. which is claimed by the two camps has thus cropped up.

The assignment of this thesis is to testify whether or not the T. S. accompanied by its Svopajñabhāṣya was composed by Umāsvāti. This issue is somewhat odd in a way, because a mention that Umāsvāti or Umāsvāmi is the author of the T. S. which is unanimously accepted by the two sects is found in the praśasti of the Bhāṣya alone in the earlier literature of both traditions. However the Digambara Version lacks the entire Bhāṣya portions, and the abundant epigraphical evidences in the South record that Umāsvāmi alias Grāddhapiccha is a Digambara author of the T. S.¹ On the other hand, none of the autobiographical document in the praśasti has been yet proved of its historicity, and no early inscriptive evidence remains in the North and the West to prove that Umāsvāti belonged to the canonical tradition in the North. The problem thus remains to be investigated. The present day academic circle is divided into three groups as to which party Umāsvāti belonged to, i. e., the Āgamic tradition which the Śvetāmarbas uphold whole-heartedly, the Digambara tradition which came to compile its own pro-canonical texts, and the Yāpaniya tradition which was later absorbed into the Digambara fold and is no more existent.² As the codices in the Western stock reveal, the lay Jainas did least bother about nor even distinguished which version of the text belonged to which tradition. This problem was raised and became controversial among the academic circles in this present century when the T. S. study came to attract the scholars' serious attention.
Undoubtedly this is a touchy problem involving sectarian sentiments. Leaving them aside for the historical pursuit of the problem itself, the verification of the authorship of the Sabhāṣya T. S. involving the determination of its date has its own significance and importance. The T. S. stood at the end of the canonical period. The Third Canonical Convention was held at Vallabhi in the latter half of the 5th century A. D., and the great schism split the Jainas into the two camps. The canonical age was succeeded by the commentarial period in the Svetambara side and by the prakaraṇa period in the Digambara side, and the age of logic commenced in both camps at the same time. The T. S. thus stood at the point of intersection in the history of the Jainas in the two traditions, to the literary activities of which it exerted unfathomable influences. An ascertainment of the position of the T. S. in the literary history of the Jainas as such is only possible when the problems of its authorship and its date are decisively solved and when its historical background is brought to light.

The problems proposed in this thesis are of three categories (1) Testification of the authorship of the Sabhāṣya T. S., (2) Ascertainment of its date, and (3) Its historical evaluation. The first two problems that are the original assignment of this thesis are indisputably fundamental, which however have not yet been settled successfully by the modern scholarship. The major reasons for it seem to lie in the scholars' attitudes towards the problems coloured by the sectarian considerations and in their methods of handling the limited materials. Conscious attention is therefore paid to the matter of methodology which would save us from falling in the pitfalls. The literary materials involving theoretical discussion are handled by adopting the comparative method and the method of conceptual evolution, for which my indebtedness goes to Pt. Sukhdalji's Commentary on Tattvārthasūtra of Vācaka Umāsvāti and Jaina Ontology by Dr. K. K. Dixit. Ample opportunities are hence provided to conduct independent inquiries into the specific problems. The external source materials including MSS, archaeological and literary materials are used as far as available mainly adopting the text-historical method and the historical method. For this type of inquiry, all these methods are required to achieve a warrantable result and the emphasis on any one of which would ensue a danger.

The first proposal to verify the authorship of the Sabhāṣya T. S. involves three problems: (1) Which version of the text is the original ?, (2) Was the Bhāṣya composed by the aphorist himself ?, and (3) Was the Sabhāṣya T. S. composed by Umāsvāti? A series of these interrelated problems is attempted to be tackled in the first two chapters step by step in the sequence shown in the table of contents. The last problem of the verification of prāṣasti to determine the authorship of the T. S. is approached by the method of a critical analysis of the existing paṭṭāvalis, and the testimony vouches for the fact that the Sabhāṣya T. S. is the original text composed by Umāsvāti.

The second proposal to ascertain the date of the text (thereby the date of Umāsvāti in approximation) is handled in Ch. III, Sec. IV, pt.2. This is a vexing problem because the dates of the relevant authors or texts, both Jaina and non-Jaina, have
not yet been definitely settled down in the present day academic circles, upon which depends the final assignment of the date of our text. However, the date of the T. S. sometime in the late middle of the 5th century A. D. arrived at from the available external and internal evidences would be the closest approximation in the present state of progress in research. Also on the more reliable epigraphical evidences the traditional date of the Third Valabhi Council based on the date of Mahāvīra’s nirvāna and the currently accepted date of Bhadrabāhu II based on the traditional legend (see also Ch. III. Sec. IV, Pr. 1, (3)) are proposed to be reassigned, even though the final assignment of their decisive dates has to be suspended for the want of further evidences which may turn out in the future.

The third proposal is taken up in the final chapter. A historical evaluation of the T. S. must be assessed on the basis of 1) Umāsvāti’s performance in composing the T. S., 2) Its capacity of influencing the post-Umāsvāti authors, and 3) Its position held in the literary history of the Jainas in the two traditions. The first problem is dealt with in Sec. I while analyzing the mechanism of the T. S., i. e., its structure, source materials and their organization. This clarifies what kinds of problems were in what way posited by Umāsvāti to bring out the innovation of the Āgamic concepts and the formulation of new concepts. The second problem becomes self-evident to a great extent while making a survey of the factors of reaction raised to the T. S. in the commentarial works on the canon in Sec. II, and while tracing the further development of certain theoretical problem proposed by Umāsvāti in Sec. III. A series of independent discussions conducted in Sec. III with a view to finding how certain concepts had gone through the stages of evolution by the time of Umāsvāti, how these concepts were handled by Umāsvāti, and how they took the course of development in the immediate post-Umāsvāti period in both traditions. In so doing, the obscure imports of certain aphorisms and their Bhāṣya expositions come to be clarified. Since the problems raised in the T. S. are many and the concerned literary materials are inexhaustible, the inquiries made in Secs. II–III within a limited scope are impossible to cover them all, of which improvement is left wide open to the future. The third problem is treated in the final section by way of clarifying the historical background of the Jainas in the Gupta age involving their literary activities. The history of the Jainas in the Gupta age has been so far buried in oblivion, which is attempted to be brought to light in order to explain the background and the cause of the great schism, that enables us to place the T. S. in the clear-cut position in the literary history of the two Jaina traditions.

The problems proposed in the last category are particularly of challenging nature, however they are indeed difficult as they involve many technical and historical problems yet unsolved. Nevertheless this thesis is hoped to be able to contribute to the research activities in this direction, and any constructive suggestions for its improvement will be appreciated. The Bhāṣya which was composed by the aphorist himself and the Sarvārthasiddhi which is the oldest extant Digambara commentary
on the T. S. composed by Pūjayapāda are directly involved with the problems in question, however the rest of numerous commentaries including the great commentaries such as Rājavārtika and Ślokavārtika are excluded from the scope of major treatment. The Sabhāṣya T. S. is based on the Tattvārthadīhigamasūtram (Calcutta, 1903) ed. by K. P. Mody, the text of the Sarvārthasūdhi is based on the edition made by Phulcandra (Banaras, 1971, 2nd ed.), and the canonical texts are based on the Suttāgame (Bombay, 1933–54) in two volumes ed. by Pupphabhikku, unless otherwise specified. In this thesis, we are distinguishing the two recensions of the text i.e., the text of the Bhāṣya and the text of Pūjayapāda by Śvetāmbara and Digambara according to the current practice, of which the latter expression is appropriate, but not the former as it belongs to the period prior to the schism. This convention should be allowed here for the sake of the brevity of expression, but not for any other purposes. Some portions of this thesis were already published in the current journals.

The subject matter of the present thesis which is submitted for the Ph. D. degree to the Gujarat University was originally assigned to an introductory chapter to my English translation of Bhāskaranandi’s Tattvārthavṛtti by late Dr. A. N. Upadhye, University of Mysore, which has developed into this shape and was completed under the guidance of Pt. D. D. Malvania, L. D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad. Both of my guiding scholars, who were good friends and have been the leading heads of the academic circles of the two rival traditions, are of unusual personality in showing extraordinary patience to the immature student without whose proper direction, encouragement and assistance it was impossible for me to fulfill this difficult task. Also Dr. K. K. Dixit, the former research officer at L. D. Institute of Indology, has kindly stood by me for long in the capacity of a consultant, by whom my historical attitude towards problems was molded. I cannot adequately express my sense of gratitude to all of my teachers, to whom this thesis is humbly dedicated.

I would also like to express my sincere appreciation for the kind cooperation to many friends, to the librarians and staff members of the following institutions: L. D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad (and Dr. Nagin J. Shah): Department of Jainology and Prakrits, University of Mysore, Mysore: University of Mysore Library, Mysore: Indian Government Epigraphy Office, Mysore (and Dr. G. S. Gai): Oriental Research Institute, Mysore: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona: Dr. A. N. Upadhye’s private library, Kolhapur (and his family): Rajaram College Library, Kolhapur: Hemacandra Jīna Mandir, Patan (and Mr. Sarabhai M. Shah and Mr. Babubhai P. Dave, Patan).

— Suzuko Ohira
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A STUDY OF TATTVĀRTHHASŪTRA WITH BHĀŚYA
CHAPTER I

WHICH VERSION OF THE TEXT IS THE ORIGINAL?

Sec. 1. MSS OF THE T.S.

Since numerous MSS of the T.S. are available (the \textit{Jinaratnakosa} counts 39 entries), it is incumbent upon us to begin with their survey with a view to finding if any external evidences can be therefrom established to solve our problem, "Which version of the text is the original?" To make a general remark of the MSS condition of the T.S., the Digambara text as well as the \textit{Svetambara} text accompanied by the Bh\={a}tya are well preserved in the codices without damage, however curiously enough, the \textit{Svetambara} copies unaccompanied by the Bh\={a}tya so far consulted are without exception polluted by the Digambara aphorisms. Does it at all imply that the Digambara recension of the text was the archetype from which the \textit{Svetambara} recension was derived? And how did this strange phenomenon come to occur? These questions remain to be explained.

Investigated below are the codices of the Western version of the T.S. with and without the Bh\={a}tya (the Southern version is excluded from consultation as it is generally well preserved) located in the following institutions: L. D. Institute of Indology (LDII), Ahmedabad; Hemacandra\={a}rya J\={a}\=na Mandir (HJM), Pattan; Sanghavi P\=ada (SP), Pattan; Limbadi Jaina J\={a}\=na Bhandar (LJJB), Limdi (MSS were sent therefrom); and the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (BORI), Poona. Those examined include two palm leaf MSS, one of which is dated 1303 V. S. (no. 8) and the other (no. 9) appearing to be another copy of the same, which lacks the first folio and remains in the worst possible condition that it may fall into pieces sooner or later. The rest are the paper MSS ranging from the 16th to the 20th century V. S. Those in Gujarat area mainly consist of the \textit{Svetambara} versions and those at Poona mostly of the Digambara versions.

The aphorisms of the T. S. were likely not numbered originally, because they frequently exhibit themselves without an indication of the sequential number in the codices, the phenomenon of which is commonly observed in the texts of \textit{Siddhasena} and Haribhadra, and in the text \textit{Sarv\=ar\=thisiddhi}. When enumerated, the aphorisms are often misnumbered, deliberately or otherwise, for instance, sometimes
numbering is skipped, sometimes the same number is assigned to the two different śūtras, sometimes one śūtra is counted as two, sometimes maṅgalaśarāṇa (which belongs to the Sarvārthasiddhi) is reckoned, sometimes prāṣṭi is enumerated in continuation of the upasamhārakārika (up. kārika), and so on.

The following table may reflect a general feature of the MSS of the T.S. preserved in Śvetāmbara tradition so far consulted. The description of each chapter of the Sabhāṣya T.S. is omitted because the text has evaded transformation at maximum being accompanied by its Bhāṣya (a slight change is however observed, for instance, in Limdi copy of no. 1090, ser. no. 17, śūtra 1:27 of the Śvetāmbara text is replaced by the Digambara śūtra, and śūtra 1:26 of the Digambar text is exchanged with the Śvetāmbara aphorism). In order to see how far the MSS in the Śvetāmbara stock are contaminated by the Digambara edition, the examination was made by way of spot checking the following śūtras which exhibit gross disagreements between the two recensions due to the linguistic change, omission—cum—commission or matabheda: 1: 21–22(21), 27(26), 34–35(33). II: 13–14:13–14, 23(22), 31(30), 49(49). III: (12–32). IV: 20(19), 29–37(28–31), 48–53(40–42). V: (29), 38(39). VI: 18(17–18), (21). VII: (4–8). VIII: 7(6), 14(13), 26(25–26). IX: 27–28(27), 32–33(31–32), 37(36). X: (7–8). Those in parentheses indicate the Digambara aphorisms. If a chapter contains more than one Digambara aphorism, it is indicated by “S/D”. If it consists of the Śvetāmbara aphorisms alone it is marked by “S” and the contrary case by “D”. The survey here conducted is thus neither meticulous nor exhaustive, however it is hoped to be enough to have a general view of the MSS condition of the T.S. handed down in the western tradition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser. no.</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Cat./Acc. no.</th>
<th>Date (V.S.)</th>
<th>Maṅgala śloka</th>
<th>S. Kārika</th>
<th>Text (Chapters)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LDII</td>
<td>cat. 3474, acc. 5917</td>
<td>c.1950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1–31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>cat. 3467, acc. 3198</td>
<td>c.1550</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S/D S/D S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>HJM</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>20th c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S/D S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BORI</td>
<td>1076/of 1891–95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LDII</td>
<td>cat. 3466, acc. 3911</td>
<td>c 1650</td>
<td>1–9</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S/D S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>HJM</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S/S S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>''</td>
<td>'' '' ''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ŚP</td>
<td>cat. 227, box 179</td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>1–9</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S/S D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>cat. 322, box 91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>''</td>
<td>'' '' ''</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser no.</th>
<th>Text (Chapters)</th>
<th>Up. Kārikās</th>
<th>Praśasti</th>
<th>Other Appendices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S/D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S/D</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>S/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S/D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Illegible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S/D</td>
<td>S/D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Numbered text with the Bhāṣya ... ... ...</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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15. Unnumbered Digambara text ....
Numbered Śvetāmbara text with the Bhāṣya .... 1–6

16. as above ... ... ... ... ... ....
as above ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 1–6

17. as above ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ...
(must be as above, latter half unchecked) ... ...

The forms of entry are various: (no. 1) sambandhakārikā (s. kārikā) alone; (nos 2–3) text alone; (nos. 5–7) 1–9 s. kārikās + text; (nos. 8–9) 1–9 s. kārikās + text + up. kārikā + 4–6 praśisti verses; (nos. 10–11) maṅgalacarana + text; (no.12) maṅgalacarana + text + s. kārikā + up. kārikā; (no. 13) maṅgalacarana + text + 21 up. kārikās + 1–9 s. kārikās (these 21 up. kārikās include the original verses1–14, 16–21 and 23; the original verse 18 which is numbered in the MS as 21 comes after the original verse 20); (no.14) Sabhāṣya T.S.: and (nos.15–17) Digambara text + Sabhāṣya T.S. The MS B (1532 V. S.) and MS D (1467 V. S.) which were used for the edition of the T. S. by K. P. Mody appear to have come from the same source of our MSS nos. 15–17 above. He notes that the MS K used by him further adds Siddhasena’s commentary on it. Puṣpikās vary sometimes: (no. 10) iti tattvārthādhiṣṭhite jiva-nirūpaṇo nāma pañcamo'dhīvāyaḥ iti tattvārthādhiṣṭhite srava-nirūpaṇo nāma saṣṭho'dhīvāyaḥ (no.15) tattvārthādhiṣṭhite rhad-vacana-saṅgrehe bhāṣyato daśa-mādhyāyaḥ samāptahī (no 16) tattvārthādhiṣṭhite jina-vacana-saṅgrehe bhāṣyato daśamo 'dhyāyaḥ samāptahī (no.17) tattvārthādhiṣṭhite bhāṣyataḥ dvitiyo'dhīvāyaḥ.

The Śvetāmbara copies unaccompanied by the Bhāṣya are thus in all the cases defined by the Digambara sūtras. And pollution is the worst in the cases of Chs. III and X which underwent a thorough revision in the South. Serial nos. 10–13 are accompanied by the well known verse of benediction, ’moṣamārgasya netāram.....’, which belongs to the Sarvārthaśuddhi. Nos. 12–13 push back the s. kārikā to the end of the text as this maṅgaḥala verse is prefixed at the outset; and strangely enough, a majority of the chapters of these two copies consists of the Digambara sūtras. No. 13 is said to have been copied by Bhimaji, pupil of Mahāmāraprabhasūri of Pūṇimāpakṣa, therefore it allegedly belongs to the Śvetāmbara side. The copysts of these MSS seem to be least bothered about whether the text is a Śvetāmbara version or Digambara version. They tore up the Sabhāṣya T.S. into pieces, mixed the Śvetāmbara and Digambara sūtras, and produced their own versions in effect. They even bound the Digambara text with the Sabhāṣya T.S., of which practice seems to date back, judging from the MSS used by K. P. Mody, as early as or much earlier than 1467 V. S.

The palm leaf MS of 1303 V. S. preserved at Saṅghāvī Pāda, Pattan, is again a peculiar copy; an obvious attempt was made here to rearrange the third chapter which is the only chapter in this copy consisting of the Digambara aphorisms. The order of the Digambara sūtras rearranged in this chapter is as follows: 1–10/ 20–30
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(24 slightly altered; 27–28 missing)/ eka–dri–tri–gayuṭo sthita–mānuṣyāḥ/ tat...? ṇadāḥyāḥ/ 27/ tr-palyopamoṭṣa–sthīṭa/ 31/ 28/ 11–14/ 17 (altered)/ 19/ 15/ 18 (altered)/ 16/ 32–39// Since the rearranged sequence does not improve the original reading but disturbs the context confusingly, it is difficult to see the intention behind this performance. Some copyists, who might have been monks or professional copyists, behaved thus quite freely in altering the original text, which suggests that the rules and regulations in scribing copies were loose, had they been established at all.

The Bhāṣya was used by Pūjayāna in his Sarvārthasiddhi, Akalāṇka in his Rāja-vārtika and Virasena in his Dhavalā, but after them it is difficult to know if any serious attention was paid to it in the South. We are not at all sure whether the Bhāṣya was in front of Vidyānandi or not. Bhāskaranandi who belonged to the 12th century A. D. does not refer to the Bhāṣya at all, neither Śrutasāgara of the 16th century. Virasena of the 9th century refers to the T.S. of Grāhāpiccha, and the epigraphical evidence at Śravānabelgola in the 12th century onwards indicate that people believed that Grāhāpiccha alias Uṃāsvāti was the author of the T.S.² It is most likely therefore that the Sabhāṣya T.S. gradually receded into background in the South after Virasena’s time, having given an authoritative position to the revised version of the T.S. accompanied by its important commentaries, and the authorship of the T.S. was then passed over to Grāhāpiccha Ācārya alias Uṃāsvāti.

The convention of scribing the text portion alone was perhaps followed after the model of the Digambara version. Amṛta-candra, although he is suspected to have resided in the West, might have very well quoted the up. kārikā from the Rājavārtika.³ The practice of attaching the up. kārikā completely or partially to the text portion alone might have again started after the model of the Rājavārtika. Likewise the copyists prefixed the first nine s. kārikās to the Śvetāmbara text most probably after the Digambara version wherein the famous maṅgala verse is usually prefixed. Although the density of pollution must have gone worse with the march of time, the corruption likely began at an earlier stage when the Digambara recension became very popular. Soon after the T.S. was brought down to the South by the emigrants, it underwent a thorough revision particularly of its linguistic aspects. This refined version seems to have attracted those people in the western tradition, and influenced them to transform the copies of their own text to the extent that they have almost lost their identity to be the Śvetāmbara recensions.

Since this explains the reason for the defiled phenomena of the Śvetāmbara text by the Digambara aphorisms, and since the Śvetāmbara recension of the text accompanied by the Bhāṣya has been well preserved, a doubt raised at the outset that the Digambara edition might be the original on the ground of the MSS evidences disappears. The critical edition of the Sabhāṣya T.S. ought to be based on Siddhasena’s
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_Bhāṣyānusārīṇī_ which has preserved the reading and meaning of the text as well as its autocommentary.\(^4\) The authenticity of either recension of the _T.S._ must be therefore testified upon the ground of the internal evidence alone, which shall be taken up in the following sections.

Sec. 2. LINGUISTIC CHANGES

Which version of the text is the archetype is to be testified in the 2nd through the 4th sections. This is indeed an irritating problem, for it is pretty difficult to find the crucial keys for its solution. An attempt is made here to approach the problem from the following three different angles: Sec. 2) Linguistic changes, Sec. 3) Omissions and comissions, and Sec. 4) Matabhedas. To give a conclusion first, the problem is best tackled by the second and the third methods which logically seem to be most barren in bringing out a fruitful answer, and the linguistic approach which is expected to produce a most fruitful result has turned out to be miserably barren.

We shall begin with the survey of linguistic changes evinced in the two recensions of the _T.S._ In dealing with the problem, the relevant aphorisms, which are grouped together under certain peculiarities, are going to be rated upon the basis of the evidence wherein the clarity of an aphorism, that is the vital concern of the aphorist to convey, is considered to be better achieved in the given context. The number at the end of each group indicates a positive point. When the cases are difficult to evaluate, the number of the occurrences as such is given in brackets. The Digambara śūtras are always indicated in parentheses. Thus “2. (0), [1]” means that the clarity of the import of an aphorism is positively better achieved in the Śvetāmbara version in two cases discussed in this group, nil in the case of the Digambara recension, and one instance therein is difficult to be rated upon this criterion as either recension has its own positive ground. The data collected here is by all means not attempted to be exhaustive, but is expected to be sufficient to have a warrantable result.

1. The order of words and aphorisms

(1) I:22 . . . nārake-devānām
(21) . . . deva-nārakānām
II:35 nāraka-devānām . .
(34) deva-nārakānām . .

The Āgamic description of the four gatis as a rule begins with the lowest order and ends with the highest, inasmuch as the description of the three worlds is made in the ascending order. The Śvetāmbara reading shows conformity with the canonical description, while the Digambara reading grammatical.

0, (0) [2]
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(2) VI:6  avrata-kaśāyendriya-kriyā...
(5) vi: kaśāyāvrata-kriyāḥ
VI:7  ...bhāva vīryādhikaraṇa...
(6) ...bhāvādhikaraṇa-vīrya...
VIII:10  ...kaśāya-nokaśāya...
(9) ...akaśāya-kaśāya...

The word order of VI:5 appears to be based on the psychological process in the sequence of cause and effect, or stress is laid on indriya as the most important cause of sāṃprāyika āśrava. In the canonical codes such as Śūkṣma 5.2.517 and Samavāya 16, āśravadvāra is mentioned as of five. i.e., mithyādṛṣṭa, avirati, pramāda, kaśāya and yōga, which are enunciated to be the causes of bandha in VIII:1. Pramāda therein is generally included in the other items, i.e., avirati or kaśāya, in the later works. The aphorist of VI:6 seems to have thus followed the Agamic tradition. VI:7 expresses it rightly, firstly because bhāva and vīrya constitute here a pair of psychological and physical factors of kriyā and secondly because adhikaraṇa meets its exposition in the immediately succeeding aphorism. The Śvetāmbara reading of VIII:10 exhibits grammatical accuracy. Nokaśāya is a technical term used by the karma specialists, and ahaśāya in Sanskrit rendering may tend to mislead the meaning.

2, (0) [1]

(3) IX:31(32)  vedanāyaś-ca
32(31)  vīparītām manojñasya
IX:31(32)  pertains to amanojña, therefore the Southern version does not make sense.

1, (0), [0]

2 Compoundization

V:22  vartanā pariṇāmah kriyā...
(22)  vartanā-paṇiṇāmā-kriyāḥ...
VI:13  bhūta-vratya-anukampā dūnām sarāgasanyama...
(12)  bhūta-vratya-anukampā-dūna-sarāgasanyama...

The compoundisation of these words, even though it impresses us with its seemingly neater expression, weakens emphasis on each individual important concept, thus the Śvetāmbara reading is preferred.

2, (0), [0]

3. Dictionaries

(1) VI:16  bahu-ārambha-parigrahatvam ca nārakasyāyuṣaḥ
(15) """"  """" nārakasyāyuṣaḥ
VII:4  ...ihāmutra ca...

7
The conjunction ca in VII:16 and VII:4 is not needed, however the word ca is preferred to vā in VII:7(12).

The addition of the word sarve to I:(26 ) saves it from giving way to ambiguity. The word labdhī is used in the other senses also, therefore dānādi is required in II : (5). The word ādini in II:7 includes various characteristics of the jīva not referred to in the previous aphorisms, e.g., kārttṛtvā, bhoktṛtvā, etc. of which senses cannot be expressed by the conjunction ca which can be referrable to the common nature of
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dravya such as astītva, guṇavattva, etc. Therefore the inclusion of ādīni is herein required. The word tad in II:(20) evinces ambiguity. The Jaina view of the construction of the lower world is explicitly conveyed by supplying the word prthutarāh to III:(1). The Śvetāmbara reading of IV:9 clarifies the meaning better. IV:13 offers the clear-cut Jaina view of the plurality of the sun and the moon. As to the aphorism IV:52(41), the precise meaning is attained by the Śvetāmbara reading. The word paripāma, leśyā-paripāma, yoga-paripāma, etc. therefore atma-paripāma in VI:15 expresses the purport more exactly. Saṅgha is an independent concept, which is required to be in the sūtra VI:(24). Ādāna-nikṣepa is a technical term, which is better to be retained as it is in VII:29(34). Regarding the sūtra VII:32 (37), the reading on nidāna-karaṇāni is preferred because all the rest of the compounds are made out of nouns and verbs. Tad-gati is the subject matter under consideration in x:6(6), therefore it is in this context necessary to be stated.

13, (0), [0]

(3) I:23 yathokta-nimittah... [Bh. yathokta-nimittah
cṣayopaśama-nimittah ity-arthaḥ]

(22) cṣayopaśama-nimittah...

II:38 teṣām paramparam sūkṣmat (37) paramparam sūkṣmat

III:10 tatra bharata...

(10) bharata...

VI:22 viparitam śubhasya (23) tad-viparitam śubhasya

VII:6 maitri-pramoda-kārunya-mādhyasthāni sattva-guṇa...

(11) ca sattva-guṇa...

VIII:7 mātṛyādīnāṃ (6) mātṛyāśrutavadhi-manahparyaya-kevalānāṃ

VIII:14 dānādīnāṃ [Bh. antarāyāḥ paṃcavidhāḥ/tad-yathā –
dānasyāntarāyāḥ, tābhasyāntarāyāḥ...]

(13) dāna-lābha-bhogopabhoga-viryānāṃ

The Digambara sūtras here convey the purport of the text more exactly either by adding the explanatory words used in the Bhāṣya, by dropping the unnecessary wording from or by supplying the minimum wording to the Śvetāmbara readings. VIII:7 and 14 have to refer way back to I:9 and II:4 for the word ādi.

0, (7), [0]

(4) III:2 tāsu narakāḥ [Bh. ratnaprabhāyām naraka-vāsanāṃ
trimśac-chatasaharsāni/šeṣāsu paṃcavimśatāḥ
... narakaśatasahasram-ity-ā śaṣṭhyāḥ]

(2) tāsu trimśat-paṃcaviṃśati ...yathākramāṃ
VII:27 ... \textit{opabhogādhikatvāni}  
(32) ... \textit{opabhoga-paribhogānarthakāyiṇī}  
VIII:8 ... \textit{ṣṭyānagṛddha-vedaniyāni ca}  
(7) ... \textit{ṣṭyānagṛddhayās-ca}  

These belong to a miscellaneous category, of which divergence in reading is difficult to be rated. By adding the word \textit{vedaniya} to each type of sleep in VIII:8, its positive sense of experience is conveyed. However dropping this word from the \textit{sūtra} does not harm its import.

\texttt{Subtotal 19, (9), [6] — 34}

4. Two \textit{sūtras} expressed by a single \textit{sūtra} in either text.

(1) Two Digambara \textit{sūtras} found in one in the Śvētāmbara recension

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
V:2 \textit{dravyāni jīvās-ca}  
(2–3) \textit{dravyāni/ jīvās-ca}  
VI:18 \textit{alpārambhā-parigrahātvaṃ svabhāva-mārdava-ṛjāvam ca mānuṣasya}  
(17–18) \textit{alpārambhā-parigrahātvaṃ mānuṣasya/ svabhāva-mārdava-ṛjāvam ca}  
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

The division of the \textit{sūtra} V:2 into (2) and (3) is justifiable in this context. VI:18 which adds \textit{ārjava} is all right as it is, for the difference of the two concepts, i.e., \textit{alpārambhā}, etc., and \textit{svabhāva-mārdava}, etc., is not so great.

\texttt{0, (1), [1]}

(2) Two Śvetāmbara \textit{sūtras} found in one in the Digambara recension

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
I:21–22 \textit{dvī-vidho’vadhīḥ/ bhava-pratyayo nāaka-devānām}  
(21) \textit{bhava-pratyayo’vadhir-deva-nārakānām}  
V:7–8 \textit{asānkhyaeyah pradesā dharmādharmayoḥ / jīvasya}  
(8) \textit{asānkhyaeyah pradesā dharmādharmaika-jīvānām}  
VI:3–4 \textit{śubhaḥ punyasya / aśubhaḥ pāpasya}  
(3) \textit{śubhaḥ punyasyāśubhaḥ pāpasya}  
VIII:2–3 \textit{sakaśāyatvāj-jivāh... pudgalān-ādattē / sa bandhaḥ}  
(2) \textit{sakaśāyatvāj-jivāh... pudgalān-ādattē sa bandhaḥ}  
IX:27–28 \textit{... dhyānām / ā muhūrttē}  
(27) \textit{... dhyānām-āntarmuhūrttē}  
X:2–3 \textit{bandha-hetv-ahāvā-nirjarābhyām / kṛṣṇa-karma kṣayo mokṣaḥ}  
(2) \textit{bandha... nirjarābhyām kṛṣṇa-karma-vipramokṣo mokṣaḥ}  
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

The Digambara \textit{sūtras} in this group exhibit an attempt to combine two aphorisms dealing with the same topic. I:21–22 impart the meaning more lucidly. The Śvētāmbara reading of V:7–8 is better, because dharma-adharma and jiva belong to two
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different categories. VI : 3–4 which are possibly made in two sūtras for the sake of emphasis can be also combined into one. In case when the beginning word is a pronoun sa, it signalizes in the text that a new sūtra begins, i. e., II : 8–9 (8–9), VI : 1–2 (1–2), VIII : 22–23 (22–23), and IX : 1–2 (1–2), which is obviously the aphorist's style of writing. The same style is naturally expected to be kept here also. The aphorisms IX : 27–28 or IX : (27) include the definitions of dhyātā, dhyāna and its duration, which consist of three different concepts that ought to have been treated each independently. As such, neither reading of the two is appropriate. The Śvetāmbara sūtra X : 2 does not make sense. For from the Bhāṣya on X : 2, it is evident that this sūtra 2 is intended to go with X : 1 as the cause of jīvan–mukti. The cause of the manifestation of kevala jīṇa which is already mentioned in X : 1 is sufficient to explain the cause of jīvan–mukti state, therefore the addition of X : 2 creates redundancy. Besides it invites a contradiction. Threefold yogas subsist throughout the penultimate stage of a sayoga kevali, therefore herein still exists the cause of bandha called iryāpathika, even though its duration is very short. The statement of ‘bandhahetv-abhāvāt’ as the cause of the rise of sayoga-kevalihood is thus not correct. The Bhāṣya on the sūtra X : 3 reads, ‘hetv abhāvāc-cottarasyāprādurbhāvāh,’ wherein ‘hetv-abhāvāt’ must mean ‘bandhahetv-abhāvāt,’ which seems to suggest that the sūtra 2 is also considered to be the cause of the videha-mukti. The sūtra 2 thus stands in an ambiguous position. The Digambara reading which clearly expresses the Jaina position is hence justified.

3, (1), [2]

subtotal 3, (2), [3] — 8
grand total 22, (11), [9] — 42

Out of forty-two cases of the analysis of linguistic changes evinced in the texts of the two traditions, twenty-two cases in the Śvetāmbara recension exhibit better in clarifying the purport of the text, while the favourable instances in the Digambara edition is only eleven, and nine cases remain indeterminate. The text of Pujyapāda obviously demonstrates an effort made to improve the aphorisms from the grammatical and phraseological viewpoints, i.e., 1) by grouping the homogeneous ideas together by way of compoundization and combining two sūtras into one, 2) by adjusting the sequence of words, and 3) by dropping the redundant words and supplementing the minimum words needed for clarification. In so doing, many mistakes were committed on the technical level, which brought out ambiguity in conveying the precise meaning of the aphorisms. The revision of the text must have been made not too long after the happening of the great schism which shall become clear in the later chapter, hence the same Āgamic heritage allegedly existed in the South at that time. Therefore the technical mistakes committed here cannot be due to the lack of Āgamic tradition in the South. It is likely due to overemphasis laid on the linguistic refinement of the
original text. At any rate, this survey tangibly shows that the linguistic method has failed to offer a ground to prove which version was the archetype from which the other edition was originated, because we can argue on the basis of the positive result above that the Śvetāmbara recension made an improvement upon the other from the viewpoint of the technicalities involved with the canon.

Sec. 3. OMISSIONS AND COMMISSIONS

1. The aphorisms missing in the Digambara version

II:19 \( \text{upayogah sparsādiṣu} \)

IV:49-51 \( \text{grahānām-ekam/ nakṣatranām-ardham/ tārakānāṁ caturbhāgaḥ} \)

IV:53 \( \text{catur-bhāgaḥ VESānāṁ} \)

V:42-44 \( \text{anādir-ādimāṁcā/ rūpiṣv-ādimān/ yogopayogau jīveṣu} \)

IX:38 \( \text{upāśanta-kiṣṇakajāyiayās-ca} \)

A remark is made by K.P. Mody that the MS K used by him for his edition of the T.S. has a marginal note saying that some regard sūtra II:19 as a part of the Bhāṣya but Siddhasena treats it as a sūtra. The Digambara version dropped it perhaps considering it to be a part of the Bhāṣya. IV:49-51 and 53 are of minor nature, the exclusion of which does not affect the context. The concept of pariṣama expressed in V:42-44 is defective and its elimination is quite proper, the discussion of which has been already advanced by Sukhlal in his commentary on the T.S. The removal of IX:38 involves a different view held by the Southern author of the T.S., which shall be touched upon in Ch. III, Sec. III, Pt. 3. The Śvetāmbara text is thus substantially well preserved in the Digambara version, however this does not testify that the Śvetāmbara version is the original which met an improvement in the South, because a later recension can also degenerate the earlier one instead of improving it.

2. The aphorisms missing in the Śvetāmbara version

(1) IV:(42) \( \text{laukāntikānām-aṣṭau sāgaropamāni sarveṣām} \)

VI:(21) \( \text{samyaktvām ca} \)

(2) II:(48) \( \text{taijasam-api [49Bh. tajjasam-api ūśrimān labdhi-pratyayaṁ bhavati]} \)

II:(52) \( \text{śeṣās-trī-vedāḥ [51Bh. pāriśeṣyāc-cā ganyante jarāvya-āṅga-potajās-trividhā bhavanti—striyāḥ pumāmso napuṃsakāniti]} \)

VII : (4-8) [Bhāvanās are explained in the Bhāṣya on sūtra 3, although there is a slight disagreement between the two texts.]

VIII : (26) \( \text{ato'nyat-pāpam [26Bh. ato'nyat-pāpam]} \)

X: (7) \( \text{āviddha-kulāla-cakrad-vyapagato-lepālābudvad} \)

\( \text{erāṇḍa-bjāvad-agni-śikhāvac-ca [These are traceable in X:7 up.]} \)
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kārikās 10–12 and 14 rather than in 6Bh of, which illustrations for the 2nd and 4th causes of the ascendance of a soul are somewhat confused.]

X.(8) dharmāstikāyābhāvāt [6Bh. and up. kārikā 22
dharmāstikāyābhāvāt]

(3) III : (12–32) [Description of Jambūdvipa. The Digambara sūtra (24,

'‘Bharataḥ śadvimśati-pañca-yojana-sata-vistārah
śad-caikona vimsati-bhāga yojanasya', and (25),
‘tad-dviguna-dviguna-vistārā varṣadhīra-varṣā
videhāntāḥ', are found in III:11Bh., 'tatra pañca
yojana-satāni śadvimśāni śat-caikona-vimśati-bhāga
bhārata-viṣkambhaḥ sa dvir-dvīr-himavat-dhaimavatādīnām
ā videhebhyaḥ'. Sūtra (27), 'bharatairāvatayor
vyddhi-hrāsau śat-samasyābhīṣyām-utsarpīṇy-avasarpiṇibhyāṁ',
is located in IV:15Bh., 'tā anuloma-pratiloma
avasarpīṇy-utsarpīṇyau bharatairāvateśv-anādy-anantaṁ
parivartate ho-rātravat'.]

(4) V:(29) sad-dravya-lakṣaṇam

The aphorisms in the first group are of minor nature, the exclusion of which
does not upset the major context of the work. The Digambara aphorisms in the
second series are all found in the Bhāṣya, some in exact agreement in wording. Prior
to the exposition of bhāvanās, VII:3 (3) reads, 'rat sthārayātam bhāvanāḥ pañca pañca.'
The word yathākramam accompanying the numerical subdivisions of the categorical
items is the author’s idiomatic expression, meaning ‘in the enumerated order as im-
mediately explained as follows.’ VII:3(3) is not accompanied by the word yathākramam,
therefore the further exposition of bhāvanās is not expected to be made. This
attests that the Digambara sūtra VII:(3) is not the original, which is likewise with
the case of the aforementioned sūtra III:(2) that does not further expound narakas
e numerated therein (see Sec. II, 3.4).

As to the 3rd series, the Digambara sūtras III:(12–32), that is, twenty-one,
aphorisms out of thirty-nine in Ch.III, are lacking in the Śvetāmbara text, among which
three aphorisms, i.e., III:(24–5, 27) are found in the Bhāṣya on III:11 and IV:15,
although their wording is not in exact agreement. The number of missing sūtras here
is very large in proportion, thus in the Śvetāmbara text the description of Jambūdvipa
is strikingly short in comparison with that of the upperworld. These additional
aphorisms include:(1) Description of Jambūdvipa as to the mountains, lakes, rivers
and size of the regions (12–26), (2) Mode of time in the different regions affected
by the descending and ascending time cycle, and the lifetime of human beings.
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(27-31), and (3) width of Bharata calculated as 1/190 of that of Jambūdvipa (32). The first group helps us to formulate a graphic idea of the geographical feature of Jambūdvipa, which is described by way of outlining the regions and mountains in the other recension. The second and the third groups are of comparative importance, of which crucial śūras are all found in the Bhāṣya. As a whole, these are of positive value as the MSS in the western tradition exhibit a mass pollution of this chapter by these Digambara aphorisms. The Jambūdvipa samāsa, another prakaraṇa attributed to Umāsvāti, depicts the geography of six regions and six mountains in due order, excluding the central four regions of Kurus and Videhas which are treated in the 2nd āhnika. Its sketch of Mt. Himāvan includes the colour of the mountain which corresponds to III:(12), the name of the lake on top of it (cf (14)), its size (cf. (15-16)), one yojana lotus in it (cf. (17)), the name of a goddess residing in it (cf. (19)), the names of a pair of rivers flowing from it (cf (20)), and their directions (cf. (21-22)). The description of each varṣadhara-parvata refers to its colour, the names of the lake, goddess and rivers, and the directions of the rivers. The colour of Mt. Śikhari is said in the T.S. hema, which is mentioned tapaniya in the Jambūdvipasamāsa. III:(16) is also found in the 4th āhnika, ‘vāpi-kunḍahraṭa daśavigahāh’. Similarly, III:(26) and (32) can be traced in the same āhnika, ‘merūtarāṣu viparyayāḥ’ and ‘rūpādi dvīgūna-rāṣiguno dvīpavyāso navatī sata-vibhaktō bhavatādiṣu viṣkambhaḥ’.

The above examination reveals that the composition of the Digambara śūtras III : (12-32) was made by drawing materials from the Bhāṣya and the Jambūdvipasamāsa. Logically speaking, however, an argument in reverse case is also possible that the Bhāṣya as well as the Jambūdvipasamāsa drew materials from the Digambara recension of the T.S. From the inquiry so far made into the contents of the missing śūtras in the Śvetāmbara edition in the series 1-3, there is a tangible evidence that the Śvetāmbara text is the archetype on the ground of idiomatic usage of the word yathākramam, but the case is too minor to justify the whole thesis. Generally speaking, the omission or commission of words and aphorisms cannot decisively determine the authenticity of one text from which the other is derived. Thus our attempt has not yet achieved its end.

The 4th series remains to be investigated. The Śvetāmbara recension lacks V:(29) ‘sad-drayya-lakṣaṇam’ which is present in the Digambara version immediately preceding the śūtra ‘utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya-yuktāṃ sat (29(30))’. Now, in what context the problem of sat is posed? It is posed in the domain of pudgala, i.e., V:23 36, of which 25-28 and 32-36 pertain to the matter of āṣu-skandhas as follows:

Aṣu-skandhas 25-28 25 Aṣu-skandhas as the components of pudgala
26-27 Origination of aṣu-skandhas
28 Cause of the visibility of skandhas
32-36 Process of atomic combination
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| Sat-nityatva | 29 | Threefold nature of sat |
| 30 | Nityatva |
| 31 | Justification of 29-30 |
| (Dravya | 37-44 | Guṇa-paryāya-parināma, kāla |

The arrangement of these sūtras strikes us to wonder why V:29-31 are inserted in the strange context of aṇu-skandhas instead of properly placed in the context of dravya. This must be explained in order to solve the present problem, whether V:(29) is a later accretion or not.

The Bhāṣya on V:28 reads, ‘dharmādīnī santāt kathāṃ ghṛtyāta itī/atrocyeate/lakṣanataḥ/’. It does not say explicitly that dravya is sat in the sense of the Sarvārtha-siddhi to V:(29), ‘yat-sat-tad dravyamity-arthaḥ’ but implies it. The Bhāṣya proposes here that one can establish the existence of these dravyas form the nature of existence itself, which makes an introduction to the next sūtra. An inferential method as such in proving the existence of things is foreign to the thinking pattern of the Jaina canon, and its source must be sought in the non-Jaina literature available at the time of Umāsvāti. The Vaiśeṣika sūtra text of Candrānanda, Chapter IV āhika I reads, ‘sad-akāraṇavat tan-nityam /1/ tasya kāryām līgam /2/ kāraṇābhartā-dhi kāryābhartā /3/ anityam-iti ca viśeṣa-pratiṣedha-bhāva /4/ mahatv-aneka-dravyavatvāt-rūpāc-copalabdhiḥ /6/ adravyavatvāt paramānāv-anupalabdhiḥ /7/ saṅkhyaḥ paurimaṇī pṛthaktvam samyoga-vibhāgau paramāparatve karma ca rūpānitya samavāyāt cākṣusāni /12/ arūpiṣy-acākṣusātvaḥ /13/.’ Here the existence of a paramāṇa which is nitya and invisible is inferred from its kārya. Perception arises in the case of a mahat because it has many dravyas and it is possessed of a form. Things become perceptible to the eyes due to the inseparable relation of rūpi-dravya with various guṇas such as saṅkhya. That which is sat and without cause is said to be nitya. Thus the problems of sat-nityatva, aṇu-skandha and cākṣus-acākṣus are herein posed, and it is exactly in this milieu of paramāṇa-mahat that our topic of satsāmāṇya is taken up. In another word, the quest for sat-nityatva of V:29-31 is made in relation to the origination and perceptibility of aṇu-skandha, that is, within the framework of ‘pudgala’, but not in the context discussing the ontological nature of sat in relation to dravya itself. If the latter were the prime interest of the aphorist, the same question should have been posited in the context of dravya as so done in the Pañcāstikāya 1:8-10, but it is not the case here. ‘sad-dravya-lakṣanam’ does not therefore fit in the context here at work, thus it is justified to be the later interpolation. This Dīgāṃbarā aphorism is too important to be missed, and the supposition in the reverse case that it was the original sūtra unquoted by the Śvetāmbara recension is improbable. This testifies that the aphorism V:(29) does not belong to the original text of the T.S.

As to the four categories considered under “Omissions and Commissions” the Dīgāṃbara text exhibits an improvement made on the Śvetāmbara recension by excluding the defective pariṇāma account of V:42-44 (group I), by promoting the important
bhāvanā items of VII:3Bh. to the sūtra proper (group 2), and by supplementing sūtras III:(12–32) (group 3) and V:(29) (group 4), which are all of positive value. But the decisive clue that can corroborate the authenticity of the Śvetāmbara version was offered by the sūtra V:(29) alone, to which we may add the case of the author’s idiomatic usage evinced in VII:3(3) in relation to VII:(4–8) as a minor but positive evidence.

Sec. 4. MATABHEDAS

Part 1 Matabhedas

The following eight cases and two polemical instances which are going to be discussed independently in pts. 2–3 are concerned with the major matabhedas, which include the doctrinal discordances maintained in the two traditions and the different views held in the two recensions of the T.S we shall begin with the eight cases of matabhedas found in the two texts.

(1) I:34–35 Nayas are of five kinds, i.e., naigama, saṅgraha, vyavahāra, rjusūtra and śabde.

—The source supporting the view: Āvaśyakaniryuktī 144

(33) They are of seven kinds, adding samabhīrūṣaṇa and evambhūta to the above five.

—Anuyogadvāra 953, Āvaśyakaniryuktī 754

Six nayas are also upheld by Siddhasena Divākara, but the majority of the authors in both traditions accept sevenfold nayas. Therefore the divergence as such which must have arisen at the different stages of development cannot be really speaking called a matabheda.

(2) II:13–14 The sthāvaras are of three kinds, i.e., prthvī, aś, and vanaspati. Tejas and vāyu are the trasas.

—Sthāna 3. 3. 215, Jivājivabhigama 1. 22, etc., Uttarādhyaayana 36. 60–73, etc.

(13) The sthāvaras are of five kinds, i.e., prthvī through vanaspati.

—sthāna 5. 1. 488, Praśamaratī 192

(3) II:31 The jiva’s anāhāra in transit path is up to three instants.

— Bhagavati 7. 1. 259, Sūtrakṛtaniṣṭaṁ 147.

(30) It is up to two instants.

— Prajñāpanā 1175 a (Dixit: Jaina Ontology, p. 87)

(4) II:49 Āhāraka śarīra belongs to a caturdaśa pūrvadhara.
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(49) It belongs to a pramatta saṃyata.

— Prajnāpanā 21. 575.

This is again not a matabheda but an interpretational difference, because the Śvetāmbaras and Digambaras believe that it belongs to a fourteen pūrvadvāra alone, and at the time of using it, he is necessarily a pramatta saṃyata. Both sects believe that all the pramatta saṃyata do not possess ābāraka śarīras.

(5) IV:2 Jyotishkas are of tejo leśyā, and Bhavanavāsis and Vyantaras of four leśyās, i.e., krṣṇa through tejas.

Sthāna 1.72.

(2) Four leśyās apply to three deva nikāyas, i.e., Bhavanavāsis, Vyantaras and Jyotishkas.

(6) IV:3, 20 Twelve kalpas.

The Āgama unanimously maintains 12 kalpas, e.g., Prajnāpanā 5.243, Uttarādhyayana 36.211-12.

(3, 19) IV:(3) accepts 12 kalpas, but (19) enumerates 16 kalpas.

(7) V: 38 A certain ācārya says that time is also a substance.

(39) Time is also a substance.

The Āgamic tradition explains the metaphysical world by way of the five astikāyas or by way of six dravyas. Kāla is treated as an independent dravya by the latter view, e.g. Uttarādhyayana 28.7-8. In view of the former, kāla is either excluded totally from five astikāyas or included in them as the paryāya of jīva and ajīva. Therefore this case is not considered to be a doctrinal discordance.

(8) VIII : 26 Inclusion of samyaktva, hāsya, rati, and puruṣaveda in puṇya karmas.

(25) Their exclusion from puṇya karmas.

Siddhasenagaṇi is critical about the inclusion of these four karmas in the puṇya group, but he quotes kārikās which support both views.

Out of these eight cases, both views in three cases are supported by the Āgamic tradition, i.e., 2, 3, and 8, three cases are strictly speaking not matabhedas, i.e. 1, 4, and 7, the last two cases of nos. 5 and 6 are of minor importance in nature. Conspicuous matabhedas did not thus yet take the form of expression in the revised text, which suggests that the revision was made soon after the occurrence of the schism. After all, these divergent views maintained in the texts of the two traditions cannot offer us a solution to ascertain which of the two is the original text. We shall now try to examine the last two polemical cases one by one. These are: Pt.2) Rules of atomic combination, and Pt. 3) pariśahas.
Part 2 Rules of atomic combination

— V: 34 (35) ‘guna-samye sadrasingam’—

The theory of atomic combination is treated in V:32–36 (33–37) as follows:

32 (33) snigdha-rukṣatvād-bandhaḥ
33 (34) na jaghanya-guṇānām
34 (35) guṇa-samye sadrasingam
35 (36) dvya-adhikādi-guṇānām tu
36 bandha samādhikau pārinnāmikau
(37) bandha adhikau pārinnāmikau ca

These aphorisms are the same in both recensions of the text with the exception of a slight difference in the case of śūtra 36(37). V:33–35(34–36) which lay down the rules of fusion by the degrees of atoms in both similar and dissimilar cases are commonly shared by the two traditions without any alteration in reading, but the concept of these aphorisms elucidated by the commentarial works in the two traditions displays a marked discordance, which is shown in the following table (quoted from Pt. Sukhlalji's Commentary on Tattvārthasūtra, p. 217):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Śv. commentaries similar</th>
<th>Śv. commentaries dissimilar</th>
<th>Dig. commentaries similar</th>
<th>Dig. commentaries dissimilar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. M(inimum) + M.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. M. + 1 degree</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. M. + 2 degrees</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. M. + 3 degrees, etc.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Non-M. + Non-M. of equal degrees</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Non-M. + Non-M. of 1 degree</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Non-M. + Non-M. of 2 degrees</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Non-M. + Non-M. of 3 degrees, etc.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is indeed strange that the same aphorisms can impart such a striking disagreement in effect. By examining the possibility and impossibility of combination in all these eight different instances against the rules of atomic combination stated in the sūtras 33–35 (34–36), it becomes patent at once that these sūtras are in accordance
with the contents of the table in the Śvetāmbara tradition, but are in discordance with those in the Digambara tradition. The Bhāṣya to these sūtras does not explain more than what the aphorisms say, although it adds a few illustrations to facilitate understanding. And really speaking, the commentarial elucidation is not much required to these sūtras 33-35, because their meanings are quite lucid by themselves. Then, how could the Digambara commentaries have produced such a remarkably different result from the same sūtras? An investigation shall be made on this point below according to the exposition of the Sarvārthasiddhi, because the Rāvavārtika and Ślokavārtika do not say beyond what has been covered by Pūjyapāda.

Pūjyapāda defines the word sadṛśānām in V:(35) as tulya-jātīya, which shows no discrepancy with the Śvetāmbara definition of this term. The purport of this sūtra (35) which bans combination between the similer atoms with the same degrees is illustrated as follows (s - snigdha or smooth, r - rūkṣa or rough):

1. Dissimiler \[2s + 2r; 3s + 3r.\]
2. Similar \[2s + 2s\]
   \[2r + 2r\]

Here the rule of prohibition is extended to the dissimilar cases also, which certainly contradicts the sūtra statement. Therefore a question is raised, ‘yady-evam sadṛśa-grahanām kim-arthām?’, to which a reply is made, ‘gupta-vaiśampye sadṛśānām-api bandha-pratipatty-arthāṁ sadṛśa-grahanām kriyate’ which is obviously drawn from the Bhāṣya on V:34. An inquiry into the obscure position of ‘sadṛśānām’ is not further pursued in the Sarvārthasiddhi. According to Pūjyapāda, atomic combination is thus prevented or proceeded in the following cases:

1. Same degrees
   a. between the similar atoms (No)
   b. between the dissimilar atoms (No)

2. Different degrees
   a. between the similar atoms (Yes)
   b. between the dissimilar atoms (Yes)]

The last case, i.e., (2) (b), is not herein discussed, but the probability of their combination is positive from the succeeding sūtra. As the commentator himself admits the word sadṛśānām in the sūtra has no meaning in this context; nay, it is unwanted as it misleads what is desired to be conveyed of the Digambara theory of the coalition of atoms.

The sūtra (36) lays down a rule for permitting the combination between atoms with the difference of two degrees. The word dvya-adhirādi is said to mean here dvya-adhikātā. The purport of this sūtra in permitting combination is illustrated by Pūjyapāda as follows:

1. Similar kinds \[2s + 4s; 3s + 5s; 4s + 6s \ldots\]
   \[2r + 4r; likewise\]
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(2) Dissimilar kinds \(2s + 4r\); likewise

According to the commentary on the sūtra (36), the atomic combination is thus allowed or banned in the following cases:

1) Difference by 2 degrees

(a) between the similar atoms (Yes)
(b) between the dissimilar atoms (Yes)

2) In all other degrees

(a) between the similar atoms (No)
(b) between the dissimilar atoms (No)

These rules imparted in the sūtra (36) invalidate the statement of the sūtra (35) which is utterly insignificant and unwanted. Pūjyapāda quotes a verse from the Satkhandāgama 5. 6. 36 in testifying the Digambara concept of the rules of atomic combination, ‘niddhassa niddheṇa durādhienā lukkitassa lukkitheṇa durādhienā / niddhassa lukkitheṇa havadi bandhino jahannavajje visame same vā’. The formulae pronounced here include:

1) Combination takes place when there is a difference by two degrees

(a) between the similar atoms
(b) between the dissimilar atoms

2) This rule excludes the case of minimum degree

(a) between the similar atoms
(b) between the dissimilar atoms

These rules which lucidly explain the previous table of atomic combination conceived in the Digambara fold correspond to those enunciated in the sūtras (34) and (35), which indisputably proves that the sūtra (35) is undesirable. Since ‘gūrāsāmye’ in V:(35) has no position in the Digambara concept of atomic combination, the word sama has to be dropped from V:36, thereby a slight difference in reading is ensued between V:36 and V: (37). Likewise ‘sadṛśānān’ in V: (35) has no place in these rules, which clearly explains why the explanation of this word is so bewildering in the Sarvārthasiddhi. The defective nature of the sūtra (35) which does not convey but upsets the Digambara theory of atomic combination demonstrates that these concerned aphorisms in the text of the Sarvārthasiddhi are not the original.

It is difficult to have a clear-cut view of the Digambara theory of atomic combination from these aphorisms alone which are reproduced from the original text with a minor change. Neither Pūjyapāda’s exposition elucidates it. The earliest source that tangibly exhibits its Digambara position is the Satkhandāgama, for which authority Pūjyapāda admits. The revisor of the text obviously followed the Satkhandāgama without fully realizing the undesired nature of the aphorism V: (35), which is clearly reflected in Pūjyapāda’s performance in the Sarvārthasiddhi. This tends to suggest that the revisor of the text was Pūjyapāda himself. The revision of the T.S. must have been made in the South not too long after the great schism. It means that many mionr
doctrinal differences could not have yet existed as so evinced in the previous discussion. This leads us to suspect that Pūjyapāda is here trying to establish this concept of the Śaktihanḍāgama as the Digambara position of the theory of atomic combination to strike a difference from their rivals’ position.

Part 3 Parīṣahās

— IX: 11 (11) ‘ekādaśa jine’ —

Sūtra IX:11(11) reads, ‘ekādaśa jine’ that to a jina occur eleven parīṣahās due to vedāntiya karmas, i.e., kṣut, pipāśa, śīta, uṣṇa, daṁśa-māśaka, caryā, śayā, vadha, roga, trāpa-sparśa and mala. It is not clear here if the word jine which is expressed in locative singular signifies a sayoga kevali alone or a sayoga kevali as well as an ayoga kevali. Its commentaries, i.e., the Bhāṣya and the Sarvārthasiddhi down to Śrutasāgara’s vṛtti, are all silent about it. The Bhagavatī 8.8.342 mentions that these eleven parīṣahās occur to both stages of kevalihood. However an ayoga kevali whose duration lasts only for a fraction of a muhūrtā is absolutely devoid of yoga, therefore parīṣahās as such have no opportunity to occur to him. Hence the word jine should be considered to be applicable to a sayoga kevali alone.

This aphorism IX:11(11) is commonly shared by the text of the two schools. The Śvetāmbaras are of the view that a sayoga kevali is subject to the effects of vedāntiya karmas inasmuch as to the effects of the other three types of aghātikas, therefore what is stated in the above aphorism is in perfect harmony with their concept. As for the Digambaras, the content of the same sūtra is however not the same but reverse, or only acceptable with a proviso of ‘upacāra.’ The Digambaras argue that parīṣahās such as hunger cannot arise to a jina because mohaniya karmas which are the concomitant causes (sahāya) for the rise of asātā-vedāna are absent in him even though these vedāntiya karmas in the form of dravya are present. In another word, vedāntiya karmas in the form of dravya exist in him, but those in the form of bhāva do not exist, thus no asātā-vedāna arises to him. The Sarvārthasiddhi proposes a limited clause of ‘upacāra’ upon which it concedes to accept the logical ground of this aphorism, ‘nanu ca mohaniya-daya-sahāya-bhāvāt-kṣud-ādi vedanābhāve parīṣaha-vyapadesaṁ ni yuktāḥ? sātym-evam-etat-vedanābhāve pī dravyakarma-sad-bhāvāpekṣaya parīṣahopacārah kriyate, niravaṣeṣa-nirasta-jñānavarane yugapatsakadapadārthāvahābā-sikevalajñānātis'īye cintā-nirdhābhāve pī tat-phala-karma-nirharana-phalāpekṣaya dhyānapacārau vac’ The rest of the Digambara commentators follow and develop Pūjyapāda’s explanation. This discordance of the view on the same sūtra is needless to say generated by the dogmatic divergence between the two sects as to admitting or otherwise of a kevali’s kāvalāhāra. And according to the Digambaras, this sūtra cannot be tolerated in the way as it stands. In fact the sūtra should be better read with the word of negation as the Sarvārthasiddhi comments, ‘atha-vā—ekādaśa jine ‘na santi’ iti vākyā-śeṣāḥ kalpaniyāḥ; sopaskāratvāt-sūtrānām.’
Then how the proviso of ‘upacāra’ or a figurative viewpoint should be understood in this context? Pūjyapāda proposes a thesis that pariṣahās are non-pariṣahās to a jīna because the meaning of pariṣahā as hardship does not apply to him as there is no rise of bhāva-vedaniya-karmas (asālā-vedanā) in the absence of mohaniya karmas, but these are figuratively called pariṣahās because dravya-vedaniya-karmas are present in him: just so sūkṣmakriyā and samucchinnakriyā are non-dhyānas because the definition of dhyāna as cintā-nirodha does not apply to them, but these are figuratively called dhyānas because the effect of karma-nirharana is present. Sūkṣmakriyā and samucchinnakriyā are the last two divisions of sukle dhyāna which are so acknowledged by the two traditions. Therefore if these are admitted to be a part of dhyāna, one is compelled to accept, Pūjyapāda seems to urge, the Digambara position of pariṣahās upon the basis of the same logic.

Now, it is quite doubtful that these two final divisions of sukle dhyāna are called dhyānas on the ground that they yield karmic destruction, for the Jaina dhyāna includes ārta and raudra dhyānas which cause inauspicious karmic inflow. The middle term herein is thus vitiated, hence Pūjyapāda’s thesis does not work. Sūkṣmakriyā and samucchinnakriyā are loosely called dhyānas possibly in the conventional sense in relation to mokṣa, because in most religious schools liberation is believed to be achieved by means of dhyāna or samāthī. In real sense, the definition of dhyāna does not apply to a sayoga kevali who performs sūkṣmakriyā dhyāna at his final stage with subtle kāya-yoga alone and to an ayoga kevali who is released from all the three-fold activities. At any rate, since the basis of upacāra is vitiated, the proposer’s attempt of bringing in this dhyāna illustration to corroborate his view has failed.

The proposition says that bhāva-vedaniya-karmas are absent in a jīna in the absence of mohaniya karmas. However mohaniya karmas and vedaniya karmas belong to the two separate divisions of karmas which independently yield different efficacies of their own and whose nature and functions cannot be mixed up, otherwise a chaos is invited pertaining to the distinction of the karmic divisions. So if the above thesis is allowed, the same logic must be extended to the other aghāṭikas, e. g., “Bhāva-gotra-karmas do not arise to a jīna, because the concurrent mohaniya karmas are already exhausted in him.” Then Pūjyapāda insists that bhāvavedaniya-karmas are absent in a jīna, but dravya-vedaniya-karmas are present in him. This is absolutely illogical because the same karma is discussed from the two viewpoints of dravya and bhāva, therefore wherever there is one, there is the other together. Otherwise the same logic must be similarly applied to the other aghāṭikas, e. g., “Dravya-audārika-sārīrana-karma is present in a jīna, but its bhāva-karma is absent in him.” These views are certainly irrational, but the dogmatical belief in tradition does not often go with the theoretical accuracy as it involves itself with the religious sentiments. The Digambaras could not tolerate to acknowledge the presence of bhāva-vedaniya-karmas in a
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jina, but they could not deny the presence of dravya-vedanīya-karmas in him. For this reason, the revisor of the text seems to have conceded to accept the sūtra 11(11) without alteration, of which purport had to be however amended by the commentary in accordance with their dogmatic belief. Pūjyapāda tried to amend it by employing the dialectics of upacāra so that the positive sense of this aphorism would not be entirely spoilt at least, in which he failed. This testifies that the aphorism IX:11(11) did not originally belong to the Digambara tradition. And the fact that this Digambara aphorism cannot be comprehended without its commentary decisively demonstrates that the revisor of the text was Pūjyapāda himself.

CONCLUSION

The last two cases discussed in Sec. IV, Pts. 2–3, which involve doctrinal discordances in the two traditions, are crucial to determine the authenticity of either version of the T.S. It is impossible to tackle the problem from the scrutiny of the concerned aphorisms alone, and it is absolutely needed to mobilize the expositions of the commentarial works which have concealed the key for its solution. There may be still some other similar instances as such. However these two cases relevant to matabhedas along with the case of V:(29) discussed in Sec.III, 2.4) are enough to establish the evidences to testify that the text preserved in the Śvetāmbara camp is the archetype from which the Digambara recension is derived. In addition to them, we may count the case of the author’s idiomatic usage of ‘yathākramam’ (Sec. III, 2.2)) and the case of his style of writing wherein a pronoun sa always opens a new aphorism (Sec. II, 4.2)) as the minor evidences in proving the same. Then the question raised in reference to the revision of the Chapter III, whether the Digambara text drew these materials from the Bhāṣya and the Jambūdvipasamāsa or vice versa (see Sec.III, 2.3)), is automatically answered.
CHAPTER II

IS THE BHĀSYA AN AUTOCOMMENTARY OR NOT

Sec. 1. MSS EVIDENCES

The original text is accompanied by the Svopajñabhāṣya. The word Bhāṣya in a broad sense applies collectively to all the depending portions attached to the text and in a narrow sense to the textual commentary alone. We are using the word Bhāṣya in both senses (inasmuch as the title T.S. is used in both senses, i.e., the text in two recensions and the Subhāṣya T.S.), which should be distinguished in the given context. This term was foreign to the author himself, which became conventionalized in the course of time inasmuch as the word sūtra designated in the title. For the Bhāṣya clearly mentions that the title of the text is Tattvārthādhyāgama-śāstra (praśasti 5), which is sometimes called Tattvārthādhyāgama (praśasti 6) or Tattvārtha saṅgṛaha (puṣpikā to Chs. 4-5). The textual commentary refers to the text as śāstra (e.g., I:1Bh.) and sūtra (e.g., I:11Bh.) as well. Thus the term sūtra likely became customary after the sūtra text of the Digambaras won its popularity in the South. The Bhāṣya consists of the sambandhakārikā (s. kārikā), praśasti and textual commentary, which are annexed to the text at the beginning, end, and middle, respectively. S. kārikā or an introductory verse conveys what the text is and why it was written. Praśasti or a colophon informs us who the author is. Bhāṣya or a textual commentary is made for and arranged after each sūtra, and each chapter is appended by a puṣpikā indicating its end. The physical outlook of the work is thus well planned and even modern. The s. kārikā praśasti are composed in verse in āryā metre, the text in sūtra style, and its commentary in prose.

Do all these appendices belong to the same author of the text or not? This somewhat odd question, as the praśasti registers the author's name, must have arisen due to the reason that the Southern version is not accompanied by the Bhāṣya. Even when the Western version of the text has been proved to be the original, the same doubt does not seem to disappear so easily for various reasons, e.g., due to the unconventional format of the work accompanied by an introductory verse and a colophon which is new in the olden days, due to the mastery competence in Sanskrit.
Sec. 1. MSS EVIDENCES

displayed in the s. kārikā which is again the earliest specimen in the extant Jaina literature, and due to the yet unverified strange name and gotra of the author and his background recorded in the praśasti. The problems involved here are of two kinds: 1) whether the Bhāṣya is an auto commentary or not?, and 2) whether the sabhāṣya T. S. was composed by Umāsvāti or not? These are the interrelated problems and the first question cannot be ultimately answered without solving the second problem. Nevertheless we shall proceed our quest according to the order of the arrangement of the Bhāṣya components, and the second problem pertaining to the rification of praśasti which establishes the authorship of T. S. shall be handled in the last section of this chapter.

Let us begin with the examination of the printed edition of the Bhāṣya against the testimony of the codices reported in Ch. I, Sec. I, with a view to finding whether any new evidence to solve the problem is derived therefrom or not. The printed edition of the Sabhāṣya T. S. consists of thirty-one s. kārikās, the text accompanied by its commentary, and six couplets of praśasti verses in due order. Is this construction of the T. S. invariable in the MSS corpus? Diverse forms of this work in the codices have been already reported. The text accompanied by the Bhāṣya has escaped alteration, but that unaccompanied by it underwent monstrous transformations. Ms no. 1 located at L. D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad, is a copy of the s. kārikā alone. Does it then imply that it was originally an independent poem? First of all, the intrinsic evidence that the s. kārikā is an introduction to the body of text which cannot stand alone as an independent poem vitiates the ground of this suspicion. Secondly and extrinsically, the archetype of this copy can be traced in the separate text upon which Devagupta commented, that is bound together with Siddhasena’s Bhāṣyānusārīṇī.¹ It is unknown why Devagupta commented on the s. kārikā alone, however his benediction evinces that his original intention was to compose ‘tattvārthaṣya... īkā’, which was obviously not fulfilled for some reason or the other. The Bhāṣyānusārīṇī reproduces the entire work of the Sabhāṣya T. S. minus s. kārikā, of which brief commentary he made is no more than a supplement to Devagupta’s exegetical exposition. It is therefore evident that Siddhasena attached Devagupta’s commentary along with its text at the outset and used them as a part of the Bhāṣyānusārīṇī. Hence the doubt raised regarding the Ms. no 1. has been removed.

The palm leaf MSS (nos. 8–9) at Saṅghavi Pāda, Pattan, copy only the latter half of the praśasti, i. e., verses 4–6, which records the author’s name, title of the work and its purpose. The former half of the praśasti, i. e., verses 1–3, talks about the lineage of his teachers, his parents, the place of his birth, and the place where the T. S. was composed. Theoretically speaking these lines can be added or dropped at any time, by which the context of the rest of couplets are least disturbed. Does it suggest then that the verses 4–6 alone were authentic to which the rest were accrued
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later by someone else? We are here reminded of the indepenable nature of these palm leaf MSS which made a crazy revision over the third chapter of the Digambarā text. These three couplets of praśasti are furthermore numbered as 33–35 in continuation of thirty-two upasamāhāra kārikās (up. kārikās), and the enumeration as such is an obvious conflation, for both poems do not belong to the same category. For these reasons, it is difficult to assess much reliability to these MSS. What actually happened here seems to be that only the latter half of praśasti which is of more informative value than the former half was copied in order to adjust the space left on the last page.

Likewise some MSS extract the first nine s. kārikās alone at random and attach them to the text. And some others copy the text along with the mangalācaraṇa which belongs to the Sarvārthasiddhi. As we have already described, various versions of the T. S. as such have been derived by the athesisation, amplification and conflation of the transmitted text. Then it does not change the authentic position of the printed text, which must be primarily based on Siddhasena's Bhāṣyāṇusārini, the oldest commentary on the Sabhāṣya T. S. Siddhasena never raised a doubt about the common authorship of the text and its Bhāṣya. Therefore the statement that Umāsvāti was believed to be the author of the Sabhāṣya T. S. is correct within the time-limit of the Bhāṣyāṇusārini, more than which we cannot draw any conclusion on this problem from the existing codices. Then, a testimony of the common authorship of the text and its Bhāṣya must be again made on the basis of the internal evidences alone, which shall be taken up in the following sections.

Sec. 2. SAMBANDHAKĀRIKĀ

Some scholars are of the view that the s. kārikā, praśasti and puṣpikā must have been composed by Umāsvāti himself because these portions are left uncommented in the Sabhāṣya T. S. and because a puṣpikā is appended at the end of each chapter referring to both text and its commentary. Their opinion may be true from the viewpoint of literary practice in tradition, however it cannot prove the point in question, because theoretically speaking, their interpolations in such a way can be made at any time.

To give a conclusion first, it is impossible to attest that they were composed by the same aphorist from these separate Bhāṣya portions alone. Our study in the previous chapter has revealed that for a decisive testification of the authenticity of either version of the text, it requires the commentaries on the text of both versions. In another word, in order to prove that Text A is the original from which Text A' is derived we need the existence of the Svopajñābhāṣya, i.e., B/A, and the Sarvārthasiddhi, i.e., B/A'. This is precisely so due to the unmistakable reason that A cannot be comprehended without B/A as both were derived from the same pen, and A' cannot be understood without B/A' as both were derived from the same pen on the basis of A and B/A.
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We should at present forget about the theorization of this formula, because we are in the position to demonstrate that A and B/A were composed by the same hand. Therefore in order to testify that Text A and its Commentary B/A inclusive of all the portions were composed by the same hand, it would require the existence of Text A' and its Commentary B/A' inclusive of all the counterportions. Among the Bhāṣya components, the textual commentary alone satisfies this condition for its testimony. The ultimate proof of the common authorship in respect of the textual commentary is therefore expected to be arrived at, however it is expected to be difficult for us to testify the same in respect of the other Bhāṣya portion which lack their counterparts in the other tradition.

The common authorship of the praśasti can be established if the textual commentary were proved to have been written by the same aphorist and if the biographical accounts in the praśasti were verified to be authentic, because the fact that Umāsvāti or Umāsvāmi is the author of the T.S. as so unanimously admitted by the two schools is found in the praśasti alone in their earlier records. Only then, the same authorship of the s.kārika can be accepted so long as there are enough positive evidence for it within itself and in relation to the text, textual commentary and praśasti. The puspikā as such which can be easily interpolated at any time by any person can never be proved of its authenticity after all, which must be taken for granted on the basis of the MSS evidence within its capacity and on the basis of the literary practice in tradition as so suggested by the other scholars. In this section, therefore, we shall concentrate ourselves to find the positive evidences for the joint authorship that the s.kārika exhibits within itself and in relation to the text, textual commentary and praśasti.

The s.kārika consists of two major portions, i.e., the former 2/3 relevant to the life of Lord Mahāvīra and the latter 1/3 relevant to the information of the work. The latter portion includes the following topics: (1) Salutation to Lord Mahāvīra (21) and an introduction of the nature of the text (22); 2) Difficulty of the task in composing the Compendium of the canon (23–26) and reasons for its achievement (27–30); and 3) Mokṣamārga as the theme of the work (31). Kārika 21–22 and 31 alone are herein essential, which satisfy the primary requirements for a maṅgalacaraṇa consisting of the indication of the subject matter, purpose, relation and the dedicated. It is therefore suspected that these three verses were originally composed as the benedictory verses in the body of the text as the conventional practice goes, to which the middle portion of verses 23–30 were inserted, while augmenting the former 2/3 portion relevant to Lord Mahāvīra to the kārika 21, and thus it turned out to shape up the present form. The former portion contains the following topics: 1) The Jainas' ideal way of life (1–3); 2) Classification of man (4–6); 3) Nature and cause of the tirthakara (7–10); and 4) Life of Lord Mahāvīra (11–20). All the first three topics herein are the under-
plots leading to the theme of Lord Mahāvīra, for whose biography’s sake 1/3 of the total kārikās is spared.

The essential three kārikās read, ‘kṛtvā tri-karana-suddhoṁ tasmai parama-
rṣaye namaskāṁ/ pūjyatamāya bhagavate vīrāya vilīnamahāya/[21] tattvārthādhi-
gamākhyāṁ bahv-arthem saṁgrahaṁ laghu-grantham/ vakṣyāmi śīśya-hitaṁ-imam-
arhad-vacanaikadeśaṁ/[22] na te ca mokṣamārgād-dhitopadeso’sti jagati kṛtsne’smin/
tasmāt-param-imam-eveti mokṣamārgaṁ pravakṣyāmi /[31]/. The first kārikā is a verse of salutation, while the rest convey us the first-hand information of the work as to its nature and theme. The nature of the work is said here to be bahv-arthem saṁgraha of arhad-vacanaikadesa, which echoes in the puṣpikā at the end of each chapter (excepting Ch. III), ‘tattvārthādhi-game’rhat-pravacana-saṁgrahe’ and in the similar expressions. The real task attempted and accomplished by the author of the T. S. is to summarize the contents of the canon within the scheme of seven tattvas, for which mokṣamārga is used as a guiding theme. Since the Bhāṣya portions are altogether dropped from the Digambara version, Pūjyapāda and the following commentators on the T. S. in the South, even though having duly emphasized the theme of mokṣamārga, paid least attention to the T. S. as such. Actually there was no need for them to emphasize this aspect, because since the beginning of their literary activities, the T. S. was received in the South in the capacity as such replacing the contents of the canonical texts redacted at the Third Valabhi Convention. At any event, the exact nature of the work attempted by the author is expressed in the s. kārikā and puṣpikā alone in the Sabhāṣya T. S. but in no other place.

The author of the s. kārikā utters a desperate outcry that the task he has begun is such a difficult kind (23–26), nevertheless he is somehow encouraging himself to get over with it in order to gain benefit for himself and for the other from the achievement of this work (27–30). This portion of kārikā expressing the author’s private world is worthy, because this is an exceptional place in Sabhāṣya T. S. where his inner struggle in fulfilling the task is so vividly conveyed with a tone of unrestrained emotional flow that the readers can meet him person to person. Umāsvāti wrote the T. S. in the Gupta age when all the rest of the philosophical schools had come to possess their own standard texts. The Jainas could not have been left behind, and the T. S. was the need of hour. With this historical background, we can well understand the position of the author here who imposed this difficult task upon himself. This portion enables us to appreciate the motivation and purpose of author in composing the work, otherwise it is utterly an unnecessary part in the context, for it does not help to comprehend the nature and content of the work itself. As such, this portion would not have existed if the s. kārikā were written by someone other than the author himself. Neither the genuine nature of this expression can be imitated or composed by the others.
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Samyagdarśana which is the basic condition to be a Jaina is sung at the very outset. The Jaina way of life, the classification of man, and the nature as well as the cause of tirthakara (1-20) are stated in view of mokṣa, of which underlying tone is the logical assertion of the karma theory of Jainism which distinguishes it from the other religions in its ethical outlook. These topics, some of which are the modifications in the Āgama, are in fact too self-evident and too familiar accounts to be communicated to the Jainas themselves in this place of introduction. What the author seems to be aiming at here is to distinguish the Jaina position of these religious and theological issues from that of the other schools, the conscious attempt of which is persistently maintained throughout the composition of the text and its commentary. The T.S. was composed in the darkest age for the Jainas when they were migrating to the other parts of India from Mathurā. The kārikākāra seems to be loudly appealing to the then Jaina communities for the common objective of transmitting the tradition of Mahāvīra, the motivation of which is likewise reflected in the kārikā 28 and prājñā 4-5. The historical circumstances as such perhaps made the author more particular about in declaring these Jaina positions at the outset to be demarcated from those of the others. The reference to these topics at the very beginning of an introductory section does not otherwise make much sense.

Prājñā verses 4–5 deliver the purpose of the composition of the work in two ways: 1) For the sake of upholding the teachings of Arhats handed down by the worthy preceptors through generations, and 2) Due to compassion for the beings upon having observed the world afflicted with pains and snagged by the thoughts of wrong Āgamas. The second message seems, rather than to be a stereotyped expression, to convey the then historical circumstances of the religious struggles in the Gupta age when the new religions such as Vaishnavism and Śaivism came into power in the florescence of the Hindu revival movement, which finally drove the Jainas away from Mathurā. The first message is obviously announced to the then Jaina communities, a similar aspiration of which is sung in the s.kārikā 28, ‘tasmāi-tat-prāmāṇyāt samāsato vyāsataś-ca jina-vacanam/ śreya iti nirvicāram grāhyam dhāryam ca vaśyam ca’. Being the arthat-pravacana-saṅgraha, the T.S. is no other than the jina-vacana itself. In another word, the T.S. was composed for the sake of facilitating the transmission of the legacy of the Jaina canon, the fact of which has passed the test of time. At any rate, we can point out in the s.kārikā and prājñā a coherent spirit for the ultimate aim in composing the work.

Thus all these kārikās which are inessential or do not have much relevancy to the information of the work itself become meaningful and comprehensible in the historical context wherein the author was placed. It means that it would have been very difficult for a later interpolator if at all there were any to compose these portions unless he shared the same historical background. Pūjyapāla dropped from the Sarvārthasiddhi all these
inessential portions in the ś.kārikā for these did not mean much in the context of his time, and replaced the s. kārikā by the maṅgalācarāma which was directly derived from the kārikās 21 and 31. We have thus collected in this section sufficient data which may not establish themselves as decisive evidences, but are positive enough in accepting the joint authorship of the ś.kārikā if the testimonies of the other Bhāṣya portions were produced.

Sec. 3. TEXTUAL COMMENTARY

Part 1 Treatment of citations

The problem, whether or not the textual commentary was composed by the same aphorist, is going to be handled in the first three parts of this section: Pt. 1) Treatment of citations, Pt. 2) Modes of elucidation, and Pt. 3) Polemical aphorisms and their expositions. Here again a decisive testimony comes from the independent inquiries into the controversial sūtras and their expositions made in Part 3, and the ample positive evidences alleged in the first two parts serve in the capacity of fortifying the same testimony.

The sūtra V.38, ‘kālaṣ-ceṣy-eke’, suggests that there were two views on kāla in the canon in respect of its dravyatva. As is evinced in the quest for matabhedas, the Jaina canon preserves many conflicting views as to one and the same concept which have arisen in the long course of time. The aphorist is therefore necessarily constrained to represent a selected view on it according to his own judgment, or he may simply juxtapose the different views in tradition by reserving his personal justification. The sūtra V.38 is made in the sense of the latter. The Bhāṣya contains several similar cases as such which quotes the opinions of the others by way of indefinite pronouns such as ‘kecit’ ‘ēkačārya’, ‘eka’, and the like, as follows:

I:5 nāma-sthāpanā-dravya-bhāvatasa-tan-nyāsaḥ
   Bh. kecid-apy-āhur-yad-dravyato dravyaṃ bhavati tac-ca pudgala-dravyam-\ eveti pratyetavyam

I:6 pramāṇa-naya-air-adhiqamah
   Bh. tatra pramāṇam dvi-vidham... catur-vidham-ity-eke

—Fourfold pramāṇas are enumerated in the Anvypadāvāra 131, ‘pamāṇe cau-vvihe pañcātekac tam-jahā- nāna-ppamāṇe ṭhavana-ppamāṇe davva-ppamāṇas bhava ppamāṇe’, which are likewise recorded in the Sthāna 4.1.321. The Bhagavati 5 4 192 reads, ‘pamāṇe cau-vvihe p-o tam -jahā-paccakke anumāne o amme āgame...’ which reflects an influence made by the Nyāyasūtra 1.1.3.

I:31 ekādini bhāyi-vi yugapad-ekasminnā, caturbhyah
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II.43 sarvasya

Bh. *eke tv-ācārya nayavādāpekṣam vyācakṣate/ kārmaṇam evaikam-anādi sambandham/ tenaivikena jīvayānādiḥ sambandho bhavatiti/ tajjasam tu labdhy-apekṣam bhavati/ sā ca tajjas-labdhir-na sarvasya, kasya-cid-eva bhavati/

— The Bhagavatī 8.9.349–50 hold that both are anādibaddha.

A majority of these views quoted in the Bhāṣya does not speak in support of the positions of the text but goes against them. The commentator refers to these conflicting views without any critical attitude. An attitude as such primarily belongs to the saṅgrahakāra as so demonstrated in the sūtra V:38, wherein he attempts to give a fair representation of the then available views. The Sarvārthasiddhi ignores all these citations made in the Bhāṣya. Pūjyapāda stands in a commentator's position, who accepts the viewpoints established in the text. Once the established viewpoints are received, juxtaposition of the contrary cases loses its meaning for it least helps to clarify the purport of the text. Pūjyapāda likely dropped these citations as they are not competent in serving for his purpose. This lends probability to the joint authorship of the textual commentary.

Part 2. Modes of elucidation

(1) Exposition of the technical terms

I:13 explains matijñāna by way of its synonyms, 'matīḥ smṛtiḥ saujñā cintābhini-bodha ity-anarthāntaram', which is an Āgamic method of exposition called ekārthikā-nuyoga.3 The same method of explaining words by way of their equivalents occurs consistently in the Bhāṣya, e.g., nisarga (I:3), avagraha, ihā, apāya and dhāraṇa (I:15), naya (I:35), vigraha (II:29), aparā (IV:39), upagraha (V:17), hiṃ-ā (VII:8), krodha, māna, māyā and lobha (VIII:10), kṣamā (IX:6), and so on. Some of these synonymous terms may represent the canonical usage, for the equivalents of mati are traced in the Nandi 80 and Āvaśyaka niryuktī 12. This is the major method of explaining words in the Bhāṣya which rarely adopts the nirukti method of derivation, and the case is reverse in the Sarvārthasiddhi wherein the latter method is predominant.

The different approaches of these two commentators in explaining words seem to have been derived from the different backgrounds of their ages where they belonged
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rather than from their different personal styles. The Ágamic literature which does not yet know how to define a concept adopts the method of its exposition by way of synonymous terms, which is followed by the Bhāṣya as so done in the sūtra I:13, whereas the Sarvārthasiddhi knows how to define a concept, and the key words among those listed above are all clearly explained by Pūjyapāda. The T.S. employs various anuyoga methods in approaching problems, for instance, five jñānas in the first chapter are merely distinguished or classified one after the other by way of anuyogadvāras such as karaṇa, adhikaraṇa, kāla, svāmi, alpabahutva, kṣetra, tathājñāna-atathājñāna, etc. The T.S. also tries to define certain concepts and succeeded in it, e.g., samyagdarsana in I:2(2), sat in V:29(30), guṇa-dravya in V:37(38), and 40(41), āsrāva in VI:1-2(1-2), and so on. However many of them were born in the cross current with the non-Jaina thoughts wherein the aphorist was compelled to define them in order to distinguish the Jaina positions from those of the others, but such method of defining terms was never adopted by the bhāṣyakāra in elucidating aphorisms.

The explanation of technical terms in the Bhāṣya is often insufficient, like those occurring in I:13(18), II:1(1), 8(9), 26(25), VI:1(1), 5-6(4-5), IX:9(9), etc. which are well explained by the Sarvārthasiddhi. On the other hand, the Bhāṣya sometimes gets into over detailed explication of the technical terms e.g., those in VIII:10, IX:6, and so on. Thus the exposition of terms in the Bhāṣya is as a whole unbalanced, which is duly improved in the Sarvārthasiddhi. These evidences well suggest the later position of the Sarvārthasiddhi.

(2) Exposition of the aphorisms

Whether the purport of an aphorism that he composed is correctly conveyed to the readers or not—this must be the vital concern of the aphorist. Therefore if he himself were to draft a commentary on his own sūtra, he would first of all impart its general import which is the vital message he wants to convey. For an ordinary commentator, it would not be necessary the first step to take, but to start with exegesis or word by word explanation is more an effective method to achieve the clarification of the entire purport as it has been so done in tradition. The difference in the mode of elucidation as such is clearly displayed in the Bhāṣya and the Sarvārthasiddhi, of which illustration shall be given below:

I:1 samyag-darśana-jñāna-cāritrāṇi mokṣa-mārgaḥ

Bhāṣya:
General import of the sūtra (samyag-darśanaṁ samyag-jñānām samyag-cāritramitya-eva tri-viḍhō mokṣa-mārgaḥ)—their definition and subdivisions are to be given later (iham purastāl-lakṣyato vidhi ēkaś ca vistaraṇopadeśyāmaḥ śāstrānupūrvti-vinyāsārtham tāldeśa-mātram-īlam-ucyate) three pathways together constitute mokṣamārga (etāni
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cia samastānī mokṣa-sādhanāni / ekatarābha'vepy - asaḍhanānty - atas - trayāṇām grahaṇam) — their order is made according to the causal sequence (eṣām ca pūrva-lābhe bhajaniyam-uttaram / uttara tābhe tu niyataḥ pūrva-lābhaḥ) — the modifier śamya is explained (tatra samyag iti prāśamsārtho nipātah, sāmañcater-vā bhāvaḥ) — explanation of the words darsana and samyag-darsana (darsanam-itī dyēśer - avyabhicāriṇi survendriyāṁ indriyārtha prāptiretaḥ samyag-darsanam/ praśastaṁ darsana- nam samyag-darsanam/ sāgatam vā darsanam samyag-darsanam) — application should be likewise extended to the rest (evam jñāna-cāritrayor-api).

Sarvārthasiddhi :
Explanation of the word samyak (samyag-iti/ avyutpannah śabdo vyutpanno vā/ aṅcateḥ kvaṁ samaṅcatitī samyag-iti/ asyārthah praśamsā) — three pathways modified by the word samyak — their brief explanation, of which detailed definition and subdivisions are to be followed later (eteṣām sva-rūpaṁ lakṣānato vidhānataś-ca purastoś-vistareśa nirdeśyāmah / uddeśa-mātraṁ tv-idam-ucyate) — their etymological derivations — their arrangement made according to the causal sequence (jñānasya samyag-vyapadeśa - hetuvaś/ cāritrāś-pūrvaṁ jñānasya prayuktam, tat-pūrvakāvāc-cāritrasya) — exposition of mokṣa and mārga — general purport of the sūtra (ataḥ samyag tat-pūrvakāvāc-cāritrasya) — exposition of mokṣa and mārga — general purport of the sūtra (ataḥ samyag-darsanam samyag-jñānam samyak-cāritram- ity etat tritayam samuditam mokṣasya sākṣān-mārgo veditavyaḥ) — introduction to the next aphorism.

The example above is at random picked up from the first aphorism of the first chapter, but both the Bhāṣya and the Sarvārthasiddhi throughout maintain each unique pattern of the mode of exposition as such. The bhāṣyakāra’s exposition begins with the more important messages and ends with the less important ones in terms of the desired intention of the aphorist, while Pūjya-pāda’s method of exposition takes almost a reverse step which is made in view of the audience. This again lends plausibility to the fact that the text and the Bhāṣya were composed by the same hand.

We shall now turn ourselves to the independent inquiries into the following polemical aphorisms and their expositions : (1) I : 23 (22), (2) V : 31 (32), and (3) IX : 27 (27).

Part 3 (1)

I:23 'yathokta-nimittatḥ ūdā-vikalpāḥ 'seṣānāṁ'
I:(22) 'kṣayopāśama-nimittatḥ ūdā-vikalpāḥ 'seṣānāṁ'

Aphorisms I:21-23 discuss two types of avadhi jñāna generated by two different causes, which read, ‘dvī-vidho’vadhiḥ//21// bhava-pratyayo nāraka-devānām //22//'
yathokta-nimittah śad-vikalpaḥ ottesville 23/23/. ‘yathokta-nimittah’ mentioned in the sūtra 23 is impossible to be understood from these aphorisms alone. The Bhasya on the aphorisms 21 comments, ‘bhava-pratyayah kṣyopaśama-nimittas-ca’, and the Bhasya on the aphorism 23 elucidates the point, ‘yathokta-nimittah kṣyopaśama nimitta ity-arthah’. The said phrase, ‘yathokta-nimittah’, in the sūtra 23 indisputably refers to the Bhasya on the sūtra 21, which proves that Umāsvāti was composing this text portion along with its commentary. This bears witness to the fact that the concerned aphorisms and their Bhasya expositions were written by the same hand. The same sūtra is read in the text of Pujiyapāda, ‘kṣyopaśama-nimittah śad-vikalpaḥ istringstream 1 I (22)’, an improvement of which reading could not have been made without referring to the Bhasya on the sūtras 21 and 23.

Incidentally, it became unquestionable in this context that the author first drafted the text side by side taking down necessary commentarial notes, upon which the further details of exposition were made later.

V:31 (32) ‘arpitānarpita-siddheḥ’

It has been previously examined that the anomalous arrangement of V:29–31 relevant to sat-nityatva was derived in the context of the topics discussed in the Vaiśeṣika-sūtra 4.1. These sūtras read, ‘upāda-vyaya-dhauvyaya-yuktam sat (29), ‘tad-bhāyavayayam nityam (33),’ and ‘arpitānarpita-siddheḥ (31). The concept expressed in the aphorism 29 does not yet occur in the extant canonical corpus. Sūtra 30 is directly derived from the concept expressed in the sūtra 29. V:31 offers the ground of reasoning for the sūtras 29–30 that the existence which is eternal is at the same time characterized by the mutually contradictory characteristics. Arpita-anarpita, expressing a theory of relativity, are included in ten dravyānuyogas listed in the Sthāna 10 972, which are made in actual use, for instance, in the Uttarādhyaśāna nirūkти 49, ‘āeso puṇa du-viho appiya-vavahāra atarpitā ceva/ ikk-ikkc puṇa ti-viho atījā pare tad-uṣhae ya’ (three characteristics here denote kṣāyika, aupāśamika and kṣayopāśamika).

Umāsvāti posited the problem of sat-nityavta in the context of pudgala wherein the matter substance is discussed from the standpoint of bhāva as to its nature (23–24), dravya as to its components (25–27), kṣetra as to its perceptibility (28), and bhāva as to the process of combination (32–36) and a similar method of approach is likewise observed in handling the rest of the topics, i.e., dravya-puṇa-paryāya and pariṇāma, as these can be treated from the standpoint of bhāva (37,40–44). [The topic of kāla expressed in the aphorisms 38–39 is absolutely misarranged in this context.]

The Nyāyasūtra 4.1.10 takes up the topic of rebirth, and in this connection examined and refuted in 4.1.11–24 are the theories of the origination of things upheld by
various schools. The Nyāyasūtra 4.1.25–40 then investigate various views on the nature of things, 'sarvan-antiyaṁ-upatti-vināśa-dharmakavāt (25)', 'sarvan nityoṁ paṁca-bhūta-nityatvāt (29)', 'sarvan prthag-bhāva-lakṣaṇa-prthaktvāt (34)', and 'sarvan-abhbāvob hāveṣv itaretarabhāva-siddheḥ (37)', which represent the positions of the Śaṅkavāda, Brahmnism, Sautrāntika-Vaibhāṣika and Śūnyavāda respectively. The first two schools herein assume the nature of things to be anitya or nitya on the basis of upatti-vināśa-dharmakatva or paṁca-bhūta-nityatva. The Vaiśeṣikasūtra 1.2.18 (text of Candrānanda) refers to the nature of sat that it has no specific mark of its own, 'sal-lingāvīśeṣa-viśeṣa-lingābhāvāc caiko bhāvaḥ iti'.

The Āgamic authors posited problems from various points of inquiry. From the viewpoint of dravya, pudgala is ultimately conceived in terms of atoms, and from the viewpoint of bhāva it is understood in terms of its properties. The Bhagavati 14.4.511 discusses that an atom is everlasting from the standpoint of dravya, but everchanging from the aspect of bhāva, ‘paramāṇu-paṭigale nam bhante: kim sāsae asāsae? goyamā: siya sāsae siya asāsae, se keśa-ṭhetan bhante: evam vuccai siya sāsae siya asāsae? goyamā: dava-ṭṭhayāsāsās, vanna-pajjavehiṁ jāva phāsa-pajjavehiṁ asāsae, se tena-ṭthetan jāva siya sāsae siya asāsae.’ Neither the Kaṇṭhavāla’s view of sarve-anityatva nor Brahmanvāda’s view of sarva-nityatva expressed in the Nyāyasūtra above are acceptable to the Jainas. Umāsvāti thus caught hold of the causes of anityatva upheld by the Śaṅkavāda, i. e., upatti-vināśa, and the Brahmanvāda’s nityatva which can be expressed in terms of dhrauvya and proposed the Jaina view of sat from the standpoint of dravya-cum-bhāva that existence can be simulatenously qualified by these three mutually differing characteristics, which clearly distinguishes itself from the Vaiśeṣika assertion that the existence has no specific mark of its own. The idea of pariṇāma-nityatā is already implied in the Uttarādhyayana 28.6 wherein the definition of and the relation held among dravya-guṇa-paṛyāya are expressed, ‘guṇāntam-āsāo davaṁ, ega-dava-ssiyā guṇā / lakṣhaṇaṁ pajiyaṁ tu, ubhaṁ assiyo bhave.’ And in this very context of the Nyāyasūtra discussion of the nature of things, Umāsvāti proposed the Jaina view of nityatva to be pariṇāma-nityatā in the sūtra 30, that is, the state of the existence in these three forms is everlasting. The concept of sat-nityatva was thus grasped and expressed by Umāsvāti primarily in the context of pudgala.

Then the aphorism 31 proposes arpitā-anarpita theory to be the reasoning ground of the concepts expressed in the previous two aphorisms. The Bhāṣya says that threefold natures of sat and the twofold natures of nitya, the latter of which remains without explanation, are established by the viewpoints of arpitavyāvahārika and anarpitavyāvahārika. It then shows how these viewpoints are to be applied to four kinds of sat as follows:
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Viewed from arpita-anarpita stand-
points in respect of three numbers,

Kinds of sat  i.e., singular, dual and plural.  predication by sat and asat

(1) dravya  dravya  is
(2) mātrka  mātrka  is
               amātrka  is not
(3) utpanna  utpanna  is
               anutpanna  is not
(4) paryāya  sad-bhāva paryāya  is
               asad-bhāva paryāya  is not
               tad-ubhaya paryāya  avaktavya

What is expressed here is more obscure than cryptic. The Bhāṣya does not first of all explain the technical term arpita-anarpita, which are understood to be viśeṣa-aviveṣa in the canon. Secondly, aphorism 31 is offering the theorization of the concept of three different natures of sat expressed in the sūtra 29 about which no exposition is made, instead the Bhāṣya strangely brings in an inferior list of the fourfold characteristics of sat about which alone the discussion is furthered. Thirdly, in discussing the matter, an application of arpita-anarpita viewpoints is considered in respect of each individual nature of sat in four forms, but not in respect of mutually differing threefold characteristics of sat which is the very point to be explained. Finally, an explanation of the theory of these two viewpoints is totally neglected regarding the nature of nityatva. The Bhāṣya is thus out of tune here in every respect.

The Sarvārthasiddhi defines the terms arpita-anarpita, then briefly and clearly elucidates the purport of the sūtra V: 31 (32) with an appropriate illustration. Modern scholars follow the Sarvārthasiddhi in explaining this sūtra, solely giving up the obscure exposition offered by the Bhāṣya. The later commentator like Siddhasena gaṇi says that the bhāṣyakāra is elucidating the aphorism by way of the nayavāda consisting of dravyāstika and paryāyāstika and by way of the syādvāda. This is farfetched, because this sūtra does not pertain to the theory of knowledge, and the first chapter wherein these ought to be dealt with does not refer to them at all. The concepts of these two principal divisions of nayavāda and saptabhaṅgi are not yet clearly grasped by the canonical authors nor by Umiśvati, otherwise the exposition of nayas made in 1:34–35Bh. should have been altogether different. As a matter of fact, until these aphorisms V: 29–31 were formulated, the concept of the anekāntavāda could not have been developed. These sūtras themselves provided the basis for the immediate arrival of the age of logic. Then, what does this sudden appearance of the list of fourfold natures of sat mean in relation to its threefold characteristics in question?

The Sthāna 4.2.372 reads, cattāri ekka pa. tam. davie-ekkae māu-ekkae pajae-
ekkae samgaha-ekkae, cattāri kai p. tam. daviya-kai māuya-kai pajava-kai sam-
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gaha-kai, catr̥ri savya p. tam. ŋama savvaė ṱhavaŋ-savve āesa-savvaė niravasesa-savvaė.” This is obviously made up with two different topics, which are assembled together under the heading of number, i.e., one, many and all, of which the first topic alone we are now concerned. Likewise the Daśavaikalika niryuktik 8.7 reads, ‘nāman ṱhavāṅ davie māugapada saṃgahekkke cēva / paivava bhāva ya tathā satte. ekkaṅa bhaniya’. [Its cūri explains mārkapada by utpāda, dhruva and vigama as the concept existed in the Drṣṭivāda, which is of course impossible] Saṅgrahapada here is replaced by utpanna in the Bhāṣya. From the way the Bhāṣya explains each content of sat by the three numbers of singular, dual and plural, it seems that the commentator deduced these fourfold kinds of sat directly from the Sthāna above by making the said alteration as to saṅgrahapada.

The canonical authors used to posit problems from various points of investigation such as dravya, kṣetra, kāla and bhāva, and the canon exhibits the concept that guṇa is always found in dravya but paryāya is found in both. However, these four items in the Sthāna, i.e., dravya, mārka, utpanna and paryāya, which are said in the Daśavaikalika niryuktik to be the contents of sat, constitute the closest concept to threefold natures of sat formulated by Umāsvāti, i.e., utpāda, vyaya and dhrauva.

The commentator’s performance as examined above is indeed a strange kind, bringing in the inferior Āgamic classification of sat and imparting the application of arpa-anarpita viewpoints to them instead of to the threefold natures of sat in question. Such performance is inconceivable unless we assume that the commentator is here attempting to justify that the concept of the sūtras 29-30 which were formulated by the author himself in the context of the non-Jaina views are the authoritative Jaina views in the light of the canonical code. He seems to be thus attesting that the Jaina concept of sat in threefold natures and its consequent theory of pariṇāma-nityatā are all found in the canon in the closest form of expression as such. The commentator here appears to have been much involved with this proof establishment as the aphorist, and seems to have neglected his primary duty of explaining the meaning of the technical terms and elucidating the purport of the sūtra. He is doubtlessly writing this commentary from the standpoint of the aphorist, but not from that of the commentator. The irrelevant nature of this commentary is otherwise difficult to be explained.

IX : 27 (27) ‘... ekāgra-cintā-nirrodho dhyānam’

IX : 27-28, ‘uttama-samhananasayaikāgra-cintā-nirrodho dhyānam/ ā muhūrūtī,’ are made in one sūtra in the text of Pūjyapāda, ‘uttama-samhananasayaikāgra-cintā-nirrodho dhyānam ā antarpumhūrtī (27).’ Herein dhyāna is defined as ‘ekāgra-cintā-nirrodhaḥ,’ which is explained to denote two different contents in the Bhāṣya, ‘ekāgra-cintā-nirrodhaḥ-ca,’ but is commented to denote one content by all the other commentarial works on the T. S. in both traditions. Pūjyapāda explains it, ‘nānārthāvalambanena cintā parispandavati, tasyā anyāseṣa-mukhyebhyo vyāvartya ekasminn-agre niyama ekāgra-cintā-nirrodha ity-ucyate.’ As the examination of Umāsvāti’s treatment of
dhyāna made in Ch. III, Sec. III, pt. 3 evinces, it denotes two different contents, i.e., ekāgra-cintā and (kāya-)yoga-nirodha, of which the former defines dhyāna of those in chadmaṣṭha and the latter of kevalis. This is the concept of dhyāna maintained in the Āgamic tradition, of which position is also clearly reflected in the argument on this matter exhibited in the immediate post-Umāsvāti literature in the Śvetāmbara tradition. It is difficult to read the definition of dhyāna as of two different contents from the sūtra text proper, and the aphorist’s commentary alone elucidates it as such, which corroborates the joint authorship of the sūtra and its commentary. In fact, the aphorism should have been expressed in dual ending, ‘ekāgra-cintā-niro-
dhau,” then the said obscurity would not have arisen.

Part 4 Siddhasena’s criticism

That the textual commentary was made by the same aphorist has been thus decisively established on the strength of the independent quests made in part 3, to which we may add another proof alleged in the inquiry into the controversial sūtra V:28(28) and its commentary pertaining to the perceptibility of things which is conducted in Ch. III, Sec. III, Pt.2. The positive evidences for it attested in the first two parts fortify the same conclusion.

Siddhasenagiri and the following commentators on the Sabhāṣya T.S. never suspected that it was composed by Umāsvāti. However Siddhasena raised bitter criticisms against the Bhāṣya in his Bhāṣyānusāraṇī, most of which were likewise reproduced by Haribhadraśūri and his disciples in the Laghviṣṭikā. As such, even though these controversial issues advanced by him do not have much to do with our problem under consideration, it would not be out of place here to take up this topic in order to clarify the nature of his condemnation. His criticisms are made against the Bhāṣya on the following aphorisms:

1) II:17Bh. The twofold divisions of upakaraṇendriya mentioned by Umāsvāti are not supported by the Āgama.

2) III:3Bh. “The height of the bodies of nairayika in Ratnaprabha is seven dhanus, three hastas and six aṅgulas, which is doubled for those in other bhūmis.” This statement finds no mention in the canon.

—Jivātivābhigama 3.2.86 endorses the description made in the Bhāṣya.

3) III:9Bh. “Between Nandanaavana and Saumanasavana, the circumferential decrease of the space-units of Mt. Meru occurs at every 1/11 unit as it ascends.” The decrease of pradeśas occurs even within the measure of one aṅgula, therefore the statement of “pradeśa pariḥāṇi at every 1/11 unit” is out of sense. Also Umāsvāti does not mention its occurrence below and above these vanas.
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— Umāsvāti must have given here a mathematical formula of the pradeśa parihaṇī of Mt. Meru, therefore Siddhasena’s criticism does not make much sense. The space between these two vanas alone was likely mentioned for the sake of an illustration, it is otherwise difficult to understand it.

4) III:15Bh. Umāsvāti counts altogether fifty-six antaradvipas at Mt. Himavan and Mt. Sikhari, but some sources count ninety-six. However since fifty-six antaradvipas are also mentioned in the Jīvājīvābhigama, etc. Siddhasena concedes a point that the source used by Umāsvāti might have been lost.

— Prajñāpanā 2.105 also counts fifty-six antaradvipas.

5) IV:26, sūtra & Bh. The divisions of Lokāntika which are told as of eight by Umāsvāti are counted as nine in the canon.

— Sthāna 8.790 enumerates eight, but its 9.894 lists nine. The nature of difference here is interpretational, whether to count the central Ṛṣṭavimāna or not.

6) VIII:12Bh. The name of the second samhanana is vajraṇārāca as so called in the Karmaprakṛti, but not ardhaṇarjaṇāranāraṇa.

— Sthāna 6.572 calls it usabhājaṇāraṇa, likewise Samavāya 242, Jīvājīvābhigama 1.38 and Prajñāpanā 23.615.

7) IX:6Bh. Caturdaśa and ekavimśati rātriṇī pratisāṃśas of ascetics are called in the canon under the name of dvitiyā saptarātrikī and tṛtiyā saptarātrikī.

— Samavāya 42 and Daśaśrutaskandha 7 use the terms padhamā sattarāmīdiya, doccā sattarāmīdiya and taccā sattarāmīdiya.

All these points raised by Siddhasena are of minor importance, which are better called complaints rather than criticisms. The 4th is not even a complaint, which can be dropped from the list. Two issues, i.e., 1 and 3, fail to find their sources in the canon of which the 3rd can be dropped off as it does not make much sense. The 2nd statement made by the Bhāṣya is alleged in the canon, and both pros and cons of the 5th issue are supported by the Āgama. The 6th finds another name in the canon which does not support both Umāsvāti and Siddhasena. Siddhasena’s assertion of the 7th issue is endorsed in the canon. Pūjyapāda agrees with Umāsvāti as to 1, 2, and 5, but goes with the side of Siddhasena as to 6, while he describes 4 differently from the Bhāṣya and drops references altogether as to the 3rd and 7th issues. Thus Siddhasena’s complaints as to 1 through 6 have no claim, and the 7th issue is too minor to be argued about. The controversial issues created by Siddhasenagāni are thus worth for nothing, least contributing to the positive improvement of the Bhāṣya.
Part 5: The Bhāṣya and the Sarvārthasiddhi

Before we proceed to the suspending problem of the verification of prājñāsti, it would not be idle to reflect upon the nature of improvement made by the Sarvārthasiddhi on the Bhāṣya even though this topic is again of an appending nature in the context of our assignment. The chronological priority of the Bhāṣya to the Sarvārthasiddhi is self-evident, and in front of Pujyapāda was the Bhāṣya from which he drew most of his materials to write the Sarvārthasiddhi as evinced in the modes of elucidation of the two commentaries. Let us study below what kinds of improvements Pujyapāda made upon the Bhāṣya with a view to appraising the position of the Sarvārthasiddhi.

The language of the Bhāṣya is archaic, which is changed in the Sarvārthasiddhi into the classical Sanskrit that we are familiar with. The Sarvārthasiddhi improved the method of explaining terms by giving their definitions or by conferring their precise meanings, which was done in the Bhāṣya by way of the Āgamic method of equation by synonyms. The unbalanced exposition of words in the Bhāṣya, often left without explanation (they are most likely considered to be self-evident) but sometimes overdetailed, is balanced up in the Sarvārthasiddhi. The untimely expositions made in the awkward places in the former find the proper places in the latter, for instance, Pujyapāda explains five śarīras under II: (36) which Umāsvāti does in II:49Bh. Then the Sarvārthasiddhi adds sufficient grammatical expositions to achieve clarity of the meanings of words and passages, which are generally lacking in the Bhāṣya. The citations of the current views on the controversial issues and the recapitulating verses, etc., in the Bhāṣya which are not essential in elucidating the purport of the text are all curtailed in the Sarvārthasiddhi. Instead, the latter adds ample illustrative examples to facilitate understanding. The concept of parināma which is defective in the original sūtras V: 42-44 and thereby dropped from the Digambara version is lucidly expounded under the sūtra V: (42), and likewise the confused exposition of V:31 (32) is duly improved by Pujyapāda. Pujyapāda was able to make all these improvements, firstly because he had the Bhāṣya beside him upon which he could work over critically from the standpoint of a commentator, and secondly because he was a Sanskrit grammarian who was competent in expressing himself in the plain style of Sanskrit.

The factor of time gave him a greater advantage in elucidating the text more systematically from the advanced level of technicalities and dialectics. Having come after the Saṅkhandaṅgam, Pujyapāda knew 14 guṇasthānas, 14 mārgaṇaṁsthānas and 14 jīvasaṁsāras which Umāsvāti was not fully acquainted with. Aphorism I : (8) is systematically expounded from the technicality of these sthānās. Having come in the age of logic which was propelled by Siddhasena Divākara, Jinabhadrā, Kundakunda, Samantabhadra, and so on, he could explain nayavāda (1 : 6) clearly with further penetration from the dicho-
tomous standpoint of dravyārthika and paryāyārthika. Kāla in V: (22) is elucidated from the mukhya-vyāvahārika viewpoints. A dichotomous anuyoga couplet of dravyār
bhāva, which is taken into account in the T.S. in explaining indriya (II: 17-18(17-18)),
ādhikāraṇā (VI: 8(7)) and saṃvāra (IX: 1(1)), is furthered in the Sarvārthasiddhi,
wherein its application is extended to manas (II: 11), leśyā (II: (6); vāc (V: (19), etc.
(Later work like the Dravyasāṅkhyāgraḥa applies it to all the tattvas.)

On the other hand, Pujjayapāda failed in clarifying the import of certain aphorisms as we have already discussed. In company with all the rest of commentators, he had difficulty in comprehending the sūtra V: 28 (28) pertaining to the perceptibility of things (see Ch. III, Sec. III, Pt.2) and IX: 27(27) pertaining to the definition of dhyāna. He overlooked the unwanted nature of the sūtra V: (35), thereby his ex-
position of the aphorisms V (:35-36) is ambiguous and confused. He likewise failed in clarifying the Digambara position of pariśhahas occurring to a jina in IX: (11), and his exposition of the sūtras IX: (36-37) pertaining to dharma dhyātās and their guṇasthānas is puzzling. IV: (19) which enumerates sixteen kalpas is in conflict with IV: (3) which counts kalpopapannas as of twelve subdivisions. The Sarvārthasiddhi does not offer any logical explanation for this chaotic coordination of the number of kalpas involved with the Digambara position. Almost all of these blemishes were handed down as they are to the later commentators, who neither attempted to improve them.

Another distinct feature noted in the Sarvārthasiddhi is its open attitude in attacking the non-Jaina views and defending those of the Jainas, which was gradually getting to be the common atmosphere of the days. Umasvāti refers to the non-Jaina systems by way of the generic term tantrāntariya, for instance, in I: 35 Bh. (non-Jainas in general), III: 1Bh. (Buddhists), V: 22Bh. (Buddhists), etc., against whom no critical attitude is held. Pujjayapāda challenges them by naming the opponents or otherwise, for instance, pertaining to mokṣamārga in utthānika, pertaining to pramaṇa in I: (10), pertaining to pratyakṣa in I: (12), and so on. He defends the Jaina position in respect of the material nature of karma in V: (19), in respect of the nature of sallekhana as non-suicide in VII: (22), etc.

We have already pointed out a few instances which suggest or demonstrate that Pujjayapāda was the revisor of the text. Also the facts that the linguistic refinement of the original text is the main feature of the revision of the text and that the Jainendravyākarana was composed prior to the Sarvārthasiddhi again lend support to the above testimony that the revisor of the text was the grammarian Pujjayapāda himself. As the revisor of the text, Pujjayapāda rather tried to preserve the original text as much possible as it is. However he composed the Sarvārthasiddhi primarily from the D.gambara point of view. His sectarian viewpoints are noted in the exposition of anāgabāhya (I: (20)), atomic combination (V: (34-36)), kevalī kavalāhāra (VI: (13)), pariśhaha (IX: (11)), distinction of siddhas by liṅga (X: (9)), and so on.
The prime contribution of the Sarvarthasiddhi is that it revised and improved the Bhāṣya by way of clearly elucidating its general contents in the current language and concept of the time. Time demanded a proper revision of the Bhāṣya. And for the Jainas in the South who refused to acknowledge the authority of the canonical list made at the Third Valabhi Council, an improvement of the Bhāṣya was the call of time along with a revision of the original text. Pūjyapāda performed this task commendably well. And since he wrote a new commentary on the T.S., the rest of the Bhāṣya portions, i.e., s.kārikā and praśasti, disappeared also. The revised version of the T.S. came to be circulated popularly along with the Sarvarthasiddhi in the South, thereby the latter prepared the ground for the arrival of the Rājavārtika and Ślokavārtika which would not have been derived immediately from the Bhāṣya. The contribution made by Pūjyapāda should be evaluated highly in this historical context. Pūjyapāda's date is somehow fixed by the scholars in the beginning of the 6th century A.D. And considering all the circumstances, it may be proper to assume at least half a century of a temporal distance between Umāsvāti and Pūjyapāda.

Sec. 4. VERIFICATION OF PRAŚASTI

—AUTHORSHIP OF THE T. S.—

The testification of the authorship of the Sabhaṣya T. S. solely depends upon the verification of the praśasti document, which has not yet been performed successfully by the modern scholarship. The verification of the praśasti record not only enables us to testify the common authorship of the praśasti itself, but also that of the s.kārikā of which positive data for it have been sufficiently well produced in the foregoing section. This problem has to be therefore tackled by all means. The colophon records his biography as follows:

1. Preceptor for initiation: Ghoṣanandikṣamaṇa (ekādaśāṅgavid)
   Grand-preceptor: Śivaśri (vācakamukhya)
   Preceptor for education: Mūla (vācakācārya)
   Grand-preceptor: Muḍāpādakṣamaṇa (mahāvācaka)

2. Father: Svāti of Kaubhīṣṭa gotra
   Mother: Vatsi (Siddhasena comments that his mother's name was Umā and her gotra Vatsa)

   place of birth: Nyagrodhikā

3. Author: Umāsvāti
   Position: Ucchairnāgara Vācaka
   Title of the work: Tattvārthadhiyamaṇaśāstra
   Place of its composition: Kusumapura
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None of other works ascribed to him even bears his name. Also the practice of attaching such a colophon with full information of the author to this extent, even though the date is excluded, was not conventionalized in the classical period. His name sounds peculiar and his gotra Kaubhīṣṭaṇḍa which finds no mention in the Gotapravaraṇamāṇḍari appears equally strange. Thus there are enough reasons to suspect that this colophon might be a later interpolation.

Unfortunately much of what is told about himself in the praśasti has ever been sealed to us because its testimonial sources, either literary or epigraphical, are inaccessible. Then we are not able to establish a full testimony to the said account. What we can do at the most under the circumstances is to try to prove the historicity of any items mentioned above if possible, by which the rest of whole account could be authentic. As it shall be duly clarified in the third chapter, Umāsvāti refers to or distinguishes the Jaina concepts from those of the non-Jainas expressed in the Vaiṣeṣikasūtra, Nyāyasūtra, Sāṅkhya-kārikā, Yogasūtra and Abhidharmakosā. All the works up to the Yogasūtra are known to have been composed before the date of Vasubandhu. Thus it is certain that Umāsvāti’s date falls between Vasubandhu and Pūjyapāda, that is, approximately the 5th – 6th centuries A.D. Also from the scope of the source materials represented in the T.S. which shall be again dealt with in the following chapter there is no doubt that he belonged to the Āgamic tradition in the North. If therefore there are any early resources around this period onwards in the Śvetāmbara tradition which refer to Umāsvāti and/or which bear witness to any praśasti statement, e.g., the name of his teacher, parent, gotra, śākhā, work, etc., they are extremely valuable for us to tackle our present problem.

Fortunately we are in possession of such materials. The Kalpasūtra therāvalī records Uccairnāgara śākhā which is according to the praśasti the legitimate śākhā of our author, but it is silent about Umāsvāti as it lists the gurus’ lineage up to Skandila, president of the Second Canonical Convention. The Nandisūtra therāvalī speaks of Śvāti as a descendant of Hārita gotra which is followed by many other paṭṭāvalīs, however this gotra is denied by his autobiography. The biographical record claimed by himself and the one offered by the Nandisūtra thus shows a conflict. This Nandi paṭṭāvalī is however the oldest source available to us in relation to our problem, of which important nature should not be overlooked. We ought to therefore carefully examine the relevant contents expressed in this text and explain the nature of this conflict with a view to establishing the historicity of the praśasti document.

Mathura inscriptions of the Kushan dynasty have confirmed the general trustworthiness of the sthavrāvalī recorded in the Kalpasūtra, for nearly 1/3 of the gaṇas, kulas and śākhās mentioned in the latter are identified by the former, by which some of the readings in the Kalpasūtra were improved and the actual relation of a particular śākhā to the particular kula and gaṇa which is not coordinated in the Kalpa therāvali became
patent.\textsuperscript{13} On behalf of this historical authenticity, we shall be allowed to use this \textit{Kalpasūtra} as a criterion to measure the reliability of the other paṭṭāvalis which are as a rule distorted with a view to establishing the authority of a particular patriarchal order concerned.

\textbf{Uccairnāgarī} (variously spelled in the inscriptions of the mixed dialect of Prakrit and Sanskrit as Uccanagari, Uccenāgarī, Ucenāgarī, Uccenakari, etc.), which is a sākha belonging to Brahmadāsika kula of Koṭika (Koṭṭiya) gaṇa as so endorsed by the \textit{Kalpasūtra}, enters at least ten times the stage of Mathurā inscriptions during the reigns of Kanishka and Huvishka, i.e., 2nd century A.D.\textsuperscript{14} It appears that Koṭika gaṇa was one of the most influential parties in those days, of which name is said by Bühler to have survived in the 14th century A.D.\textsuperscript{15} A few other kulaś and sākhās in this gaṇa are listed in the inscriptions, and its Vidyādhari sākha makes its appearance again in the Mathurā inscription of 432 A.D. The inscriptions were made by the lay Jainaś mostly in memory of the donation of images, which as a rule register the names of their preceptors in the above gaṇa, kula and sākha in due order. Once it happens, however, that Brahmadāsika kula is mentioned together with Uccairnāgarī sākha\textsuperscript{16} and twice Uccairnāgarī sākha alone.\textsuperscript{17} All these belong to the period of king Huvishka. This may suggest that the larger divisions of gaṇa and kula were already on the way to be expressed by the smaller division of sākha, which is exactly so found in the case or Uccairnāgarī sākha recorded in our prāśasti. Uccairnāgarī is the name of a sākha, and Uccairnāgarī a member of the sākha, thus “Uccairnāgarī vācaka” signifies a reciter of Uccairnāgarī sākha. Furthermore Uccairnāgarī is identified with a place name which is also known as Varaṇa, modern Bulandashahar (Baran or Bannu) in U.P.\textsuperscript{18}

It is interesting to note in this connection that 1/4 of the names of these three units of gaṇa–kula–sākha listed in the \textit{Kalpasūtra} are derived from the place names of Northern India ranging from Bengal through Rājasthān as follows: Antaraṇjikā (Atranji-khera, on the Kalinadi), Bhadariyakā (Bhaddilapura, identified with Bhadia, Hazaribagh Dt.), Bhrahmadāśika* (Bambhalijja, Bambhadivā, island, unlocatable), Dāśikhabatikā (Bengal), Indrapuraka (Indore, Bulandashahar Dt.), Kākandikā (Kākandi, Kākan, Monghyr Dt.), Kamiyakā (Kampillapura? a city on the bank of the Ganges), Kauśambikā (Kosam, Allahabad), Koṭiwarśiya (Dinaipur, Bengal), Madhyamikā* (Nāgarī, Rājasthān), Māsapūrikā (Māsapuri, the capital of Purivaṭṭa, not identifiable), Pundravardhāniya (Mahāsthāna, Bogra Dt., Bengal), Śrāvastikā (Srvasti, U. P.), Tāmraliptikā (Tamaluk, Mīrnāpore Dt., Bengal), Vāniya* (Vāniyagāma, a city near Veṣāli), Vāraṇaś* (Varaṇa, or Varunā, Bulandashahar, U. P.), Vāsaliya* (Vaccha).\textsuperscript{10} Those with an asterisk appear in the Mathurā inscriptions, which are likewise distributed over the same geographical area. It means that the Jainas at Mathurā had come from all these places, attesting that Mathurā likely became the centre of the Jainas by the 2nd century A. D. in the North.
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According to the Kalpasūtra, Uccairnāgari śākhā was founded by Ārya Śāntisenika, a disciple of Ārya Datta. Koṭika gaṇa to which Uccairnāgari śākhā belongs was instituted by Susthita and Supratibuddha. Umsvāti is not referred to in the Kalpasūtra theraṁvalī, a brief table of which pertaining to the later discussion is provided below (based on the Kalpasūtra in the S.B.E., v.22):

... 8. i Mahāgiri 1. Uttara  

2. Balissaha  

ii Suhasti  

5. Śrīgupta of Hārita gotra  

6. ...  

7. Susthita  

8. Supratibuddha  

Founder of Uttarabalissaha gaṇa from which Candanāgari śākhā derived.  

Founder of Vārāya gaṇa from which Vajranāgari śākhā derived.  

Founder of Koṭika gaṇa from which Uccairnāgari śākhā derived.  

10. Indradatta  

11. Datta  

12. Śāntisenika  

Founder of Uccairnāgari śākhā  

25. Kālaka  

33. Sāndilya ...

The following pāṭāvaliṁs speak of our author (unless the source is specified, those indicated with pages refer to the Paṭṭāvalīśamuccya, v.1, ed, by Darśanavijaya):

I. 1. i. Nandisūtra pāṭāvali 980 V. N. (453 A. D.) p. 12  

... Mahāgiri – Suhaththi  

Bahulassa sarivvaya (Balissaha: Kosia)  

Sāi (Hāriya)  

Sāmajja (Hāriya)  

Sāndilla ...

ii. Nandisūtra cūrṇi (Nandisūtra cūrṇi with Haribhadra’s vṛttī, pub. by Kṣabhadevaśī Kṛṣṇimalagi Śvetāṃbara Sansthā, pp. 6-7  

... Mahāgiri – Suhaththi  

Suṭṭhita-Suppādibadhā
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Mahāgiri
Balissaha (Kāsava)
Śāi (Hāriya)
Sāmajja (Hāriya)
Śānḍīlla (Kosita)...

iii. Haribhadra’s vṛtti on Nandisūtra (ibid. pp. 14-15)
   ... Mahāgiri
   Balissaha (Kauśika)
   Svāti (Hārita)
   Śyāmācārya (Hārita)
   Śānḍīlya (Kauśika)...

iv. Malayagiri’s tīkā on Nandisūtra (Rāya Dhanapati Simha Bahādurakā :
   Āgama saṅgraha, v. 45)
   ...
   Mahāgiri
   Balissaha (Kauśika)
   Svāti (Hārita)
   Śyāmācārya (Hārita)
   Śānḍīlya (Kauśika)...

1. 2. Dharmasāgaragaṇi: Tapāgaccha paṭṭāvali. 1646 V. S. (1589 A. D.) p. 46
   ...
   Mahāgiri
   (his disciple) Balissaha
   (his disciple) Svāti, author of the texts such as Tattvārtha
   (his disciple) Śyāmācārya, author of Prajñāpanā (d. 376 V. N.)
   (his disciple) Śānḍīlya...

3. Śrīguru paṭṭāvali author and date unknown, p. 165
   ...
   Mahāgiri – Suhasti
   { Susthita – Supratibuddha of Koṭika gaccha
   (etad-vārake) Balissaha
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(his disciple) Svāti Vācaka of Tattvārthasaṅgraha
(his disciple) Kālakācārya of Prajñāpana (d. 376 V. N.)

Indradīna ...

II. 4. Dharmaghosāṣūri: Duḥṣamākāla śramaṇa saṅgha staya. c. 1300 V. S.
p. 23 Prathamodaya yugapradhānas

... Mahāgiri
  Suhasti
  Ghaṅgasundara
    Śyāmācārya
    Skandila
    Revatimitra ...

p. 24 Dvitiyodaya yugapradhānas

... Revatimitra
  Simhasūri
  Hālīla
  Jinaḥbradra
  Umāsvāti
  Puspamitra ...

P. 24 also offers the account of Umāsvāti's life: grhavāsa 20 years, vrataparyāya 15 years, yugapradhāna 75 years, total age 110 years, 2 months and 2 days.

Avacūrī p. 17

... Revatimitra
  Āryamuṇgu
  Svāmi (Svāti)
  Hārina Śyāmārya
  Śāṇḍilya ...

p. 18
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. Hārila 54 (yugapradhāna)

(Here a verse is inserted, 'pamcasae panasie vikkamakātā
uddalajñāti utthāmiof haribhadasūri sūro, bhaviṇām
disāe kallānam')

Jinabhadra 60
Umāsvāti 75
Pusyyatiṣya 60 ...

II. 5. Vinayavijayagupta: Śriyugapradhāna. 1651 A. D. p. 140

Lokapraśa sarga 34.

These repeat the accounts of prathamodaya and dvitiyodaya yugapradhaṇas as above.


... Yākintūṇa Haribhadasūri

Viraprabhāsaūri

Umāsvāti (yugapradhāna, 1190 V. N. or 663 A. D.)

Jinabhadragupta ...

7. Jinvijaya: Kharalagaraccha pāṭṭāvalī saṅgraha (pub. by Bābū Purandara Nāthar)

p. 9

... Devadattagupta kṣamāsramana (900 V. N. or 373 A. D.)

Govinda vācaka

Umāsvāti vācaka, author of Praśanāraṇī

Devinda vācaka

Jinabhadragupa kṣamāsramana (980 V. N. or 453 A. D.) ...

p. 26

... Govinda

Sambhūtindina

Lauhityamuni

Pausyaṃukhya

Umāsvāti vācaka (bhāṣyādyesa vidhāyakam munivara)

Jinabhadrasūri . . .
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The genealogical tables of these paṭṭāvalis pertaining to Umāsvāti disagree one another to a great extent, and we cannot rely upon any one of them immediately. These are classified into three groups above so that their internal relationship can be easily traced. The paṭṭāvalis in the Group I unanimously place Svāti before Śyāmācārya, those in the Group II after Jinabhadra, and those in the Group III before Jinabhadra. Svāti is thus spoken in close connection with Śyāmācārya and Jinabhadra. Group II offers the genealogies of prathamodaya and dvitiyodaya yugapradhānas. Herein the lineage of prathamodaya yugapradhānas follows the table of the Group I, which refers to Śyāmācārya but drops a mention of Svāti (Svāti is mentioned in its avacūri p. 17), and the lineage of dvitiyodaya yugapradhānas places Umāsvāti after Jinabhadra. Group II is evidently attempting to shift Umāsvāti’s chronological position to the later period. In III. 6, Umāsvāti comes much later than Haribhadrasūri of the 8th century A. D., of which impossible occasion seems to have happened due to the effect of the verse inserted before the turn of Jinabhadra in II.4, avacūri p. 18. It seems therefore that the last group was likely influenced by the table of the second group which was obviously derived from the first group. Then the materials in the first group alone deserve further investigation.

The paṭṭāvalis in the first group consists of (1) Nandi paṭṭāvali and its commentaries, and (2) two independent texts. A glance over these genealogies makes it patent that the Nandīśūtra is the archetype of the rest of the works. Svāti who has no place in the Kalpasūtra finds a seat in the Nandīśūtra onwards bearing Hārīta gotra. Two characteristic features are noticed in the mode of his entry in these archives, namely, his gotra and his relative position in the genealogy. We shall examine these points below against the record of the Kalpa therāvali.

(1) Gotra

The Nandīśūtra and its commentaries ascribe Hārīta gotra to Svāti as well as to Śyāmācārya, while the other two paṭṭāvalis do not refer to it. Umāsvāti speaks of his gotra as Kaubhiśana. Śyāmācārya, if he is identified with Kālakācārya, is said in the Kalpasūtra as of Gotama gotra. The Kalpa therāvali assigns Hārīta gotra to Śrīgupta alone, who is the founder of the Vāraṇa gaṇa (said to be Cāraṇa in the Kalpasūtra, which has been corrected into Vāraṇa by Bühler on the inscriptive evidences.)

(2) Relative position

(a) Predecessors

(1) { Mahāgiri — Balissaha — [Svāti] all except I. 3
Suhaṣṭi

(2) { Mahāgiri — Balissaha — [Svāti] I. 3 (Śrīguru paṭṭāvali)
| [etad vārake]
Suhaṣṭi — Susthīta—Supratibuddha
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Svāti is interpolated after Balissaha to the list of the Kalpa genealogy. The second table is essentially the same with the first one, excepting that it brings in Susthita — Supratibuddha of suhasti line against Balissaha as the rivals.

(b) Successors

The Nandisūtra is doubtlessly responsible for formulating the lineage of [Svāti]—Śyāma—Śaṅdilya, to which the rest of the texts take recourse.

The tradition ascribes Mahāgiri and Suhasti to be the contemporaries of Sampati, which may be an open question. Even then, Svāti's position assigned herein as his grand-disciple is an improbable fact. Also his position as the predecessor of Śyāma, author of the Prajināpanā, is incredible, for the content of the T. S. cannot be succeeded by that of the Prajināpanā. Śaṅdilya whom Jacobi identifies with Skandila can neither be acceptable as the grand-disciple of Vācaka, for the content of the T. S. stands later than the period of the Canonical Convention at Mathurā. His relative chronological position in relation to his predecessors and successors cannot be therefore acceptable as it is. Before we get into an inquiry why this could have happened so, we would like to examine the curious fact here first, i. e., why Svāti's first entry in the archive was made in this particular place in relation to Balissaha with the assignment of a foreign gotra, because to be the disciple of Balissaha is an obvious interpolation to the Kalpa genealogy, and to have Hārīta gotra comes into conflict the praśasti record. So we shall go back to the Kalpasūtra and review how the ācāryas involved in this scene are informed of themselves:

1. Balissaha (his gotra not mentioned)—the founder of Uttarabalissaha gaṇa, from which Candanāgari śākhā derived.

2. Susthita and Supratibuddha (of Vyāghrāpatya gotra—the founder of koṭika gaṇa, from which Uccairnāgari śākhā derived.

3. Śrīgupta of Hārīta gotra—the founder of Vāraṇa gaṇa, from which Vajranāgari śākhā derived.

It strikes us to find that the ācāryas coming in this scene are all related in one way or the other to the śākhā called Nāgari, i. e., Candanāgari, Vajranāgari and Uccairnāgari, to the last of which our author claims to belong. It appears that his entry in the Nandisūtra, after which the rest of the texts followed, was made in some connection with these three Nāgari śākhās which are the only śākhās bearing the name Nāgari in the Kalpasūtra. Then what is the probable reason that the Nandi allowed his entry in relation to Nāgari śākhā? We shall speculate on this point with regard to his gotra and his relation to Balissaha.

1. Gotra

The Nandi cūrṇi and the other commentaries do not raise any doubt as to why the Nandisūtra assigned Hārīta gotra to Svāti. We shall propose a probable archival
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error occurred in the Nandisūtra in the following way. Uccairnagara is, as already mentioned, known also as Varaṇa, an ancient kingdom which is counted as one of the twenty-five and a half Aryan countries of the Jainas. The Nandi author likely confused Uccairnagara with its another name Varaṇa as the place of śākhā where Svāti belonged, Svāti was then assigned to belong to Varaṇa gaṇa which was founded by Śrīgupta of Hārita gotra. Thus by the second confusion of the place name and gaṇa, Vācaka’s gotra came to be fatally recorded as Hārita, which was likewise extended to Śyāmācārya. The confusion seems to have thus happened accidentally.

(2) Relation to Balissaha

The Nandi verses 25-26 read,

‘elāvaccasa-gottam vamāmi mahāgirīm suhatthim ca/
tatto kosia-gottam bhalāsā sarīv-vayam vandē/
hāriya-guttam sāī ca vamāmi hāriyam ca sāmājām/
vande kosiya-gottam samālīlām ajja-iyadhāram//’

(Bahula’s twin brother is Balissaha)

It is patent from the Kalpa therāvali that Balissaha is the direct disciple of Mahāgiri, from the line of which Suhasti’s line differs. The Nandi verses above do not clearly distinguish their relation, which however is elucidated by its cūrṇī. And in this Nandi cūrṇī, Svāti is plainly stated as the pupil of Balissaha, ‘balissahassa amtevāśi sāī hāriyassagotte.’ The cūrṇī author least bothers about our problem, why Svāti’s seat was all of a sudden allotted under Balissaha. But why did the Nandisūtra reckon Svāti after Balissaha?

In the previous genealogical table of the Kalpasūtra it is noted that all the three Nāgari śākhās are derived from the gaṇas established by the disciples of Mahāgiri and Suhasti alone. Also it has just been suggested that Umāsvātī’s identity to be an Uccairnagara was likely muddled with a Vajranāgara (whose śākhā branched off from varaṇa gaṇa) in connection with the assignment of his foreign gotra. This tends to support a surmise that he was popularly identified with the Vācaka of Nāgari śākhā who might have been known to people as Nāgara Vācaka. If his specific Nāgari śākhā were already confused with the other or forgotten, but if he were popularly identified with Nāgara Vācaka, it is most desirable for him to be placed in the spot wherein some way all these three Nāgari śākhās are conveniently found together in the established patriarchal lineage. And sure enough, such a spot is ready in the Kalpa therāvali in the circle of Mahāgiri–Suhasti whose disciples are responsible for branching off of all these Nāgari śākhās. Then this is the exact place where Nāgara Vācaka ought to be assigned — under one of the organizers of the three gaṇas who are each responsible for the origination of their own Nāgari śākhā. It appears that this is the picture how Svāti came to be allotted under one of the disciples of Mahāgiri–Suhasti. It is
not known why the Nandi author proposed Balissaha as the predecessor of Svāti instead of Śrigupta or Sushthita–Supratibuddha. It may be that the Nāgari śākhā which branched off from Balissaha’s gāta was more well known than the other two. It is neither known whether it was so done intentionally or accidentally.

The Śriguru paṭṭāvali enters Balissaha and Sushthita–Supratibuddha as the rivals (vāraka: hostile, opposing). The addition of this abrupt information seems to have an intriguing attempt to assert that Svāti does not belong to Sushthita–Supratibuddha line, namely, Uccairnāgari śākhā, for this party is said to have stood hostile against Balissaha party of which Svāti is placed as a member. It may allude to a fact that there were some prestige struggles for the prerogative over our eminent Vācaka among the Nāgari śākhās. This paṭṭāvali is undated, but from the manner of its description it may stand close to the period of the Tapāgaccha paṭṭāvali of Dharmasāgaraganī, i.e., 16th century A.D. This tradition could be an old one, but it cannot be so old, for it essentially follows the interpretation of the Nandi commentaries. It can certainly not be older than the cūrṇī which comments upon the Nandisūtra. Then the implication made in the Śriguru paṭṭāvali should not be counted seriously for the consideration of our problem.

It is sufficiently convincing that the Nandi author created a seat for Svāti in the genealogy of the Kalpasūtra wherein all the Nāgari śākhās branched off from the disciples of Mahāgiri–Suhasti. Ārya Śāntisenika, the founder of Uccairnāgari śākhā, was totally forgotten in the context because he stood outside this Mahāgiri–Suhasti circle. A doubt may arise as to how his gotra Hārita could have escaped a criticism expected from Haribhadra and Malayagiri who are said to have commented upon the T. S. The author of the Nandi vṛtti was not likely the same Haribhadra who wrote a commentary on the T. S. after the Bhāṣyānusārīntī. Malayagiri’s commentary on the T. S. does not exist, and we are not sure if he composed it at all. Thus this doubt shall be dismissed.

Although much remains still in darkness, yet foregoing discussion sufficiently well explains that Svāti referred to in the Nandisūtra is identical with Umāsvāti who belonged to one of the three Nāgari śākhās recorded in the Kalpasūtra, and that the Nandi record of his gotra was likely derived by the confusion of the place names. The Nandi author seems to have attempted to justify his interpolation of Svāti after Balissaha by way of bringing in the line of Śyāma–Śaṇḍilya who belonged to much earlier date than Umāsvāti. The modes of such manipulation suggest that this interpolation was made in a considerably later time when the position of the T. S. came to be well recognized in the Jaina circle. The later authors of the paṭṭāvalis in the Groups II and III faced difficulty in accepting Umāsvāti’s chronological position created by the Nandisūtra and attempted to adjust it by pushing him further down. This is enough to ascertain that the Nandisūtra, although it is accompanied by the
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archival errors, is the oldest valid source to verify the autobiographical account of Umāsvāti. Then it suffices to prove that the praśasti is the authentic document written by the author himself.

Our task is not fully over yet. We have not yet raised a question—what is this Nāgari śākhā? Mathurā inscriptions list all the three Nāgari śākhās recorded in the Kulpaśūtra. The seat of Ucchārrāgari śākhā is Bulandashahar, U. P. Vajranāgari (Pk. Vajjanāgari) should be, according to Bühler’s proposal, corrected into Vṛjjanāgari which is derived from Vṛjī country of Bihar.21 The location of Candanāgari śākhā is not traceable. It is likely that a Nāgari śākhā means the śākhā derived from a place name bearing the word ‘nagara’22 inasmuch as the later Nāgara gaccha was derived from Vaḍanagara. The relation between the Nāgara caste of Brahmanical system and the Jainā Nāgara sect is denied by the scholars.23

His gotra ‘Kaubhīṣṭa’ is not listed in the Gotrapravaramaṇiari. Its possible forms of corruption are also difficult to be traceable therein. Bhīṣṭa meaning terrifying, frightening and horrible, is the name of Śiva,24 to which ‘ku’ is affixed. In all probability, Vācaka Svāti was a descendant of the Śaiva Brahmin.25 His proficiency in Sanskrit and his interest in and knowledge of the non-Jain thoughts which are all unusual for the Jainas in the classical age also support a conjecture that he was likely a convert from the Brahmanical faith. Naming a child by giving the names of his parents was a common practice in ancient India. Umā-Svāti certainly sounds peculiar, and he seems to have been called Svāti after his father in the olden days as the earlier paṭṭāvali report. Nyagrodhikā, the birth place of author, is difficult to identify, which might have probably been in U. P. not far away from Ucchārrāgari or Bulandashahar. Kusumapura must be identified with Pāṭaliputra, the ancient capital of the Nandas through the Guptas, where the First Jainā Canonical Conference was held. Umāsvāti seems to have preferred the classical name ‘Kusuma’ to ‘Pāṭali’ for the usage of the latter violates the metrics of the poem which is composed in Āryā metre.

We have thus somehow achieved in justifying and attesting the fact that the praśasti, which was believed by Siddhasenagari to have been written by the author himself, is the authentic record of Umāsvāti in the light of the Nandisūtra paṭṭāvali with the help of the Kalpa therāvali. This clears up the pending problem of the authorship of the s.kārikā. We have thus duly demonstrated that the Subhāṣya T. S. was composed by Umāsvāti himself.
CHAPTER III

A HISTORICAL EVALUATION OF THE T.S.

Sec. 1. SOURCE MATERIALS OF THE T.S. AND THEIR ORGANIZATION

A historical evaluation of the T.S. must be assessed on the basis of 1) Umāsvāti’s performance in composing the T.S., 2) Its capacity of influencing the post-Umāsvāti authors, and 3) Its position held in the literary history of the Jainas. The first problem is taken up in Sec. I — Source materials of the T.S. and their organization. The second category of problem becomes self-evident while handling the relevant problems in Sec.II–III, even though the exhaustive inquiries into this matter are not possible within the limited scope of this study — Sec.II — References to the T.S. in the Āgamic commentaries up to the 10th century A.D.: Sec.III — Some problems in the T.S. The third problem is handled in Sec. IV — Historical position of the T.S.

That the T.S. is a compendium of seven tattvas derived by way of epitomizing the canonical contents as so pronounced in the sūkṣmā 22 has been already endorsed by Ātmārāma in his Tattvārthāsūtra jaināgamasamānāvaya, wherein he traced the Digambara recension of the T.S. sūtra by sūtra in the canonical body. The T.S. has stood the test of time as the standard work of Jaina philosophy, as it inclusively represents the essential Jaina doctrines peculiar to this system so far developed in the canon, which are lucidly discerned from those of the non-Jaina systems and which are presented in the concisely organized form. In view of this and with a view to evaluating his performance in composing the T.S., an attempt is made in this section to examine the mechanism of the organization of its source materials, both Jaina and non-Jaina, used for the composition of each chapter of the T.S., in order to clarify which concepts were in what way derived from the Āgama, which concepts were in what way distinguished from those of the other schools, which concepts were in what way improved or formulated by Umāsvāti, and how these were put together in the text. Some important concepts proposed by him are further discussed independently in Sec. III.
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Introductory Sūtras I : 1-4

The beginning four aphorisms lay down the basic plan of the T. S., which read, ‘sanyag-darśana-jñāna-cāritrāni mokṣa-mārgah/ tattvārthīra-śraddhānām samyag-darsānam/tan-nisargād-adhigamād vā/ jivātivāsrava-bandha-samvara-nirjarā-mokṣās-tattvam.’ That mokṣamārga consists of threefold pathways is propounded in the Uttarādhyayana 23.33 wherein Gautama replies to Kesī, ‘aha bhaye painnā u, mokkh-sabbhūya-sāhanā/ nāṇam ca dāmsaṇam ceva, cartitam ceva nicchae.’ Likewise the Rṣibhūṣitam, which is enumerated as one of the angābāhya texts in the T. S. 1:20 Bh., refers to the same concept in its Ch. 24, ‘lamhādhuvam asāsātan-īnām samyagre savva-jivāṇām samyati-karanam iti naccā nāya-dāmsaṇa-cārittāni sevissāmi, nāṇa-dāmsaṇa-cārittāni sevittā anādiyam jāva kantāram vittvātīta śivam acala jāva jīvāṇam abhuvagate citīnīśāmi.’ That having faith in nine tattvas constitute the content of samyaktva is again known to the Uttarādhyayana 28. 15. The Sthāna 2.1.102 lists samyagdarśana in two divisions by nisargaja and abhigamaṇa.

As widely accepted, the Uttarādhyayana 28 entitled Mokha-maggagat provides the materials for Umāsvāti in outlining the composition of the T. S., of which contents are as follows: (1) Introduction: 1-3, jñāna-darśana-cāritra-tapas as constituting mokṣamārga; (2) Jñāna: 4, five jñānas—5-6, dravya-guṇa-paryāya—7-13, six dravyas and their functions; (3) Darśana: 14, nine tattvas—15, samyaktva or having faith in nine tattvas as a believer’s qualification—16-27, ten types of devotees including nisargaruci and abhigama-ruci—28, right faith is attainable by praising tattvas, devotion to the knowers of tattvas, and avoidance of wrong tenets—29-30, there is no jñāna and cāritra without darśana, there is no cāritra without jñāna and without cāritra-guṇa there is no mokṣa—31, eight angas of samyagdṛṣṭi; (4) Cāritra: 32-33, fivefold cāritras such as sāmāyika; (5) Tapas: 34, tapas in two divisions accompanied by six subdivisions each; (6) Conclusion: 35-36, fruits of fourfold pathways to liberation.

Umāsvāti improved ninefold tattvas here into seventold tattvas because puṇya-pāpa can be logically absorbed in āśrava and bandha tattvas.1 The popular sequence of nine tattvas is jiva-ajiva, puṇya-pāpa, āśrava-samvara-nirjarā, and bandha-mokṣa, as so found in the Sthāna 9.867, Praśamarati 189, Pañcāstikāya 116, Mūlācāra 5.6 and so on. The Uttarādhyayana 28.14 separates bandha tattva from mokṣa, i. e., jiva-ajiva, bandha, puṇya-pāpa, āśrava-samvara-nirjarā-mokṣa. The T. S. 1:4 modifies them once again according to the causal sequence towards mokṣa, i. e., jiva-ajiva-āśrava-bandha-samvara-nirjarā-mokṣa. Fourfold paths to liberation in the Uttarādhyayana 28 are also replaced by the then known threefold pathways because tapas can be logically included in cāritra. This triplet was prevalent in the canonical literature in relation to various concepts such as ārādhanā, of which order usually appears in the sequence of jñāna-darśana-cāritra, as so expressed in the Uttarādhyayana 23.33. The Uttarādhyayana 28. 29-30 attach importance to their causal sequence towards
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mokṣa in the order of darśana-jīva-nācārita, after which Umāsvāti followed, in addition, attributing the word samyak to them in the fashion of “four noble truths” as pointed out by many scholars.

Even though the T. S. thus utilized the materials of the Uttarādhyayana 28, the structure of these two prakaraṇas are fundamentally different. The Uttarādhyayana 28 is based on the doctrine of fourfold mokṣamārgas wherein tattvas constitute the content of darśanamārga, while the T. S. is based on the doctrine of tattvas for which mokṣamārga plays a role of the guiding theme.

An exposition of mokṣamārga by way of the doctrine of tattvas that by which the entire teachings in the Āgama can be known never occurred in the pre-Umāsvāti period. In fact it was possibly the first attempt in this direction made in the philosophical systems in India, after which appeared similar works such as Daśapadārthasāstra of Candramati and Padārthadharmasamgraha of Prajñastapāda in the Vaiśeṣika system. Tattvas, either nine or seven, succinctly express the principles of Jainism based on the law of causality inasmuch as the twelve interdependent origins do for Buddhism. Tattvas constitute primarily the ontological principles expressing the process of a soul’s contact with karma up to their total removal from it, upon which the ethical-religious doctrines and practices of the Jains have been developed. The doctrine of tattvas is thus the product of the late canonical period brought about in the context of the Karma theory. Umāsvāti caught hold of the Uttarādhyayana passage stating that having faith in nine tattvas constitutes the content of samyaktva, and planned to systematize the essential contents of the canon known to him within the framework of seven tattvas. Although the doctrine of seven tattvas alone expresses mokṣamārga, these belong fundamentally to the ontological category. Umāsvāti therefore made use of the doctrine of threefold mokṣamārga as the guiding theme of this prakaraṇa, which allowed him to express the ontological principles of āsṛava up to mokṣa tattvas in terms of ethical context, and which allowed him to discuss about the theory of knowledge that was coming to be current in the later canonical stage.

Seven tattvas are thus distributed in the second through the tenth chapters in the T. S., wherein jīvanāmāṃśa is dealt with in the first five chapters consisting of jīva and jīveyas, and cāritramāṃśa in the rest of chapters, then having faith in the entire work of which is assumed to be darśanācara. Jīva is treated in the first chapter, firstly because it does not fit in the category of tattvas, and secondly because it serves as an introduction to the rest of chapters as the means of tattvārthadīghigama. Ch II is relevant to the theory of souls, Chs. III–IV fall in the fields of cosmography and mythology, Ch. V conducts a discussion of ontology, Chs. VI–IX pertain to the subject of ethics and disciplinary codes, and Ch. X deals with the theological topics of liberation and siddhahood. Thus virtually all the branches of knowledge developed
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in the Āgamic period are attempted to be organized in this scheme of seven tāttvas guided by the theme of threefold pathways to liberation.

Chapter I

Umāśvāti discusses the following topics on the theory of knowledge: (1) 4. seven tāttvas as prameya; (2) 5-6. three methods of knowledge, i. e., nikṣepa, pramāṇa and nayā; and (3) their exposition: 7-8. the other anuyogadvāra — 9-33. pramāṇa — 34-35. nayā.

All these methods of knowledge minus naming five knowledges as pramāṇa were in vogue in the later Āgamic texts, e. g., the Nandi, Anuyogadvāra, etc. The Uttarādhyayāna 28.24 lists pramāṇa and nayā as the methods of cognition of all the nature of dravya, and its 28. 4-5 say that fivefold jñānas are the methods of cognizing dravya, guṇa and all paryāyas. Pramāṇa mentioned in the Uttarādhyayāna 28.24 therefore must denote no other than these fivefold knowledges, even though it is not explicitly so identified. The T. S. made this point clear for the first time,⁸ obviously to distinguish its Jaina position from that of the non-Jaina schools. Nikṣepa continues to be the primary method of anuyoga in the niryukti literature, and sat−saṅkhyā, etc., of anuyogadvāras are employed in the Samtaparūvanasuttāṇi 7 of the Saṭkhandāgama. Seven nayās are likewise treated in the Anuyogadvāra and Saṭkhandāgama, although Umāśvāti resorts to five nayās which is referred to in the Āvaśyaka niryukti 144.

Over 2/3 of this chapter is spared for the exposition of pramāṇa, and the topics dealt with in this connection are: five jñānas as pramāṇa (9-10)—its two major divisions, i. e., parokṣa and pratyakṣa (11-12)—exposition of each knowledge by way of its subdivision, cause, possessor, place of operation, etc. (13-30)—number of knowledge possible to occur to a soul simultaneously (31) — viparyaya jñāna (32-33). A majority of these materials is deduced from the classification of knowledge worked out in the Sīhatsa 2.1-103, and also from the Nandi and Anuyogadvāra. The definition of jñāna stated in the sūtra 33 finds no mention in the canon, which was probably formulated by Umāśvāti on the line of the Yogasūtra 1. 8, ‘viparyayo mithyādānam-atad-rūpa-pratīṣṭham’. Umāśvāti takes the position of yugapadvāda of kevali’s upayogas in I:31Bh. against the canonical position of kramasvāda, of which discussion shall be made separately in Sec. III, Pt.1.

The Nyāyasūtra II.2.2 says that aitihya is included in śabda, and arthāpatti, sambhava and abhāva in anumāṇi. In counteracting, the T. S. I:12Bh. defends the Jaina position that anumāṇa, upamāṇa, āgama, arthāpatti, sambhava and abhāva are all included in mati and śruta, as these are caused by the sannikāra of indriyas with their arthas. The Nyāyasūtra I.1.4 defines pratyakṣa as indriya-sannikarṣotpanna, from which the Jaina position is discerned in the sūras 18-19 by negating sannikāra between the eyes and their objects. I:35Bh. emphatically articulates that nayā is an in dependent method of knowledge peculiar to the Jaina school alone.
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Chapter II-IV

Although Chs. III and IV pertain to Jaina cosmography and mythology which are distinctly called Lokaprajñāpati and Devagatipradarsana in the respective puṣpikā, these chapters are better handled here together with Ch. II in view of their source materials and their common category coming under the jiva tattva. Ch. II conducts a theoretical discussion of Jaina concept of the jiva in general, i.e., its states in relation to karmas, its nature, classification, transmigration, birth and physical body. Its peculiar characteristics and its further divisions and sub-divisions in each form of existence as so embodied in saṃsāra are taken up in the succeeding two chapters. These three chapters are thus relevant to the saṃsāri jivas, and the siddhas are treated in the final chapter.


The materials contained in these three chapters are mostly provided in the Jivāḥvābhigama, which is a catalogue of the classification of jivas based on two kinds up to ten kinds, of which investigation is made by way of various anuyogadvāras such as śārīra, kaśāya, leśyā, indriya, saṃjñā, veda, drṣṭi, darśana, jñāna, yoga, upayoga, āhāra, upapāda, sthitī, gati, and so on. Its third chapter describes the three worlds in relation to the classification of jivas by gatīdvāra. Some other materials are supplemented to it from the Prajñāpanā, Sthāna and Jambūdvipaprajñāpati.

As to the contents of Ch. II, the number of physical sense organs and the object of senses (20-21) as well as three kinds of sex (4)Bh.) are generally so acknowledged by the other philosophical systems likewise. Also the modes of birth and the types of uterus birth etc. (32, 34-36), the varieties of bodies (37) and the kinds of sex of the beings in various gatis (50-51Bh.) are to a certain extent commonly shared by the other schools, for these are derived from the same traditional stock, of which slightly different positions held by the Jainas are lucidly expressed in the relevant aphorisms.

The other concepts discussed in this chapter are peculiar to the Jainas. The idea of the beginning seven sūtras which classify the soul in terms of the technicalities of karma doctrine is new. These five states of a soul were undeniably the then prevalent categorical items, which occur in I:8 Bh. as the divisions of bhāva anuyogadvāra. The Sthāna 6.649 and Anuyoga dvāra 127 enumerate six types of bhāva including sānnapātika,
which is excluded from the T.S. possibly because it fails to be an essential part. (The Praśamarati 196-97 count the sixth.) Their subtypes were obviously born by way of systematizing those enumerated in the Anyuyogadāra 127, and particularly noteworthy here is Umāsvāti’s performance in determining the subtypes of pārśīmika bhāva. The construction of the T.S. is based on the doctrine of tattvas. Umāsvāti therefore seems to have caught hold of the then popular concept of bhāva anuyogadāra, and began his exposition of seven tattvas with the Jaina concept of the soul in terms of karma doctrine. The subtypes of the soul’s fivefold states became standardized in the later karma works. The presence of karma, yoga and the activity of āhāra involving the soul’s transmigratory passage are again stated in view of the karma theory. Likewise anapavartyāyus expressed in the last aphorism is a technical term in the karma doctrine. It should not be lost sight of that the canonical classification of the five sensed-beings by jalacara, etc. found in the Prajñāpanā 1 and in the other canonical texts met a reclassification by Umāsvāti in II:34Bh. in accordance with their modes of birth such as jārayuja, possibly under the sway of the non-Jaina classification. He quotes the Astādhyāyī 5.2.93 for explaining the term indriya in II:15Bh., and Vyāsa’s commentary on the Yogasūtra III:22 in II:52Bh.⁴

The description of the worlds made in Chs.III–IV is no more than a skillful reproduction of the Ṛgamic cosmography. It had been developed in the traditional Indian soil, and many of its aspects are commonly shared by the other schools likewise. Therefore in describing the kula, Umāsvāti is conscious in discriminating the Jaina position from that of the others, for instance, he notes in III:1Bh., ‘api ca tantrāntariyā asaṁkhyaeyeṣu loka-dhātuṣv-asaṁkhyaeyeṣu pṛthivi-prastārā ity-adhyavasitaḥ/tiṣṭtha-pratiṣṭhe-dhārtham ca sapta-grahaṇam-iti’, which must refer, as Siddhasena points out, to the Buddhist view expressed in the Abhidharmakośa 3.3.Bh. Haribhadrasūri refers to a purānic view also, ‘...tantrāntariyāḥ śaṁkṛtyādyah asaṁkhyeyeṣu loka-dhātuṣu... aneka brahmāndopalakṣanam-etad, tat–pratiṣṭedhārtham...’. The standard of measurement and time is mentioned in the Abhidharmakośa, and the T.S. IV:15Bh. also refers to the Jaina standard of time.

The Abhidharmakośa Ch. III entitled Lokanirdesā carries the similar topics discussed in the T.S. Chs. III–IV as pointed out by many scholars, of which contents are as follows: 1-7. three dhātus, i.e., kāma, rūpa and ārūpya, situated one above the other, and five gatis therein (i.e., nāraka, preta, tīryaṇca, manuṣyavy deva) — 8-18. modes of birth (i.e., and jīva, jārayuja, samavedaja and upapādaka), the antarābhava and the birth of sattvas in five gatis — 19-44. bhavacakra explained in terms of twelve pratiṣṭedamūtpade — Middle world 45-52. vāyu-jala-kāncana-maṇḍalas—Mt. Meru, its surroundings, formation and size, four concentric continents and oceans — 53–57. Jambūlīvipā, its size, shape, regions and rivers — Lower world: 58–59. nāraka by its divisions — Upper world: 60–77. heavenly bodies, their sizes, time divisions created by,
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the motion of the Sun, divisions of the upper world, residents, their sexual behaviours and sizes of bodies — 78-84. lifetime of samsarins — 83-102. standard of measurement and time, etc.

The outline and contents here must have been carefully studied by Umāsvāti in order to clearly explain the Jaina position of cosmography and mythology. The Buddhist treatment of indriya expressed in the Abhidharmakośa Chs. I-II differs greatly from that of the Jainas, which is likewise elucidated in the T.S. Ch. II mainly drawing materials from the Prajñāpanā 2.

Chapter V

The 5th chapter pertaining to the Jaina ontology consists of two parts, i. e., (1) 1-16. five astikāyas; and (2) 17-44. six dravyas. The canonical tradition explains the metaphysical world by way of these two different principles, which Umāsvāti also adopted. The first portion relevant to the nature of five astikāyas is no more han at reproduction of the Āgamic materials, for instance the Bhagavati 2.10. The second part explains the function of six dravyas (17-22), the nature of pudgala (23-36), and the nature of dravya (37-44). These topics are offered in the Uttarādhyayana 28.7 in respect of the laksāna of six dravyas, the Uttarādhyayana 36 in respect of pudgala and dravya, the Prajñāpanā 13.418 in respect of the theory of atomic combination.

Śūtras V:17-22 examine the upakāra of six dravyas, e.g., 'gati-sthity-upagrahau dharmādharmayor-upakāra (17)', which is made after the canonical works, e. g., the Sthāna 5.3.530, Uttarādhyayana 28.9, etc. Upakāra is explained in V:17Bh. to be the equivalent of prayojana, guṇa and artha; and upagaha to be the synonym of nimitta, apekṣa, karama and hetu. The mode of exposition made in the T. S. is inferential, inferring the existence of an imperceptible substance from its perceptible attribute. An inferential thinking pattern as such which is foreign to the Āgama was doubtlessly introduced from the Vaiśeṣikasūtra, wherein the 2nd and 3rd chapters attempt to establish the existence of dravyas from their guṇas, for instance, 'niṣkramanam praves-anam ity-ākāṣasya liṅgam (2. 1. 20),’ 'aparāsmīn param yugapad-ayugapac-ciraṃ kṣipram-itī kāla-liṅgāni (2. 2. 6),’ 'prāṇapāna-nimesonmesa-jivana-mano-gatindriyāntara-vikāraḥ sukha-duḥkhechā-dvesau prayainās-cāmano liṅgāni (3. 2. 4),’ and so on. The Vaiśeṣika definition of kāla obviously give some influence for the formulation of the aphorism V:22.5

The Bhāṣya on V:22 explains paratva-aparatva as of three kinds, i. e., praśamsa-kṛta, kṣtra-kṛta and kāla-kṛta, the first two of which are irrelevant to kāla as the bhāṣyakāra admits. The latter two occur in the Vaiśeṣikasūtra 7.2.25, which were both reproduced by Umāsvāti along with an additional illogical pair of anuyoga items, i. e., praśasta-apraśasta. Another strange notion which strikes us in this context of ontology is the nature of jiva stated as of mutual assistance (V:21) (which is used as a catchphrase by the present day Jainas). It is looked at from the common sense
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moralistic viewpoint that finds no mention in the canonical texts, which must have been formulated by the author himself. The Prasamarati replaces it by the Āgamic concept of samyaktv-jñāna-cāritra-virya-śikṣā.

The Buddhist usage of the term pudgala differs from that of the Jainas. It has been already discussed that the treatment of pudgala was born in the context of the Vaiśeṣikasūtra Ch. 4 and that the concept of sat in threefold characteristics was also derived in the milieu of the Nyāyasūtra 4. 1. 11-40. The Jainas do not sanction four or five mahābhūtas as the constituents of the matter, but believe śabda, etc., to be its modifications. In the sūtras 23-24, this point is carefully discriminated from the concepts held by the other systems. The Vaiśeṣikasūtra refers to the nature of aṇu to be sat-akāraṇavat-nitya (4. 1. 1), adravyavat-anupalabdhi (4. 1. 7) and parimandala (7. 1. 26). The T. S. V: 25Bh. quotes a passage in this regard, ‘kāraṇam-eva tad-antyam sūkṣma nityaḥ ca bhavati paramāṇuh | eka-rasa-gandhasvaro dvi-sparsah kārya-lingas ca.’ This citation fails to find its source at present, however it sufficiently well distinguishes the Jaina concept of aṇu from that of the other schools. The law of perceptibility of things which shall be separately dealt with in Sec. III, Pt. 2 was formulated by Umāsvāti to clarify its Jaina position. The theory of atomic combination is taken up in V: 32-36, which are disturbed in the middle by the aphorisms on satsāmānya. The nature of dravya is treated at the end in relation to guṇa, paryāya and parināma. Kāla is reclaimed as a dravya in this context, which is certainly out of tune having lost its proper place, which should have been introduced right after the exposition of five astikāyas. Dravya and guṇa are defined in the sūtras 37 and 40, of which concepts were derived by way of improving the same in the Uttarādhyayana 28. 6 with the help of the Vaiśeṣikasūtra 1.1.15-16.6

Umāsvāti introduced and innovated some important concepts in this chapter by facing the relevant non-Jaina concepts, but having been likely carried away by the topics in which he was engrossed, the general arrangement of these topics here is undeniably disorganized.

Chapter VI

The treatment of āsrava includes the following topics: (1) 1-2. definition; (2) division; and subdivision: 3-4. by pūrya and pāra — 5. by sāmparāyika and ibrāpātha — 6-10. subdivisions of sāmprāyika by causes and by various categorical topics; and (3) 11-26. causes of āsrava binding eight mūla prakṛtis.

There is no convenient Āgamic source which readily provides en bloc the materials used in this chapter to facilitate its composition. The Tattvārthasūtra jainā-gamasamanvaya most frequently refers to the Bhagavati passages in its śatakás 1, 6, 8 and 9, and less frequently to the Śīhāna and Uttarādhyayana. The sources of these materials
are widely dispersed in the canonical corpus, and this chapter is outlined according to Umāsvāti’s original plan and scheme.

This chapter displays an inventory of kriyā belonging to various categories which had been worked out independently in the long Āgamic period, thereby exhibiting occasional reiterations of the same concept, for instance, four kaśāyas occur again as the subdivision of jivādhikaraṇa, and ārambha is reckoned both in jivādhikaraṇa and in twenty-five kriyās. The third topic of kriyā, either good or bad, as the cause of āsrava in binding mūla prakṛtis is directly concerned with the subject matter of Ch.VIII.

It should not be lost sight of that Umāsvāti changed the traditional sequence of three yogas, i.e., manas, vāc and kāya, into kāya, vāc and manas, probably because he attached more importance to kāyikakriyā which had been repeatedly denounced in tradition in relation to prākāśita. The definition of āsrava was for the first time stated by Umāsvāti. Yoga in threefold divisions is the fundamental cause of āsrava, or yoga itself is conceived by him to be āsrava. Yoga is classified here into subha and asubha, the former of which ensuing āryapatha āsrava belongs to those without kaśāyas and the latter ensuing sāmparāyika āsrava belongs to those with kaśāyas. It should be noted down that Umāsvāti deems yoga, which theoretically belongs to a neutral category, in terms of subha-asubha on the basis of the absence and presence of kaśāyas. Umāsvāti seems to have formulated this concept with the help of the Kaśāyaprabhāta Ch. VII, wherein Guṇadhara conceives kaśāyas in terms of upayoga which is altogether a new concept in that age. Threefold yogas are consciously or unconsciously derived by the operation of the soul’s nature, upayoga. Therefore subha upayoga necessarily ensues subha yoga and asubha upayoga does asubha yoga. Subha yoga then activates punya āsrava which brings forth punya bandha, and asubha yoga prompts pāpa āsrava which brings forth pāpa bandha.

The canonical texts such as Sīhāna 5.2.517 and Sāmakāya 16 list fivefold āsravadvāras, i.e., mithyādārśana, avirati, pramāda, kaśāya and yoga, which are enumerated as bandhaavāras in the T.S. VIII:1. Theoretically speaking, there is no difference between āsrava and bandha as to their root causes, because bandha is the logical consequence of āsrava promted by the same causes. Threefold yogas are universally present in all those on the stages of thirteen guṇasthānas with or without kaśāyas, therefore Umāsvāti justified yoga to be the root cause of āsrava, meanwhile classifying it into subha and asubha, in the latter of which he included all the rest of the four kinds of āsravadvāras reckoned in the canon. For among the four subdivisions of sāmparāyika āsrava, i.e., avrata, kaśāya, indriya and kriyā, indriya is explained in the Bhāṣya on VI:6, ‘paṭeca pramitayasendriyāni’, and mithyātva is included in twenty-five kriyās. Kriyā had repeatedly been propounded in the early canonical works to be the cause directly inviting āsrava, so Umāsvāti must have wanted to lay emphasis on it by
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counting twenty-five in all in the place of mithyātva which is just a part of them. Fivefold āsravadvāras in tradition are thus in theory further systematized by Umāsvāti.

All these five causes of āsrava are therefore enumerated as the causes of bondage in VIII: 1, which is certainly logical. However, he defines bandha in VIII: 2, ‘sakaśāyatvat...’, which creates difficulty involving the treatment of īryāpathika bandha that is logically ensued by īryāpatha āsrava as so puṇya karmas are reckoned in VIII: 26. Umāsvāti obviously excluded here sayoga kevalis who are free from kaśāyas from the object of the treatment of bandha, perhaps due to the supposition that the duration of īryāpathika bandha is practically too short to be counted as bandha. The same assumption of Umāsvāti in respect of this point is again endorsed in the Prāsamaraṇī 142, ‘gramhāḥ karmāṣṭa-vidham mithyātvāvīrati-duṣṭayogās-ca’. For this reason, he does not refer to prakṛti and pradeśa bandhas of īryāpathika type, which are surely noted down in the Sarvārthasiddhi under the sūtra VII: (3). This bizarre performance of Umāsvāti regarding the treatment of īryāpathika bandha well explains the contradiction exhibited in the apborism X.2 which has been discussed in the first chapter (see its Sec. II, 4.2). His definition of bandha thus creates a logical contradiction in relation to sūtras VI: 1-5 and VIII: 26.7

Chapter VII

Three topics are of major concern in this chapter, i.e., vrata, vratis and the code of lay conduct: (1) 1-2. five vratas—3-7. their bhāvanās and the other augmentary observances—8-12. definition of five vows; (2) 13-14. vratis consisting of ascetics and laymen; and (3) 15. five āpuvratas—16. seven śīlas—17. samlekhana—18-32. āticāras—33-34. dāna.

In the canonical sources, the five vratas and their bhāvanās are treated in the Aćārāṅga II. 15 and Prāśnayakaraṇa II, and twelve vows of laity and their āticāras are discussed in the Upāsakadāśī 1 and Śrāvakāvāyaka, the latter of which also refers to samlekhana.

The Yogasūtra enumerates five yamas called mahāvratas in II: 30-31, niyamas and their bhāvanās in II: 32-34, and their phalas in the succeeding sūtras. The sūtras VII: 5 and 6 are considered to be the modifications of the Yogasūtra I:33 and II:15.8

The definition of dāna made in VII: 33 is not traceable in the canon, which seems to have been conceived after the Abhidharma kośa 4.113-4 ‘diyate yena tad-dānam pūdiśa mārtaḥ kāmayaūkāya-vāk-karma sothānam [tan-mahābhogavat-phalam ] //113// sva-parārthobhayārthīya nobhayārthīya diyate / (tad-viśeṣo dānāpati-vastu-kṣetra viśeṣartha) //114// The content expressed in the Bhagavati 7.1.263 could have been also
consulted in this connection. The disions of dāna stated in the sūtra 34 are vidhi, dravya, dātṛ and pātra, which are drawn from the Bhagavati 15. 540.

The condition of vratis as niḥśalya does not find a mention in the canonical literature wherein threefold śalyas, i.e., māyā, nidāna and mithyādārśana, are frequently talked about. It seems that Umāsvāti laid down this condition on the ground that samyaktva is the primary proviso to be a vrati as so articulated in the dialogues in the Āgama and as so emphasized in the beginning sūtras of the T. S. Mithyādārśana śalya is reckoned as the last one among eighteen vices and as one of fifteen kriyās.

As to the list of bhāvanās, those of asteya conspicuously differ between the two recensions of the T. S. Umāsvāti’s list in VII:3 Bh. agrees with that of the Acārāṅga II.15. 1043–1044 in content but differs in sequence. The Saṃavāya 82 and Maḷacāra 5.142 belong to the same group with some variations. On the other hand, the Digambara sūtra VII:6 and Kundakunda’s Cāritrapāhuḍa 34 broadly agree with the list made in the Praśnayākaraṇa (v. 1, p. 1230–31).9 These indicate that there were two major trends in the practice of bhāvanās in the Jaina communities prior to the schism.

As already noted, Ch. VI is directly related to the subject matter of Ch. VIII, and a smooth flow of discussion from Ch. VI (āsrava) to Ch. VII (bandha) in the sequence of tattvas is disturbed by the insertion of Ch. VII in the middle. This chapter deals with mahāvratas which fall in samvara tattva and anvuvrata which fall in āsrava tattva. Umāsvāti’s logical reduction of punya-pāpa from nine tattvas in tradition ensued difficulty in arranging in his scheme of seven tattvas the topics of anvuvrata which promise rebirth in svarga loka for laymen in the consequence of their good actions, thereby this chapter had to be created. And this chapter relevant to punya āsrava as so Pūjyapāda conceives it was needed to be arranged immediately before the chapter of bandha tattva in order to explain the punya karmas derived therefrom. This problem has been fully discussed in the translator’s introduction to Pt. Sukalji’s Commentary on Tattvārthasūtra.

Chapter VIII

This chapter outlines the classification of karmas so far developed in the Āgamic period: (1) 1–3. causes and definition of bondage; (2) 4. four divisions of karmas — 5–14. prakṛti bandha — 15–21. sthiti bandha — 22–24. anubhāga bandha — 25. pradeśa bandha; and (3) 26. punya karmas.
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Chapter VIII is thus directly derived from the Uttarādhyayana 33 by slightly improving its structure and contents, to which the first three sutras and the last aphorism are added at both ends. We have already referred to Umāsvāti’s formulation of the definition of bandha that it pertains to those with karāyas alone, which is not at all satisfactory. The latter portion of its definition, i.e., ‘jīvah karmano yogyān pudgalā-ā-latate’, which tersely expresses the Jaina concept of bondage, was likely formulated by the author himself, for its definition in this form of expression does not occur in the canonical texts. The last sūtra regarding puṇya karmas is mentioned in the sequel of the reduction of puṇya-pāpa tattvas, of which pāpa karmas are mentioned in the Bhāṣya. Corresponding to pāpa āsrava stated in VI:4, pāpa karmas should have been also mentioned in the sūtra proper. The Southern version of the text duly improved this point.

Chapter IX

Here discussed is the disciplinary code of ascetics, which covers samvāra and nirjarā tattvas: (1) 1–2. definition of samvāra and sixfold samvaradvāras — 3. tapas as the cause of samvāra and nirjarā; (2) their expositon: 4–18. samvāra — 19–46. tapas—47. process of nirjarā; and (3) 48–49. classification of nirgranhas.

Samvāra is not defined in the canonical body in the fashion as expressed in the aphorism 1. The term samvāra and the term āsrava are used by the Buddhists as well, therefore it was incumbent upon the author to confer the clear-cut Jaina definition of these terms. Sixfold samvaradvāras consisting of gupti, samiti, dharma, anupreksā, pariśhāhajaya and cāritra do not occur as a set category in the canon. Tenfold dharmas, which are listed in the Sthāna 10.145 and Samvāya 10, and twelfeold anupreksās do not quite fit in the context bearing the other older items; and it must be Umāsvāti himself who formulated these six kinds of samvaradvāras by excluding mahāvratas and their bhāvanās which are dealt with in Ch. VII. Needless to say, mahāvratas constitutes an important samvaradvāra as Umāsvāti counts it in samvarānupreksā in IX:7Bh. Cāritra is said to denote five stages of samyama such as sāmāyika, which finds a mention in the Bhagavatī 25.7. Uttarādhyayana 28.32–33, and so on. The problem of cāritra shall be considered separtely in Sec. III, pt. 5.

Anupreksās are partially enumerated in the canonical texts, for instance, in the Bhagavatī 25.8.802, Sthāna 4.1.308 and Auparpātika 19, wherein ekatva, anitya, aśāraṇa and saṃsāra belong to dharma dhyāṇa, and anantavarti, vipariṇāma, aśubha and apāya to śukla dhyāṇa. Aśāraṇa, anitya and ekatva bhāvanās are mentioned in the Acārāṅga I already, so these items had developed into the preliminary observances to these two types of dhyāṇa by the time of Umāsvāti. The Abhidharmakośa Ch. 6 entitled Mārgapudgalanirdesa deals with ārya satya and bhāvanā mārga, of which kārikā 6.1 reads, ‘kleśa-prahāṇam-ākhyātam satyadarśana-bhāvanāt / dvividho bhāvanā-
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*mārgo, darśanākhyās-tv-anāsravah* and its 6.5. explains, ‘ṛṣṭta-sthāh śruta-cintāvān bhāvanāyām pratyujyate.’ Its svopajñābhaṣya on 6.17 expounds sixteenfold dharmasṃrty-upasthānābhyāsas, i.e., duḥkhaḍṛṣṭi — duḥkham, amityam, śūyam, anātmakam; samudayaḍṛṣṭi — samudaya, prabhava, hetu, pratyaya; nirodhaḍṛṣṭi — nirodha, sāntam, pratiṣṭhatam; and mārgadrśṭi mārga, nyāya, pratipati, nairyaṇikam. It seems that Umāsvāti formulated anupreksā items of āsrava through bodhidurlabha in the context of samudayaḍṛṣṭi through mārgadrśṭi above, because duḥkhaḍṛṣṭi is somewhat covered by the items present in the Āgama. Anyatva sounds to have been derived from anātmaka; āśuci occurs in the śukla dhyāna anupreksā as aśubha; the concept of loka is well suggested by the items anantavartī and vipariṇāma therein; and āsrava, saṃvara, nirjara and bodhidurlabha (occurring in the Sūtrakṛtā 1.15.624, Uttarādhyāyana 3.8, etc.) are comparable to the Buddhist items such as hetu, pratyaya, 'nirvāṇa, mārga, nyāya and pratipati. Thus it appears that Umāsvāti expanded and systematized the Jaina concept of anupreksā in the context of the relevant Buddhist concept. He treated anupreksā as an independent samvaradvāra, because his list of enlarged items deviated from the canonical list, and because these twelvefold items were conceived in the context of ‘kleśa-pratihārayam-ākhvātaṃ satyadasaṃ-bhāvanāt’ of the Abhidharmakośa 6.1 which is comparable to the samvaradvāra of the Jainas. The Praśamaratī calls them twelve bhāvanās.

Pariśahajaya is an old topic occurring in the Āgama since its genesis, however it is a stray subject there treated somewhat independently. For instance, the Ācārāṅga I. 9. 3 talks about pariśahas in relation to Lord Mahāvira's wandering life at Lāhu, and the Sūtrakṛtā I.3.1 describes mental and physical hardships which a novice is to be prepared to face in his path. The Uttarādhyāyana 2 is an independent chapter devoted to pariśaha and the Bhāgavati 8.8.342 deals with it independently in relation to karmic bondage. In a broad sense, pariśahajaya sounds to fall in the category of tapaś for both are effective for nirjara, however the distinction of the two seems to lie in whether it is a performance based on the endurance of what has fallen on an aspirant's path or a planned out regular practice based on the prescriptions in the canon. The Rāhavārtika explains it under the sūtra IX: (19), 'buddhi-pūrvo hi kāya-kleśa ity-uccyate, yadrechhayopaniṣṭe pariśahaḥ. Possibly for the same reason, Umāsvāti gave a definition, 'mārgācyavāna-nirjarārtham pariṣodsabhāya pariṣahāḥ, and classed this stray item in the category of samvaradvāra together with the two other relatively new items, i.e., dharma and anupreksā. But then, the aphorism 3, 'tapasī nirjarā ca, suffers, for the same concept is applicable to pariśahajaya, too. The 22nd pariśaha listed in the Uttarādhyāyana 2 is darśana pariśaha, which is replaced by adarśana pariśaha in the T. S. The Bhāgavati 8.8.342 brings into discussion how many pariśahas occur at once, and how many of them occur to sarāga chadhasthas, vitarāga chadhasthas, sayoga kevalis and ayoga kevalis, which are likewise taken into consideration in the T. S.
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The materials for tapas are readily available en bloc in the canon, for instance, in the Bhagavati 25.7. 831-3, Uttarādhyayana 30 and Aupapātika 17-19. Among twelve-fold Āśāmic subdivisions of tapas, dhyāna meets quite a different treatment in the T.S. which shall be discussed independently in the later section. The source of the classification of nirgranthas can be traced in the canon, for instance, in the Bhagavati 25.6.

Chapter X

Mokṣa tattva is discussed in respect of the following topics: 1-4. two types of mokṣa, i.e., jivan mukti and videha mukti—5-6. ascendance of the liberated souls to siddha loka—7. maintenance of siddhas' individualities. This chapter is short and the guide-line of its content could have been suggested by the Prajñāpāna 36. Aupapātika 41-43, etc. However, the treatment of mokṣapada here is made on the theoretical line, and the Tatvārthasūtra jaivagamasamanvaya refers for its sources to various texts such as the Bhagavati, Uttarādhyayana, Prajñāpāna, etc.

The concept of mokṣa differs among various schools, and its Jaina concept has to be clarified that liberation is the state of a soul released from its entire karmas. The rise of kevalajñāna in the penultimate stage to mokṣa is admitted likewise by the Sāṅkhya as expressed in the Sāṅkhyaśāstra 64, 'evan tattvādhyāsān-nāsman na me nāham-ity-apaṛīṣeṣam aviparyayād-visuddham kevalam-utpadyate jñānam'. Its kārikās 67-68 describe the states of jivan mukti and videha mukti, 'samyag-ṭhānādhigamād-dharmādānām akāraṇa-prāptau tiṣṭaṁ samśāra-vaśāc-cakra-bhramavād-dhīra-śariraḥ// prāpte śarira-bhede caritārthaḥ pradhāna-vinirṛttau ekāntikam-ātyantikam ubhayāṃ kaivalyam-āppnoti//'. Discussion has been already advanced as to the obscure position of the T.S. X:2 (see Ch. I, Sec. II, 4.2).

The idea that the liberated souls ascend to siddha loka is peculiar to Jainism, which is aphorized along with its theoretical reasons for support. The reason of siddhas' refusal into aloka ākāśa due to the absence of dharmaśākṣikāya expressed in X:6 Bh. is new to the age, for the Bhagavati which is familiar with the concept of five astikāyas argues in its 16.8.585 that a deva cannot move his limbs in the aloka ākāśa for no jiva-ajiva exist therein, because motion is elsewhere incurred when a jiva tries to fetch matters to nourish his body. Likewise the Sthāna 10.931 says that motion occurs only when jivas and matters exist, therefore jivas cannot go beyond the loka ākāśa wherein no matter exists. The Southern version duly aphorized this Bhāṣya exposition.

The maintenance of siddhas' individualities is insisted upon in the T.S. probably with a view to distinguishing the Jaina position from that of the Sāṅkhya, because according to the latter, pluralism of souls which is likewise acclaimed by them meets a contradiction, for the individualities of prakṛta is reflected in puruṣas disappear once for all when kaivalyahood is attained. The Nandi 21, prajñāpāna 1.7.7-10 and Jivātivāhigama 1.7 classify the emacipated souls into two types i.e., anantara siddhas and parampara siddhas, who are examined in terms of anuyogadvāras such as tīrtha,
pratyekabuddha–bodhita, liṅga and saṅkhyā. Umāsvāti employs here twelve anuyogad-vāras, and speaks of anantara siddhas and parampara siddhas in terms of naya, i.e., pūrva-bhāva-prajñāpaniya–naya and pratyutpanna-bhāva-prajñāpaniya–naya.

The Bhāṣya to X.7 mentions a yogi's rūdhī which is generally accepted by the rest of schools as expressed in the Yogasūtras, SāṅkhyaKārikā, Abhidharmakośa, etc. Up.kārikās 24-27 classify sukha into four kinds, i.e., by viṣaya, vedanā–bhāva, vipāka and mokṣa, which seem to have been conceived in the fashion of duḥkhatrayas referred to in the Sāṅkhyakārikā I that are known as ādhyātmika, ādhibhautika and ādhibidaivika.

CONCLUSION

The greatest achievement of the T. S. thereby its philosophical meaning of this text, lies in its systematization of the philosophical contents of the Jaina canon in terms of seven tattvas, and in its innovation of certain traditional concepts as well as the formulation of certain new concepts which are largely made in the cross current with the non-Jaina thoughts. The success of this work is doubtless due to the personal capacity of the author, however its achievement was not possible without the existence of the later canonical texts (the texts most heavily used are: Bhagavatī, Uttarādhyāyana, Prajñāpanā, Jivājivābhīgama, Nandi, Anuyogadvāra and Sthāna) which had in majority gone through the process of systematization to a greater extent and stood in the position to be ready to offer their en bloc for the composition of the T. S. and without materials the existence of the non-Jain standard texts from which Umāsvāti imbibed the wider philosophical vision that enabled him to discern sharply the Jaina concepts from theirs and that enabled him to cover most of the universal problems at current.

As to the distribution of the subject matters to ten chapters the allotment of the topic of jīvas to Chs. II–IV is likely suggested by the Jivājivābhīgama, of which broad outline might have been hinted at by that of the Abhidharmakośa III and that of the rest of chapters are automatically regulated by the themes of seven tattvas and three jewels. And as to the construction of each chapter, most of them must have been derived from the outlines made in the readily systematized portions of the Āgamic works, with the sole exception of Ch. VI which was drafted by Umāsvāti on the independent line. Ch.X is made much under the sway of the Sāṅkhyakārikā.

The non-Jaina standard works, such as Vaiśeṣikasūtra, Nyāyasūtra, SāṅkhyaKārikā, Yogasūtra and Abhidharmakośa, must have been thoroughly studied by the author not only to master the skill in composing the text in sūtra style in Sanskrit which did not exist in the then Jaina practice, but also in order to distinguish clearly the Jaina tenets from theirs. Here he learnt how to define a concept which was foreign to the Āgamic authors, and introduced some different types of thought pattern such as inferential method of approach into Jainism. Also it should not be forgotten that he took a good advantage of the rational thinking pattern of the then karma specialists, who came to be active in the later Āgamic stage.
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Various important traditional concepts were improved or innovated by him, for instance, concept of seven tattvas (Ch.I), identification of five knowledges with pramāṇa (Ch. I), Yugaspadvāda of kevala jñāna-darsaṇa (Ch. I), five states of souls in relation to karmas (Ch.II), reclassification of five-sensed beings according to the modes of birth (Ch.II), definition of ēravya-gūna-pāryāya (Ch. V), definition of kāla (Ch.V), definition of āsrava (Ch.VI), formulation of sixfold saṁvaradvāras (Ch.IX), formulation of twelve anupreksās (Ch. IX), concept of ṇhāna (Ch.IX), concept of sukha (Ch.X), etc; many of which were derived while discriminating the Jaina positions from those of the non-Jaina schools. Likewise the concept of sat (Ch.V), law of perceptibility of things (Ch.V), definition of dāna(Ch.VII), mūḍha as the proviso of vratis (Ch. VII) etc., were formulated by Umāsvātī in the same background. These concepts proposed by him are distributed to all the chapters excluding Chs. III-IV and VIII of which materials he merely reproduced from the then existing canonical works. Most of these concepts came to be standardized in the post-Umāsvātī period, and particularly the Southern authors followed the categorical concepts standardized by Umāsvātī. Some of them met improvements, and some of them became the sources of further development, among which the most important is the concept of sat that came to provide the ground for the immediate arrival of the age of logic in the two traditions.

While organizing the legacy of the tradition quite faithfully at large, he did it much in his own way. His contribution in inclusively representing the fundamental Āgamic subjects in all branches of knowledge in the concisely organized form, coupled with his innovation and formulation of numerous concepts by absorbing the outside philosophies, made the T. S. worthy to be the standard text of the Jainas for nourishing their thought world and worthy to be an epoch-making source for the further conceptual development in various fields including ontology, epistemology and logic, and so on.

All these demonstrate that Umāsvātī was an excellent thinker of the days that the then Jainas could have produced, besides that he had a genius competence in organizing the canonical contents without losing the point. Certainly, the T. S. has its own deficiency. Umāsvātī’s systematization of the canonical contents of jñāna (Ch. I) and of kriyā (Ch.VI) is loose with redundant items, his presentation of the topics in Ch.V is disorganized, and equally unsatisfactory, are the definitions of pariṇāma (Ch. V), bandha (Ch. VIII), dhyaṇa (Ch. IX), and so on. Likewise the Bhāṣya expositions of nāya (Ch. I) and arpira-anarpita theory (Ch. V) are obscure. Umāsvātī himself improved some minor points in his Prasūtanarati and the Southern recension of the T. S. and the Sarvārthaśādhi made a major improvement on the deficiencies exhibited in the Saṁhāya T. S. Admitting all these defects, we could still count them as the minor points in comparison with the amount and the quality of task accomplished by Umāsvātī, who since remained unrivalled in this attempt.
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The T.S. found and established its position in the South from the very beginning of the literary activities therein, which shall become evident in our later study. But how did it come to be received in the Śvetāmbara fold? As we have just observed, while systematically organizing the canonical contents, Umasvāti introduced some new concepts into Jainism and made radical improvements on certain traditional concepts, many of which were born in the context of the current theoretical problems of the other philosophical systems. Besides he wrote it in Sanskrit, which would have hardly escaped a strong resistance in the Śvetāmbara tradition wherein Sanskrit had been deemed as a profane language as easily surmised from Siddhasena Divākara’s anecdote that he was penalized to take praśīka praśāscitta for having planned to translate the Prakrit texts into Sanskrit. The following survey is conducted with a view to finding what kinds of reactions were advanced to the T.S. in the medieval Śvetāmbara camp in order to make an appraisal of its position therein.

Since the bulk of materials to be examined is too vast, our inquiry is confined to collect the citations from and references to the T.S. made in the commentarial literature on the canon up to the 10th century A.D., for it is evident that the position of the T.S. became well established after the 10th century A.D. in the West from the frequent references to it by naming the author in the commentarial literature on the Āgama thenceforth. The works examined, which are listed in Bibliography II, include nityuktis, bhāṣyas, cūṇās and vṛttis that are available at L. D. Institute of Indology in the printed form during the period of this research. Ten Prakīrṇakas are added to them as these are known as of later composition.

This survey has its own limitation and defects. Firstly, since its major attempt is to collect the express references to the contents of the T.S., it could not catch hold of the inexpress references but important concepts derived under the sway of the T.S. such as the anekāntavāda, of which rapid and forcible development in the post-Umasvāti period was impossible without comprehending the nature of sat as so expressed in V:29 and its two succeeding sūtras. Secondly, all the independent prakāramas composed by various authors, e.g., Siddhasena Divākara, Jinabhadra, Mallavādi, etc., are excluded together with the works in the various other branches falling outside the Āgamic commentaries. Thirdly, a commentary A-2 on A-1 and A-1 on A generally repeat the contents expressed by the latter, hence the citations from the T.S. made by the former tend to overlap with those made by the latter. Lastly, the examination of the available materials was performed somewhat hastily, thereby many references and quotations must have escaped the sight.

In view of all these dissatisfactory nature, the present survey is not expected to obtain the exhaustive data of the influences roused by the T.S. on the post-Umasvāti literature in the medieval West, but is hoped to be enough to grasp the general trend of its reactions. The superficial presentation of these citations in a tabular form by way of numerical series can hardly do a fair justice to the high potency that the
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T.S. actually possessed in influencing the later thoughts. The deficiency of this section is hoped to be supplemented in the next section wherein some controversial aphorisms evinced in this survey are going to be independently discussed with further penetration along with some other problems involved with the T.S.

The following table indicates the references to or the citations from the T.S. recorded in the examined works. Those texts which do not display any as such are not herein reckoned. The sequence of these works roughly follows the chronological order, however the relative chronology of the various Prakīrṇakas may fall later. Some works of unknown authors which are ascribed to certain authors by some or by tradition are grouped under the ascribed authors. Many of the niryukti gāthās and bhāṣya gāthās are indistinguishably mixed in the cases of the Brhatkalpa and Vyākhyāra. In this table, the chapter and aphorism of the T.S. referred to are indicated first, which is followed by a citation made in the examined text by indicating gāthā number or page number, when a citation is made by the word iti, uktam, etc., it is marked by a single asterisk; in case a quotation is made by the title work, i.e., T.S., it is marked by double asterisks.

PRAKĪRŅAKAS (after the 6th century A.D.)

Marāṇasamādhi

I:1 15

NIRYUKTIS

Bhadrabāhu (the later 5th century A.D.)

Āvaśyaka (based on Āvaśyakasūtra-niryukter-avacūrṇih)

I:1 910, 1082
I:31 Bh. 979
IX:27 1477ff.

Śūtrakṛtā

I:1 112

NIRYUKTIS

Ascribed to Bhadrabāhu

Pinda

I:1 69-70

Ogha

I:1 740

BHĀṢYAS

Saṅghadāsa

Brhatkalpa

I:1 1323
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Ascribed to Saṅghadāsa

Vyavahāra

I:1 405 (v. 9, p.69)

Jinabhadra (c. 650 V.S.)

Viśeśāvasyaṅsakṣeram with svapajñāavṛtti (exclude Koṭṭācārya’s vṛtti)

I:1 1030, 1050, 4003; vṛtti on 1002*, 1171*
I:20 vṛtti on 76*, 107, etc.
I:31Bh. 3709 ff.
I:33 3374; vṛtti on 114*, 317
V:29 754, 2298, 2420, 4101, etc.
V:31 2642
VIII:26, 26Bh. 2401
IX:27 366 ff.
X:6 2299, 3760
X:6Bh. (illustrations of X:6) 3761
X:6Bh. (dharmanāstikāyābhāvāt) 23: 5, 3782

Cūrnīs

Agastyaśāstra (the 6th century A. D.)

Daśavaikālika

I:1 pp. 1*, 193
I:13 p. 16**
V:29 pp. 10. 18
VII:4–5, 5Bh. p.85
IX:3 p.19*
IX:27 p.16*

Jinadāsa (650–750 V. S.)

Nandi

I:1 p.11
I:2 p.8
I:31Bh. pp.46–47

Anuyogadvāra

I:1 p.86
V:29 p.29

Daśavaikālika

I:1 p. 215
V:29 p.16
IX:27 p.29ff
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**Uttaraādhyaṇa**
- 1:1  pp. 181, 222, 229, 265
- VII:12  p.67 *

**Sūtrakrṣita**
- 1:1  pp. 240, 403 *
- 1:32  p.60 *
- 1:33  pp.322, 398
- V:26  p. 12
- V:29-30  p. 404

**Nīśītha**
- I:1  v.3. pp.60, 354, v.4, p.251

**VṛTTHIS**

*Haribhadra (705-775 A.D.)*

**Nandī**
- I:2  p.9
- I:31Bhi.  pp.47-50
- I:33  p.53 *
- II:17-18  p.23 *
- VI:1  p. 43 *

**Anuyogadvāra**
- I:28  p. 103 *
- VIII:4  p. 122 *

**Daśavaikālīka**
- I:1  pp. 179, 194, 233
- V:29  p. 39
- V:30  p.127

**Āvaśyaka**
- I:1  pp. 68 *, 527 *, 531 *, etc.
- I:2  p.810
- I:2Bh.  p.838 *
- I:4  p.816
- II:9  p.600 *
- II:27  p. 17 *
- V:29  p. 598 *
- V:37  p. 590 *
- VIII:18  p.591 *
- VIII:15-21  p.73 *
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIII:26, 26Bh.</td>
<td>p.252 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX:8</td>
<td>p.656 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX:27</td>
<td>p.773 * , etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX:36</td>
<td>p.587 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VRṬTIS

Koṭṭācārya

_Viṣeṣāvyakaḥbhaṣya_ vrṭti by Koṭṭācārya, gāthā 2319 onwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I:1</td>
<td>p.788, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:31</td>
<td>p. 746 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:31 Bh.</td>
<td>p. 740 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II:7</td>
<td>p. 479 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV:2</td>
<td>p. 623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V:18</td>
<td>p. 480 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V:22</td>
<td>p. 462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V:29</td>
<td>p. 442, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V:31</td>
<td>p. 505 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI:3–4</td>
<td>p. 431 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI:9</td>
<td>p. 431 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII:12</td>
<td>pp.586 *, 589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII:33</td>
<td>p. 787 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII:1</td>
<td>p. 436 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX:27</td>
<td>p. 370 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX:36</td>
<td>p. 588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X:6</td>
<td>p. 407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X:6 Bh. (Illustrations of X:6)</td>
<td>p. 754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X:6 Bh. (dharmaśīkatīyābhāvat)</td>
<td>p. 408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VRṬTIS

Śīlānā (862 or 872 A.D.)

_Acārāṅga_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I:1</td>
<td>pp.42, 131, 178, 203 *, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:2</td>
<td>pp. 177, 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:4</td>
<td>pp. 17, 178, 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II:27</td>
<td>p. 74 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II:32</td>
<td>p. 70 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V:37</td>
<td>p. 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V:40</td>
<td>p. 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V:42–43, 42–43 Bh.</td>
<td>p. 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII:12</td>
<td>p. 134 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII:1</td>
<td>p. 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX:18</td>
<td>p. 68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Śūtrakṛtya

I:1 v.1, pp. 1, 9, 77, 91, 170, etc.; v.2, pp.42, 66, 131, etc.
I:2 v.2, p. 119
II:1-7 v.1, p. 122
II:31 v.2, p.88 *
III:4 v.1, p. 123 *
V:26 v.1, p.3
V:29 v.1, p.2. *; v. 2, pp 83, 120, 154 *
V:30 v.1, p.51; v.2, p. 119
VII:6 v.2, p. 133 *
IX:18 v.2, p.119

These references are made to the śūtra text, Bhāṣya, or to both. The citations accompanied by the word iti, etc., increase in accordance with the progress of time which may be an indication of the process of gaining a recognized position of the T.S. in this tradition. Still Agastyasimha alone quotes a śūtra by title only once. The following table exhibits a distribution of the referred śūtras in each chapter. A śūtra with a single asterisk indicates that the concerned śūtra was directly derived from the Āgamic text in its original form or with a slight modification. A śūtra bearing double asterisks indicates that it is a succinct and systematic presentation of the canonical concept which is originally expressed in the elaborate and prolix passages. A śūtra bearing no mark involves a disputable problem.

Chapters Aphorisms

I 1, 2, 2Bh.*, 4, 13*, 20*, 28*, 31*, 31Bh., 32*, 33
II 1-7, 8*, 9*, 17-18*, 21**, 31*, 32*, 38-39 * *
III 4 * *
IV 2 *
V 18*, 22, 26, 29, 30, 31, 37, 40, 32-43 & 42-43Bh.
VI 1 *, 3-4, 9 * *
VII 4-5 & 5Bh. * *, 6, 12 *, 18 *, 33
VIII 1, 4 *, 15-21 *, 26 & 26Bh.
IX 3 *, 8, 18, 27, 36 *
X 6 * *, 6 Bh. (illustrations of X:6) * *, 6Bh. (dharmaśīkāyābhaṁvāt)
(* 20, * * 7, 23 — total cases 50)

The aphorisms referred to in these works are thus distributed in all the chapters. Heavy references are made from Chs. I, II and V among which Chs. I and V contain many aphorisms involving disputable problems. Chs. III and IV are the descriptive summaries of the Jaina cosmography and mythology which had been already rounded off in the canonical period, thus they are barren to produce problems
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for further development. These post-Umāsvāti authors frequently quote the sūtras from the T. S. instead of from the canonical passages even though the original forms of these aphorisms are readily available in the canon itself, which suggests that the T. S. came to be well accredited in this tradition. The final table below shows a distribution of these debatable sūtras according to the authors who referred to them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors/ Aphorisms</th>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prakīrṇakas</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhadrabāhu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saṅghadāsa</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinabhadra</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agastyaśiṃha</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinadāsa</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haribhadra</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koṭṭācārya</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīknaka</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above forcibly speaks that the sūtra 1:1 on threefold pathways to liberation (although the concept was not formulated by Umāsvāti himself) gave an immediate and profound influence over the post-Umāsvāti authors who commented on the canonical texts which generally advocate fourfold pathways to the final release. IX:27 on the definition of dhyāna also soon invited reactionary arguments on it. V:29, although herein referred to after Jinabhadra onwards, must have roused an instantaneous effect in the fields of ontology and logic. Likewise Yugapadvāda of kevala jñāna-darśana opined by Umāsvāti in I:31Bh. provoked further hot argumentation in the post-Umāsvāti period. These are considered to be the immediate and important reactions to the T. S., which are pregnant with problems for further development.
As for the rest, the function of kāla stated in V:22 is an improvement made by Umāsvāti on the canonical concept by way of introducing the Vaiśeṣika concept, which is likewise with the case of the definitions of dravya-guṇa in V:37 and 40. VII:6 was formulated by Umāsvāti in the context of the Yogāśīra. We have already discussed about the definition of sāmyagdarśana expressed in I:2, the defective nature of the sūtras V:42-43 and 42-43 Bh, and the problem of VIII:1 involving the cause of bandha. Discussion has been also advanced as to the definition of a jñāna in I:33, the definition of dāna in VII:33 and the definition of pariśa ha in IX:8, which were formulated by Umāsvāti. ‘Dharmāstikāyābhāvāt’ in X:6 Bh was still new to the age and the five states of souls in II:1-7 were explained by him in the context of karma theory. A reference to seven tattvas enumerated in I:4 makes its appearance in the works of Haribhadra and Śīlānka. It should be however noted that Haribhadra defends the canonical position of nine tattvas in his Sadārśanasamuccaya, and Śīlānka refers to nine padārthas while enumerating seven tattvas. VIII:26 with its Bhāṣya pertaining to eightfold punya karmas is accepted by Jinaḥbhadra and Haribhadra, even though it involves itself with a remark made by Siddhasenaśīrṇi (see Ch. 1, Sec. IV, Pt. 1, 8)). V:26 concerning the production of skandhas involves a problem relevant to the perceptibility of things in V:28. V:30-31 pertain to the problem of V:29, and IX:18 shares a problem with the āphorism I:1 regarding the content of cāritra.

As this cursory analysis of these disputable sūtras evinces, their citations made in the post-Umāsvāti literature well reflect the important and controversial concepts brought about by Umāsvāti. It should be also taken note of that some defective aphorisms in the T. S. continued to be referred to in the commentarial literature as they are without receiving proper improvements. Quotations from the Prasūnāraṇi are found in Jinaḥbhadra’s Niśitka cūrṇi (v. 3, pp. 5-6 from P. R. 145), in Haribhadra’s Āvaśyaṇa vṛtti (p. 63 from P. R. 151) and in Koṭṭācārīya’s Viṣeṣaṇaśyaṇa vṛtti (p. 454 from P. R. 238). Among the works examined, Jinaḥbhadra (in his svopajñāvṛtti to Viṣeṣaṇaśyaṇakabhāṣya) and vṛttikārās wrote in Sanskrit. Quotations from the Aṣṭādhyaṇi are frequent in Agastyaśimha’s cūrṇi and in the vṛttis composed by various authors. It took some generations after Umāsvāti to see the establishment of the medium of writing in Sanskrit. The examination of the non-Jaina doctrines and the attack on them began with Jinaḥbhadra mainly with the vigorous tool of th anekāntavāda, which became severer as time went on. Likewise the exposition of karma doctrine became further elaborate in the course of time. These are some salient features noticed in these commentarial works.

It is not sure if the T. S. was consciously reckoned by the Svetāmbaras as the standard text of Jaina philosophy by the 10th century A.D., however it quarts evident from the above data that its accredited position was by that time well
established. We should also remember that Siddhasena took liberty in criticizing the Bhāṣya. After the 10th century, the commentators such as Śaṅkara, Abhayadeva and Malayagiri frequently quote the T.S. passages by citing the name of the author or the title of his positions, Vāceka. And Hemacandra’s famous and well said illustration of Umāsvāti as ‘uponīsvātim saṅgahitārah’ under ‘utkṣeṇenāpena’ in his Siddhāhena 2.2.39 positively confirms that the public recognition of his authoritative position became immovable in the West by that time.

Sec. 3. SOME PROBLEMS IN THE T. S.

This section consists of the following independent articles on the problems involved with the T.S. Pt. 1) kevala jñāna and darśana, Pt. 2) Perceptibility of things, Pt. 3) Treatment of dhyāna, Pt. 4) jivasamaśa mārganāsthāna and guṭasthāna, and Pt. 5) Treatment of āśrītra in mokṣamārga. The intention of the separate treatment of these problems here is twofold, i.e., firstly to supplement the foregoing study made in the previous two sections by penetrating into the deeper strata of the problems, and secondly to provide for the sake of the succeeding section the internal data that the Digambāra literature is in all cases the post-Umāsvāti product with the sole exception of the kaśyaprābhya on the basis of the development of certain concepts under consideration. The relevant problems are therefore examined in relation to the canonic and the immediate post-Umāsvāti literature of the two traditions as far as possible.

Part 1 Kevala jñāna and darśana

In I.31Bh. Umāsvāti proposes an understanding that a kevali’s Jñāna and darśana manifest themselves simultaneously (yugapadvāda) due to the simultaneous destruction of these two āvaraṇiya karmas, ‘kim cānyaḥ/ matjerāṇaḍīṣu catuṣṇi pūrṭayenopayogao hṛvati ni yugapati/ saṁyogavecchita-jñāna-darśanasyatam bhagavataḥ kevalino yugapati-sarva-bhāva-grāhake mirapekṣe kevalajñāne kevalaśarṣu ne cānusamayam upayo bhavati/kim cānyaḥ/ ksayopāśana-jāni catvāri jñāṇāni pūrvāni ksayād eva kevalam/ tasmāna kevalinah seśāni santūt.’ His proposal came to be accepted unanimously by the Digambaras who do not shoulder the burden of the canonical literature. The yugapadvāda immediately invited another view represented by Siddhasena Divākara in his Śivamati II that jñāna and darśana are identical in the case of a kevali (abhedavāda) on the ground that both upayogas can distinctively cognize all the objects at the same time. The Bhagavatī 18.8.640 and Prajñāpanā 30.663 maintain that a kevali’s upayogas occur in successive order (kramavāda), upon which ground the Āvāsyaka niryuktī 979 disapproves the yugapadvāda. Jinabhadra defends the canonical position in his Viśeṣāvaiśyakaḥśravya 3709–55 and Viśeṣānandavatī 186–244 that the two upayogas are neither identical in nature nor manifestable at the same time. Yaśovijaya
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in the modern time offers a synthetic solution to this problem that all these views represent the different nāyavādas. Umāsvāti’s proposal thus invited a wider range of reactions both in time and space.

Umāsvāti seems to have contributed here in effect in stimulating an epistemological interest as exhibited by Siddhasena Divākara in his attempts of defining dārsana. These three positions differ pertaining to the nature and temporal manifestation of a kēvīli’s upayogas. And each ground held for their different theses seems to be sound in its own way logically or by scriptural authority, which suggests that this problem involves itself with the canonical stages wherein the relevant rules and concepts were formulated. The following is an attempt to understand this problem from this angle.

The Jains claim as much as non-Jains that avadhi, manalparyaya and kevala jñānas are due to yogic labdhi, for instance, in the Dāśāśrutasanskanda Ch. v, and the successive occurrence of dārsana after jñāna as expressed in ‘jñāna pāsai’ in the earlier texts as well as in the Buddhist pītakas must have been derived from the common background of yogic practice. In the earliest texts such as the Ācarāṅga I and Sūtrakṛtā I, when jñāna and dārsana are mentioned in the same passage (which are mostly pertaining to Lord Mahāvīra), their order occurs generally jñāna first and dārsana second, for instance, in the Ācarāṅga I.2.2.79, 1.5.6.329, 1.9.1.472, etc., and the Sūtrakṛtā I.2.3.22, 1.4.1.4.1.6.2, 1.6.3, 1.9.24, etc., wherein the Ācarāṅga I.9.1.472 is said in relation to meditation, and the Sūtrakṛtā I.2.3.22 refers to auptara-nāḥi and auptara-dāṃṣi, its I.6.3 and 1.9.24 to anamta-nāḥi and anamta-dāṃṣi. The Sūtrakṛtā I.6.5 mentions savva-dāṃṣi and abhibhūva-nāḥi in due order, and its I.15.1 reads, ‘jam-aṭam paduppamam āhamissam ca nīyo/ savam manmai tam iti damasamvaranantae’, which if dārsana is taken in the sense of nirvikalpa cognition, the order of the occurrence must have been conceived as dārsana first and jñāna second. The later canonical texts do not seem to have paid much attention to the order of their occurrence, for instance, the Bhagavatī 18.8.640 reads, ‘...evam vucaii paramāhohie nam macye paramāṇu-poggalam jam samayam jñāni no tam samayam pāsai, jam samayam pāsai no tam samayam jñāni? goyamā sāgāre se nāne bhavai, anāgāre se dāmsaye bhavai, se tenaṭṭham jñāna na tam samayam jñāni evam jñāna anamta-paesiyam/ kevali nam bhante! mahusse paramāṇu-poggalam jahā paramāhohie tahā kevalī-vi jñāna anamta-paesiyam/ sevam bhante sevam bhante! tti.’ The Prajñāpanā 30.663 reads, ‘...hamā goyamā; kevali nam imam rāyanappabham puḍhavim anāgārehim jñāna pāsai na jñāni/ se kevāṭṭham bhante! evam vucaii – kevali nam imam rāyaṇappabham puḍhavim anāgārehim jñāve pāsai na jñāni? goyamā! anāgāre se dāmsaye bhavai, sāgāre se nāne bhavai, se tenaṭṭham evam vucaii...’.
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The canonical authors insist here that the two upayogas of ordinary beings as well as kevalis cannot occur simultaneously due to their different nature or function, i.e., anākāra and sākāra. Jñāna or sākāra cognition necessarily follows darśana or anākāra cognition in the case of an ordinary man's cognition. A kevali's cognition is not generated by the sense organs and mind, therefore this order is not possible to him. These passages are curiously silent about which cognition occurs first to a kevali. However the Daśāvatāraskandha 5.116-117 vindicate that a kevali's upayogas take place in the successive order of jñāna–darśana, upon the destruction of the relevant āvaraṇa karmas. Also the later work like the Karmagantha clearly mentions in its svopajñātikā I.3 (Jaina Ātmananda Sabhā, v.1, p.5) that a kevali's jñāna precedes darśana, anyade-catvasmin samye sakala-karma-virimukto jivaḥ saṁjñaye tasmin samye jñānopayogopayuktah eva, na darśanopayogopayuktah, darśanopayogasya dvitiya-samaye bhāvita... Therefore a reverse order of occurrence in the case of a kaivalī's upayogas, i.e., jñāna–darśana, was clearly understood by some, however it seems like that the canonical authors were in general not serious in giving consideration to the problem regarding which cognition occurs first to a kevali.²⁷

The Jainas had a peculiar notion about jivas such as the water beings and fire beings since the very beginning of their history, and it is not difficult to see that they soon came to grasp the world phenomena in terms of jiva-ajiva or jiva-karma. Upayoga (upa-syuj) is the differentia of the jiva from the ajiva, but the usage of this technical term does not appear in the earliest strata of the canon, i.e., Ācāraṇīya I and Śūtrakṛta I. It makes its appearance in the Bhagavati side by side the other anyyoga items such as jñāna, darśana and samjñā, for instance, in its 12.10.466, 19.8.658, 20.3.664, 25.6, 26.1 etc., and the Prajināpana 29 is devoted to the exposition of upayoga, of which 30th pada takes up pasyattā and 31st samjñā, each independently. The Bhagavati 2, 10.119 which mentions, ‘...uṣṭaya-lakṣkhane puṁ jīve...’, fully enumerates eightfold jñānas (five jñānas plus three ajñānas) and fourfold darśanas. The Bhagavati 19.8.658 and 20.3.664 express upayoga in terms of sākāra and anākāra. The Prajināpana 29 classifies upayoga into two, i.e., sākāra and anākāra, which are explained by way of eightfold jñānas and fourfold darśanas. As already taken note of the Śūtrakṛta 1.15.1 refers to darśanāvarana, wherein the origin of the concept of darśanāvaraniya karma may be traced. It seems therefore that the concept of jñāna–darśana along with their āvaraṇियa karmas evolved independently from the concept of upayoga which consists of sākāra and anākāra types (which might have been derived by the non-Jaina influence), then they likely came to be coalesced into one category because of their identical nature. Possibly for this reason, upayoga came to be dropped from the list of 14 mārgaṇayāsthānas which include the items of jñāna and darśana.

The Kaśāyapraśāhṛta is devoted to examine fourfold kaśāyas in the context of karma doctrine, the exclusive treatment of which finds no place in the canonical
Sec. 3. SOME PROBLEMS IN THE T. S.

literature. Guṇadhara takes up kaśyayas in the 7th chapter as constituting upayoga, which is again a new concept. Upayoga is already explained as the characteristic nature of the soul in the canon. The Bhagavata 12.10.466 reckons the ātmā as of eight kinds, i.e., ṛṣaya, kaśyaya, yoga, upayoga, jñāna, darśana, ērītra and virya. Guṇadhara seems to have caught hold of this concept of kaśyaya ātmā as the characteristic nature of the samādhi jīva, and expressed kaśyayas in terms of upayoga, the characteristic nature of the soul. Kundakunda follows the Kaśyapaprābhṛta on this matter, as he explains, for instance, in the Pravacanasāra II. 63ff. that kaśyayas constitute aṣīdha upayoga. And the later Digambara authors including Kundakunda seem to have widened the content of upayoga as the source of the conscious activities of which expressions take place in the form of threefold yogas of mind, speech and body. In another word, it came to be conceived as the source of cognitive, volitional, emotional and physical activities, or as the source of both conscious and subconscious activities, thus it came to include in its content the psychic attention and the sense reactions of the lower beings.

The canonical literature speaks of upayoga invariably in terms of sākṣāra-anākṣāra that are identical with jñāna-darśana, which is considered to be the characteristic nature of the soul. The T. S. II : 8-9 represent this canonical concept of upayoga. The karma specialists understood that jñānavarāṇiya karma categorically differs from darśanāvarāṇiya karma on the basis of their different nature. However, curiously enough, they did not establish darśanamohaniya karma and cāritramohaniya karma as the two independent categories in the class of mūla prakṛtis. These two mohaniya karmas distinctly differ by nature inasmuch as jñānavarāṇiya karma and darśanāvarāṇiya karma do, and the former two are related within the context of mohaniya category inasmuch as the latter two are interdependent in the context of upayoga. Nay, the latter two types of cognition share much closer mutual relation than the former two types of delusion because darśana (faith) and cāritra belong to entirely different categories. They could have in fact formulated a single category of upayogāvarāṇiya karma accompanied by the two subdivisions of jñāna and darśana inasmuch as they did for mohaniya karma. The later karma specialists abstracted kāyika samyaktva as a siddha’s guṇa in the sequel of the eradication of mohatiya karmas. Likewise they could have abstracted ananta upayoga by the destruction of upayogāvarāṇiya karmas. Jñāna and darśana are identical–cum–different within the category of upayoga consisting of sākṣāra and anākṣāra types. Therefore if these two ēvarāṇiya karmas were made in one in the form of upayogāvarāṇiya karma, our problem in question would not have cropped up. The abhedavāda expressed by Siddhasena Divākasa seems to be perfectly logical in grasping the nature of the problem.

A catalogue of karma prakṛtis was completed by the time of Umasvāti. And the table of the gīnasāhā ṣa was nearing to completion by the end of the Āgamic age.
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The list of karmas by itself does not mean much unless it finds its expression in a soul as the content of his life phenomena. Karmas thus came to be expressed through the medium of guṇasthāna. A rule was established at a certain time that one necessarily attains sayoga kevalihood when his jñānāvaraṇīya, darsanāvaraṇīya and antaṛāya karmas are simultaneously annihilated. The idea that a sayoga kevali is possessed of kevala jñāna and darsāna at the same time was in all probability derived from the earlier texts wherein Mahāvīra is described to have been endowed with ananta jñāna and ananta darsāna at the same time during his preaching period, which must have been meant originally as all knowing and all seeing or a supreme knower and a supreme seer (ānuttara-nānā and ānuttara-dāmsī) by way of epithet. And it is important to note that this statement was made when the karma doctrine was not yet developed. The later canonical authors enunciated various rules and formulated various concepts on the basis of the earlier scriptural passages, which was incumbent upon them to do so, as these stood for them qua holy utterances.

The scheme of the karma theory works mechanically like mathematical computation according to the established rules without leaving any ambiguity. Karmas are the matters. And the doctrine of karma is maintained on an understanding that the removal of karmas reveals the transcendental nature of the soul at once like a lamp light stripped off its lamp shade. Therefore according to this doctrine, it is difficult to accept the position that the capacity of jñāna-darsāna can be manifested to a kevali simultaneously upon the destruction of these karmas but their function operates in successive order, because the soul’s illuminating capacity of jñāna-darsāna is no other than the soul’s function or nature of jñāna-darsāna itself. This position does not therefore go with the concept of karma theory itself. A kevali is possessed of the lower kinds of jñāna-darsāna which function through the sense organs and mind. But he does not need to use them for cognizing the objects. When he uses kevala jñāns-darsāna, the rest of the lower types of jñāna-darsāna do not occur. And according to the karma theory, all the objects are illumined to him at the time when he employs his ātmā for cognition. The yugapadavāda expressed by Umāsvāti is perfectly sound according to the doctrine of karma.

If the kramavāda were insisted upon irrespective of the karma doctrine in the original sense of the earliest canon that anuttara darsāna follows anuttara jñāna in the context of dhyāna, it certainly makes sense. And the kramavāda likely took its ground when the theory of karma was not yet developed. But the problem in question is discussed in the context of karma doctrine. Or if a rule were established by the karma specialists that sayoga kevalihood reveals itself by the gradual removal of jñānāvaraṇīya, darsanāvaraṇīya and antaṛāya karmas, the kramavāda expressed in the canon takes the upper hand. However in this case, the successive order of the manifestation of jñāna-darsāna takes place to a kevali only once, which cannot be repeated again,
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because once these two āvaruṭiyā karmas are annihilated, two cognitions should be functioning to him constantly according to the theory of karma. The kramavāda faces thus difficulty in maintaining its position.

Umāsvāti posed this problem in the context of karma theory developed in the later canonical age. The canonical authors likely maintained the kramavāda based on its earlier position, which cannot be insisted upon in the advanced stage of karma doctrine. And as long as jīna-jarājina are identified with sākāra-anākāra upayogas as sa upāsita in the āgama, both are identical-cum-different. Sādhasena Divākara seems to offer therefore the most appropriate explanation on this matter which is expected from the doctrine of the Jinas developed in that period.

Part 2 Perceptibility of things

The Jaina atomists in the Āgamic age discussed about their theory of atomic combination inasmuch as the non-Jaina atomists did, however unlike the non-Jainas the Jainas never bothered about inquiring into the cause of visibility of a thing, possibly because the aspect of pradēśā by which the theory of atomic combination is also viewed self-evidently explains it away. The non-Jaina theoreticians like the Vaiśeṣikas posit the problem of perceptibility of things. Umāsvāti introduced this problem into Jainism and laid down a rule of the cause of perceptibility of skandhas in the T. S. V.28(28), ‘bheda-saṅghātābhyaḥ caṅkuṣāk’. The Bhāṣya imparts a brief exposition on this sūtra, ‘acāṅkuṣōtu yathoktāt saṅghātāt bhedāt saṅghātā-bhedāc-ceti’, which denies as the cause of visibility the rule of the production of skandhas stated in the aphorism 26 (26), bheda-saṅghātebhya utpadyañte’. This sūtra 28 in relation to the sūtra 25 is difficult to be comprehended by the later students of Jainism who are not acquainted with the Āgamic method of approaching problems. Nay, all the commentators on the T.S. who were well acquainted with the Āgamic method of approach, in fact, failed to explain this sūtra and its exposition, possibly because the problem posited here itself was not fully comprehended by them for the question as such did never have a place in the Jaina way of thinking.

For instance, under the sūtra (27), Pūjyaśāda gives an introductory remark on the sūtra (28), ‘āḥ, saṅghātā-puṣṭa śkanḍhānām-ātmālābhe siddhe bheda-saṅghāta-grahāya-anuvajakam iti tīt-graṅja-prajñā-pratipādānārātham-idad-ucyate —’. He seems to understand that the palpability of a thing arises by the saṅghāta method mentioned in the production of skandhas and by the bheda-cum-saṅghāta method discussed in the aphorism (28), but not by bheda nor by saṅghāta-cum-bheda as he comments on the sūtra (28), ‘...atra yo’ caṅkṣūṣāḥ sa katham caṅkṣo bhavatiti ceducyate —bheda-saṅghāṭābhyaḥ caṅkṣūṣāḥ/na bhedād-iti/ kātrapattī-iti cet? bhūmaḥ- saṅkṣīnte-parināmaśca śkanḍhāṣa bhede saṅkṣmyāpārītyāgāl-acāṅkuṣātavam-eva/ saṅkṣmya-
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 pariñataḥ punar-aparaḥ saty- api tad-bhedे'nya saṅghāiantara-saṁyogāi-saukṣmya-pari
 nāmoparame sthāulyotpattau cākṣuṣo bhavati'. However, the saṅghāta method of
 skandha formation is plainly negated by the Bhāṣya from being the cause of its
 palpability. Besides śūra 28 reads it in dual ending, therefore it is difficult to take
 it in the sense of simultaneous process of bheda-cum-saṅghāta. Thus his explanation
 is not at all convincing. This aphorism is not only difficult to understand but also
 the problem raised by Umaśvāti here is important in view of the Jaina concept of
 pudgala, therefore we shall attempt to tackle the problem to see what Umaśvāti!
 exactly meant to say in this aphorism.

 The theory of atomic combination is taken up prominently in the Bhagavati and
 Prajayāpana in the canon. The Jaina theerocticians in the Āgamic age developed a
 peculiar method of approaching a problem by way of certain anuyogadvāras or the
 points of inquiry, among which the most common set consists of dravya, kṣetra, kāla
 and bhāva. In discussing a certain problem, the Jaina theerocticians as a rule specify
 which kind of anuyogadvāra is applied to the problem in question, and go on to
 say that this problem is considered in this way from this point of view but it is
 considered in the other way from the other point of view. In dealing with the
 subject of atomic combination, they likewise posited or must have posited the
 problem by way of the anuyoga method, which is usually expressly mentioned but
 sometimes not at all mentioned particularly in some Bhagavati passages wherein the
 discussion of atomic combination falls. Among these four viewpoints of inquiry,
 the aspect by kāla is not directly concerned with our problem under consideration.
 Thus from the aspect of dravya, the theory of atomic combination can be discussed
 as to the composition and decomposition of the paramāṇus and skandhas. From the
 viewpoint of kṣetra, the problem can be discussed as to the union and disunion of
 pradeśas. And from the aspect of bhāva, it can be dealt with in relation to the
 transformation of the degrees of properties of the atoms and composites. Sometimes
 avyāgaanā anuyogadvāra is added to these three, but we can at present neglect this
 viewpoint in the context of our problem. We shall see below how the canonical authors
 handled the matter from these three standpoints, i.e., by dravya, kṣetra and bhāva.

 Firstly, from the viewpoint of dravya, the Bhagavati 12.4.444 (which develops
 the subject matter treated in 1.16.80) exhibits how many paramāṇus are combined
 into what kinds of skandhas, and how such skandhas are to be decomposed into what
 kinds of constituents by way of arithmetic computation as follows:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of loose atoms</th>
<th>Combination</th>
<th>Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of atoms in one composite</td>
<td>Number of divisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Likewise up to the cases of saṅkhyaeya, asaṅkhyaeya and ananta atoms.)

From the point of inquiry by kṣetra, the Bhagavati 5.7.214 discusses that an atom has no half, no middle and no pradeśa, that a composite of two atoms along with even numbered atoms has no middle but has halves and pradeśas, that a composite of three atoms along with odd numbered atoms has no half but has middle and pradeśas, and that a composite of saṅkhyaeya through ananta atoms has pradeśas but may or may not have halves and middle. Thus a concept is deduced that an atom (one pradeśa) has no part, no parts, but has a whole, and that a composite of two atoms (two pradeśas) has no parts, but has a part and a whole, and that a composite of three atoms onwards (three pradeśas onwards) has a part, parts and a whole. And the Bhagavati 5.7.215 tries to show how the nine possible types of combination of pradeśas (e.g., 1 pradeśa + 1 pradeśa) exhibit what kind or kinds of the mode of spatial combination considered in the nine possible ways (e.g., ‘part + part’ meaning ‘by a part, a part is touched,’ and ‘part + parts’ meaning ‘by a part, parts are touched.’ X indicates the occurrence of combination. pt-part, pts-parts, and w-whole) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pt+pt</td>
<td>pt+pts</td>
<td>pt+w</td>
<td>pts+pt</td>
<td>pts+pts</td>
<td>pts+w</td>
<td>w+pt</td>
<td>w+pts</td>
<td>w+w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 + 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 + 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 + 3 up to ananta</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 + 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 + 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 + 3 up to ananta</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3 + 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 + 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3 + 3 up to ananta</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Prājñāpanā Chs. 3 and 5 handle the problem of pradeśins in order to express the relative numerical strength of the concerned substances made up of paramāṇus and pradeśas. It should not be lost sight of that the Bhagavati 5.7.212 and 25.4 touch upon the motion and rest occurring in the atoms and composites as to their part, parts and whole (5.7.212) and by way of their fourfold aspects, i.e., dravya, kṣetra, kāla and bhāva (25.4). Then it is communicated in the Bhagavati 5.8.220 that an atom (dāvva ap padese) is necessarily one pradeśin (khettao niyamā appadese), that a composite of two atoms onwards (dāvvo sapadese) may be one pradeśin or two pradeśas onwards (khettao siya sapadese siya appadese), and that the one pradeśin substance (khettao appadese) may consist of an atom or a composite with two atoms onwards (dāvvo siya sapadese siya appadese).

From the standpoint of bhāva, the Bhagavati 8.9.345 discerns three kinds of saḍdi vīrasā bandha, i.e., bandha, bhājana and pariṇāma, the first of which is explained to be caused by the various degrees of snigdha and rūka guṇas. The degrees of guṇas such as snigdha are said, for instance, in the Prājñāpanā 5 to go through infinitefold transformations. The Bhagavati 20.5.667-668 show the possible modes of combination of the properties of skandhas by sūkṣma (which include the case of paramāṇa also) and by bādara. Likewise the Bhagavati 25.4 and Prājñāpanā 3.7 discuss about the numerical strength of guṇas possessed by the paramāṇus and skandhas. The Prājñāpanā 13.418 then enunciates a rule of atomic combination, "bāmṇa-parināma naṃ bhāme: kai-viha pannate? goyamā: du-viha pannate/ tam-jahā—niddha-bāmṇa-parināme, lukkha-bāmṇa-parināme ya/ sama-nidbhāye bādha na hoī sama-lokkhayāe vi na hoī vemāya-niddha-lukkhatthe na bādho u khamdhāram/ niddhiṣa niddheya dāyāhie naṃ lukkhasa lukkhena duvānie naṃ/ niddhassa lukkheya uvei bādho jahāṇa-vajjo visamā samā vā", from which the rule of combination expressed in the T.S. V:32-36 was deduced.

The atomists in the canonical age thus expressed the concept of atomic combination and division by the number of atoms by way of arithmetic computation from the viewpoint of dravya. For instance, three discrete atoms are combined into one composite, which can be decomposed in two ways, i.e., either into three discrete atoms or one loose atom plus one composite with two atoms. However the same composite consisting of three atoms is viewed differently from the aspect of kṣetra, for it can be one pradeśin, two pradeśas or three pradeśas. And when the composite is one pradeśin it is invisible as it is the size of an atom, and visibility arises in the case of a composite with two pradeśas onwards. From the aspect of bhāva, an atom and a composite with one pradeśa (called a sūkṣma pariṇata skandha) are allowed to have the properties of one colour, one smell, one taste and two touches (either one of snigda-rūka and either one of sita-ūṇa), of which degrees can be one up to infinite each. A composite with two pradeśas onwards (called a bālara pariṇata skandha) has full
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properties, namely, five colours, two smells, five tastes and eight touches, of which degrees can be likewise one up to infinite each. And the atomic combination proceeds according to the rule pronounced in the Prājñāpanā 13.418 above, for which the degrees of snigdha-rūka guṇas play an important role.

In this relation, Abhayadeva quotes certain gāthās in his commentary on the Bhagavatī 5.7.217, 'sāṃkōa-vikōa va, uvaramiśe' vāgāhanāe-vi/ tattiva-mitiṇām cia, cīra-m-pi davvāna' vatthānām/ saṃśhāya-bheyao vā, davvovaram puñāi saṃkhīte/ niṃā tad-davvogāhanāe nūso na samdeho/ ogāhaddā davve, saṃkōa-vikōya o avahaddhā/ na u davvām saṃkōana-vikōa-miṭṭamni sambaddham'. In commenting the first and the last gāthās above, Ratnasimhaśāri explains the concept of saṅkōa-vikōca stated therein in the Paramāṇukhaṇḍaśaṭṭhitākā (Ātmānanda Sabbath p. 4), 'vivakṣita-kṣetra-pradeśa-vyāpitāṃ nāma paramāṇūṇām-avagāhanā, tebhyo' lpatetraśu bahuśtārō ga kṣetra-pradeśeśu tāvatām-eva pūrgaśānaṃ sūṣkmi-bhvanām saṅkōcaḥ, spārhi-bhvanāṃ vikocih/tataś-ca saṅkōca-vikoycābhādhyām-avagāhanāya uparamo bhavatiḥ/... saṅkōcād-vikōcē ca paramāṇūṇām sūṣkma-parināmatayā nyonyānupravetāḥ saṅkōcaḥ sūṣkma-parināma-parinātānaṃ tu bādāra-parināmatayā bhvanām vikocah, tāu saṅkōca-vikōcau samāśrityeṣy arthāh'.

We can interpret the concept stated herein in the following way. Ten atoms, for instance, can be combined together in one up to ten pradeśas, but not in more than ten pradeśas. When these ten atoms are combined in one pradeśa, the mode of their spatial interpenetration is called sūkṣma pariṇāma, wherein the entire spatial unit of each atom is penetrated by the entire spatial unit of the other atoms as so described in the Bhagavatī 5.7.215. This mode of spatial interpenetration is expressed in terms of saṅkōca. When the same ten atoms are combined in two to ten skandha pradeśas, the mode of their spatial diffusion, in a skandha is called bādāra pariṇāma, which is expressed in terms of V.kōca. Various modes of their spatial diffusion have been already shown in the foregoing table of the same Bhagavatī passage. In another word, X number of atoms can be combined in two ways from the standpoint of kṣetra, i. e., (1) X atoms are combined in one pradeśa and (2) X atoms are combined in two to X pradeśas. X atoms are invisible in the former type of combination as the mode of their spatial combination is subtle, but they are visible in the latter type as the mode of their spatial combination is gross.

The Jainā is curiously silent about the function of śita-uṣṇa guṇas, either one of which is pronounced to be present in an atom along with either one of snigdha-rūka guṇas. It seems that śita-uṣṇa guṇas play an important role in the theory of atomic combination of the Jainas as the causes of saṅkōca-vikōca or interpenetration-diffusion of the spatial units of the atoms and composites, inasmuch as snigdha-
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rūkṣa guṇas serve here as the causes of the mutual attraction and actual coming together of the atoms and composites. It is not difficult to postulate that motion or vibration may occur to the atoms and composites when they are combined together to go through interpenetration or diffusion of their spatial units, which is assumed to be happening constantly in the natural phenomena. The foregoing Bhagavati statement of the motion and rest pertaining to the atoms and composites seems to be expressing the concept as such.

Now going back to our problem, proper, Umāsvāti discusses the problem of atomic combination in the context of pūdgala as follows:

V : 23–24 nature of pūdgala (viewed from the aspect of bhāva)
25–28 components
25 aṇu-skandha as components (dravya)
26 method of skandha formation (dravya)
27 method of aṇu formation (dravya)
28 cause of the perceptibility of skandha (kṣetra)
32–36 process of atomic combination (bhāva)

It is indisputable that Umāsvāti posited the problem in the same manner as the Āgamic theoreticians did. Thus from the standpoint of dravya, pūdgala is considered in terms of its components, namely, atoms and composites. And the production of the atoms and composites is logically posited from the same standpoint of dravya. Therefore the atoms are produced by the division of a composite, and the matter composites are produced by the combination of atoms, by the division of composites, and by the combination—cum—division of both atoms and composites. However, the perceptibility of a thing depends solely upon the number of its prādeśas with which the number of atoms constituting a composite has nothing to do. This is the standpoint of kṣetra, upon which ground Umāsvāti clarified in the Bhāṣya that the three methods of skandha formation do not apply to the law of the visibility of a thing. To explain the account further, the one pradeśi skandha is necessarily invisible. So the one pradeśi skandha consisting of two to infinite atoms does not have the capacity of raising palpability to the eye. Therefore, saṅghāta, bheda, and saṅghāra—bheda of two to ananta atoms taken place within one pradeśa is barren as to its potency of imparting perceptibility. Perceptibility arises in the two pradeśa skandhas onwards, thus only the number of pradeśas of a composite is responsible for the rise of the palpability or the dimension of a thing. In another words, the sūtra V:28, ‘bheda—saṅghārabhyāṃ cākṣusāh,’ has to be understood in the sense that the visibility of a thing arises due to the division and combination of the pradeśa components, i.e., atoms and composites. The union or disunion of the pradeśas of matter components alone is competent to manifest the visibility of a skandha to the eye. It is significant that the simultaneous process of
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saṅghāta-cum-bheda in skandha formation is dropped here, because from the viewpoint of kṣetra it is looked at as the two phenomena of saṅghāta and bheda.

The canonical authors treated one and the same problem from the entirely different angles of dravya, kṣetra, bhāva and kāla. And since the viewpoint of kṣetra itself gives a solution to the problem of the origination of the palpability of a thing, they did not need to bother about positing this problem. But Umapātī (who was considerably affected in arranging the topics on pudgala and satsāmānya by the contents discussed in the Vaiśeṣikasūtra 4.1) obviously considered it worthwhile to be aphorized in order to distinguish its Jaina view from that of the non-Jainas, for instance, the Vaiśeṣika view which maintains, 'saṅkhyaḥ parimāṇī pṛthakvam sanyoga-vibhāga pariṇāparatva kūmā ca rūpi-dravya-samavāyāt cākṣuṣāni (Vaiśeṣikasūtra 4.1.12)'. Neither the number of atoms nor their size have the capacity to produce visibility of a thing according to the Jainas. And such a way of positing a problem, i.e., by dravya, kṣetra, etc., must have been taken for granted as to any types of problems in the canonical tradition, and perhaps for this reason Umapātī did not feel the need of further exposition on this matter and thereby imparted a very brief commentary on it. All the commentators on the T. S. failed in their attempt of comprehending this aphorism and its exposition, because the need of positing the problem in such a way did not exist in the thinking pattern of the Jainas. This sūtra V:28 is impossible to be understood without its Bhāṣya exposition, which demonstrates that it was composed by the same aphorist.

Part 3 Treatment of dhyāna

The role of dhyāna is weighty in the Jaina monastic praxis, because liberation is said to be impossible to be achieved without it, however having been subordinated to tapas it never gained an independent position in the monastic conduct of the Jainas in the canonical stage. This is precisely so because of the ontological ground of Jainism consisting of the two principles of the soul and the matter, wherein the disintegration of them aimed at for mokṣa is assumed to be achieved mainly by the rigorous practice of tapas, for which the last two stages of śukla dhyāna constitute a part, and dharma dhyāna and the first two subdivisions of śukla dhyāna are the mere aids. The auxiliary position of dhyāna in the ascetic practice of Jaṅnaism thus differs greatly from its position held in Buddhism wherein the original teachings of Buddha of Duḥkha-kṣaya were formulated on the ground of the way of meditation practice.

The dependent position of dhyāna to tapas in the canon was likewise received by Umapātī. However he spared nearly 1/3 of the total aphorisms in Ch. IX for the exposition of dhyāna, and while bringing this subject matter into prominence, he added to it certain features which were previously unknown, i.e., the definition of dhyāna and the dhyātās' gradation in the scheme of guṇasthāna. He did it in order to
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discriminate the Jaina concept of dhyāna from that maintained by the other systems, and in so doing he introduced these new features into the Jaina system. A treatment on dhyāna made in the T.S. immediately attracted his successors, who made further efforts to develop what was worked out by Umāsvāti to the effect that Jaina yoga came to be established as an independent branch by the end of the medieval period. In view of this, his treatment of dhyāna requires a critical examination, which is going to be attempted in the following.

The Jaina canon classifies dhyāna into four types, i.e., ārta, raudra, dharma and śukla, which are each subdivided into four kinds. The first two types are excluded from the consideration of dhyāna in the non-Jaina systems, and the last two subdivisions of śukla dhyāna i.e., sūkṣmakriyā and samuechinnakriyā, which aim at the total karmic destruction by way of yoga-nīrodha are peculiar to the Jainas alone, that do not again fall in the category of dhyāna in the normal usage of its term. Samuechinnakriyā is the state of dhyāna revealed in the immediate sequel of sūkṣmakriyā, therefore it is called dhyāna in the nominal sense alone, which does not involve in essence any effort for its performance. The content of Jaina dhyāna is thus very peculiar by itself jumbling together the non-dhyāna elements in its ordinary sense of term. The first two subdivisions of śukla dhyāna, i.e., prthaktva vitarka and ekatva vitarka, correspond to the beginning stages of sāmprajñāta samādhi in the Yoga system and to the rudimentary stages of the first dhyāna of the Buddhists. This indicates that the Jainas did not attach that much importance to the practice of dhyāna in the Ṛgmic period in comparison with the non-Jainas who developed the elaborate methods of meditation scheme.

It is not impossible to trace how these contents stated above came to be established under the category of dhyāna in the canon. The Sūtrakṛtā I. II. 26-28 read, ‘te ya bhuyadagam ceva tam-uddissā ya jām kaḍām/ bhoccā jhānām jhiyāyanti akheyyannasamāhiyā/ jahā dhamkā ya kamkā ya kulala māggukā sihi/ macchesanaṁ jhiyāyanti jhānām te kālūṣadhamanāṁ/ ēven tu samaṇa ege mīchhadditāṁ anāriyā/ viśeṣaṁ jhiyāyanti kaṁkā va kalusāhamā.’ The mental activity of a sinful kind is here already expressed by the term dhyāna, which denotes nothing more than a manoyo in the later term. This soon prepared the rise of raudra and ārta classes in the Sūtrakṛtā II.2.9, ‘ahāvare atṭhame kirīya-ṭhāne ajjhatta-vattie tti āhijjit/ se jahā-nāmae kei purise natthi ṇam kei kim-ci visaṃvādei sayam-eva hine dine duṭṭhe duṭṭame ohaya-mana-ṣāṅkappe cinta-soga-sāgarā-sampavīṭhe karayala-palhattha-muhe atṭa-jhāṇovagac bhūmiṣya-dīṭṭhe jhiyāi...’ In the course of time, these two dhyānas came to be considered in relation to avrata, and mental activity brooding over the objects of parigraha and abraham came to be called ārta dhyāna, and that over the objects of the first four avrata came to be called raudra dhyāna as their subdivisions evince.

Śuṣukla-śukla dhyāna practised by Mahāvīra is described in the Sūtrakṛtā I. 6. 16-17 in connection with the total destruction of karmas, ‘aṅuttaram dharmam-ūraittā
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ānuttaram jñātā varām jhīyā/ susukka-sukkam apagandha-sukkam samkh-īndu-egamavādāyā- sukkam! ānuttaram paramam maheshi asasa-kammān sa visokirtā/siddhiṃ gae sām- avāpa-patte nāgya sileya ya damavāņa. Here is hovering a traditional belief that the fire of pure meditation burns up the last karmas without residue, and the concept of the last two stages of śukla dhyāna must have been developed from these passages. Mahāvīra adopted dhyāna praxis along with the other severe penances, which were the common practices pursued in the then śramaṇic circles, and he is often narrated to have been engaged in contemplation in the earliest part of the canon, for instance, in the Ācārānga 1. 9. 512 and 520. And when dhyāna or yoga came to be sanctioned as the direct method of achieving mokṣa in the other religious systems, the Sūrakṣita passages above must have won an invariable position in the Jaina scheme of dhyāna as the immediate cause for the final release.

Jumbling these elements together, the Jainas also developed their own classification of dhyāna. The fourfold divisions of dhyāna accompanied by the fourfold subdivisions each are enumerated in the Bhagavati 25.8.802, Sthāna 4.1.308 and Aupāpatika 19, the contents of the former two texts of which are exactly identical. These texts talk about lakṣāṇa regarding the subdivisions of ārta and raudra dhyānas, and lakṣāna, ālambana and anupreksā regarding the subdivisions of dharma and śukla dhyānas, which are disregarded in the treatment of dhyāna in the T.S. On the other hand, the T.S. adds in contribution two main new features, namely, the definition of dhyāna and the dhyātās’ gradation ın the scheme of guṇaśṭhānas.

Dhyāna is defined in IX : 27, ‘uttama-saṭhananasyaiṅkāgra-cintā-nirodho dhyānam’, of which duration is stated in the succeeding sūtra 28, ‘ā muhurtāt’. These two aphorisms are combined into one in the text of Pūjyasadda, ‘uttama-saṭhananasyaiṅkāgra-cintā-nirodho dhyānam ā antarmuhurtāt (27)’. The definition of dhyāna offered by Umāśvāti thus includes three different categories, i.e. its definition proper, the physical prerequisite of a dhyā and the duration of dhyāna. The source of its time duration is difficult to be traced in the canonical code, and it was likely formulated by Umāśvāti against the different views held by the other schools. The requirement of the best joints for dhyātās is likewise absent in the Āgamic source, which must have been again offered by Umāśvāti with the dhyātās of the highest stages in mind. The Bhāṣya understands ‘uttama-saṭhanana’ to mean the first two divisions of joints, i.e., vajra-bha-nārāca and asūra-vajra-nārāca, which is extended to the third division of joints called nārāca in the Sarvarthasiddhi. Dhyāna is defined as ‘ekāgra-cintā-nirodhaḥ’ which is said in the Bhāṣya to denote two separate contents, i.e., ekāgra-cintā and nirodha, but to denote one content in all the other commentaries on the T. S. in both traditions. We shall see how this definition of dhyāna was formulated by Umāśvāti.

Then, sūkṣmakriyā and samucchinnakriyā dhyānas are described in the Uttarādhīyayana 29.71-72, kevala-nāma-damsaya samuppādei jāva sayogi bhavai ||71|| aha auyam pālairā āmtomuhutt-addhavasese joga- niroham karemāne-sulunakriyam appadivāṁ sukkhajjāntam jhayamānē tap-paṭhamayānē mana-jogam nirumhāi vai-jogam nirumhāi, kāya-jogam nirumhāi, ānupāna-nirohaṃ karei/ isi-pamca-rahas-akkar-uccaraṇaaddha ya nam ayagē samucchinnakriyam aniyatti-sukkhajjāntam jhiyamānē veyanijjām auyam namām gottam ca ee cattāri kammānte jugavam khavei ||72|| Here the performance of a sayogi kevali and ayoga kevali is identified with that of the last two stages of śukla dhyāna, which had never been so done in the other canonical texts such as Prajñāpāramitā 36 and Aupāpatika that describe the final performance of these kevalis approaching towards the final release. The Uttarādhīyayana 29.72 above describes sūkṣmakriyā dhyāna as involving the performance of bringing the threefold yogas into cessation.

Two contents of dhyāna offered by Umapāti are ‘ekāgra-cintā’ and ‘niroda’. The Yogasūtra I 2 defines yoga, ‘yogas-citta-vṛti-nirodhah,’ from which the Jaina concept of dhyāna greatly differs. According to the Śāmic classification of dhyāna, the last two stages of śukla pertain to kevalis’ yoga-niroda, while the rest involve themselves with various mental activities, sinful or otherwise. Umapāti therefore discerned these two types of dhyāna in tradition, and offered the definition of ‘ekāgra-cintā’ to the ārta through the first two stages of śukla, and ‘niroda’ to the last two stages of śukla. ‘Ekāgra-cintā’ was apparently derived from the Uttarādhīyayana passage of ‘ezagga-mana-sannivesanaya’ or ‘mana-samāhāraṇa’ while replacing manas by cintā.

Then, ‘niroda’ which is meant as the definition of kevalis’ dhyāna was derived from the Uttarādhīyayana 29.28 and 29.72. In the T.S. IX:42, Umapāti specifies that sūkṣmakriyā is performed by a kevali possessed of kāya-yoga and samucchinnakriyā by an ayoga kevali. Samucchinnakriyā is the stage wherein manifested is the state.
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of an ayoga kevali who has just accomplished videha-mukti or the final release. Therefore the statement that its dhyañā is an ayoga kevali precisely represents the canonical view of this dhyañā, which involves no problem. However the concept of sukṣmākriyā expressed by Umāsvātī that it is the preformance of kāya-yoga-nirodha comes into conflict with the Uttarādhyañavāna 29.72 which says that it is the performance of yoga-nirodha in three forms. While formulating his own idea or sukṣmākriyā dhyañā, Umāsvātī seems to have taken recourse to the Uttarādhyañavāna passage of ‘kāya-samāhāraṇa’ saying that collection of kāyayoga alone leads one to mokṣa but not the collection of mental and vocal activities (29.55-58). It should be reminded here that Umāsvātī altered the order of threefold yogas into kāya-vāk-manas in the T.S. VI:1 from the usual order of mano-vāk-kāya. It is however difficult to widen the said concept of kāya-yoga-nirodha as inclusively expressive of the nirodha of all the threefold yogas beginning with kāyayoga, because it invites technical difficulties involved with the other established concepts in this connection. According to Umāsvātī, a sayoga kevali thus performs the third stage of sukla dhyañā immediately after completing the process of bringing his subtle activities of mind and speech into cessation which takes place after the performance of samudghēta.

The Uttarādhyañavāna 30.35 reads, ‘atīra-ruddāṇi vajīttā, jhājjā susamāhīeldhamma-sukkāmm jhānām, jhānām tam tu buhā vaev’, which finds an expression in the T.S. IX:30 (29) that the last two dhyañās alone are the causes of mokṣa. And since dhyañā which is a part of tapas is here taken up in the context of śaṁvara and nirjarā, ārta and raudra dhyañās do not fall in the context in question. The definition of dhyañā offered in IX:27-28 which contains three different categories, i.e. the dhyañās’ physical prerequisite of the best joints, the definition of chyāra proper and the duration of dhyañā, must be therefore primarily formulated in view of mokṣamārga. But here he brought in all the four types of dhyañā in the canon, perhaps in order to distinguish the Jaina concept of dhyañā from that of the other schools. This invited ambiguity by leaving an impression that the said definition is applicable to all the types of dhyañā. Or as we have previously understood and as so also understood by the later authors on dhyañā, Umāsvātī might have desired to extend the said blanket definition to them all, because ‘ekāgra-cintā’ surely applies to ārta and raudra dhyañās also. And even if we exclude these two lower types from the said definition of dhyañā, the proviso of uttama-saṁśāranana (which certainly is over too narrow to be applied to the two lower types) is over narrow to be applied to the class of dhrama dhyañā, which led Pūjyaṇāda to expand its content up to the third division of joints. Neither Umāsvātī lucidly expresses that ‘ekāgra-cintā’ is applicable to those in chadmaṣṭha and ‘kāya-nirodha’ to kevalis, as these are aphorized in one compound in singular ending. This obscure expression invited a misunderstanding as so evinced in the commentaries on the T. S. in both traditions. These unhappy points are therefore bound to face improvements, of which task was vested in his successors.
In the Āvasyaka niryukti 1477, Bhadrabāhu offers a definition of dhārāṇa in Chadmāsthā after Uṃāsvāti by dropping the proviso of the best joints, ‘antamukalācara citta-saṃrddhām pavāya jhānam/tam puna atītam ruddha dhammaṃ sukkaṃ ca nayaṃvaṃ.’

In its gāthā 1481 onwards, however, he expresses a dissatisfaction about Uṃāsvāti’s idea of sūkṣma-kriyā dhārāṇa to be the performance of kāya-yoga-nirodha in three kinds, ‘tattva u bhājīja koi jhānam jo mānasā pariṇāmo/ tam na havai jina-dithām jhānam tivihe-vi jogam/1481// kāe-vi ya ajihappam vāyā manassā cēva jaha hoī kāya-vaya-māno-juttam tiviham ajihappam-anhāvam//484// jai egaggam cittaṃ dhrāyāvo vā nirumbhāvo vā-vi jhānam hoinamu tahe īares-vi deva-em-eval/1485//. He emphatically explains then that vāg-yoga-nirodha also falls in the domain of dhārāṇa. His criticism in the first half of the gāthā 1481 is obviously directed against Patañjali’s definition of yoga, and a similar criticism against it pervades in the works of his successors.

Bhadrabāhu is quite right in proposing this amendment by representing the canonical view described in the Uttarādhvayana 29.72. It is interesting to see however that his proposal faces a doom to be turned down by Jinabhādra who offers a full support to Uṃāsvāti’s view in his Viśeṣavāya-kabāra, ‘sudaṛṣa-aṇuyatra-vvāśrāṃ nirodha va vijjamāṇam/jhānam karāṇa matam na tu cita-nirodha-mettā yam/3669// hoja na maṇomāyam vāyiyam va jhānam jinasa tad-abhāve/ kāya-nirodha-payattassa bhāvaṃ-iha ka nivāreti ?/3670// āhābhāve maṇasā chaṭumāṭhassa-eva tam na jhānam se/ adha tad-abhāve vi matam jhānam to kiṇṇa suttasā/3672// juttam jām chaṭumāṭhassa-karāṇa-mettā’ nusāri-nānassā tad-abhāvānni payattabhāvo na jinasa so jutto/3675// chaṭumāṭhassa mano-mettā-vihārajattassa jati matam jhānam/kidha tam na jinasa matam kevala-vihiita-payattassa/3676// Jinabhādra explains this point again in his Jhānajjhayaṇa 83–34, ‘nivvā ra-gamva-kāle, kevalino dara-niruddha-jogassa suhumakriyā’ naiṭṭīṃ, taiddīm taṇukāya-kiriyassā/ tass-eva ya selesīṃ gavassa selesu va nippakampassā/vuccinākkiram-appadī-vāim jhānam parama-sukkaṃ.’ Also he attempts to remove the ambiguity created by Uṃāsvāti, thus he says in the Jhānajjhayaṇa 2–3 in his own words that ‘ekāgra-cintā’ applies to Chadmāsthās and ‘nirodha’ to kevalis, ‘jām tthiran-ajihvasē, tam jhānam jām calam tayam cittaṃ/ tam hūjja bhāvanā vā, anupehā vā have cintā/ antamukātutta-mittam. citta-tathāgam-egār-viṇṇuni/ chaṭumāṭhānam jhānam, joga-niroho jinām tu.’ He followed Bhadrabāhu in removing the proviso of uttama-saṃbhana, and the definition of dhārāṇa thus improved by Jinabhādra came to be generally accepted by the later Jaina authors.

Yet here is Agastyaśimha who wants to say something about the Jhānajjhayaṇa treatment of dhārāṇa, because his cūrtī on the Daśāvaikālikā (Prākrit Text Society ed., p.16) reads, ‘iddānā jhānam/tassā imam sāṃjñām lakkañham-egagg-cintā-niroho jhānam ...egaggassa cintā egagg-cintā, etam jhānam chaṭumāṭhassa; niroho kevalino jogassa, cintā narihi tti kevalino tan-niroho na sambhaviṇ ‘tti keti, tam na, dāvamaṇa-niroho tissi bhūtita, jai egagg-cintā jhānam tato joga-niggho sutarām-eval je puna
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bhāvanā- “egago-cintā-niroho jhānām” ti etam na ghaḍate kevalino, ābhinībhojya-bhedo cintā tī, tamāḥ “dādham-ajjhavasānam jhānām”-iti, te avidita-viggaḥa-bhedā sutta-dūṣaneṇam buddhi-māhappam-ābhilasamai, pariphegu jampiyan, dādham-ajjhavasāo etam vīsesena cintā-rūvam, ko etas a jjhavasāto? yad-uttam kā cintā? takkādato savve ābhinībhojya-nāṣa-bhedā pādhītā tatvārthel kāla-nirohi ā muhuttāto.... The point of Agastyasimha’s criticism on the Jñānajñhayana is not quite clear, but from the way of his argument that kevali’s yoga-nirodha involves dravya-mano-nirodha, he seems to suggesting that sūkṣmākiṛā is the performance of yoga-nirodha in three kinds (because their cessation proceeds in the order of mind, speech and body). This he seems to be insisting on in support of Umāsvāti’s position. In that case, his understanding of the T.S. treatment of sūkṣmākiṛā is confused. Also it is strange that Agastyasimha understand cintā in the sense of the synonym of ābhinibodhika jñāna by way of quoting the T.S.

These are the immediate reactions expressed by the post-Umāsvāti authors to the obscure definition of dhyāna proposed by Umāsvāti and its improvement made by Jinabhadra came to be generally welcomed by his successors. The proviso of uttama-samhanana was naturally removed from its definition, but the time duration of antarmuhurta was generally retained. These authors unanimously accepted the traditional classification of the four kinds of dhyāna after Umāsvāti, and gave the definition of ‘ekāgara-cintā’ to ārta andraudravya dhyānas as well. Hemacandra was the first author who removed these two types from the category of dhyāna in his Yogasāstra, which is a sure improvement on Umāsvāti’s treatment that has been waited for too long.

The non-Jaina schools provide the stages of dhyāna or samādhi, for instance, the Yogasūtra lists fourfold samprajñāta samādhis and asamprajñāta samādhi, and the Abhidharmakosa enumerates upapatti and samāpatti of which steps and stages are therein elaborately worked out. The Āgamic classification and subclassification of dhyāna are made on the basis of the objects of concentration, excluding the case of sūkla dhyāna wherein the first two stages are arranged in the progressive order towards the advancement of mental concentration, and the last two stages are arranged in the progressive order towards mokṣa. Perhaps for this reason, a necessity was felt by Umāsvāti to arrange them according to the stages of the progress of meditation as so done in the non-Jaina schools, and guṇāsthāna was seized for this purpose. As already mentioned, the Uttarādhyayana 29.72 already identifies the dhyātās of the last two stages of Sūkla dhyāna with the sayoga kevali and the ayoga kevali who are the saints in the last two guṇāsthānas. This was so done because of the peculiarities of these dhyānas known to be performed by kevalis alone, but not due to the conscious attempt to arrange the meditators of these dhyānas in their specific guṇāsthānas. Umāsvāti performed this task of assigning the meditators of fourfold dhyānas to the proper guṇāsthānas by drawing the existent materials in the Āgama as we see below.
We have earlier mentioned that the Bhagavati, Sthāna and Aupapātika to uchupon the lakṣāṇas of dhyāna subdivisions, which are dropped from Umāsvāti’s treatment of dhyāna. These are as follows; 1) ārta: kamdaṇḍayā, soyaṇḍayā, tipaḍayā, paridevaṇyā, 2) raudra: osamaṇa-Jose, bahula-da, annaṇa-da, āmaratāma-da, 3) dharma: ānā-rui, nisagga-r, sutta-r, ogādha-r, and 4) śukla: avvāhe, asammohe, vivege, viussagge. The Prajīnāpanā 1.74 classifies sarāga-damsanāriyās into ten types, i.e. nisagga-rui, uvaesa-r, ānā-r, sutta-r, biya-r, abhigama-r, vitthāra-r, kirīyā-r, samṭevas-r, and dhamma-r. The first three lakṣāṇas of dharma dhyāna find their corresponding types here in the classification of sarāga-darsāna-āryas. The 4th lakṣāna called avagārā-ruci meaning inclination towards the deep study of scriptures may correspond to type of ārya called abhigama-ruci above.

The Prajīnāpanā 1.71 further classifies viyarāya-damsanāriyā into two, i.e., uvasamta-kaśāya and khyā-kaśāya, of which the latter is further divided into two i.e., chaumatttha-khyākaśāya and kavali-kṣipakasāya. Herein chaumatttha-khyākaśāya is again of two types, i.e., sayambuddha and buddha-bohiya; and kevali-khyākaśāya is also of two types, i.e., sayogi-kevali and ayogi-kevali. The four lakṣāṇas of śukla dhyāna enumerated in the texts such as Bhagavati do not find here the corresponding four types in vitarāga-daraśana-āryas, nevertheless these lakṣāṇas are self-explanatory that these belong to the class of vitarāga-daraśana-āryas alone, but to no others. The Prajīnāpanā 1.76 continues to say that sarāga-cārita-āryas are of two types, i.e., sūkṣma-samparāya and bādara-samparāya, who belong to the 10th and 9th guṇasthāna in the list of 14 stages. Summing up all these accounts, the performers of dharma dhyāna according to these Āgamic texts fall in the 9th and 10th stages, and those of śukla dhyāna in the 11th stage onwards.

The compass of the stages of dharma dhyāna above does not exactly agree with that offered by Umāsvāti who might have used some other materials which escaped our sight or which are no more available to us. The source materials used for allotting the stages of ārta and rađra dhyānās are difficult to be traced, but these are logically assignable with the basic knowledge of avratas and guṇasthānas. Systematizing the Āgamic literature on this subject, Umāsvāti assigns the meditators of rađra dhyāna to the 1st through the 5th stages, those of ārta to the 1st through the 6th stages those of dharma to the 7th through the 12th stages, and those of śukla to the 11th through the 14th stages, of which the performers of the first two subdivisions to the 11th and the 12th stages, those of the 3rd subdivision to the 13th stage, and those of the 4th subdivision to the 14th stage. The 11th and 12th guṇasthānas are thus shared by the meditators of dharma dhyāna and by the meditators of the first two stages of śukla dhyāna, who are necessarily the pūrvavids. (Umāsvāti does not know the full list of 14 stages, neither he calls them in terms of numerical series, therefore the corresponding stages of meditators expressed here for the sake of convenience and clarification).
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The text of Pūjayāpaḍa drops the portion of dhyātā from the sūtra 37 along with the succeeding sūtra 38 of the Śvetāmbara recension. Consequently, no statement is made in the Digambara text as to the authorized performers of dharmya dhyāṇa, of which explanation must be supplied by the commentaries. The Sarvārthastādhi on the aphorisms (36-37) explains that the meditators of dharmya dhyāṇa belong to the 4th through the 7th stages prior to the ascendance of śreṇis. Here arises a discordance between the two recensions of text, which however does not mean the doctrinal divergence between the two traditions, because the Dwāvalā 13/5.4.26/14/10 is in perfect agreement with the view held by the Śvetāmbara tradition. Pūjayāpaḍa, who is thoroughly familiar with 14 guṇasthānas and the concept of karuṇas involving two śreṇis, insists that dharmya dhyāṇa cannot be performed in the stages beyond the ascendance of śreṇi. However it is not at all clear what is the exact reason underlying this rule of prohibition, because commenting the sūtra (37) he permits the performance of dharmya dhyāṇa to the possessors of the pūrvās in the 11th and 12th stages, “ca śabdena dharmymapi samuccayate/ tatra “vyākhyānato viṣeṣa-partipattikḥ” iti śreṇyāroh māt-prāñ-dharmyam, śreṇyōh śukle iti vyākhyāyate.” His statement is doubtlessly confused and contradicted. His position is defended by Akalanāka under the sūtra (36), “kaścid-āha-upaśānta-kṣīnāmohā-kṣāyayoṣ-ca dharmyam dhyāṇam bhavati na pūrveṣam evet; tan-na; kim kāraṇam? śuklaḥ-vāja-prasaṅgāt/14/ syād-etat- ubhayaḥ dharmyaḥ śuklaṁ copāśānta-kṣīnakaśāyayo-astiti? tan-na; kim kāraṇam? pūrvaḥ pūrvaḥ śṛṇyo-νeṣyate ṣrēṣṭe, pūrveṣu cesyate /15/ (36).” The defence is made in a miserably poor manner. This obviously explains that Akalanāka was also unable here to find a logical reason for the creation of the border line of śreṇis beyond which belongs to the domain of śukla dhyātās.

Umaśāvāti utilized the existing canonical materials and systematically arranged the respective dhyātās in the corresponding guṇasthānas after the model of the treatment of dhyāṇa made in the non-Jaina circles. His table can impart a general idea as to which type of dhyātās falls in approximately which collective stages of guṇasthāna. However, the canonical classification and subclassification of dhyāṇa are on the whole schemed according to the objects of meditation, therefore the gradation of dhyāṇa and dhyātās in the orderly stages as so worked out by the non-Jaina requires the total reclassification of dhyāṇa itself in the canon. Haribhadra approached this problem from the entirely different angle and established his own scheme of the stages of dhyātās under the influence of the non-Jaina yoga. Some authors solved this problem by way of introducing the four steps of pada, piḍa, rūpa, and arūpa to dharmya dhyāṇa under the influence of the Śaiva yoga. The treatment of the stages of dhyāṇa thus gave rise to new approaches in the post-Umaśāvāti period.

As we have observed in the texts like the Bhagavatī dhyāṇa had already met a semi-systematic treatment regarding its lakṣaṇa, ālambana and anuprektā in the later Āgamic stage, which Umaśāvāti did not adopt. Jinabhādra revived this canonical
Sec. 3. SOME PROBLEMS IN THE T.S.

treatment of ālambana to dharma dhyāna in his Jhānajñhayana, the first elaborate prakāra on the Jaina dhyāna, which initiated its further development. This subject matter attracted the Jainas in both traditions, which continued to develop while much assimilating the non-Jaina elements until it finally established itself as the scheme of Jaina yoga which is represented by the works of Haribhadra, Ṣubhacandra, Hemacandra, and so on. Theoretical development of the concept of yoga must have given a considerable impact on the actual methods of yoga practice. Umāsvāti's treatment of dhyāna made in the T.S. prepared for this direction, and his performance, even though exhibiting some defective treatments, should be evaluated as a whole highly meritorious in this historical purview.

Part 4 Jivasamāsa, mārgaṇāsthāna and guṇaṇaṅthāna

14 jivasamāsas, 14 mārgaṇāsthānas and 14 guṇaṇaṅthānas by which media the karma doctrine is expounded make their first appearance in the Śaṭkhandāgama in the standardized form. These three sthānas are reckoned at the outset of its first book called Śaṃkaraśāstutṣṭajī which are planned to be explained in the beginning several books from the viewpoint of eight anuyogaadvāras, i.e., sat, dravya (sānkhyā), kṣetra, sparśaṇa, kāla, antara, bhāva and alpabahutva. Umāsvāti does not know the designations of these three Sthānas nor is he acquainted with their complete lists. However the T.S. exhibits a good knowledge of them, and it may not be idle to inquire how far these 14 sthānas had been developed by the time of Umāsvāti in order to estimate the temporal distance between the T.S. and the Śaṭkhandāgama (and between the Kaśyapa-prābhṛtya and the T.S. at the same time).

Jivasamāsa is a classification of samsāri jivas who are arranged from the lowest order to the highest according to the number of their sense organs. The list thus consists of the subtle one-sensed beings (1), gross one-sensed beings (2), two to four-sensed beings (3–5), five-sensed beings without mind (6), and five-sensed beings with mind (7), who are each classified into the underdeveloped and the developed. The classes of jivas as such are known to the later Āgamic texts, for instance, the Jivājivābhīṣaga, wherein the crystallization in this form is not yet attained. The T.S. Ch. II shows a similar classification of jivas, which however does not adopt paryāpta–aparyāpta divisions that are extensively used in the canon. Umāsvāti must have represented in T.S. the then most advanced and prevalent classification method of the beings, from which the final formulation into 14 jivasamāsas expressed in the Śaṭkhandāgama is a matter of time.

The T.S. 1:8 Bh. enumerates 13 mārgaṇāsthānas which are called by the name of anuyogaadvāras, i.e., gati (1), indriya (2), kāya (3) yoga (4), kaśāya (6), veda (5), leśyā (10), samyakta (12), jāna (7), darśana (9), cāritra (8), āhāra (14), and upayoga
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(13). Bhavya or the 11th mārgaṇāsthāna is missing in this list, and upayoga of the 13th sthāna here is replaced by samjñā in the Satkhandāgama. Umāsvāti's list is thus short of the 11th sthāna and exhibits some difference in the arrangement of items. The T. S. I : 8 counts eight anuyogadvāras which are employed in the beginning books of the Satkhandāgama in the same order (Anuyogadvāra 102 counts nine with the addition of bhāga). Umāsvāti directs the readers to apply these thirteen mārgaṇā sthānas to samyagdārśana from the standpoint of these eight anuyogadvāras, of which exposition is called sadbhūtapadaparūpāṇī inasmuch as the Satkhandāgama designates it samaparūpāṇa and so on. It is thus undeniable that the crystallization of 14 mārgaṇāsthānas took place well-nigh soon after the completion of the T. S.

It has been already shown that Umāsvāti employed guṇasthānas in order to express the gradation of the stages of dhyātās as so done in the non-Jaina circles. This is a sure indication that the concept of guṇasthāna had been well developed by that time, even though its designation and the numerical identification of its stages were not yet known. Guṇasthānas are reckoned in the T. S. in relation to pariñāhājaya, dhyāna and nirjara of karmas. IX : 10-12, 35-38 and 40 count the following stages: avirata (4), deśavirata (5), pramattasamjñata (6), bādarasamparāya (9), śūkṣmasamparāya (10), upasāntakāsāya (11), kṣīnakāsāya (12), (also chandmasthavitarāga, 11-12), kevali or jina (13-14). IX : 47 lists samyagdṛṣṭi (4), śrāvaka (5), virata (6-7), anāntanubandhipiyovikarā (4-8), darśanamohakṣapaka (8-10) mohopāśamaks (8-10, 11; on the śreni), upasātamoha (11), mohakṣapaka (8-10, 12; on the śreni), kṣīnamoha (12) and jin (13-14), wherein karmic purge is said to increase by innumerable times more in each stage in comparison with that in the preceding one. The Kaśyaprābhātī 1.14 lists; samyaktva, deśavirata, samyjña, darśanamohopāśamana, cāritramohopāśamana (i.e., bādarāja and śūkṣma samparāja, 14.121-122), darśanamohakṣapana and cāritramohakṣapana. This clearly demonstrates the proximity of distance between this text and the T. S.

The first stage of mithyātva and the third stage of samyagmithyātva had since long existed in the canon. However the 2nd stage of sāsvādana was perhaps not at all known to Umāsvāti together with certain karaṇas involving śrenis such as the antara karaṇa. Saṅkramaṇa which involves the concept of śrenis is mentioned in the T. S. Thus excluding sāsvādana stage, all the rest of the guṇasthānas must have been known to Umāsvāti. The Samavāya 14.48 imparts a full list of 14 items, i.e., micchadītthi, sasāyānasamaddhi, sammāmicchadītthi, avirayasamaddhi, virayāviraye, pamattasamjñae, appamattasamjñae, niṣṭabha, anīṣṭabha, suhumasamparā, (uvasaṁmae or, khavae or), uvasaṁtamohe, kṣīnamoh, sajogikevali and ajogikevali.

Stages 1-7 excluding the 2nd are found in the Āgama like the Bhagavatī, for instance, its 18.1.6 lists samyagdṛṣṭi (4), mithyādṛṣṭi (1) and samyagmithyādṛṣṭi (3). Its 18.1.7 has the list of saṁyata (6-7), asaṁjñata (4) and saṁyata-saṁyata (5), and
its 1.1.16 asaṁyata or āvirati, pramattasamyata (6) and apramattasamyata (7). These classifications are based on the types of darśana and saṁyama, both of which are the important ethical topics discussed since the time of the Ācārānga I and the Sūtrakṛti I. The Prajñāpana I.65-77 impart a full classification of āriyas as follows:

āriya

1. ājñāhippatāriya
   arahāmī, cakkavaṭṭi, baladeva, vāsudeva, cāraṇā, vijjāharā

2. an ājñāhippatāriya
   khettāriya, jālāriya, kulāriya, kammāriya, sippāriya, bhāsāriya, nṛṇāriya, damśanāriya, carittāriya

damśanāriya

1. saṅga d.
   nisaggaru, uvasa r., ānā r.. sutta r., biya r., abhigama r., vithāra r., kirīya r.. saṃkheva r., dhamma r.

2. viyarāga d.
   1. uvasaṁtakasāya v. by time division: (1) paḍhamasamayā u. v., apaḍhamasamayā u. v., (2) caṛimasamayā u. v., acarimasamayā u. v.

2. kiṇakasāya v.
   1. chaumattha k. v.
      1. sayaṁbuddha e. k. v.
   by two time divisions.

2. buddhabohiya c. k. v.

2. kevali k. v.
   1. Sayogi k. k. v.
   each by two time divisions.

2. ayogi k. k. v.

carittāriya

(1) 1. saṅgaocraticāriya
   1. bāyarasamparāya s. c. [9th stage] (1) by two time divisions.
   (2) paḍīvāi, āpaḍīvāi

2. suhumaṁparāya s. c. [10th] (1) by two time divisions.
   (2) saṃkileṣsamāṇā, visujjhamāṇā

2. viyarāgaocraticāriya
   1. uvasaṁtakasāya v. c. [11th] by two time divisions.

2. kiṇakasāya v. c.
   1. chaumattha k. v. c. [12th]
      1. sayaṁbuddha c. k. v. c.
      each by two time divisions.

2. buddhabohiya c. k. v. c.
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2. kevali k. v. c.
   1. sayogi k. k. v. c. [13th] each by two time divisions.

2. ayogi k. k. v. c. [14th]
   (2) 1. sāmāyiyacaritāriyā ittariya s. c., āvakahiya s. c.
   2. chedovatthāvaniya c. sāiyāra c. c., niraiyāra c. c.
   3. parihāravisuddhiya c. nivissamāna p. c., nivīṭhakāya p. c.
   4. suhumasamparāya c. sāmkilissamāna s. c., visujjharīsāna s. c.
   5. ahakkhāya c. chaumatttha a. c., kevali a. c.

The classification of these two types of āryas is primarily based on the modes of eliminating rāga or kaśāya. The classification of viyarāgacaritāriyā which is identical with that of viyarāgadaṃśaṃāriyā contains the guṇasthānas 11–14, and sarāgacaritāriyā are expressed in terms of the 9th and 10th guṇasthānas. This indicates that by the time of the Prajāpāna all the stages excluding the 2nd and 8th (apūrvakaraṇa) were ready. And the subclassification of the 9th stage by paḍvāra and apaḍivāra and that of the 10th stage by sāmkilissamāna and visujjhamāna adumbrate the direction towards the formulation of the concept of śrēṇis. It is curious to note here that caritāriyā are explained by way of the two different types of classification, namely, by guṇasthānas and by the stages of saṃyama. These five stages of saṃyama or caritra later came to constitute the 8th mārgaṃsthāna together with asaṃyama and deśasaṃyama. The Bhagavatī 25.7 is devoted to the exposition of these five types of saṃyatas in terms of thirty-seven anuyogadvāras. And in company with the Uttarādhyyayāna 28, Umāsvāti refers for the content of caritramārga to these five types of saṃyama. This classification of āryas based on these fivefold saṃyatas seems to have been developed when these items were taken up in the Chedasūtras. For instance, the Byhakalpa 6 enumerates six types of kalpa, i.e., sāmāyika-saṃyata, chedopasthaṇiya-saṃyata, nirviśamāna, nirviśṭakāyika, jina and sthavira; and the Vyavahāra 1 discusses about cheda and parihāra in relation to the monks’ performance of prāyaścitta. And it is likely that these five types of āryas came to stand in the capacity of monks’ guṇasthāna in the later monastic disciplinary jurisprudence.

The Buddhists were also ready with the classification of āryas known by the name of eight ārya pudgalas. It is informed that only four śrāmaṇya phalas were discussed in the old text like the Samyuttanikāya, i.e., srotāpanna, sakṛdāgāmi, anāgāni and arhat. It is said that each of these four stages of āryas came to be considered later in terms of those who are on the way to the stage and those who have arrived at the stage, thus furnishing the eight classes of āryas.21 Attention has been early drawn to the resemblance of this Buddhist concept of the śrāmaṇya phalas and the Jaina concept of guṇasthānas.22 It may be worth while to summarize here the essential features of their resemblance. Firstly, the stages in both systems
are primarily based on the classification of āryas arranged in the ascending order towards liberation. Secondly, the order of these stages in both systems imparts the conceptual indication of the stages of spiritual attainment, but not the empirically chronological one. Thirdly, in both systems the beginning stages are concerned with the attainment of dārśana (srotāpatti or the stage prior to srotāpanna in Buddhism) and the rest of the stages pertain to the attainment of cāritra by way of the removal of mohaniyakarmas or klāśas. Fourthly, both schemes provide a chance of death in the deva loka in order to take up a spiritual stage once again (sakṛdagni in Buddhism and the 11th stage in Jainism). The Abhidharmakośa Ch. 6 called Mārgapudgalanirdeśa is devoted to this classification of āryas, which was certainly known to the Vībhāṣa authors.

It appears that the Jainas had been since long attempting to classify the āryas into the ascending stages towards liberation, one of which classification based on the modes of eliminating kṣāyas (Prajñāpānam above) developed into scheme of 14 guṇasthānas by way of assimilating the old standing classification based on dārśana and sāmyama (e.g., Bhagavati 18.1.6–7 and 1.1.16), and thereby the other kind of classification based on the five types of sāmyama was set aside and came to be absorbed in to the list of 14 mārgaṇāsthānas. And the early karma specialists are doubtlessly responsible for the final formulation of the schemes of these 14 sthānas.

The stages of aspirants are provided in the other schools also in conformity with their own dogmas. Guṇasthāpa likewise represents an ethical feature typical of the Jainas based on their karma theory. The Prajñāpānam classification of these stages of cārittāriya is worked out in terms of the removal of mohaniya karmas. It suggests that this classification belongs to the period when kṣāyas became the point of focus in the field of karma doctrine. Between the time of the Prajñāpānam and the T.S., the concept of two śreṇis involving the 8th stage of apūrvakarāṇa must have evolved, and the 2nd stage of sārvādāna must have been formulated in the post-Umāsvāti period.

The provision of śreṇis, a fall from upāśama śreṇi and a device of sārvādāna stage for the falling aspirants to the bottom — these are the peculiar features in the concept of guṇasthāna. The concept of bhāva anuyogadvāra in five or six types (five plus śāṅnipātika) may be a comparatively later product as it is located in the Anuyogadvāra 127. However the concept of a soul’s operation called kṣaya (kammamkhavei occurs in the Sūtrakṛtga I.2.1.15) and upāśama must belong to much older period. The idea of kṣaya sounds to be an ontologically logical deduction, while that of upāśam appears to be an empirical deduction. If their combined operation called kṣayopāśama is considered to be much impurer than the upāśama operation, it is quite logical to assume that upāśama and kṣaya types alone can advance an aspirant to the further spiritual ascendance, of which paths are expressed in the forms of two śreṇis. And since the total eradication of karmas alone can lead him to the final release according to the Jainas, it is imperative to postulate that kṣapaka śreṇi alone is competent to achieve his end. Then it is again imperative to assume that the ascendant on upāśama śreṇi
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must sometime fall by the end of this śreṇi in order to take up the ladder of the kṣapaṇas. This also fits in explaining the empirical phenomena in the actual practice wherein the monks often relax in the middle and fall in their spiritual paths. A similar idea likewise prevails in the Buddhist texts as evinced by their frequent usage of the term avinivartaniya in the antonymous sense. The karma specialists regulated the time limit of his stay at the end of the śreṇi within one samaya up to antarmuhurta, and gave two choices for his mode of departure from this śreṇi, namely, either by way of death or by way of fall. By way of death, he is destined to be an Anuttarasura deva, of which idea is comparable to that of sakṛdāgāmī in Buddhism. By way of fall, he is destined to fall below the 6th stage of pramattasāmyaṇa due to the rise of karmas. A creation of sāsvādana stage was possibly made on the basis of a logical assumption that the saint on the 11th stage cannot fall straightway to the bottom stage of mithyātva. It thus seems that the concept of guṇasthāna was on the whole worked out on the rational ground.

The above examinations evince that jivasamāsa and mārgaṇaśthāna were crystallized soon after Umāsvatī’s time, more than the time of which must have been required for the final formulation of guṇasthāna. The classification of karmas shown in the T.S. Ch. VIII is no more than the deduction from the canon, for instance, from the Uttarāthiyāyana 33. Following suit of the canonical authors, Umāsvatī engages himself here in the discussion of karmic bondage alone, while the Saṅkhandaṇadāgama further takes up the problems of vedāṇa in its Books 10-12, which is considered from the viewpoint of nikṣepas. Its Book 9, touches upon karaṇas such as upakrama, saṅkrama, niddhāti and nikācana, a mention of which also occurs in the gāthā to the Bhagavatī 1.1.12. Umāsvatī refers to karaṇas such as saṅkramaṇa (VIII : 22Bh.) and apavartana (II : 52Bh.), and explains anubhāva in terms of udaya. Taking all these into consideration, the temporal distance between the T.S. and the Saṅkhandaṇadāgama is not too far away, say, at the most ten years.

The list of guṇasthānas reckoned in the Kaśyaparābhūti and the T.S. is quite alike. Likewise the classification of kaśyayas into four types with subdivisions made in the Kaśyaparābhūti Ch. 8 is located in the Prajñāpana Ch. 14 and the T.S. VIII : 10Bh. The synonyms of these four kaśyayas enumerated in the T.S. VIII : 10Bh., and those of rāga-dveśa listed in the Prajñamartai 18-19, which are dispersed in the canonical texts and not provided in one place en block, are again located at large in the Kaśyaparābhūti Ch. 9. Its fifth chapter takes up the concept of saṅkramaṇa from the standpoint of various anuyogadāvāras, and it is also taken up in most of the later chapters which are arranged according to the guṇasthānas. The concept of saṅkramaṇa likely came to the focus of the then karma specialists’ attention, of which discussion is however conspicuously absent in the canonical texts. As already taken note of, Umāsvatī likely took a help of the Kaśyaparābhūti in formulating the concept of yoga.
as śubha and asūbha. Naya in the Kaśyapa-prabhṛta is explained by Yatirśabha as of five kinds. In all probability, the Kaśyapa-prabhṛta was in front of Umāsvāti. And it appears that the relevant concepts of karma doctrine were formulated and developed by the group of these early karma specialists who began to be active in the later classical period.

Part 5 Treatment of cārita in mokṣamārga

The concept of the threefold pathways to liberation, i. e., darśana, jñāna and cārita, may be even traced in the Sūtrakṛta I.6.17 which reads, ‘anuttaragam paramam mahesi aṣesa-kammam sa visohaitta/ stiddhist gae saim-ānantapatte nāneta silena ya dāmsānena’, and the Sūtrakṛta II.7. 812, ‘...agamita nānām dāmsanam agamita carittama pāvayam kāntīnum akaravye se khulu para-loga-palimāṁcetas citthai...’ However the conscious attempt of discussing mokṣamārga in threefold ways (Uttaradhyayana 23.33 and Rāhulāśitsan Ch. 21) or fourfold ways, i. e., triplet plus tapas (Uttaradhyayana 28), came in a considerably later canonical stage, to which Vaṭṭakera augmented virya (which was a prevalent category in the context of acāras or guṇas in the later Āgamic age) as the fifth pathway in his Mālāsāra. The monastic conduct or cārita is as old the theme as the history of the sect, but the concept of cārita in the context of mokṣamārga is thus a new problem arisen in the later classical period.

The T.S. is a prakaraṇa which represents the contents of the canon within the scheme of seven tattvas guided by the theme of mokṣamārga. Therefore, even though tattva essentially express the ontological principles, the first five chapters of the T.S. can be considered in the sense of jñānamīmāṁsā, the last five chapters in terms of cāritramīmāṁsā, and the belief in the entire tattvas in terms of darśanamīmāṁsā. Among the last five tattvas, bandha (Ch. VIII) is purely an ontological item and mokṣa (Ch. x) is merely manifestation of the accomplished state of a soul, by which the actual disciplinary code of ascetics is not expressed. Āśrava tattva (Ch. VIII) represents the householders’ discipline. Umāsvāti opens up the topic of mahāvrata in this seventh chapter while discussing ānuvrata, which was better if it were handled in the section of saṃvara tattva because the ascetics, conduct is necessarily directed towards mokṣa whether it is attainable or not in this life. (Mokṣa is not attainable without the knowledge of the fourteen Pūrvas, thus no one after Jambū is said to be capable of attaining it. When I visited nuns at Rukṣi near Bihubali at Kolhapur Dist., Pājuṣāri Ajitamati Amāre replied in reference to this problem that one can be born in mahāvidēha to achieve mokṣa in the future. Svarga is attainable even by remaining as a layman, therefore a serious initiation into an ascetic’s carrier must be necessarily based on the faith that at certain future birth, he is able to be released from saṃśāra.) Thus in the scheme of tattvas, saṃvara-nirjarā represent the disciplinary code of ascetics that must constitute the content of cāritramārga. However Umāsvāti,
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following suit of the Uttarādhyāyana 28.32-33, identifies cārita with sāmyama in five types, i.e., sānyāika, chedopasthāpanā parihravishuddhi, sūkṣmasamparīya and yathākhyāna. Besides he formulated sixfold sāmvaradvāras excluding mahāviṣṇu. Umāsvāta’s performance as such exhibits that many concepts relevant to cārttramārga were yet taking the course of development in the late canonical stage. The fol owing is an attempt to understand how the relevant concepts of cārttramārga came to evolve in the canonical period, how they were handled by Umāsvāti and how they were treated in the immediate post-Umāsvāti authors in the two traditions.

The categorical items of jñāna-dāśa-cārito occur in the canon in reference to various concepts such as ārādhaka (Bhagavati 8.14.354), virādhanā pratikramaṇa (Āvāyika 4.6), jīva guṇa (Anuvadāvīra 145), bodhi and buddhi (Sthāna 3.2.207), prajñāpāta (Sthāna 3.4.255), samkhyā (Sthāna 3.4.258), prāyāsita (Sthāna 3.4.264), ganiśa (Sthāna 3.4.277), and so on. This set category also occurs in various contexts in the Jāmic texts, for instance, as one of the guṇas of Lord Mahāvīra (Bhagavati 2.5.107), as one of the properties of aṃśa (Bhagavati 12.10.466), as one of the subdivisions of nirgranthas (Bhagavati 25.6.4), as one of the subdivisions of ārya (Prajñāpāta 1.1.72-77), as one of the subdivisions of vinaya (Aupapātika 19), as one of the divisions of jīva pariṇāma (Prajñāpāta 13.14.14-15), and so on. It appears that this triplet had originally been conceived in reference to an ideal monk’s virtuous qualities, which later came to be applied to many other concepts including mokṣamārga. The Bhagavati 8.10.354 above classifies three kinds of ārādhaka in threefold degrees each, i.e., the highest, medium and lowest, and shows the possible modes of their combinations. The highest degree of cārito is said necessarily to go with the highest degree of dāśa ārādhana. It then discusses three grades of each ārādhana in relation to rebirth, and says that he who is possessed of the highest degree of each ārādhana attains liberation or rebirth in kalpatīta, from which the deduction of the concept of the threefold pathways to liberation is a matter of time. We should also remember the aforementioned pass-ages of the Śrīrakṣita 1.6-17 and 11.7.812 as the possible sources of the threefold paths to liberation. The designation of them as triśātma is a post-Umāsvāti phenomenon, which occurs, for instance, in the Tandulavaičārika 118, but not yet in the niryukti literature.

A description of Lord Mahāvīra and his elder disciples often ends with such an idiomatic expression as stated in the Bhagavati 1.1.7, ‘‘...samjāmena yasas appānaḥ bhāvenāye viharati.’’ The Bhagavati 2.5.111 reads, ‘‘...paccakkhaṇe kim phale? samjāma-phale, se nām bhaṁte! samjāme kim phale? anāṃkāya-phale, evam anāṅkās āvā-vphale, tave vandalism phale, vākṣye akirīṇa phale, se nām bhamete! akirīṇa kim phale? siddhi-pajjāvaṇnā phale pujyātī gaṇātā.’’ These passages discern sāmyama from tapas. The Jainas in tradition thus seem to have expressed the ascetic conduct as a whole in
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terms of samyamā-tapas. Therefore when the Daśavaikalika 6.1 says, 'nānā-damsanā-
sampannānā samjame ya tava rayam/ gaṇim agama-sampannām, ujjānammi samosādham' it must be conveying the picture of a monk endowed with ideal guṇas. And mokṣa-
mārga in fourfold pathways expressed in the Uttarādhyayana 28 must have been directly derived from this traditional concept.

The Sūhāna 2.3 120 reads, 'duvihē ayyē p-o tam-o nānāyāre ceva no nānāyāre ceva, nōnānāyāre duvihē p-o tam-o dāmsanāyāre ceva, nōdamsanāyāre ceva, nōdamsanāyāre duvihē paṇṭatte, carittāyāre ceva, nōcarittāyāre duvihē p-o tam-o tavāyāre ceva, viriyāyāre ceva.' Again the Sūhāna 5.3 526 enumerates fivefold ācāras, i.e., jñāna darśāna, cařitra, tapas and virya. The Uttarādhyayana 29.59 discerns cařitra from tapas and vinaya, 'nānā-viṇaya-tava-caritta-jogaes sampāṇī, sasāmya-parasāmya-
visārae ya asamghāyanīje bhavai.' Since vinaya is a part of internal tapas, its separate enumeration is rather strange. But it likely gained an important position as an independent category of ācāra or guṇa in the later canonical stage, for its subdivisions include jñāna-Jarāṇa-cařitra. Virya which is a quality required for the performance of tapas is said as of twofold in the Sūtrakṛta I 8.1–2, 'duhā veyam suyakhāyam viriyam ti pavuccai/ kīm nu virasa virattam kaham ceyam pavuccai/ komnem-ege Pavedenti akhammaṇa vā vi suvayā/ eehīm dohi ṭhānehim jehim disnti macciyā.' The Bhagavat 1.8.70–71 also touch upon this matter, and the Uttarādhyayana 3.10 says that virya is difficult to obtain. These independent categories, i.e., vinaya and virya came to be added to fourfold guṇas or ācāras of ascetics expressed in the canonical texts and in the Nīryuktic, from which fivefold pathways to mokṣa (basic four plus virya) of the Mūlācāra must have been derived.

In the earliest strata of the canon wherein the main focus of discourse falls in prāṇātipāta and parigraha, samyama is used in terms of the control of senses or indriyasamvara including samiti and gupti. For instance, samyama is discussed in reference to himśa in the Ācārāṅga I. 5. 3. 298 and the Sūtrakṛta I. 7. 389, in reference to parigraha in the Sūtrakṛta I. 10. 474, in reference to apramatta in the Ācārāṅga I. 1. 4. 30, in reference to mādhyaśa in the Sūtrakṛta I. 2. 87, in reference to the threefold yogas in the Sūtrakṛta I. 8. 486, in reference to kriyā in the Sūtrakṛta I. 10. 489, and in reference to five vows in the Sūtrakṛta I. 3. 4. 232. Gupti is taken up, for instance, in reference to vāc in the Ācārāṅga I. 8. 2. 409, Sūtrakṛta I. 2. 2. 122 and 10. 487, in reference to ātmā in the Sūtrakṛta I. 3. 8. 431, 11. 512 and 520, and in reference to samiti in the Sūtrakṛta I. 14. 584. The usage of samiti occurs, for instance, in reference to sārṣā, etc., in the Ācārāṅga I. 6. 4. 354, 9. 2. 492 and 498, in reference to pama-samvara-samvūde in the Sūtrakṛta I. 2. 1. 88, in reference to ēṣanā in the Sūtrakṛta I. 11. 509 and in reference to gupti in the Sūtrakṛta I. 14. 584. The concept of gupti (manas. vāc and kāya) and samiti
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(īryā, bhāṣā, esṭāṇā, ādānanīkṣepa, and utsarga) are herein not yet distinguished. And the Bhagavati 2. 1. 91 also exhibits the stage wherein gupti and samiti are on the way for discernment, ‘tie nam se khandae kaccāyaṁssa-gotte anagāre jate iriyasamie bhāṣāsamie esṭāṇasamie āyāṇa-bhāṁdi-mitta-nikkhevanāsamie uccāra-pāsyāna-khela-simgāra-jula-prāṭhāvāryāsamie maṇgasamie vayasanāsamie kāyasanāsamie maṇgasuttie vaigutte kāyagutte gutte guttimdi-gutta-bambhāyāri . . .’

Saṃyama is classified into four kinds, i. e., manas-vāk-kāya-upakaraṇa, in the Sthāna 4. 2. 385, five kinds, i. e., the earth-being through the plant-being, in the Sthāna 5. 2. 524; seven kinds, i. e., sthāvīras, trasas and ajīvakaṇa, in the Sthāna 7. 705; ten kinds, i. e., the five one sensed beings up to the five-sensed beings plus ajīvakāya, in the Sthāna 10 937; and seventeen kinds, i.e., ten kind plus ‘pīhasamīmāme uvehasamīmāme avahattusamīmāme pamajjanāsamīmāme maṇgasamīmāme vaisamīmāme kāyasanīmām’ in the Samavāya 57. These items cover the domain of indriyasamvara, samiti and gupti.

Saṃvara is classified in to five kinds, i.e., mithyātva, avirati, pramāda, kaśaya and yoga in the Sthāna 5. 2. 517; six kinds, i.e., śruta up to sparśa plus no-indriya, in the Sthāna 6. 553; eight kinds, i.e., śruta up to sparśa plus manas-vāk-kāya in the Sthāna 8. 759; and ten kinds, i.e., eight plus upakaraṇa and suśikṣāgra, in the Sthāna 10.939. The categorical items listed in the Sthāna 5. 2. 517 is relevant to vrata, indriyasamvāra, gupti and samiti, those in the Sthāna 6.558 to indriyasamvāra, and the rest to indriyasamvāra and gupti.

Thus the concept of saṃyama which includes samiti-gupti and indriyasamvāra connotes the concept of samvāra which is primarily an ontological term. It seems therefore that a concept-couple of saṃyama-tapas which represents the monastic code came to be expressed by an ontological concept-couple of saṃvara-nirjarā when the doctrine of tattvas came into vogue. Indriyasamvāra denotes the control of senses over their objects and gupti-samiti denote the means of control as such. Thus the latter concepts which specify the methods as such while covering the concept of the former likely came to remain as the content of saṃyama and the former was destined to disappear in the later time.

Samiti-gupti and indriyasamvāra, which constitute the content of saṃyama and samvāra, are the antidotes of hiṁsā and pīrigraha as so clearly indicated by their bhāvanās. The category of fivefold vrata (i.e., ahimsā, satya, āsteya, brāhma and aparigraha) is dealt with in the Uttarādhvāyana 30. 2 as the cause of anāśrava along with rātri-bhojanavrati (its 30.3 mentions samiti-gupti to be the same cause), in the Samavāya 16 as one of the fivefold anāśravadvāras or samvaradvāras and in the same Samavāya 16 as nirjarasthāna. And fivefold avratas are treated in the Prajñāpāna 22. 584 and 594 in relation to kriyās (of which 22. 585 and 595 take up ahimsā and ahimsā-satya respectively in reference to karma bandha). The Ācārāṅga 11. 15 takes up the
topic of five vratas independently along with their bhāvanās, and likewise the Daśavai-
kālīka 4.5-10 offer an independent treatment of it along with rātri-bhojanavirati

This evinces that the category of five vows, among which ahīṃsā and aparigraha (which is used in the sense of a synonym of ahīṃsā in the Ācarāṇa I and Sūtrakṛtā 1) must have evolved first (as these constitute the integral part of the Jaina doctrine), had occupied an independent position apart from the other ethical principles, which came to be later recognized as one of the anāsravadvāras or samvaradvāras when these ontological categories became prevalent. Umāsvēti includes mahāvratā in the category of samvāra in IX: 7Bh. which pertains to samvarānupreksā, samvarānca maṇḍrati-gupty-ādi pariṇāma-tguṇatas-cintayet...'. However he discusses the topic of mahāvratā in the context of āsrava in Ch. VII, possibly because he found it more convenient to handle it together with anuvratā for he was likely constrained by the compact form of composition in śūtra style. Vrata seems to have thus occupied no clear-cut position in the context of samyama in the canonical period even though the aforementioned Sūtrakṛtā I.3.4.32 talks about samyama in reference to five vows. The post-canonical author like Kundakunda expressly places vrata in the category of samyama, for instance, in the Cāriirāpāhūḍa 27, 'paṇc-īdiya-samvarāṇaṁ paṇc-vayā paṇcavāma-kāraṇāsulpaṇca-samīdi taya-yu' tri samyama-caranaṁ nirāyāram', and in the Barīṣaṅkekkha 76, 'vada-samīdi-pālaṇā danda-caccāena imīya-jaena pariṇāmahāsa pana samyama-dhammo have niyama'. Likewise the Mūla-cāra V counts vrata, samiti and gāpti as constituting of the content of cāritramārga.

The Siṅhāna 5.2.524 above enumerates another list of fivefold samyamas, i.e., śāmāyika, chedopasthāparā, purīhārav.śuddhi, sūṣmasamāparāya and yathākhyāna, which are called samyamas as well as cāritras in Bhagavati 8. 2. 319, 25.6 and 25. 7.785. They should be compared with six kalpas expressed in the Bhātakalpa 6, i.e., śānu-kāi-samīta, cādopasthāsānyā-sūṣma, nirv.śamāna, nirviṣṭakāyika, jīna and sthavira. It is evident that the content of cāritra was formulated after the composition of the Chedasūtras. These five stages of cāritra were later absorbed in the 8th mārga-sthāna, however they were likely in full swing in the capacity of guṇasthāna in the monastic practice, under the authority of the Chedasūtras. Cāritra is therefore clearly discerned from the concept-couple of samyama-tapas in the Bhagavati 1. 1. 17, 'goyamaḥ iha-bhavye cāriite, no para-bhavye carite no tad-abhayacaritte/ evam tave samāme'. Likewise when the Siṅhāna 2. 3. 120, etc., distinguish cāritra from tapas, cāritra must have denoted samyama in five stages in as much as it denotes so in the Uttarādhyayana 28, for the term samyama used in a concept-couple of samyama-tapas seems to have never been called by the name of cāritra. The term cāritra was likely preferred to samyama in this context by the later Āgamic authors in order to avoid ambiguity.
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In the context of fourfold mokṣamārgas, the ascetic conduct is expressed by cārita-tapas which ought to be equivalent to samyama-tapas in terms of ethical conduct or saṃvara-nirjarā in terms of karma theory. However the Uttarādhyāyana author identifies cārita with samyama in five types such as sāmāyika. This category of cārita which represents the pragmatic stages or types of ascetic conduct belongs to a different category from samyama-tapas (i.e., equivalent of saṃvara-nirjarā) which represent the general theory and practice of ascetic conduct. Therefore when cārita in the former sense which necessarily embraces the disciplinary code of samyama-tapas within its practice is coupled with tapomārga, it doesn’t make much sense. It seems that the Uttarādhyāyana author identified cāritramārga with its equivalent samyama in five stages much under the sway of the circumstances in the monastic praxis. Umāsvāti followed its suit as he says in the T. S. I: 33Bh., ‘Uktam jñānam/ cāritram navame’dhyaye vakṣyamah’, which the Paścimerati 228–229 articulate in more precise expression.

It is as clear as crystal however that cāritramārga is equivalent to saṃvara-nirjarā in the scheme of tattvas. Moreover he formulated sixfold saṃvaradvāras which consist of gupti, samiti, dharma, anupreksā, pariśahajaya and cārita. Samyama in tradition does not generally include in its content dharma, anupreksā and pariśahajaya, among which pariśahajaya is an old stray item since the time of the Ācarānga I. Umāsvāti perhaps thought that since these are the important items they should also find a place in the disciplinary code of the Jaina ascetics. Then saṃvaradvāra is the only category that can absorb these items in the scheme of seven tattvas. Mahāvarta is invariably an important saṃvaradvāra as Uāmsvāti counts it as a part of the content of saṃvara anupreksā, however its treatment was unfortunately made in the seventh chapter, and he did not even take a trouble of recounting it in this particular context, which he could have done.

Now, let us see how the post-Umāsvāti authors handled these problems raised in the T S. (The following order of the post-Umāsvāti authors is not necessarily chronological.) Siddhasenagāni follows Umārvāti’s exposition that cāritramārga denotes sāmāyika, etc., of five stages, which is clear also from his explanation of samyakcārītra made on I:1B1. (c.f. Kipiśa’s edition, v.l., p.25). The commentators of the Āgamic literature generally follow the themes and concepts expressed in the concerned canonical texts, therefore cāritramārga continues long to be explained in terms of the fivefold stages of samyama, for instance, in the Viseṣāvaśyakabhāṣya 1257–1277, 3159, etc. and the Śūrutaśāntogavṛtti II 5.1. Bhadrabāhu follows fourfold mokṣamārgas in dealing with the Uttarādhyāyana(cf. Niryukti gathā 499), however the position of threefold mokṣamārgas is upheld in his Āvaśyaka niryukti 910. He explains cārita dharma in terms of samyama-tapas in the Daśavalkālikika niryukti 45–48, and takes recourse to the same concept-couple of samyama-tapas in explaining the aspirants’ practice toward mokṣa, for instance, in
the Daśavaikālika niryukti 344 and Āvaśyaka niryukti 1081. The content of saṃyama is to be indriyasamvāra in the Daśavaikālika niryukti 45–46, and samiti-gupti in its gāthā 185. Bhadrabāhu seems to be in support of including saṃyama-tapas under the category of cāritramārga, however his performance here is traditional and it is difficult to see if he were at all conscious about the problem under consideration.

In the Daśavaikālika niryukti 181 (the chapter is called Kṣudräkācāra), Bhadrabāhu enumerates the fivefold categories consisting of tapas and virya in addition to three jewels. Also he touches upon another set of the five guṇas of monks wherein virya is replaced by vinaya, for instance in the Āvaśyaka niryukti 207 and Daśāśrutaskandha niryukti 2.8. These set items of five already exist in the canon, which are reckoned irrespective of mokṣamārga in both canonical and niryukti literature. Bhadrabāhu calls fivefold vinayas by the name of mokṣavinayas in the Daśavaikālika niryukti 314, possibly on the analogy of mokṣamārga for they contain jñāna-dāśāna-cāritra vinayas. And it seems that emphasis laid by Bhadrabāhu on these set items of five influenced the southern authors to utilize them in the context of mokṣamārga because the Mūlācārā V takes up fivefold mokṣamārgas including virya, and the Mūlācārā sāpires pages for the exposition of vinaya.

As aforementioned, Kundakunda identifies saṃyama with vrata, samiti, gupti, etc. Pujyapāla seems to have recognized Umasvāti’s unsatisfactory identification of cāritramārga with saṃyama in five stages, because the Bhāṣya exposition on the sūtra 1:33 in question completely disappears from the Sarvārthasiddhi. Unfortunately, he did not come out with a positive amendment of this Bhāṣya statement. The Rājavātika does not substantially add much to the Sarvārthasiddhi on this matter.

The Mūlācāra V entitled Pañcācārādhyākṣa outlines mokṣamārga by way of fivefold ācāras, i.e., dāśāna, jñāna, cāritra, tapas and virya, of which content is as follows: (1) Introduction: 1–2. mantraka verse and enumeration of five ācāras: (2) Dāśāna: 3–4. eight aṅgas of dāśāna = 5. mārga and mārgaphala = 6–51. nine padārthas as the objects of faith and their exposition — 52–54. threefold kāṅkṣās — 55–58. twofold vicikitsās: (twenty-two pariśahajayas are counted as its bhāva type) — 59–63. fourfold dṛṣṭimohas — 64–67. dāśāna sādhan — 68. definition of samya-dāśāna: (3) Jñāna: 69. jñāna ācāra for the destruction of eightfold karmas — 70–71. definition of jñāna— 72–89. exposition of svādhyāya in eight divisions: (4) Cāritra: 90–97. exposition of five vratas — 98–99. abstinence from rātri bhojana — 100–139. exposition of five samitis and three guptis — 140–146. bhāvanās of five vratas: (5) Tapas: 147–214. exposition of twofold tapas with six subdivisions each: (6) Virya: 215–220. definitions and exposition: and (7) Conclusion: 221. five ācāras leading to the attainment of siddhāhata.

The overall construction of this chapter is based on that of the Uttarādhyāyana 28. Cāritramārga includes in its content five vratas plus rātri-bhakti-virati along with their bhāvanās and eight mātrkās. While utilizing the structure of the Uttarādhyāyana
Sec. 3. SOME PROBLEMS IN THE T. S.

28, Vaṭṭakera did not follow the Uttarādhyāyana author in explaining the content of cāritramārga; he explained it by the concept of samyama in terms of the earlier canonical tradition. This is an amendment made on the Uttarādhyāyana 28. Then, against the enlarged content of sixfold samvaradvāras formulated by Umāsvāti, Vaṭṭakera came out with a proposal to the effect that the content of samvaradvāra should be confined within the domain of samyama by clarifying it to include vrata, samiti and gupti. Possibly he followed after Kundakunda on this matter. Since Vaṭṭakera revived the canonical treatment of samvaradvāra by including vrata, samiti and gupti as its content, pariśahajayā, anupreksā and dharma which were absorbed by Umāsvāti in this category had to go astray again. In consequence, Vaṭṭakera classed pariśahajaya under the category of darśana as the bhāva type of vikitsā, which in effect sounds more strange than what Umāsvāti actually did. The five items of anupreksās, i.e., ekatva, anitya, asaraṇa, saṃsāra, and aśuci, are enumerated in the Āgama as the observances of dharma dhyāna (the first four items) and śukla dhyāna (aśuci which appears in the canon as aśubha). In addition to them, Umāsvāti formulated the rest of the seven anupreksā items after the model of the subdivisions of dharma-smṛty-upsthānabhyāsas in the Abhidharmakośa VI, and treated these twelve items as an independent samvaradvāra (for the details, see Ch. III, Sec. 1). Vaṭṭakera again took recourse to the Āgamic treatment of anupreksās and placed all of them under the last subdivision of dharma dhyāna. The nature of these anupreksās is predominantly conformable with the observance of dharma dhyāna, therefore Vaṭṭakera's performance is quite reasonable and commendable, thus it became standardized in the later works on dhyāna and yoga. (We should however note that the Mūlācāra VIII takes up twelve anupreksās as an independent category.) Tenfold dharmas are totally ignored in the Mūlācāra V (which appear in its Ch. X called Śilaguruḍhikāra). The Mūlācāra V thus offered certain positive amendments on the treatment of cāritra made by the Uttarādhyāyana 28 and the T. S.

Unlike the Mūlācāra which is a compendium of the Jaina ethical doctrines possibly composed by plural authors, Śivakoṭi’s Mūlārādhana is a detailed expository work on Jaina ethics made by a single hand. Virya which is the quality required for karmic destruction in the performance of tapas is a redundant item in the context of mokṣamārga, and probably for this reason Śivakoṭi resorted to the traditional position of fourfold paths to liberation. In dealing with the concept of mokṣamārga, however, Śivakoṭi advances a step further in theory by saying that jñāna is included in darśana and tapas in cāritra (verses 3–6), of which the former is ultimately reduced to the latter category of cāritra (verses 8, 11, 14, etc.). The traces of the concept as such are not impossible in the canonical tradition, for instance, the inclusion of jñāna in darśana is adumbrated in the Āvaśyaka niryuktī 1179, dāṃsāṇa-pakkho sāvaya carita-bhaṭṭhe ya mānḍa-dhamme ya/ dāṃsāṇa-carittra-pakkho sāmāne paṭaloga-kaṅkhumī. That cāritra is the direct cause of mokṣa is also expressed in the Āvaśyaka niryuktī 1178,
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‘sutta-vi samaddidhi na sijjhay caraṇa-karaṇa-parihiṇa jām ceva siddhi-mūḍho tam ceva nārī.’ The Uttarādiyāyana 29,59-61 likewise read, ‘...nāṇa-sampāṇanaṁ naṁ iyë sav allihīṁ mṛna janayai nāṇa-sampāṇaṁ naṁ jive caur-amte samāra-kāntare na vinassai...dīvya-sampāṇanāyāṁ naṁ jive bhava-micchattā-cheyanaṁ kare, pareṁ na vijñāyai.../...cārīta-sampāṇanaṁ naṁ jive selesi-bhāvamjanayai/selesai pādīvane ya anagāre cārīta kevali-kumārīye kāre,taš pača sījhay bhujhay muccai parinivvāyai savīdūkkhāṁnaṁ-anīm kare.’ Herein tapas is embraced in the category of cārītra. However the express statement of Śāvakaṇṭha that daśana and cārītra constitute the primary pathways to liberation which can be finally represented by cārītratārgya alone is never found in the previous literature. This logical abstraction seems to have been made in the context of guṇasthāna which begins with the stage of daśana and ends with cārītra.

Lastly, Kundakunda is also an early Digambara author who composed his prakarāṇya by adopting the theme of mokṣamārga. He receives the traditional threefold mokṣamārgas, sometimes along with tapas and virya, and spares pages for the exposition of cārītra, for instance, in the Pravacanasāra III, Niyaṁsaśra and Śaṭprābhṛti. However his treatment of this subject matter as a whole deviates from the trail of the Jaina tradition due to his peculiar viewpoint. In the Pancaśāśtra he persistently pursues the theme of dravya-guṇa-paryaya and satsāmāṇa expressed in the T.S. while analyzing the contents of jīvāṅka and jīvāṅka, in view of ascertaining what is the transcendental nature of the soul and what is not, which are epistemologically established by him in the form of niśaya and vyavahāra nayas. In consequence, he arrives at conclusion that since śuddha upayoga, the transcendental nature of a soul, cannot subject itself to destruction by nature, various pathways enunciated in tradition stand in the position of vyavahāra alone, which the Samayasāra 294 expresses, ‘ayārād-nānāṁ jīvādi-dāmsānca vyavahāram ṛkur-hādhrā cārītaṁ tu vyavahārō.’ From the corollary of his analysis, despite of his attempt in laying emphasis on the traditional pathways to the final release, jīvāṅkamārga alone is deduced to be the sole road to mokṣaṁ as much as certain nā-Jaina authors maintain. Ethically helpful is therefore the way to strengthen the soul’s purity. For this reason, the treatment of dhyāna is brought out on the front stage in the Niyaṁsaśra and Śaṭprābhṛti, which is intended for the sake of the soul’s purification and for the purpose of discriminating the self from the non-self by meditating upon the parameśmā, but not for the purpose of yoga-nirodha. It is not that Kundakunda as a Jaina does not accept the traditional concept of getting rid of karmas by śukla dhyāna as he discusses it, but he does not much bother about this aspect. For the same purpose of promoting ātma-suddhi, the Niyaṁsaśra proposes the practice of pratikramana, pratyaśikhyāna, prāyaścitta and sāmāyika. Kundakunda adopts the theme of mokṣamārga propounded in tradition, but he does it rather in the fashion of formality, and the road to liberation that he vindicates is in essence jīvāṅkamārga alone. He looks at cārītratārgya from vyavahāra standpoint, which certainly went away from the main course of the tradition.
Sec. IV

HISTORICAL POSITION OF THE T. S.

Part 1 The Jainas in Gupta age

The following are the topics included in the final section of our study: Pt. 1) The Jainas in the Gupta age, Pt. 2) Umāsvāti's date and works, and Pt. 3) Historical position of the T. S.

As the foregoing analysis of the T. S. evinces, Umāsvāti belonged to the 5th century, sometime after the Abhidharmakośa, and sometime before the Niryuktis, Śatkhāṇḍāgama and Sarvārthasiddhi. The Gupta age to which Umāsvāti belonged maintained long stabilized peace and prosperity, thereby it brought out the most creative period in the history of India in all the fields of its cultural activities as often called the golden age of the Hindus. However, for the Jainas the Gupta age was one of the most unhappy periods, wherein the social impact of the days drove them to the other parts of India from the North, which ultimately became, together with the accidental factor of the natural calamity of long famine inviting the call of the Third Valabhi Council, the cause of the great schism into the present day Digambaras and Śvetāmbaras.

In order to ascertain the historical position of the T. S. in the two traditions, it is incumbent upon us to have a clear-cut view of the history of the Jainas in the Gupta age involving their literary activities. In view of this, we shall make inquiries into the following historical account in the first part of this section: (1) Historical background of the Gupta age, (2) Migration of Jaina communities, and (3) Great schism. The first introductory portion summarizes the cultural history of the Gupta age, which is expected to shed some light on the problems relevant to the T. S. The descriptive accounts here are made, unless specified, on the basis of Majumdar's The History and Culture of the Indian People v. 3, in consultation with The History of Ancient India v. 2 by Nakamura and Life in the Gupta Age by Saletore.

(1) Historical background of the Gupta age

The Gupta empire was established by Chandragupta I (320 A. D. accession to the throne), and expanded by his son Samudragupta (330 A. D. acc.) and his grandson Chandragupta II (350 A. D. acc.) The empire stretched from the Bay of Bengal to the Arabian Sea, and under its strong political unity and prosperity the golden age of the Hindus blossomed. The Gupta dynasty of the 5th century (Kumāragupta I, 415 A. D. acc.—Purugupta, 455 A D. acc. — Skandagupta, 455 A. D. acc.—Budhagupta, 477 acc.—495 A. D.) saw and enjoyed the consolidation of the empire, which however was gradually advancing towards decline at the end of this century. For we are told that King Kumāragupta I who performed the aśvamedha sacrifice already met an invasion led by Purṣyamitra of an unknown race whom he defeated, and another led by
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Toramana of the Hūgas whose conquest was entrusted to his son Skandagupta. When Skandagupta returned from his victorious war, King Kumāragupta I was dead and his legitimate son Purugupta was on the throne, thereby the former likely usurped the seat of the latter. Skandagupta was then succeeded by the sons of Purugupta, i.e., Budhagupta and Narasimhagupta. This civil war of the struggle for the throne is explained by the historians to be the main cause which invited the later disintegration of the empire, because soon we learn that the suzerain states in the remote district such as Valabhi were on the way to set up independent kingdoms. Meanwhile the Hūgas whose advancement was once checked by Skandagupta enhanced their power as they just defeated Persia, and advanced to the heart of the Gupta empire, Pātaliputra. It was around 500 A.D., and with the destruction of this capital, the empire passed away in effect, even though the dynasty still lingered on.

Fa Hien who travelled around the Gupta empire during 405-411 A.D. briefly gives us an idea of the general peace, prosperity and contentment of people prevailed in the country. Currency was controlled by the central Government and the unit of gold was dināra which corresponded to denarius of Rome, suggesting a huge international economic block established in this hemisphere. No doubt the former half of the 5th century enjoyed the political unity and economic prosperity, which however gradually went downwards as it is corroborated by the numismatic evidence that the gold coins issued in the later part of this century suffered deterioration.

The Guptas patronized Sanskrit learning, which brought out the florescent age of the Sanskrit literature in all its branches. Sanskrit was established as the official language, making a striking contrast to the previous Mauryan and Kushan periods wherein the inscriptional documents spoke themselves in Prakrit or in the mixed dialect of Prakrit and Sanskrit. Responding to the social needs, the Buddhists had already adjusted themselves in writing in Sanskrit whereas the Jainas still continued to write in Prakrit. Umāsvāti's adoption of the Sanskrit language was doubtlessly a response to the call of time. North India in this age produced Kālidāsa in literature, Varāhamihira and Buddhagupta in astronomy, and Āryabhaṭa in mathematics. The purāṇas are mostly the products of this period, deliberately attempting to achieve reconciliation of the then flourishing heterodox cults such as Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism with the orthodox Vedic rituals. The manner of displaying the long genealogies of kings and dynasties as elsewhere noted in the purāṇas was not observed in the previous age, with which probably goes the practice of attaching a praṣasti to the literary work as so done by Umāsvāti for the first time in the literary history of the Jainas. The caste system based on heredity began to be rooted in during this Gupta age, and the commentarial activities on the Dharmaśāstra and Arthaśāstra were welcomed with a view to standardizing the social order on the basis of their principles.
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Under the long standing peace and strong patronage of learning, various philosophical systems which had long cumulated their own sacred literature and developed their thoughts into maturity, entered the stage of systematization. The Nyāyasūtra, Saṅkhya-kārikā, Brahmāsūtra, Yogasūtra, Abhidharmakośa (which were all composed before the T.S.) and Praśastapādabhāṣya were all brought out in this period. The commentarial works such as Vyās’s Yogasūtradhāṣya (which is a pre-Umāsvāti work), Śabarasvāmi’s Mīmāṃsāsūtradhāṣya and Uddyotakara’s Nyāyavārttika belong to this dynasty also. The organizing activities of the doctrinal tenets of a school in order to transmit the bulk of its literary legacy and the succeeding commentarial activities were therefore the common phenomena evinced in the then systems of thought. And the Jainas could not remain behind without possessing their own standard text which the other philosophical schools had come to possess by the time of Umāsvāti. The need of the T.S. for the Jainas was hence the call of time, which was allegedly a product of this historical trend.

Vaiṣṇavism was the official religion of the Guptas, therefore the Buddhists and the Jainas must have most suffered from the loss of royal patronage which they had enjoyed in the Muuryan and Kushan dynasties. However the kings of this dynasty are said to have taken a tolerant policy towards all the religions. During this period, the Buddhists were quite active in exchanging scholars with China, inviting Fa Hien and the others from China and sending Kumārajiva, Paramārtha and many other Kashmirian Buddhist scholars to China. Fa Hien who saw countless Buddhist monks and monasteries on the way to Mathura tells us that the kings paid due respect to the Buddhist monks and some of the kings offered land grants to them for the maintenance of their monasteries. According to him Hinayāna Buddhism was still holding its sway all over North India and Mahāyānaism was just rearing its hand here and there.

Vasubandhu was an outstanding figure among the Buddhists in the 5th century in the North. An account is told that Vindhyavāsa of the Saṅkhya system challenged disputants of all the schools at Ayodhya, against whom Buddhāmitra was invited by king Vikramāditya to challenge, for his disciples Manoratha and Vasubandhu were out of station. He was defeated. Having heard of this humiliating news, Vasubandhu refuted the Saṅkhya view by composing the Paramārthasaptati, thereby he won the favour of the king, who then entrusted to him the education of his crown prince Bālāditya. The same story is related by Hiuen Tsiang in a modified way; it is said that Vikramāditya lost his kingdom soon after this debate, and was succeeded by a monarch who widely patronized those distinguished in literary merits, under whom Vasubandhu defeated his rival, Sinha identifies this King Vikramāditya of Ayodhya with Purugupta, Bālāliya with Narasimhagupta, and the monarch succeeded by Vikramāditya with Skandagupta (475 acc.496 A. D. according to Sinha’s proposal) on the numismatic
evidence, while Majumdar places Buddhagupta (477 acc.– 495 A. D.) prior to Narasimhagupta. Vasubandhu is said by Paranārtha to have died at the age of eighty. Exactly when the Abhidharmakośa was written is not yet known.

Royal favour if not patronage that the Buddhists enjoyed during this dynasty is not recorded as to the Jainas. Fa Hien refers to the nirgranthas in Kapiśa, Lānta and Siṃhapura (700 miles from Taxila), but does not record as to the area of North India proper. Huen Tsiang who came to India in the middle of the 7th century saw numerous nirgranthas in the North, e. g., Mt. Vipula in Magadha, Vārāṇaṣi, Vaiśāli, Purṇārādhana and Sanantā in Bengal.25 Not many Jaina inscriptions during the Gupta age are available, for instance, we have only a few belonging to the 5th century which record the activities of the Jainas in the North: 1) Udāgiri cave (near Sanchi) inscription of 426 A. D. mentioning the erection of a statue of Pārśva,26 2) Mathurā inscription of 432 A. D. made by a lay disciple of Koṭilaka gati Vidyāthuri śrīkula registering a dedication to an image of Jina27 3) Kahāum pillar inscription of 450-61 A. D. referring to the dedication of five images of Tīrthankaras, and 4) A copper-plate inscription of 478-79 A. D. at Pahārpur (Rajshahi Dist. of Bengal) stating a Brahmāṇa couple’s land donation for the sake of maintaining worship in a Jaina vihāra.28 This phenomenon of the paucity of inscriptions in the Gupta age is contrasting to the previous Kushan dynasty where-in the Jaina inscriptions at Mathurā are abundant. What does this phenomenon signify and how did it happen? These questions remain to be investigated.

(2) Migration of Jaina communities

Behind the seeming silence of the Jaina activities evinced by the paucity of inscriptions during the Gupta age, a monumental series of the historical events seems to have taken place—the gradual mass migration of the Jainas from the North to the South and the West, and the great schism into the present day Digambaras and Śvetāmbaras. These are the vital issues in the history of the Jainas, however the existent literature and inscriptions of both traditions do not speak of them in clarity which have thus sunken into oblivion and been buried in darkness. The following is an attempt to explain and reconstruct these historical events from the available archaeological and literary evidences in the background of the Gupta age.

The migration of the Jainas to the South must go back to a considerably ancient time, for instance, the Aśokan period, if śramaṇa mentioned in Kaḷiśi Rock Edict XIII at Malakālmuru, Mysore, is taken in the sense of both Buddhist and Jaina monks.29 A tradition also exists in the West that Sāmpratī, grandson of Aśoka, sent the Jaina missionaries to the non-Aryan countries meaning to the South.30 Hāthigumphā inscriptions of Khārarāla, the 2nd century B. C., reveal that the king was an adherent of Jainism.31 Kaḷugumalai hill inscription
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of the 2nd–1st century B. C. records the dedication of monasteries to a monk Kapi Nāṭa by lay Jainas, one of whom is Kālitaṇa, son of Antai and the merchant prince of a mercantile guild (nigaṇṭa) of Velarai. Mūttupattī cave inscription at Madurai, goes back to the 1st century B. C., and the cave inscriptions near Pāṇḍa Poona belongs to the 2nd century B. C. However the succeeding historical records of the Jainas after these early inscriptions are dead blank in all these areas until the 4th-6th centuries A.D., which shows that the prominent activities of the Jainas did not continue until the next stage. From the 4th-6th centuries onwards, the Jaina activities came to be continuously recorded in the inscriptions in most of these areas which went on increasing in number with the march of time, and side by side their literary activities came to be dynamic up to the present day. We shall see below when and how the early references to the Jainas make their appearance after the long blank period in various parts of India from the available data at present.

The earliest reference to the Jainas in Karnatakā area is found in the Kudlur plate of Mārasimha, in which it is said that Königunvarman or Mahāghava I (c. 350-400 A. D.), the founder of the Western Ganga dynasty, “obtained great power by favour of the doctrine of Arhad-bhaṭṭāraka,” and it is added that “by favour of Simhanandi Ācārya he (obtained) strength of arm and valour.” Mādhava II (c. 400-435 A. D.) made a donation to Viradeva Ācārya in favour of a Digamba [Nirgranth] temple. Most of the Ganga kings patronized the jainas, including Avinīta (c. 500-540 A.D.) and Durvinita (c. 540–600 A.D.). The earliest Kadamba inscription referring to the Jainas is of Kākusthavarmā (c. 405-435 A.D.), grandfather of Mrgeśvarman (c. 475-490 A.D.), registering a land grant to a Jaina Ācārya called Śrutakīrti. Three copper plate charters of Mrgeśvarman of the Kadamba dynasty are available to us, which record is land donation to the Arhats for the purpose of abhiṣeka, pūja etc., in his 3rd regnal year (c. 477 A.D.), to the holy Arhat, the Śvetapaṭhas and Nirgranthas in the 4th regnal year (c. 478 A.D.) and to the Yāpaniyas, Nirgranthas and Kūrckakas in the 8th regnal year (c. 482 A.D.), along with an ordinance of the construction of a Jaina temple. The Kadamba kings continued to donate lands to the Jainas. Early Chālukya king Jayasimha, grandfather of Pulakeśin I (c. 535–566 A. D.) also seems to have patronized the Jainas. Śravaṇabelgola inscription begins with the year Śaka c. 522 (c. 600 A.D.) recording the history of the migrated Sāṅgha and the samādhi manasa of Prahācandra. Śravaṇabelgola inscriptions in the 7th century mostly pertain to the death fast of ascetics. Many kings of various dynasties in Mysore during the 6th to the 12th centuries patronized the Jainas, of which inscriptions are numerous, however the earliest epigraphical evidence of the Jainas does not go beyond the latter half of the 4th century A.D. By the beginning of the 6th century A.D., dynamic literary activities seem to have commenced.
A caveria inscription in Tamil on the Ārunāṭṭār hill, Karur Taluk, Tiruchirappalli Dist., of the 3–4th centuries A.D., registers the order of a stone abode to be built for a Jaina monk Cēṇkayapaṇṇa by Ilāṅkaiṭukō, son of King Peruṅkaiṭukō son of Āṭan Cēḷīraṇṇaṇa. Simhaṇṇa composed the Lokavīhāra after Sarvanandi's Prakrit work written in Śaka 350/455 (458/538 A.D.) which is not available to us. The Lokavīhāra quotes from the Tiloyaparamatti and the latter from the former, therefore it is assumed that both were derived from Sarvanandi's work. Pallāṅkōvil copper-plate charter (Kanchi) of Simhavarman, father of Simhaviśvau (c. 560 A.D.) documents a land grant to Vajranandi of Nandi saṅgha. At Singavaram, Gingee Taluk, South Arcot, remains a record of sālekanā of Candiranandi Āśirigar in the 6th century A. D. Mahendravarman I (c. 600-625 A.D.) is known as a Jaina adherent and Hiuen Tsiang who visited Kanchi around 640 A.D. says that the Jaina monks were numerous there. Jaina epigraphs in Tamil land increase in bulk after the 8th century A. D. As to the date of the Maṇimekalai and Śilappadhikāram which are well acquainted with Jainism, opinion is divided from the 2nd century to the 8th century A. D. Keralan inscriptions pertaining to the Jainas are said to be found during the 9th to the 11th centuries, and Jainism there is suspected to have spread from Tamilnadu. In Andhra, the earliest inscription seems to begin with the 7th century A. D., which records a land grant of Ayyaṇa Mahādevi, queen of Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana, to a Jaina Ācārya, thenceforth Jaina inscriptions increase in number.

East Indian archaeological finds of the Jainas in the Gupta period are reported to be very poor. Bihar owns two rock-cut caves of the 4th century A. D. at Rajgir, one of which came to be requisitioned by the votaries of Viṣṇu. (Likewise a Jaina monastery at Phāhpur was converted into a Buddhist vihāra by Dharmapāla in the 8th century). Phāhpur copper-plate inscription of 479 A.D. refers to Nirgranthā Ācārya Guhanandi. And some stone and metal images of Gupta era are available from Rajgir and Chauca. North Bihar likely became the deserted area for the Jainas after the destruction of Pāṭaliputra, however Hiuen Tsiang of the 8th century informs us that the Nirgranthas are numerous in Bihar, West Bengal as well as in Orissa, Maharājā Rajālhirājā Dharmadhara of the 3rd century A.D. whose gold coin was found at Sisupalagarh, Orissa, is suspected to have been a Jaina king of Mathura family, which, however appears to be a mere speculation. In the Dātha vanṣa it is stated that Guhaśīva of c. 400 A.D. was converted to Buddhism from Jainism.

No report seems to have been made as to the pre-Guptan archaeological remains of the Jains in Central India. Three Tirthāṅkara images during Rāma-gupta's reign, the 4th century, were discovered at Durjanpur, Vidiśā Dist., M. P., and some more Jaina images during his reign are available. Also Udayagiri caves near Vidiśā record the setting up an image of Pārśva in the period of Kumārāgupta I. A group of Jaina sculptures in the Gupta period is available from Sira Pahari, Panna Dist.
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M. P., and two rock-cut reliefs at Gwalior are said to belong to the end of this period. The Jaina specimens of art and architecture continue to exist in the succeeding ages.56 A tradition maintains that Vaira, Mahāgiri, Subhatthi, Camḍarudda, Rakṣhiya, Bhaddagutta, Kālaga and Āśādhva visited Ujjain which was the capital of King Samprati. Siddhasena Divākara’s legend of breaking Śiva lingam is said to have occurred in this city.58

A bronze image of Pārśvanātha preserved in the Prince of Weles Museum, Bombay, is from West India, which is said to be assignable to the 2nd century A. D. by a scholar and not later than c. 100 B. C. by the others.57 Caves of Bāvā-Pyāra’s math near Girnar belongs to the period of the grandson of Jayadāman, the 2nd century A. D., where Ācārya Dharaṇa taught, according to the Dhavālā, scriptures to Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali. No Jaina antiquities of the 3rd–4th centuries are reported to have been known yet. Dnati clad Jaina bronzes began to be available after the late 5th century A. D. onwards from Akota and Valabbi.58 The dated inscription in Rajasthan seems to begin with 687 A. D. which is incised on a pair of the images of Śabha at Basantarāha. Jaina temples must have existed at Akota, Valabbi, Vasantagātha and Bhilamāla during the 6–7th centuries, for the Jaina images were discovered at these sites. After the 8th century onwards kings in various dynasties in West India patronized the Jainas in constructing or endowing temples.59 Two Canonical Conventions were held at Valabbi during the 4th and 5th centuries. Valabbi, Bhilamāla, Mālavā, Mālava were the centres of culture and commerce in those days.60 Śyāmacārya, author of the Prajñāpanā, and Āryaraksita, author of the Anuyogadvāra, belonged to Mālavā, likewise Jinabhadra seems to have engaged in composition in Sauraṇā.61 As narrated in the Kuvalayamālā of Ucchotana (779 A. D.), a tradition maintains that Ācārya Harigupta was the preceptor of Toramāna. After the Gupta age, West India became the stronghold of the Śvetāmbara Jainas.

All the Jaina antiquities in North India are reported from Mathurā, the ancient cosmopolitan city and dynamic centre of commerce, which was at the junction of the trade routes from Pāṭaliputra to Teliā. Mathurā inscriptions of the Jainas which commence with 150 B. C. arrive at a peak in the Kushan dynasty, particularly during the reigns of Kanishka and Huvishtka who were the adherents of Buddhism. A number of Jaina inscriptions exist during Vasudeva’s reign also. And it is reported that out of 159 inscriptions from Mathurā listed by Lüders in his List of brahmi Inscriptions, 87 are Jaina, 55 Buddhist and the remaining 17 non-sectarian, from which it is inferred that the Jaina community was likely larger than the Buddhist community during that period.62 The Jainas at Mathurā were, as we have previously observed, from all over the Northern parts of India including East, West and Central India, which suggests that the majority of the Jainas in those days had already migrated to Mathurā, Mathurā inscriptions were largely made by the lay Jainas including many women.
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mostly in memory of the dedication of images. Among them, it is reported, there is a class of the late Kushan and post-Kushan Tirthankara image identified with Neminātha who is flanked by Balarāma and Vasudeva Krṣṇa holding a plough, mace and wheel.\(^{33}\)

With the advent of the Guptas in the 4th century, the number of Jaina sculptures at Mathurā suddenly decreases. Archaeological Museum at Mathurā, and State Museum at Lucknow which house the bulk of Mathurā antiquities possess only 38 and 21 Jaina sculptures of the Gupta age respectively. Not a single Jaina architectural piece of any interest in this age is said to be existent in the Museum at Mathurā and Lucknow, nor are there any Guptan terracotta figures. Mathurā inscriptions similarly decrease by number with the entry in the Gupta age. Also Jaina monuments and sculptures in North India including Mathurā are reported to be very scarce during 600 to 1000 A.D.\(^{64}\) We should also note that the Vyavahārasūtraḥāyaṃ refers to a quarrel among the Jainas and the Buddhists about the ownership of a stūpa which was likely constructed in the considerably earlier time,\(^{65}\) and that the Avasyakacūrti informs us about the marital relation of a Mathurā merchant made with the other at Southern Mathurā.\(^{66}\)

All these data evince that the Jaina activities at Mathurā which had been continuously recorded since the 2nd century B. C. suffered a sudden blow with the entry in the Gupta era beginning with the 4th century A. D., and that the places of their activities suddenly shifted thenceforth to various parts of India, the South and the West in the main, which have continued to be the centres of Jainism up to the present age. This powerfully speaks that the Jaina communities, both ascetic and lay, migrated en masse to all these places from Mathurā with the advent of the Guptas.

No record in both Jaina and non-Jaina sources seems to exist as to how and why the migration of the Jainas took place during this period, that has to be explained on the basis of these data. Notable characteristics found in the above data are as follows: Mathurā inscriptions mostly register the donation of images made by the lay Jainas who were engaged in various trades and commerce. A majority of the Southern inscriptions of the 4-6th centuries documents the land grants of the rulers to the Jainas and the samādhi maraṇa of ascetics. And a majority of the Jaina archaeological specimens during this period in the Eastern, Central, Northern and western parts of India which were under the control of the Guptan empire consists of the Jaina images. Literary activities began remarkable by the beginning of the 6th century in the south, which commenced with Second Valabha Council in the 4th Century in the West. And many cities to which the Jainas, both monks and householders, emigrated were the well-known commercial centres of the days. Now what are these facts speaking of themselves?
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The lay Jainas generally belong today and also belonged in the past to the business class which consisted of sreṣṭhis (bankers), sārthavāhas (traders) and kulikas (merchants). They organized guilds (sreṇis or nīgamas) which functions as banks, courts and as the administrative centres of the social and communal activities such as constructing temples, aiding the poor, and so forth. Beside sreṇis which were the guilds of craftsmen and merchants, there existed the other corporate bodies such as pūgas which consisted of different castes and occupations in the same area and gānas which functioned as the local political governmental bodies of a popular type. The representatives of guilds were co-active in the higher hierarchy of these administrative bodies in the towns and cities, therefore they must have exerted an influential power over the municipal affairs. The Gupta kings administered, in order to maintain the stabilized peace of this huge empire, a strong central government control over the economic, political and social matters after the policies advised in the Arthaśāstra and Dharmasastra. It is reported however that in the Śrītis of the Gupta age, there is no trace of the strict official control or political exploitation of sreṇis and sāṅghas as much evinced in the Arthaśāstra, but on the contrary, there is a remarkable tendency to safeguard the property and strengthen the constitution of these bodies. Taxes paid by the guilds were counted as one of the most important sources of kings’ revenue. And during this age of economic prosperity and peace, the guild and corporations seem to be gradually growing into a larger system like a trust organization pacing with the rooting in of the caste system which grew into complexity in the course of time. This is the general picture of the corporate bodies in the Gupta age, that of which in the Kushan period seems to be not clearly known yet, however it must have been advancing towards the same stage described above. Then the position of the huge and prosperous Jaina communities at Mathura was likely most powerful over the other castes during the reigns of Kanishka, Huvishka and Vasudeva.

The Gupta rulers who were the Vaiśāvatas and supported the Hindu activities in all respects are known to have taken a tolerant policy to the Śaivas and non-Hindus as well. However Mathura where a majority of the Jainas had likely settled down by this time is the birth place of Lord Kṛṣṇa. Hence in the florescence of Hindu revival movement, the city was probably soon handed over to the Vaiśāvatas wherein the Buddhists seem to have survived better than the Jainas. The Jaina inscriptions at Mathura are still available in number during the reign of the Hindu King Vāsudeva (202–226 A. D. : he was likely a Śaiva despite of his name) in the Kushan dynasty. And as we have aforementioned, here appears a class of the late Kushan and post-Kushan image of Neminatha attended by Balarāma and Kṛṣṇa. Kṛṣṇa theme creeps in the canonical texts such as Uttarādhyayana 22, Antakṛddhaśa, Natadharmaśaka.
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16, Vahnidasa 1 and Dißavikālikā. The theme of twelve cakravartis including Vasudeva and Baladeva also occurs in the Sthāna and samavāya, for instance.

Some features of Krishṇa stories in the Jaina canon are reported as follows (1) Only a part of the Krishṇa story is incorporated in the form of an inserted tale to serve as an illustration in explaining the Jaina doctrines such as the principle of transmigration, (2) Krishṇa, no doubt a mighty king, figures as a secondary personality in the biography of Neminātha, (3) He is not a divinity but a person who suffers karmic consequences, and (4) A mention is made about the exodus of the Pāṇḍavas, their populating Pāṇḍu-Mathurā in the South and their perishing on the Satruñjaya hill by sallekhaṇā. The last feature herein must be speaking of the migration of the Jainas from Mathurā to the South. It is also remarked that the name of Nemi and Ariśṭanemi appear in the Yajurveda as well as the Prabhāṣa purāṇa, who are however not at all relevant to Tirthaṅkara Neminātha. The Hindu purāṇas describe Rābhaka to some extent but not Nemi who appears in the Hariyamśa (also the name Ariśṭanemi, occurs) that Dakṣa gave four daughters to Ariśṭanemi, who gave birth to sixteen sons. By the time of the composition of these canonical texts, therefore, the Jainas began to adopt Krishṇa theme which was gaining general popularity among the Hindus. The Jaina purāṇas in the post-canonical stage fully took an advantage of the Hindu epics to propagate the Jaina dogmatics.

The Mahābhārata which tells the story of Krishṇa is suspected to have existed in the present form by the 4th century A. D., of which original form is speculated to go back to the 4th century B. C. And it is also postulated that there were several traditional Krishṇas who were merged into one deity in the later time. The early Paraśurāma worship in western India is indicated by an inscription of the 2nd century A.D., and avatarā worship is amply attested by the growing number of the relevant epigraphic evidences during the 4th through 8th centuries. The Hindu purāṇas of the Gupta age began to accept Buddha as an avatarā of Viṣṇu. And by absorbing the Buddhist doctrines of ahimsā, vegetarianism, etc., which are more sternly upheld by the Jainas, the Vaiṣṇavas attempted to attract the masses of the followers of Buddhism, that is considered to have played a substantial role for the decline of Buddhism. The purāṇas like the Bhāgavata likewise absorbed the first Jaina Tirthaṅkara Rābhaka as one of Viṣṇu’s avatarās. And it should be also remembered that a Rajgir cave of the 4th century A. D. came to be requisitioned by the Vaiṣṇava votaries.

All these suggest that during the late canonical and post-canonical periods there were aggressive propagation and counterpropagation among the Hindu and the non-Hindu sects including the Jaina school to dominate over the other in order to absorb the followers of the other or in order to defend their own followers to be enticed by the other. The Buddhist adoption of Krishṇa theme is, it is remarked, rather
insignificant. However the case of the Jaina’s counterattack against the Vaiṣṇavas took a persistent and vigorous course, probably because it involved with the survival of the heavy Jaina communities at Mathurā.

The history of the late Kushan dynasty is still in darkness, but it is said that it was fastly changing into Hindunization in contrast to the florescence of Buddhism in the cosmopolitan atmosphere at the beginning period of this dynasty. We do not know when Kṛṣṇa worship began to gain power. However avatāra worship is already attested in the epigraphical sources from the 2nd century onwards, and the mechanism of the theory of avatāra can easily absorb the deities of the other religions. The Vaiṣṇavas must have therefore started to absorb the deities of the other religions including the first Tīrthaṅkara of the Jainas. The Jainas who were leading the power at Mathurā must have faced this new religious movement with the sense of disgust, but since its growing popularity centred round Mathurā became innegligible, they likely retorted them in turn by subordinating Kṛṣṇa to Neminātha. However this religious fight did not stop there, grew into the socio-economic struggle of the Jaina communities at Mathurā, which became decisive by the turnover of the dynasty. For with the advent of the Guptas, the city must have become the centre of the Hindu revival movement, particularly of the Vaiṣṇavas, which went on accelerating into the intensive and large scaled force patronized by the then rulers. The Jainas must have resisted at best to maintain their position at Mathurā, however they could not stand out for too long.

The arrival of the age of eclipse for the Jainas must have been sensed by the alert businessmen already at the early stage of social change, and gradually they started to desert Mathurā to the places where such social pressures would be less and where their business activities would be more promising. It is thus plausible that the structure of the huge Jaina business communities which constituted a hierarchy or some hierarchies of corporate bodies came to be shaken up and confronted a menacing socio-economic set-back. This must have further accelerated their migration until the majority of the Jaina communities vacated the city. The exodus of the lay Jaina communities from Mathurā naturally caused the migration of the ascetic saṅghas as well, because the latter had to depend on the former for their material needs. The change of the power structure at Mathurā seems to have thus taken place during the Gupta period. The Jaina purāṇas in the post-canonical period kept on developing Kṛṣṇa theme in the Jaina context, which was perhaps the continuation of the persistent counterattack against the Vaiṣṇava movement which drove the Jainas away from Mathurā as symbolized in the pāṇḍava’s migration to the Southern Mathurā.

It appears therefore that the lay Jainas began to desert Mathurā at the beginning of the Gupta age and migrated to the West and the South. The Western area was
under the suzerains of the Guptas, and the South was completely outside the hand of the Gupta empire. Ujjain, Valabhi, Kāñcī, Madurā, etc., were well known for the then commercial centres; and Surat in Gujarat and Mangalore in Mysore were famous for the international trades with Egypt, Rome, China and Southeast Asian countries during this period; also Kolar gold mine in Mysore is suspected to have been exploited around this time.²⁴ The internal trade routes for caravans had been well developed by this time, and the overland route through Ujjain, Paithan, Tamil land to Kashi, and the sea routes between Surāṣṭra and Madurā were well known.²⁵ It is not at all surprising therefore that the lay Jainas at Mathurā who were well acquainted with these business worlds chose, guided by their keen business sense, and migrated to these promising trade centres as their futur ehomelands.

It is evident from Mathurā inscriptions wherein lay doners inscribed the names of their preceptor along with their gāna, kula, etc., that the laymen or lay communities were under the guidance of the particular spiritual teachers. In another word, monks came to have stood by this time for the lay Jainas as their spiritual guides, who in turn depended for their material needs on the lay communities. Corroborating this fact, Kalugumalai hill inscription of the 2nd to the 1st century B. C. records that the Jaina merchants donated monasteries to a Jaina monk. The canonical texts themselves which prescribe the householders' duties attest this sound tie-up of the lay and the ascetic saṅghas in those days. Where the ascetic saṅghas moved, there they were likely followed by the lay votaries in the earlier period. However the migrated Jainas, both lay and ascetic, from Mathurā in the Gupta age chose the commercial cities for their future homelands. This alludes to the fact that the lay communities invited their preceptors for their spiritual guidance after their migration and that the ascetic saṅghas which could not go without their support welcomed it and joined them.

The Jaina antiquities under the dominion of the Gupta empire mostly consist of the images of Jinas inasmuch as Mathurā antiquities of the Jainas in the Kusban age do. This implies that the doners were mostly the wealthy merchants who likely constructed temples at the sites of their finds. The Jaina emigrants to the West did not seem to have enjoyed an imperial support at their beginning stage. On the contrary, those migrated to the South were backed up by the rulers as the early Southern inscriptions of the 4-6th centuries attest. This alludes to the fact that these migrated Jainas who previously enjoyed the highly organized corporate life at Mathurā and were well acquainted with the know-how in organizing business communities immediately commenced to invite the royal favour in order to settle down in these new places. The total absence of the record of an image donation in the epigraphical sources indicates that they did not yet possess or just began to construct their own temples which functioned as the centres for community activities. Lands granted by kings were free of taxes. Therefore, for the sake of establishing a community centre
with a view to beginning a new settlement life, the wisest step to take was to win
the royal patronage, for which the capable monks endowed with scholarship and
exelled conduct were indispensable. The lay communities had to thus invite the
ascetic saṅghas not only for their spiritual guidance but also for gaining the imperial
favour. The record of Śīmānandī Ācārya’s assistance of Mahāvīra I (c.2350 B.C.)
in founding the Ganga dynasty, which is the earliest Jaina epigraphy available in
Karnataka, clearly evinces that the Jaina monk was attempting to win an influence
over the king. Likewise Śrutasūrya who is called senāpati in the inscription obviously
assisted Kākusthavarman in founding the Kadamba dynasty.

Lay communities thus required the assistance of ascetic saṅghas and ascetic saṅghas
also needed the support of lay communities. And the monks practising nudity must
have naturally preferred to go to the South, and those wearing clothes likely migrated
to the West at large. The waves of the mass exodus of the Jaina communities from
Mathurā to all these places seem to have thus happened. Therefore Śaurasenī became
the language of composition in the South; whereas the 3rd Valbhī Convention
redirected the Mathurā version instead of the Valabhi version of the previous century,
which was likely due to the strengh of monks newly emigrated from Mathurā. Then
the Mathurā vāca was expected to show the characteristic features of Śaurasenī,
however the present Āgama is characterized by the Mahārāṣṭrī elements. No doubt,
some canonical texts were composed in the West, the number of which is however
small. This phenomenon must be largely due to the gradual change of the language
of the canon in the process of the adjustment of the language of the authors into
Mahārāṣṭrī in the West, because the recension of the canonical texts used by the
cūraṇī authors is said to show the archaic Mahārāṣṭrī, while that used by the Senakrit
commentators shows the classical Mahārāṣṭrī. (As to this point, the linguistic
analysis of the canonical recensions used by the cūraṇī and vṛttī authors is urgently
awaited.)

In the 5th century, the Canonical Convention was held at Mathurā and Valabhi. This
indicates that a number of monks still remained at Mathurā, but a number of
monks had already moved to Valabhi. In the 5th century, the Convention was held
at Valabhi, which signifies that Valabhi became the centre of the Jaina in the West.
Śravaṇabelgala inscription no.1 of c. 600 A.D. which is so far the earliest available
Jaina epigraphy therein tells that Bādhrabāḥusvāmi, of the lineage of Gautama,
Lohārya ....... Bhādrabāhu, Viśākha ....... Buddhila and the other teachers, predicted
a twelve years’ famine at Ujjain, therefore the entire saṅgha set out from the North
to the South and reached a country filled with happy people, wealth, gold, corn
and domestic animals; then Prabhācandra Ācārya, separating himself from the saṅgha
fasted to death attended by a single disciple on the Kaṭavapura mountain; and in the
course of time 700 rāis accomplished samādhi marāṇa likewise. The inscriptions at
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Śravaṇabelgola during the 7th century mostly record the death fast of ascetics. This saṅgha likely migrated to Śravaṇabelgola in much earlier time than 600 A. D. and its members gradually demised by this time.

All these evince that the mass migration of the Jaina communities, both lay and ascetic, took place gradually during the Gupta period beginning with the 4th century A. D. Sporadic migrations must have occurred from time to time in the pre-Guptan era as apparent from the foregoing data, which however did not at all become a force to change the geography of the Jainas. The waves of the mass exodus of the Jaina communities in the Gupta age from Mathurā to all these places which are concentrated in the South and the West had largely determined the geography of the present day Jainas, that was a monumental event in the Jaina history.

The seemingly silent activities of the Jainas in the North during the Gupta age can be thus well explained by their gradual mass migration, who were spending their energy for the settlement in the new places. The schism took place around the time when the Canonical Council was held at Valabhi, thenceforth notable literary activities began in the South, and the unbroken canonical tradition continued in the West. Thus despite of this revolutionary change of the Jaina communities caused by the social impact of the days, the literary activities of the Jaina monks seem to have continued from the previous period in a flow without a break in both Southern and Western India. Ascetic Saṅghas owe for it to the constant care and support of the laity, to whom the former likewise amply responded by taking up the role of spiritual leadership.

(3) Great schism

When and how the great schism into the present day Svetāmbaras and Digambaras came into being is shrouded in mist. The absence of the essential doctrinal discordances between these two major schools however suggests that the schism arose in the comparatively recent time. Had the schism occurred in the 3rd century B. C., for instance, both schools would have developed substantially different doctrinal systems, event not to the extent of Mahāyānaism and Hinayānism in the Buddhist schools. However the fact stands that the Jaina dogmatic concepts which evolved since Mahāvīra's time up to the 5th century A. D. and were represented in the T. S. in essence were basically received by the two sects. This implies that the schism took place after the stage when the Āgamic concepts grew into a full maturity.

The Viṣeṣavāṣyakabhasya 3032–3092 refer to Śivabhūti's nihāva which is not mentioned in the previous literature in the Āgamic tradition. The story goes that Śivabhūti, who was unhappy about his guru's disapproval of his possessing an ornamented shawl donated by a king on the ground of parigraha, quarreled with him about the matter of prīṣṭhā as to the jīvakāpa's possession of upādhi, i. e., a broom stick and a
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mouth-piece, thus he finally left his guru by establishing his own party of naked monks. This nihava is called the Boțka (Digambara) issue. The cardinal claims of the Digambaras are three,²⁹ that nudity alone leads to mokṣa, that women are thereby not eligible to attain mokṣa, and that a kevali does not eat food through his mouth. These points are accounted in the Sarvārthasiddhi, therefore Pūjyapāda was a Digambara, before whom the schism must have occurred. Pūjyapāda and Jinabhbhāra belong to the 6th century A.D., therefore both traditions agree in asserting that the schism took place sometime before their time.

The aforementioned copper-plate inscriptions of Mrgeśavarman (c. 475–490 A.D.) register land grants made to 1) the Śvetapātas and Nirgranthas (c. 478 A.D.), and Yāpanīyas, Nirgranthas and Kūrcakas (c. 482 A.D.). This vindicates that among the migrated ascetics to the South by the end of the 5th century, there were at least four different communities, i.e., the Śvetapāta, Nirgrantha, Yāpaniya and Kūrcaka. The designation of Śvetāmbara-Digambara seems to be of a later origin, and they were likely calling themselves the Śvetapātas and the Nirgranthas at the beginning period in the South. Pūjyapāda also describes Umāsvāti as Nirgrantha Ācārya in the Sarvārthasiddhi. Since these four saṅghas were called by those distinct names, the schism must have occurred before c. 478 A.D. The Yāpaniyas practised nudity but maintained the Āgamic tradition by admitting strīmukti and kevalibhukti. Numerous inscriptions referring to the Yāpaniya saṅgha exist from the 5th century up to the 14th century, which was however absorbed later into the Digambara fold.⁸⁰ Not much is known yet about the Kūrcaka saṅgha which does not have many inscriptions, nor has left us so far any literary works.⁸¹

Harinātī gives the earliest Digambara explanation of the schism account in his Bṛhatkathākōṣa, Sec. 131 called Bhadrabāhukathānska. According to him, Bhadrabāhu in the reign of Candragupta at Ujjain predicted a famine lasting for twelve years. Upon hearing this, Candragupta received dīkṣā from Bhadrabāhu, who soon became the head of all saṅghas and called by name Viśākha Ācārya. By the order of Bhadrabāhu, Viśākha led the saṅgha to Punnāṭa kingdom in the South, while Bhadrabāhu and the others led their saṅghas to Sindhu. In the course of time when they returned to Ujjain, the famine was still persisting though less severe, wherein monks were allowed to use a piece of garment for alms collection. After the famine was over, these monks did not stop this robe wearing practice even though advised by the elders. The schism started then onwards. A prevalent belief of the later day Digambaras is that the schism occurred at the time of Bhadrabāhu I who led the saṅgha along with Candragupta Maurya to Śravaṇabelgola due to the twelve years’ famine in the North. Upon their return to the North after the end of the famine they found that the monks who had remained there slackened in discipline by wearing
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...therefore they left them and established the saṅgha according to the orthodox tardition of nudity.

These legends along with the others told in the later time\(^{82}\) were derived undeniably from the aforeintroduced Śravaṇabelgola inscription no. I of c. 600 A. D. This inscription clearly informs us that Bhadrabāhusvāmi who predicted the twelve years' famine at Ujjain is a different saint from Bhadrabāhu I whose immediate disciple is recorded as Viśākha. The inscription is totally silent about the migration of this certain nimittrijña Bhadrabāhu, which must mean that he did not at all come to the South. Prabhācandra whose death fast was followed by many other saints in the course of time was likely an outstanding figure in the migrated saṅgha, but he had nothing to do with Candragupta Maurya.

Yatīvṛṣabha (between 473 and 609 A. D.) mentions about Candragupta in his Tiloyapannatti 4.1481 that he was initiated into the Jaina faith. Verse 4.1482 then speaks about five śrutaśevakas including Bhadrabāhu, which therefore suggests that Candragupta referred to above is identical with the Maurya King by this name. Śravaṇabelgola inscription no. 31 (17–18) of c. 650 A. D. refers to Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta, who are however not at all said to have visited here\(^{83}\) This Bhadrabāhu--Candragupta theme then developed into the existence of their foot-prints impressed on the summit of the Candragiri around 900 A. D.\(^{84}\) Hariṣena (931–932 A. D.) tells that Candragupta alias Viśākha led the saṅgha to the South. Since Viśākha Ārya is the direct disciple of Bhadrabāhu I, Hariṣena identifies him with Candragupta Maurya.

From this it is apparent that Bhadrabāhu I–Candragupta Maurya legend gradually got into shape on the basis of the mention of Bhadrabāhusvāmi and Prabhācandra in the Śravaṇabelgola inscription, which fatally determined the pontifical lineage of of the Digambaras. This Śravaṇabelgola inscription no. 1 which record in Kannada script the past history of the migrated saṅgha was likely made when the saṅgha came to be firmly rooted in this area, because the inscription at Śravaṇabelgola went on increasing thenceforth indicating that it became the stronghold of the Jainas in the South. The inscription is completely silent about the schism which must have occurred before c. 478 A. D. , the date of the copper-plate ordinance of Mrgeśavarman. The recorded content of this inscription is that the saṅgha migrated to this place from the North due to the twelve years' famine predicted by Bhadrabāhu at Ujjain. This is a matter of fact history known to this migrated saṅgha. A twelve years' famine is reported in the Jainasource in reference to the cause of the Third Valabhi Council held in 453 or 465 A. D. but no record of a long famine during the 6th century A. D. in the North seems to be found in the Jaina source. Also it is quite reasonable to assume that over a century of time was required for this migrated saṅgha to establish itself as the centre of the Jainas in the South. It is therefore
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not unreasonable to infer that this sangha migrated from the North before the date of the schism. To en the content of this memorial inscription which is not obsessed by the schism issue involving sectarian claims should be treated as a valuable common historical document of the Jainas of the two traditions.

Bhadrabahu at Ujjain who foretold the twelve years’ famine was undoubtedly excelled in nimittavidya. The Avasyaka niryukti 778 alleges the occurrence of seven nihnavas in the past, “bahuraya paesa avvatta-samucchā-duga-tiga-abaddhiyā cevai satte ṇiṅhagā khalu tithhammi u vaddhamānassa”, while its gatha 781 adds Rathavirapura as the place of the eighth nihnava, “sāvaitthi usabhapuraṇa seyaviyā mihīla ullumūtite purimāntarami dasapura rāhavirapuraṇa ca nagaraṁ”. Admittedly here is a confusion in statement. The Uttarādhvayana niryukti 164 Likewise enumerates seven nihnavas, “bahuraya-paesavatta-samucchā duga-tiga-abaddhīga ceva/ees ānigamaṇam uucchāmī ahānyuvvve”, wherein ‘sattē’ of the Avasyaka niryukti 778 is obscurely stated by way of ‘eesīm’. The Avasyaka niryukti gatha 781 is dropped from the Uttarādhvayana niryukti which inserts the Viṣeṣāvasyakabhāṣya 3034 as its niryukti gatha 178, “rāhavirapuraṇa nayaram divagam-ujjāna ajjākanhe aśivabhūss-uvahimmi pucchā therānakahanā ya”. These Niryuktis were originally acquainted with seven nihnava issues alone, to which the account of the eighth issue was interpolated obviously by Jinabhadra himself,86 Niryuktikāra Bhadrabahu II thus does not seem to know anything about the schism yet. This suggests us to reassign the date of Bhadrabahu II prior to the date of the schism, if this niryuktikāra is identical with nimittajña Bhadrabahu.

Bhadrabahu II, author of the Niryuktis and nimittajña, has been assigned to c. 500-600 V. S. on the basis of the traditional belief that he was the brother of Varāhamihira (505-587 A.D.) who was born near Ujjain.86 The authenticity of this legend is dubious, because niryuktikāra Bhadrabahu II was an orthodox Jaina who was not at all likely a Brahmin convert from the contents of the Niryuktis and Varāhamihira was a staunch Hindu. In all probability, the later Jainas made up a story of Bhadrabahu at Ujjain who was excelled in nimittavidya in relation to Varāhamihira, a celebrated astronomer and astrologer. Neither the ground of the assignment of his date, c. 500-600 V. S., on the basis of the date of Varāhamihira, 505-587 A. D., is at all clear. Suppose his date is accepted as of c. 500-600 A. D. on the basis of Varāhamihira’s date, it invites difficulty pertaining to the dates of the authors such as Siddhasena Divākara, Pujyapāda and Jinabhadra who are assigned in the 6th century A. D., because a good temporal distance exists between the Niryuktis and the Sinhu-Sinvā-tharasiitī-Viṣeṣāvāsyakabhāṣya. It is better therefore to reassign the date of Bhadrabahu II before and around the time of the famine which was followed by the great schism. A twelve years’ famine can be interpreted as a long years’ famine which was severe enough to take away many persons’ lives, and surmising from the present day condition of natural disasters, even a few years’ duration of a
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horrific famine would make it. It is difficult to say if niryuktikāra Bhadrabāhu and nimmattajā Bhadrabāhu were the same person or not. But since both Bhadrabāhus do not know the schism, they must have belonged to the same period. Then we can still retain the accepted view that these two Bhadrabāhus are the same person, unless and until strong evidences against it are produced.

The Digambara legend that the schism came into being due to the slackened practice of robe wearing of those who remained in the North during the famine is difficult to accept, because the two types of monks, i.e., acelaka and saceleka had been existing side by side since Mahāvira's lifetime as so evinced in the Ācārāṅga I. Likewise the nihānava issue described by Jina Bhadra is hardly acceptable as the cause of this great schism. All these claims agree in one point that the vital issue of the schism involves the matter of robe wearing or not. From the archaeological evidences we learn that the first known dhoti clad Tirthankara image makes its appearance in the late 5th century A.D. From the inscriptive sources we learn that the schism took place before the 4th regnal year of Mṛgaśīvarman, c. 475-490 A.D. The schism must have thus occurred sometime by this time, trusting that the date of Mṛgaśīvarman (assigned in The History and Culture of the Indian People, v. 3) is reliable. Then a certain grave event which was crucial enough to divide the Jinaa church into two must have taken place before this time. And sure enough, the Third Valabhi Canonical Council took place in 453 or 455 A.D. according to tradition. Then we have to examine the relevant materials and explain how this Canonical Council came to be the cause of the great schism.

According to the Dhavālā (v. 1, pp. 65-67), the complete knowledge of the āṅgas and pūrvas was lost by the time of Dīracaśī, teacher of Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali. The Digambaras nevertheless accept the twelve āṅgas as their sacred literature. The Vīrāṭnālakha explains "Dīrghavāvakāla, etc." as the content of the āṅgabāhyas under the sūtra I : (2) and the Rājyāvatsa propounds "Uttarālaḥṣayaana, etc." as such, while the Dīrghavākāla enumerates 14 texts (i.e., Sāmānīya, Cauvisisathao, Vādīgīm, Padikamana, Vaiṣayya, Kidayamana, Dasaveyāliya, Uṭṭarajjhyayana, Kappavāhayāno, Kappakkappiyo, Mahakappiyo, Pumārīya, Mahāpumārīya, Nishiyaya) which likely constituted the common heritage of the āṅgabāhyas in the Āgamic tradition before the split of the church. The later Digambaras count the Kaśāyapārābhīya of Gaṇadhara, the Saṅkarārya of Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali and the Gāyapaṇḍatti of Yativṛśabha (author of the Cūrṇisūtra on the Kaśāyapārābhīya) as their āṅgabāhyas texts, which were, excluding the first named text, directly derived from the later canonical tradition in the immediate post-Umāvaiśā period. Their pro-canons is classified into four types: 1) Prathamānuyoga, namely, Padmapuruṇa, Harivānṣapurāṇa Mahāpurāṇa and Uṭṭarapuruṇa which are the works of the 7th to the 9th century A.D.; 2) Kanaṇānuyoga, namely, Jayadhavālā of the 9th century, including the
Sec. 3. SOME PROBLEMS IN THE T. S.

Śūryaprajñāapti and Candraprajñāapti which sound to be derived from the upāngas by these names\textsuperscript{38} : 3) Dravyānuyoga, namely, the works by Kundakunda, the revised version of the T. S. and Āptaśāṃśā, which are the post-Umāsvāti products, and 4) Carṇānuyoga, namely, Mūlācāra and Trīvaraśārada of Vāṇakaṇa, Rainakaraṇḍa śrāvakācāra of Sūnintabhadra and Bhīṣavatī ārādhana of Śivakoṭi, which again belong to the post-Umāsvāti period.\textsuperscript{39} The works other than the twelve aṅgas, 14 aṅgabāhyas and the Kṣayaśrāvīḥṣṭa are the post-Umāsvāti products extending up to the 9th century, therefore the present pro-canonical list must have been formulated after the 9th century A. D.

The Digambara list of the sacred literature clearly evinces that they did not disapprove the Āgamic tradition but they flatly refused to accept the later canonical texts redacted at Valabhī. And the Digambara literature as well as the Śvetāmbara literature after the Valabhī Council patently exhibit that there was a free flow of materials between these schools. Curiously enough, the Mūlācāra, Bhīṣavatī ārādhana, etc., which are suspected to be of the Yāpaniyas are sanctioned as the authoritative texts in spite of their nature coming into conflict with their basic creeds, because the Yāpaniyas upheld the Āgamic tradition in all respects. The Digambaras were obviously against the robe wearing monks alone and took the side of the non-robe wearing Yāpaniyas who were in the fold of the Śvetāmbaras by creeds. The Yāpaniyas were, as alleged by their inscriptions, in the South in majority together with Nīgrantaḥ, while only a minority of the Śvetapaṭhas settled down in the South. Thus a majority of robe wearing monks must have moved to the West. The cause of the schism is thus entangled with the nature of the Third Canonical Convention at Valabhī which was likely held by the robe wearing monks.

We are informed that Devapāddhigaṇi presided over the Council at Valabhī in 453 or 466 A. D. immediately after the ending of the twelve years’ famine in fear of the further loss of the sacred texts which had been handed down through the memory of monks. According to tradition, the previous Canonical Councils were convened under the similar condition that the monks who memorized the sacred scriptures were expiring due to long famines. It is said that a twelve years’ famine occurred at the time of Bhadrabāhu, Āryasuhasti and Vajravāmi respectively. The first famine was terrible, which caused all the munis except Bhadrabāhu to forget the Dṛṣṭivāda, thus the First Canonical Council was called. The other two famines did not seem to have affected the knowledge of the Jaina scriptures memorized by the survivors. A twelve years’ famine occurred again at the time of Skandila, and it happened that all the principal anuyogadharas except Skandila died in the North. So he summoned a council of Jaina monks at Mathurā and redacted the canon by taking notes of whatever could be gathered from them. A similar attempt was made by Nāgarjuna at Valabhī almost simultaneously.\textsuperscript{90}
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The traditional accounts above convey us that the Canonical Councils were summoned under a critical condition in peril of the loss of the sacred knowledge due to long famines, but not under a normal peaceful condition. And under such circumstances, the Councils were held immediately by the survivors who gathered around the same area. The Second Council was thus summoned both at Mathurā and Valabhi at the same time, and under a critical condition no attempt was made to hold a joint council of all Jaina monks. In another word, there existed no conventional practice of calling a Canonical Convention attended by the entire Jaina monks.

The schism did not arise at the Second Canonical Councils held at Mathurā and Valabhi in the 4th century. It must mean that these Councils were or at least Mathurā Council was attended by both robe wearing and naked monks. The Third Valabhi Convention was called under the similar critical condition. By this time, however, the majority of monks practising nudity had already been migrated to the South, and the geography of the Jainas was largely divided into the South and the West. The Convention must have been therefore held by the robe wearing monks in majority. And since it was the customary practice in the history of the Jainas to hold a Canonical Council by the survivors who gathered around the area hit by the famine, Devarddhī and the others who summoned the meeting under emergency would not have thought about extending an announcement of this matter to the Southern brethren. Thus the Council immediately took place according to the past rule by those who remained at Valabhi. And the Southern Jainas came to know about it sooner or later.

A Canonical Convention is a vital concern for any co-religionists, for the basic canonical texts are authorised thereby, according to the holy utterance of which their religious activities are directed. Therefore when the Council announced the final redaction of the texts without the consent of those in the South, they were not at all happy. They were not affected by the famine, and many migrated saints must have carried a good number of canonical texts with them including the Kaśyapprābha, saṅkhāṇḍāgama and Tiloyapaṇṇatti (which was likely finalized in the 6th century A. D.) which the brethren in the West did not possess. They thus came out with a decision to disclaim the authority of the canonical list made at Valabhi by saying that the complete knowledge of the sacred texts had been already lost before the time of the Saṅkhaṇḍāgama, and upon organizing the Nirgrantha sect they attempted to compile their own canonical texts inasmuch as the Śvetapāṭhas did. If the Śvetapāṭhas' action were legitimate, the Nirgranthas’ action should be likewise legitimate, inasmuch as the two Canonical Conventions were authorized in the 4th century A. D. The Nirgranthas thus came out with the principal three creeds in order to distinguish themselves from the Śvetapāṭhas. The later Digambaras then attempted to build up their history by
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bringing in Bhadrabāhu I and Candragupta Maurya, the theme developed from the Sravana belgola inscription no. 1, for the sake of establishing the authority of their tradition. (Likewise the Digambaras' claim that the Kaśyapa prābhṛta, T. S. etc., are derived from the Drṣṭiṇāda is obviously concocted in relation to Bhadrabāhu I who alone is said to have memorized the Drṣṭiṇāda.)

If the migration of the Jaina ascetic communities had not divided the robe wearers in the West and the naked ascetics in the South, the Third Valabhi Council must have escaped to be the cause of the schism. The great schism thus came into being because time had played a fatal role for it by changing the map of the Jainas into the South and the West. Unaware of this fact, the Western groups of monks performed their duty of preserving the sacred knowledge by summoning the Convention according to the past rule. This invited an emotional issue of the Southern brethren. Their attempt of compiling their own canonical texts is quite legitimate inasmuch as the two Canonical Councils were accepted in the past century. Also the Kaśyapa prābhṛta, etc., which were obviously studied by and handed down to the groups of early karma specialists who happened to have migrated to the South, should have their places in the final list of the canon. Therefore the Southern monks' protest against the list of the canon made at Valabhi is not at all unreasonable. Unfortunately, between these two remote areas there seems to have existed no attempt to have a following-up joint meeting for reconciliation or adjustment of the Valabhi redaction before they decisively split into the two church organizations.

Since the mobility of the Jainas in the Gupta age was as such, the news that the Valabhi Council redacted the final list of the canon must have reached the South rather soon. However how soon the Southern monks responded to the Western monks by organizing an independent sect is difficult to know. No record exists that all the Southern monks met at one place together to discuss about this matter. Mrgeśvarman's copper-plate charter refers to the Śvetapāṭhas in c. 478 A. D. and at least one dhoti wearing Akota bronze of the late 5th century A. D. is available. It seems therefore that the atmosphere of general dissatisfaction with the Valabhi decision soon came to prevail among the naked monks who were spread in various parts of the South, wherein the robe wearing monks were just a minority. Grouping into the Śvetapāṭhas and the Nirgranthas seems to have occurred under some heavy pressure of this awkward and obscure atmosphere, which was soon conveyed to the Western monks, who retorted the South by producing the dhoti clad Tīrthaṅkara images.

Among the basic creeds of the Digambaras, the proviso of nakedness for liberation must have been therefore declared at once. Women's illegibility for liberation is its logical consequence. However the claim of the refusal of a kevalī's kavalāhāra must have been gradually developed by the time of the Sarvārthaśīddhi, because the Digambara recension of the T. S. which accepts the Śvetāmbara reading
of the sūtra IX : 11(11) evinces an obscure position regarding this matter. Pūjyapāda could have revised this sūtra, which somehow he hesitated to do. Under the circumstances, the Digambaras had to likewise establish some other minor mātabhedas to strike differences from the Svetāmbara positions. For instance, Kundakunda follows the Kaśyapaprābhṛta as to the concept of upayoga. Pūjyapāda follows the Saṭkhandagama as to the theory of atomic combination. Vāṭakera takes the Nirūkti position as to the treatment of ācāra. From these pro-canonical authors’ performance, it appears that they attempted to compose their texts from the following traditional sources: 1) Twelve aṅgas, 2) Aṅgabāhyas belonging to the old tradition prior to the schism, e.g., those listed in the Dhāvaḷa, 3) T. S., Nirūkta, etc., which are by nature outside the category of the canon, and 4) Kaśyapaprābhṛta, Saṭkhandagama, etc., which were handed down to those who migrated to the South.

This list excludes the later canonical texts redacted by the final Valabhi Convention. Since the Kaśyapaprābhṛta, etc., which happened to have gone to the South together with the circle of karma specialists, are worthy to be included in the list of the later canonical texts, the leading monks in this circle in particular must have felt strong discontentment with the recent Valabhi list. Therefore the Southern Jainas came out with a decision to count them as their aṅgabāhyas and rejected the later canonical texts authorized by the Western groups. Hence, by the time of the composition of the pro-canonical texts, a certain agreement seems to have been made among the leading Southern monks that they should compose their own pro-canonical texts representing all and every branch of knowledge from the common traditional Agamic sources above, which include the Kaśyapaprābhṛta, etc., and which exclude the later canonical texts redacted in the West. This seems to have determined the position of the pro-canonical authors, thereby minor doctrinal disagreements came to be born. It thus likely took for some time until the Digambaras came to be prepared with their own characteristic features.

The schism came into being among the communities of monks, which had nothing to do with the lay society. Nor the ascetic sāṅghas of both schools probably stood in the sharp antagonistic positions towards each other at the very beginning. Therefore it is not at all surprising from the content of the inscription of Mrgeśavarman that the same image of Arhat in the village was likely worshipped by both the Nirgranthas and the Śvetāpatṛas even though they lived in the different quarters. The situation was likely the same in the West at the beginning stage of the schism.

Unlike the Buddhists, the Jainas seem to have taken a closed-door policy and maintained a strong tie among themselves as a minority group in India throughout the history; and even though various nibbānas and dissentient events must have happened in the long course of time, they did not become explosive forces to split the church. The schism came into being fatally due to the migration of the Jainas of the South and the West where the naked monks and the robe wearing monks were largely divided, coupled with the accidental factor of a long famine which invited the call of the Canonical Convention at Valabhi. The cause of the great schism has long been shrouded in mist, because the history of the Jainas in the Gupta age was in darkness.
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Part 2

Umāsvāti’s date and works

(1) His date

Among the works cited by Umāsvāti, the Vaiśeṣikasūtra, Nyāyaśūtra, Saṅkhya-kārikā and Yogasūtra were composed before the Yogasūrabhaṣya and Abhidharmakośa. And it is clear from the above study that the T.S. precedes the date of the Niryuktis and Saṭkhandagama. A distance between the T.S. and the Saṭkhandagama is pretty close, and we have also proposed that at least half a century of a temporal distance should be allowed between the T.S. and the Sarvārthasiddhi. Umāsvāti’s date has to be thus determined somewhere between Vasubandhu, Vyāsa and Bhadrabāhu II.

Bhadrabāhu II foretold a long years’ famine at Ujjain, after which the Third Valabha Council and the great schism took place in succession. The tradition assigns the date of the Third Canonical Council in 453/466 A.D. (980/693 V.N.) on the basis of Mahāvira’s nirvāṇa which accepted as of 527 B.C. by both traditions. His date of nirvāṇa is in conflict with the established fact that he was a contemporary of Buddha whose date of nirvāṇa is widely accepted in 487-477 B.C.92

As aforementioned, Mrgeṣavaran, c. 475-490 A.D., donated lands to the Śvetapaṭhas and Nirgranthis. Since this is the first inscriptional evidence available in relation to the schism, and since Mrgeṣavaran’s date is established on the basis of the Southern local history which has nothing to do with the Jaina tradition, this inscriptive document is of highly historical value. This copper-plate charter discovered in Dharwar Dist, registers that Mrgeṣavaran in his 4th regnal year, c. 478 A.D., divided the village of Kālavāṅga into three portions and granted them to 1) the holy Arhat and the great god Jīnendra, who inhabit in the supreme and excellent place (called) “the hall of the Arhat”, 2) the Śvetapaṭha sect, and 3) the Nirgrantha sect. The same temple was likely shared by these two sects, which clearly indicates that the ordinance was made not too long after the division of the church. In the previous year, c. 477 A.D., Mrgeṣavaran gave a land to holy Arhats for the purpose of worship, and in c. 482 A.D. he ordered to construct a temple in devotion for his dead father Śāntivarman, and donated lands to the Yāpanīyas, Kūrcakas and Nirgranthis. His grandfather Kākusthavarman (c. 405-435 A.D.) donated a land to a Jaina ācārya, but no inscription pertaining to the Jainas seems to exist as to his father. We are not sure when and how the Yāpanīyas and Kūrcakas originated. However since the royal land grants were made to these distinctly independent sects, we have to be convinced that the schism had already occurred sometime before c. 478 A.D.

The tradition claim that the Second Canonical Councils were synchronically convened at Mithunā and Valabha in 300/313 A.D. (827/840 v.N.) and that the
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Third Council was summoned in 453/466 A.D. (980/993 V.N.). We do not know in what way the Jainas kept the calendar after the death of Mahāvīra and what kinds of efforts were made to maintain its accuracy. Neither do we know in what way the difference of 153 years between the Second and the Third Canonical Councils was memorized. Unfortunately, these dates seem to be untraceable in the external sources. Also the Hindu purāṇas and astronomical sources do not expressly record the dates of long famines occurred in the 4th and the 5th centuries, which are neither locatable in the inscriptions of this period.

The traditional date of Mahāvīra's death comes into conflict with the widely accepted date of Buddha's death. Also not until the Guptas came into the stage fully supporting the Hindu revival movement, the Vaiṣṇava movement would have become that much intensive force to be able to drive the huge Jaina communities away from Mathurā. And the Jaina inscriptions and archaeological remain endorse this fact by showing a sudden decline of their number with the entry in the Gupta period and by evincing their sudden appearance in the various places of the migration of the Jainas which began after the middle of the 4th century A.D. Candragupta I came to the throne in 320 A.D. and Samudragupta in 330 A.D., Some Jainas might have migrated earlier than that time, but their number cannot be large. And since the Jainas must have been skilled in administering business matters and organizing business communities they had likely enjoyed highly organized corporate systems at Mathurā, they could have embarked in their business enterprises (which they might have even well planned previously) immediately after their migration to the new places. Under the historical circumstances as such, both dates of the Second Canonical Councils in tradition are difficult to accept, which must have taken place allegedly after 320 A.D. Then we can likewise doubt about the accuracy of the traditional date of the Third Valabhi council which must have occurred before c. 478 A.D.

Since Mṛgāśīvarman’s inscription evinces that it was made in the comparatively early stage of the schism, the traditional date of the Valabhi Convention as of 453 A.D. is too far away and improbable. We may at present propose here a wider possible range of the date of the Third Canonical council as of c. 466–478 A.D. until some other historical evidences are discovered in the future to determine it accurately. A long famine which Bhadrabāhu II predicted might have been a matter of a few to several years. Then Bhadrabāhu’s date falls in sometime before c.460–472 A.D., which can be taken as the lower limit of the date of the T. S. From his reactions advanced to the T.S., a temporal distance between the T.S. and the Nirṛyuktis is pretty short.

The upper limit of the date of the T.S. is to be determined by the dates of the Yugasūrabhidhyaya and the Abhidharmakosā. Vyāsa’s date is not at all settled down
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among the scholars yet, for instance, the 4th century A.D, is held by Radhakrishnan, 400 A.D. by Dasgupta, c.450 A.D. by UI (History of Indian Philosophy), c. 500 A.D. by Kanakura and Nakamura (History of Ancient India, v. 2), 650-850 A.D. by Woods, and the 7th century A.D. by Strauss. It is thus difficult for us to utilize his date for assigning the upper limit of the date of the T.S.

Vasubandhu’s date is likewise still controversial, for instance, 283-360 A.D. maintained by Smith, 320-400 A.D. by UI, 400-80 A.D. by Higata, 420-500 A.D. by Takakusu, 320-400 A.D. as of Mahāyānīst Vasubandhu and 400-480 A.D. as of the author of the Abhidharmakośa by Frauwallner, and 470-500 A.D. by Dasgupta. However from the aforementioned description of the historical accounts involving Vasubandhu, it is evident that he was flourishing in the middle of the 5th century A.D. The date of the composition of the Abhidharmakośa is unknown, which however comes before his conversion to Mahāyānism that took place in his later time.

Considering all these relevant factors, we may under the circumstances, assign the date of the T.S. somewhere in the late middle of the 5th century A.D. It was composed sometime after the completion of the Abhidharmakośa and sometime before the date of the Nīryuktis. Vasubandhu, Umāsvāti and Bhadradēbu II were thus contemporaries in the 5th century.

(2) His works

The tradition informs us that Umāsvāti composed five hundred prakaraṇas (for instance, Haribhadraśūri mentions it in his commentary on the Praśamaratī). He seems to have written more than a few texts handed down to us because it is pointed out that what the later work like the Uttarādhyayanaṁrtī of Bhāvavijaya says that Vācaka said so and so is not traceable in his extant works. The Praśamaratī, Jambudvīpasaṁāsa, Pūrṇa prakaraṇa and Śāvayapanaṁrtī are ascribed to him in tradition, of which the first two are generally accepted to be his works, but not the last two. None of them bears his name. It seems that he imposed upon himself the composition of the T. S. alone to be his prime task in life. The nature of these works shall be briefly discussed below.

The Praśamaratī takes up the theme of rāga-dveṣa (rāga defined as mamakāra of which content is said to be māyā-lobha, and dveṣa as ahaṃkāra of which content is said to be krodha-māna) as the causes of the karmic bondage in samārā and their vairāgyamārgas which consist of five vratas, twelve anupreksās (said as bāvanās), ten dharmas, threefold pathways to liberation and dhyāna. Unlike the T. S. which is a stiff philosophical treatise, the Praśamaratī is an ethical verse of more popular nature addressed to the monks and laymen, of which content does not go much beyond what is covered by the T. S. The parallel lines between the T. S. and the Praśamaratī are found as follows:
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### T.S. vs Prāśamarātī

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T.S.</th>
<th>Prāśamarātī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I:1, 1Bh.</td>
<td>230-231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3, 3Bh.</td>
<td>222-223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:4</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-13, 11Bh., 12Bh.</td>
<td>224-225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-32</td>
<td>226-227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II:1</td>
<td>196-197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9, 9Bh.</td>
<td>194-195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 12-15</td>
<td>190-192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28, 28Bh.</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III:1</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV:20</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V:1-4</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6, 5Bh.</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9Bh.</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-31</td>
<td>204-206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI:3-4</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII:16</td>
<td>303-304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII:1</td>
<td>33, 56, 142, 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>34-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26, 26Bh.</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX:1-2</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 6Bh.</td>
<td>167-178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 7Bh</td>
<td>149-162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X:5</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7Bh.</td>
<td>296-301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Instead of seven tattvas, nine tattvas are expounded in verse 189 onwards in the Praśamarati, thereby it adds the topic of a promise for laymen to attain svarga loka in reward of their good conduct in this life (verses 302–308). Also the process of kevali samudghāta up to sūkṣmākṛīyā dhyāna which is not explained in the T. S. is described (verses 273–282). Certain minor improvements are also made on the T. S., for instance, the sthāvaras are counted here as of five kinds (verses 190–192 against T. S. II:13–14) and samyaktva, jñāna, cāritra, virya and śikṣā are enumerated to be the jīva lakṣaṇas (verse 218 against T. S. V:21). The Praśamarati 3–4 read, ‘yady-apy-ananta-gama-paryayārtha-hetu-naya-śabda-rainādhyam/sarvajñā-śāsana-purāṇa praveśṭum-abahuśrutair-dukhkham//śruta-buddhi-vibhava-parihinakas-tathā'py-aham-asak-tim-avcintya/dramaka ivāvayaonoḥchakam-anveṣṭum tat-praveśeṣpuḥ’, which echo the s. kārikā 23–26 expressing a difficulty in epitomizing the canon. The Praśamarati is doubtlessly a post-T. S. product, for it quotes the concept like saṣṭamānāya which was formulated in the particular context in composing the T. S.

The Jambūdvipasamāsa is a systematic treatise on Jambūdvipa, of which first two āhnikas describe the geography of Jambūdvipa, the third explains the world oceans and continents, and the fourth discusses about mensuration formulae and recapitulates the characteristic features of Jambūdvipa. The Digambara edition of the T. S. revised its third chapter largely based on this work, probably with a view to attaining the validity of revision based on the original author’s text. The names of antatradvīpas listed in the T. S. III:15Bh. are identical with those in the third āhnikā which so far do not exactly coincide with the other lists, either Āgamic or non-Āgamic. These speak in support of the traditional belief that the Jambūdvipasamāsa was composed by Umāsvāti. In its 4th āhnikā and the T. S. III: 11Bh. imparted are the mensuration formulae to find out the chord, arrow of an arc, arc, and diameter in a segment of a circle, which are all identical in both texts excluding the method of measuring the arrow of an arc (the 4th series below) as follows:

\[ AC = \text{arc} = a \]
\[ AC = \text{chord} = c \]
\[ BD = \text{height or arrow} = h \]
\[ EA = EC = ED = \frac{d}{2} \]
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T. S. III:11Bh. formulae

1. \( C = \sqrt[4]{10d^2} \)
2. \( A = \frac{1}{4} Cd \)
3. \( c = \sqrt{4b(d - h)} \)
4. \( h = \frac{1}{2}(d - \sqrt{d^2 - c^2}) \)
5. \( a = \sqrt{6h^2 + c^2} \)
6. \( d = \frac{h^2 + c^2/4}{h} \)

In the place of series 4, the Jambūdvipasamāsa gives a formula \( h = \sqrt{(d^2 - c^2)/6} \), which is based on approximations and does not yield a correct result. Umāsūti improved this formula in the T. S. This demonstrates that the Jambūdvipasamāsa was composed sometime before the T. S., most likely as a provisional preparation for the composition of its third chapter called Lokaprajākapī. Perhaps for this reason, the third chapter of the T. S. turned out to be extremely summarical and short.

The Pujāprakāraṇa in nineteen verses describes twenty-one methods of Pujā for the laity. The Praśamaratī 335 refers to pujā by enumerating gandha, mālā, adhivāsa, dhūpa, pradīpa, etc., but not more than that. The mention of such an elaborate ritual has no place in the known works of Umāsvāti, which makes it doubtful to be his composition. It is also remarked that the methods of pujā described here are almost identical with those noted by Cāritrasundara in his Ācāropadeśa, and the work is speculated to be scarcely older than the 14th century A. D.

The Sāvayapanṇati is a prakrit work which expounds twelve śrāvaka dharmas (guna-sīkṣā vratas) along with their aticāras and the other relevant duties. The verses quoting the passages from the T. S. are as follows: 64—II:10-14, 69—II:31, 74—II:52, 79—VI:1-4, 80—VIII:2-3 and 81—82—IX:1-3. The essential subject matter treated in this Sāvayapanṇati is found in the T. S. Ch.VII, however the former differs from the latter as to the major treatment of twelve guna-sīkṣā vratas and their aticāras, which go with the tradition of the Upāsakadasā but not with the T. S. The methods applied for distinguishing siddhas in verses 76—77 correspond to those of the Prajñāpana 1.7.7—10 but not to those of the T. S. Besides the Sāvayapanṇati is composed in Prakrit. These points make difficult to ascribe it to Umāsvāti, and many scholars are of opinion that Haribhadra is likely its original author.

The Jambūdvipasamāsa and Praśamaratī are the minor works of Umāsvāti. The T. S. is certainly not a work possible to be completed within a year or two. A considerable length of time must have been consumed for the critical examination of the source materials, both Jaina and non-Jaina, and for their systematic organization. And it is quite plausible that Umāsvāti composed some more provisional works for the T. S. on the line of the Jambūdvipasamāsa.
Part 3 Historical position of the T. S.

Vācaka Ācārya Umāsvāti composed the T. S. at Pātāliputra sometime in the late middle of the 5th century A. D. when the migration of the Jainas to the South and the West was nearing to the end. About his personal background, we know no more than what he informs of himself in the praśasti. Pūjyapāda in his Sarvārthasiddhi delineates him as a saintly figure in a lonely āśrama attended by the order of monks. The tradition invented a legend that Umāsvāti, a wandering mendicant, composed the T. S. by the entirety of a layman. The Southern Jainas in the later age invented another story that when Umāsvāti was flying in the air to Videha by his miraculous power, his peacock-feather-bunch fell down, so he caught hold of the feathers of a vulture flying in sky, thus he came to be known as Grddhapiccha Ācārya.¹⁰⁰ No anecdote is otherwise known to us about him. He was no doubt an orthodox Jaina Ācārya, but was never a rigid and narrow-minded man of tradition. Being a free and mature thinker, he could posit the essential problems of Jainism with insight from the wider philosophical vision of the days, without falling from the middle path in dealing with the pros and cons of the Jaina and non-Jaina views. Experiencing the depression of the Jaina amidst the florescence of the Hindus, Umāsvāti seems to have firmly determined to complete the T. S. and calmly devoted to this task.

The T. S. or the essential outline of tattvas is the standard text of Jaina philosophy. It was born in response to the internal need that demanded further organization of the contents of the canonical texts which had already to a large extent gone through the process of systematization. The same trend was commonly happening to all the then other systems of thought, and each of them had come to possess its own standard text by the time of Umāsvāti. The standard work of Jainism was thus the need of hour urged by the internal and external call of time, and fortunately the Jainas had a genius capable of accomplishing this task.

Umāsvāti was a pioneer who was keenly aware of the circumstances at current. Being fully conscious of the social change wherein Sanskrit became the common language of the days, he tried to respond to this call of time, in which he was probably confident as he was likely from the Brahmanical background. Non-Jaina standard texts must have undergone the gradual stages of systematization until they were finally crystallized in the present form. For instance, Vasubandhu had Dharmatrāta’s Abhidharmahādayaśāstra before him, upon which he could develop his own treatise. Umāsvāti seems to have had none as such. He therefore took a full advantage of the readily available non-Jaina standard works that are composed in prakaraṇa form in sūtra style, of which contents, structure and concepts he must have scrutinized with a view to representing in the T. S. the clear-cut Jaina positions relevant to all the philosophical problems at current in the best organized form. He
was thus able to achieve his aim of composing the standard text for the Jainas, which in quality and value falls behind none of the other schools. The existence of these non-Jaina texts thus played an important role for the birth of the T. S., which would not have been derived immediately from the semi-systematized canonical works of the later age alone. The Āgamic texts he used were obviously the Mathurā versions which came to be soon penned down in the Third Valabhī Council.

As the migration of the Jaina communities was still on the way in the middle of the 5th century, the T. S. must have been carried by the emigrants and disseminated to the places of migration soon after it was completed. Bhadrabāhu II immediately reacted to some problems raised in the T. S., and the scholastic information as such likely reached quickly the academic circles diffused in various places. Due to the mobility of the Jaina saṅghas in this age, the events occurred in one place must have spread to the others in a good speed. And by the time of the Third Canonical Council at Valabhī, the geography of the Jainas was largely divided in the South and the West.

In the sequel of the schism, the Southern Jainas had to face to compile their own pro-canonical texts. Under the circumstances, the T. S. evidently came to the focus of the Southern scholars’ attention as the first-hand source book of Jainism in the capacity of the later Āgamic texts which they refused to accept. It therefore had to go through a revision in order to meet the quality to be a pro-canonical text, upon which the Sarvarthasiddhi was composed from the Digambara point of view. The pro-canonical authors drew their materials from the Āgamic stock which excludes the later canonical texts authorized in the West and which includes the Kaśyapprābha, T. S., Nityuktis, etc. The T. S. thus stood as one of the fundamental sources for the composition of the pro-canonical works, and the revised version of the T. S. came to stand in the position of the standard work of Jainism since the beginning stage of the literary activities in the South. The categorical concepts established by Umasvāti thus came to be generally received and standardized. Many Digambara authors early adopted to write in Sanskrit in the form of Prakaraṇa often accompanied by a svopajñābhaṣya after the model of the T. S., of which form was obviously more suitable for the purpose of composing the pro-canonical texts, and of which language was not only the need of the days but also effective in showing the point of departure from the practice in the West.

Pujjayapāda revised T. S. at the beginning of the 6th century A. D., however it is difficult to say anything definite about it without a thorough study regarding the relative chronology of the pro-canonical authors involving Pujjayapāda. Kundakunda’s name makes its appearance in the inscriptions in the late 11th century, i. e., 1075 A. D. (Śaka 997) onwards, even though Kundakūndānvaya is recorded in 466 A. D. (Śaka 388) in Merkara copper-plate, of which script is however said to belong.
to the 9th century A.D. \(^{102}\) Kundakundânvaya is then recorded in 797 A. D. (Śaka 718)\(^{103}\) onwards. Kundakunda’s style of writing is surely archaic, and ‘sad-dravya-lakṣapam’ (V: (29)) which is added to the text of Pūjyapāda and appears in the Pāñcāstikāya I.10 can be well born in the context of the Pāñcāstikāya I.8–9 wherein he analyzes the nature of sat in relation to dravya.\(^{104}\) Pūjyapāda’s revision of the T.S. clearly reveals his mastery skill in editorship, thus this sūtra V:(29) must have been drawn from the other source, namely, the Pāñcāstikāya. Pūjyapāda was thus acquainted with the Pāñcāstikāya at least, even if not with his later works such as Samīyasāra. So Kundakunda and Pūjyapāda were likely the contemporaries. The Southern inscriptions generally record the lineage of Kundakunda–Umāsvāti–Pūjyapāda. Since the later Southern Jainas believed Umāsvāti to be the author of the revised version of the T.S., this sequence is not insensible. Samantabhadra quotes maṅgalācaraṇa of Pūjyapāda in his Āptamimāṃsā, and Pūjyapāda refers to Samantabhadra in the Jainaṃdravyakarana while enunciating a rule, ‘catuṣṭayam samantabhadrasya’ (5.4.140) which refers to ‘jhayo haḥ’ (5.4.136) and which does not exist in the Așṭādhyāyī. Therefore both authors are speculated to have been the contemporaries.\(^{105}\) Samantabhadra indeed wrote in proficient Sanskrit, however it can be suspected if this logician was the same grammarian or not. His name occurs in the epigraphical sources after 1074 A. D. (Śaka 996)\(^{106}\) onwards. At present we are not getting into the ascertainment of the relative chronology of these early Southern authors including Vaṭṭkerā and Śivakoṭī, which is a big problem by itself. However from the fact that all these pro-canonical authors were well acquainted with the Āgamic tradition, they cannot belong to too late period. They must have lived in the earlier period after the schism, before the Āgamic tradition started to fade away in the South. And their late registration in the epigraphical records does not offer a decisive clue for the determination of their chronological sequence as is evinced in the case of the relevant inscriptions of the T.S. which make their appearance only after 1077 A.D.\(^{107}\) Pūjyapāda’s name occurs after 729 A. D. (Śaka 651)\(^{108}\) in the inscriptions.

After the finalization of the canon at the Third Valabhi Council, the Western Jainas entered the stage of the commentarial period in continuation of the niryukti literature. Niryuktis, which likely had existed side by side the canonical texts prior to Bāḍrabhānu II,\(^{109}\) pinpoint only the important concepts in the canon by the method of anyogalivāras and therefore differ from the so-called canonical commentaries in nature. The commentarial authors in the medieval period well responded to problems raised in the T.S. by way of criticisms and affirmations. And the T.S. gradually came to win an authoritative position by the time of Hemacandra in the West wherein the canonical tradition continued to subsist. Sanskrit came to be adopted after Haribhadra, although writing in a prakaraṇa form accompanied by a svopajñabhāṣya commenced earlier.
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The adoption of the Sanskrit language started by Umāsvāti was the call of time, which ensued the Jainas to open their closed door to the other systems of thought. Likewise the adoption of the prakaraṇa form of composition started by Umāsvāti created a lively academic atmosphere which never happened in the canonical period. For unlike the commentarial composition, the prakaraṇa composition is a form of a systematic treatise guided by a definite theme and plan, wherein required are the author's initiative judgment upon and critical attitude towards the pros and cons of the general knowledge of the concerned subject matters, along with his original capacity in methodically leading the public to convince his thesis. Siddhasena's Sanmatti, Jinabhadra's Jhārijāvāna, Mallavādi's Nāyaacakra, etc, in the West, and the procanonical works by Kundakunda, Samantabhadra and the others in the South are the prakaranaas which came out with various original problems and proposals to stimulate the academic interests and to contribute to the later conceptual development. In the South particularly, while engaging in the composition of the procanonical texts, the Digambara authors were compelled to concretize and systematize the so far developed traditional concepts, which ensued in effect in producing many doctrinal innovations and formulations, as for instance, in the case of śrāvakācāra.

Another important contribution that Umāsvāti made to the literary history of the Jainas is that he provided the basis for the immediate arrival of the age of logic which commenced after the Third canonical Convention in both traditions. He did it firstly by representing pramāṇa and nāya as the Jaina theory of knowledge so far developed in the later canonical stage, secondly by revising the Āgamic concept of dravya-guṇa-paryāya, and thirdly by enunciating the non-conflict theory in simultaneously predicating the nature of sat with its mutually contradictory characteristics in three kinds. The anēkāntavāda is based on the theoretical understanding, both ontological and epistemological, that reality consists of mutually contradictory elements at the same time (V: 29), that the nature of reality as such is constant (V: 30), and that the different characteristics of reality arise by arūpa-anarūpa viewpoints (V: 31). These theoretical formulae were soon developed into the nayavāda and saptabhaṅgi by Siddhasena Divākara and Jinabhadra in the West, and by Kundakunda and Samantabhadra in the South. The Jaina theory of knowledge came into maturity by the efforts of the succeeding logicians such as Mallavādi and Haribhadra in the West, and Akalanka and Vidyānandi in the South. It is noteworthy that the titanic logicians such as Akalanka and Vidyānandi, to whom the Western tradition owes for its later development of logic, were the commentators of the T. S. Anēkānta dialectics came to be the sole tool for the Jainas to challenge the rival schools in the medieval period, wherein an atmosphere open to the other philosophical tenets came to prevail in their literature, which never happened in the classical age.

Śaṅkara in the 8th century came out with criticisms on the Jaina doctrines with which he was probably acquainted through the T. S. and Mādhava in the 14th century
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wrote the section of Jainism in his *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* on the basis of the T.S. The dissemination of Jaina philosophy to the non-Jainas started earlier in the South much owing to the existence of the T.S. and its commentaries which were composed in the common language of Sanskrit.

The T.S. thus stood at an intersecting point in the literary history of the two traditions which began immediately after the canonical period. Here the South began with the prakaraṇa period and the West entered the commentarial period, and the age of logic commenced in both traditions. The T.S. thus contributed itself as one of the substantial works for the composition of the pro-canonical texts in the South, and it contributed to preparing for the arrival of the age of logic in the history of the Jainas. Its value in the context of the Jaina literary history would become self-evident if we reflect upon the case of its absence. If Umāśvāti did not compose the T.S. at the end of the classical age, the literary activities of the Jainas would have taken a different course: the arrival of the age of logic in both schools would have been much delayed, and the composition of the pro-canonical works in the South would have greatly suffered. And if Umāśvāti wrote the T.S. in Prakrit in the form of composition other than a prakaraṇa by merely epitomizing the contents of canon without consulting the non-Jaina texts, its value and position in the literary history of the Jainas would have been totally different.

The basic value of the T.S. remains in its nature as the standard text of Jaina philosophy, which is ever capable of nourishing and developing the thought-world of the students of Jainism. As such it has caused the Jainas in both traditions throughout ages to write numerous commentaries on it, and as such it has attracted the religious minds of the Jainas as their Bible.
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NOTES

Introduction

1. The earliest mention of the T. S. in the South appears in the inscription made in 1077 A. D., of which author is said to be Āryadeva (E. C. VIII, Nagar Tl. no. 35), Umāsvāti or Grīḍhapiccha (also spelled as Grīḍhapiścha, etc.) qua ‘padārtha-veda’ which suggests him to be the author of the T.S. occurs in the Śravaṇabelgola inscriptions of the 12th century A. D. onwards (J. S. L. S., v. 1, nos. 40, 42, 43, 47, 50, etc.). Umāsvāti alias Grīḍhapiccha is mentioned as the author of the T.S., in the Śravaṇabelgola inscription no. 105 of 1398 A. D., and Umāsvāti as the author of the T.S. occurs in the epigraphy of c. 1530 A. D. (E. C. VIII, no. 46), Śravaṇabelgola inscriptions of the 12th century and 1398 A. D. record that Umāsvāti alias Grīḍhapiccha was a disciple of Koṇḍakunda. Grīḍhapiccha as the author of the T.S. is mentioned in the Dhaśarā of the 9th century A. D. in the literary source. The name Umāsvāmi appears in the Digambara source after Śrutasāgara’s commentary on the T.S. in the 16th century A. D. (See also Jugalkishor’s “Purāṇi vātām kā khoja” in Anekānta, varṣa 1, kāraṇa 5)

2. Premi: Jaina sāhitya aur itihāsa, pp. 521-547

3. Various dates of Umāsvāti are suggested as follows:
   Pre-Christian age: Datta (c. 150 B. C.)
   1–2 century A. D. (Phulcandra (100 A. D.))
   2–3 (J. L. Jaini (135–219 A. D.))
   3–4 Premi
   3–5 Sukhlal
   6 Woods (later than 500 A. D.)

Chapter I

1. MSS catalogue no. should be referred to the following works excluding that of B. O. R. I. which is not yet published:
   Catalogue of Sanskrit and Prakrit Manuscripts, Munirāja Śri Puniyavijayaji’s Collection, pt. 1
   Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Jain Bhandars at Pattan.
   Limbāḍi Jainā Jñāna Bhaṇḍārāni Hastalikhita Pratironūm Sūcipatra.
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2. See Introduction, n. 1

3. Pannālāl suggests that Amṛtacandra and many post-Akālaṅka authors drew their materials specifically from Akālaṅka's Rāja-vārtikā. See his introduction to the Tattvārthaśāra of Amṛtacandra, p. 7

4. Haribhadra's Laghvīṭikā, of which latter half was completed by his disciples, does not serve for the reconstruction of the original text of the T.S. as it preserves the text as well as the Bhāṣya imperfectly. For instance, the Laghvīṭikā cuts off the aphorisms IV :24-26 and 36-39, with which their Bhāṣya expositions are totally lost. (See also a remark made in Ch. II, n. 4) To give a cursory observation of the Laghvīṭikā, its first six chapters are devoted to the summaritical exposition of the major purport of the Bhāṣya but not its exegetic explication, some portions of which are the total or the partial duplication of Siddhasena's Tikā, and the rest of the chapters show virtually the total duplication of the Bhāṣyānusārini. As such, the Laghvīṭikā must have been produced from the Bhāṣyānusārini, but not vice versa. (See also remark made in Pt. Sukhlalji’s Commentary on Tattvārthaśāra, Introduction, pp. 60 ff.) Hence the restoration of the Sabhāṣya T.S. must be made from the Bhāṣyānusārini.

Chapter II


2. virama praṇāmya sarvaśācām, tatvārthaśāya vidhiyate/ tikā samkṣepataḥ spaṣṭā, manda-buddhi-vibodhint//

3. Namdisuttam and Aṅuogaddārām, Introduction by D. D. Malvania, p.54 (English)

4. In this connection it should be mentioned that the bracketed portion of V:29Bh. in K.P. Mody’s edition (also in the Bombay edition of Rāyacandra śāstra mālā) which appears in Haribhadra’s Laghvī tattvārthaśākā cannot be the original paragraph, but the later accretion. Its teleological reasoning in support of the threefold nature of sat does not go with the ontological proof attempted in V: 31 Bh. Neither its dialectical tone is congenial with the writing of the Bhāṣya.

5. Sīhāṇa 10.972. dasa-vihe daviyānuoge p-o tam-o daviyānuoge māuyānuoge egālthihiyānuoge karāṇānuoge appiyāṇappie bhāviyābhāvie bāhirābāhīre sāsaya-sūsae tahanāṇe atahanāṇe //
6. All the three characteristics of sat enumerated by Umasvati make their appearance in Nagariuma’s Madhyamakastra 7.33 in the totally different context, ‘uipāta-sthitii-bhāṅganām-aviddher-nāsti sanskritam’, and it is not likely the source of Umasvati’s formulation of the nature of reality. Similar concept seems to be traceable in the Aṅguttara nikāya I. for which refer to N. J. Shah: Akalanka’s Criticism of Dharmaikīti’s Philosophy, p. 4, n. 8

7. This is opined by D. D. Malvania.

8. See also Ch. I, Sec. IV, Pt. 1, 8)

9. See Birwe’s introduction to the Śāktaśāvinyākaraṇa, pp. 35 ff.

10. Some scholars maintain that the Digambara version of the T. S. existed before Pujayapada’s time as he notes some variant readings in the Sarvānithvāsiddhi. Pujayapada notes two variants, i.e., ‘kṣiprāṇiḥśrta’ for the reading ‘kṣiprāṇiḥśrta’ in I : (16), and ‘caramadehā’ for ‘caramottama-deha’ in II : (53). The original text reads them, ‘kṣiprāṇiśrta’ in I:16 and ‘carama–dehottama–purusā’ in II:52. I:16(16) has many other variants, and II:52 shows redundancy in statement which therefore can be improved at any time. Since these two variant readings occur in the original aphorisms, it is difficult to support the thesis proposed by these scholars.

11. Various dates suggested for Pujayapada are:

   3rd century A. D.   Motilal Ladhva (308 V. S.)
   4th                J. L. Jaini (before 308 Śaka)
   5th                Sukhlal, Jugalkishor, Kailascandra

Latter half of the 5th to the latter half of the 6th century V. S. Phulcandra
7th century A. D.   Birwē (after 661 A.D.), Bhāndarkar (678 A.D.)

See also A.N. Upādhye: Śrī Kundakundācārya’s Pravacanasūra, Introduction p. 21, n. 1; Winternitz: History of Indian Literature, v. 2, p. 478 & n. 3

12. Praśasti reads as follows:

vācaka-mukhyasya śivaśriyāḥ prakāśa–yaśasāḥ praśīyena /
śiṣyena ghośanandi-kṣamānasyaikādāśāṅgavidhā // 1
vācanaṇā ca mahāvācaka-kṣamāṇa–mandaṇāpa–śiṣyasya /
śiṣyena vācakācārya–mūla–nāṃnah prathita–kirtēḥ // 2
nyagrodhikā–prasūtena viharatā pura–vare kusuma–nāṃmi /
kaubhiṣṭanāṁ svāti–tanayena vāsī–sutenārghyam // 3
arhad–vācanaṇaḥ samyag–guru–kramenāgatam samupadhārya /
dulākhārtaṁ ca durāgama–vihita–matiṁ lokam avalokya // 4
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idam ucçairnāgara-vaçakena sattvañukampaya ārybdham /
tattvāriñhādhamākhyam spaṣṭam umāsvātiṁ śāstram // 5
yas-tattvañahamākhyam jñāsyati ca kariṣyate ca tapraktam /
so'vyābādha-sukhākhyam prāpsyaty-acireṇa paramārtham // 6


15. E. I., v. 1, XLIII, Introduction, ft 32

16. I. A., XXXIII, no. 14

17. E. I., v. 1, XLIII, no. 13; v. 2, XIV, no. 34


20. That Umāsvāti is known by name Nāgara Vācaka is mentioned by C. J. Shah in his Jainism in North India, p. 240 and by B. C. Law in his Some Jaina Canonical Sūtras, p. 157, no. 1. Their sources for it are not mentioned, which must have been taken from tradition.


22. See also Pt. Sukhlalji’s Commentary on Tattvāriñhāsūtra, Introduction, p. 19, n. 1

23. This is according to the views of R. N. Mehta and A. N. Jani of Baroda.


25. Guṇākarasūri expresses the same idea that Umāsvāti was a convert from Śivism in his Bhattāryamastotraṃṛiti composed in 1426 V. S. (Śri Jinadattasūri Jñānabhadra, pp. 11–12), ‘tato’nyatra śivadāvī virakto jina-
dharmā-darsanāsakto bhūd-umāsvātīr dvija-sūnur-aśta-vratāh sūrī-padam āpa,
kramāt-pūrvagata-vetti vācako bhavat.

Chapter III

1. As to the evolution of the concept of tattvas, see K. K. Dixit: “Evolution of the Jaina treatment of Ethical problems”, pp. 28 ff.; also his Jaina Ontology, pp.5–6
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3. K. K. Dixit: ibid., p.7 and p.85
6. ibid., p.25
7. For the discussion of this matter, see also K. K. Dixit’s introduction to *Pt. Sukhlaṇḍa’s Commentary on Tattvārthasūtra*
9. Asteya bhāvanās:
   
   Bhāṣya — anuvācy-avagraha-yācana, abhikṣṇa-a.-y., etāvad-itya-a.-dhāraṇa, samāna-dharmikebhya-a.-y., anujñāpita-pāna-bhojana
   
   Ācarāṅga — anuviti-miuggaham-jāti, uggahamṣi uggahamṣi abhikkhaṇa, etāvatāva uggahana-silæ, sāhhammesu anuviti-mitoggaha-jāi, aṇunāṣaviya-pāṇa-bhojana
   
   Samvāya — uggāhanunāvīnāyā, uggaha-simajanaṇaṇaṇya, sayam-eva uggahām anugīghanāya, sāhhammiya-uggahām anunāṣaviya paribhumjaṇayā, sāhāraṇī-bhatta-pāṇam anunāṣaviya padibhumjaṇayā
   
   
   Praṇavāyakaraṇa — vivitta-vāsa-vasahi, uggaha-s., sejjā-s., vinaya as to sāhhammi, uvakaranā. . ., sāhāraṇa-piṇḍa-vāya-lābhe-s.
   
   Sarvārthāśiśīlāhī and Cāritrapāhuṭa | शून्यत्वार्थेशीली and चारित्रपञ्चाहु | Śūṇyātva-vāśi, vimoctāvāsas, paroparoddha-karaṇi, sādhammāvisamvāda, bhaikṣya-śuddhi

10. See also Schubring’s discussion on this subject in his *Doctrine of the Jainas* Secs. 178-180
13. See Sukhlaṇḍa’s introduction to *Sammatattarka*
14. It is based on: *Jainā sāhitya bhāṣā itihāsa* v. 3: Schubring *The Doctrine of the Jainas; Winternitz: History of Indian Literature* v. 2; and introductions to the works examined,
15. Haribhūdra: *Sarvasarasānasamuccaya*, under kārika 47
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tarthi punya-pāpasravādinām- api tatah prthag-upādānam na yuki-pradhānam syat, rāśi-dvayena sarvasya vyāpatvād-iti cet na punyādinām vipratipatti-nirāsārthavāl, āsrayādinām sakāraṇa-saṃsāra-mukti-pratipādaṇa-paratvād-
vā prthag–upādānasvāduṣtatā/ yathā ca saṃvara-nirjarayor-mokṣa-hetutā āsravasya 3 bandhana-nibhandhanatvam-puṇyāpānva-dvi-bhedan-bandhasya ca saṃsāra-hetutvam tarhāgamati-pratipattavyam/
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59. For West Indian archaeological evidences, see A. Ghosh, ed : ibid., chs. 8, 13, 17; K. C. Jain: Jainism in Rajasthan; etc.

60. K. M. Munshi: “Ancient Gurjaradeśa and Its Literature”

61. Namdisuttam and Anuogaddārāim, Introduction by D. D. Malvania, pp. 17–18 (English)
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90. Kapadia: *The Canonical literature of the Jains*, pp. 61-62
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94. Information from Kanakura: ibid., p. 91, n. 2
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9 davivadi gacchadi tāṁ tāṁ sabbhāva-pajjāyāṁ jām /
davivam tāṁ bhaṇṇamti aṇṇaṁ-bhūdam tu sattādo //
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105. Premi: Jaina sāhitya aur itihāsa, pp. 44–45
106. J. S. L. S., v. 2, no. 207
107. See Introduction, n. 1
108. E. I., VI, p. 81; I. A., VII, p. 112, no. 39
(English)
111. See R. Williams: Jaina Yoga, Introduction, p. 18
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age of logic, see K. K. Dixit: Jaina Ontology, Ch. 3.
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kāla 17, 30, 34, 41, 60-61
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Kaśāyaprabhūta 62, 80-81, 99, 103-104
karaṇa 103
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Mathurā 44, 116, 119-121, 123-126
Mathurā vācaṇā 125

mohaniya karma 21-22
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mokṣamārga 55-56, 104-106, 109-112
Mrgeśavarman 117, 127, 134
Mūlācāra 55, 104, 108, 110-111
Mūlaradhanā 111-112
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Nāgara vācaka 51
Nāgari śakha 50-53

Nandisūtra 31, 43, 49-52
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nayavāda 36, 40-41
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<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sukha</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sūtrakṛtānga niryukti</td>
<td>16, 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sūtrakṛtānga vyūti</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śvetapāṭha</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svaadvāda</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>15, 35, 60-61, 89</td>
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<td>Vaiṣṇavas</td>
<td>121-123</td>
</tr>
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<td>Vasubodhī</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vedāntiya karma</td>
<td>21-22</td>
</tr>
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<td>vinaya</td>
<td>106, 110</td>
</tr>
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<td>virya</td>
<td>106, 110-111</td>
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<tr>
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<td>78, 94, 109, 126</td>
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<td>vrata</td>
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<td>yugapadvāda</td>
<td>78-83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 (12)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 (14)</td>
<td>8–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 (15)</td>
<td>7–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 (17–18)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 (19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 (20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 (21)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 (22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 (23)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 (24)</td>
<td>8–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 (26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 (27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>63–64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>64 (3Bh.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (9)</td>
<td>7–8, 72, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 (10)</td>
<td>63, 72 (5 &amp; 5Bh.), 75</td>
</tr>
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[Figures before the point refer to pages, and figures after the point refer to lines]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCORRECT</th>
<th>CORRECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.30 text</td>
<td>text of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.20 IX : 31 (32)</td>
<td>IX : 32 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.21 32 (31)</td>
<td>33 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.22 IX : 31(32)</td>
<td>IX : 32(32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6 The word pariñāma is used in the senses of kāśaya-par-maitri-pramoda-kārunya-mādhyasthāni ca sattva-guṇa....</td>
<td>The word pariñāma is used in the senses of kāśaya-par-maitri-pramoda-kārunya-mādhyasthāni ca sattva-guṇa.... are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.25 „ „ „ „ ca sattva-guṇa....</td>
<td>36.69–70, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.28 is</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.27 36.60–73, etc.</td>
<td>– Tiloyapaṇṇatti 8.114 counts 52 kalpas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.31 147</td>
<td>kriyate, niravašeṣa-nirastā-ṇānāvareṇe yugapat-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 17.15 sakalapadārthavabhasikevala-ṇānāṭiṣaye</td>
<td>and praṇāṣṭi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.31–32 kriyate, niravašeṣa-nirastā-ṇānāvareṇe yugapat-</td>
<td>be easily imitated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sakalapadārthavabhasikevala-ṇānāṭiṣaye</td>
<td>samyag–darśanam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.22 praṇāṣṭi</td>
<td>mokṣān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.38 be imitated</td>
<td>double the height of those in the preceding bhūmi in the other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 33.18–19 samyag tat purvakatvāc | worlds."
| cāritrasya– exposition of | induced to be authentic. |
| mokṣa and mārga– general purport | patṭāvali. Author |
| of the sūtra (ataḥ samyag–darśanam) | disau |
| 33.20 sakṣān | Svāmi |
| 38.29 doubled for those in other bhūmis.” | |
### Errata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>conflict</th>
<th>conflict with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50.20</td>
<td>are</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>jñāna</td>
<td>ajñāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>karma, yoga</td>
<td>karma yoga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.13</td>
<td>han at</td>
<td>than a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.33</td>
<td>VII : 33 is not traceable in the canon, which</td>
<td>VII : 33 their materials without number. When</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.19</td>
<td>their</td>
<td>their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.20</td>
<td>without materials</td>
<td>without</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.14</td>
<td>number when</td>
<td>number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.13</td>
<td>366 ff.</td>
<td>3669 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.16</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>2305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.25</td>
<td>21**</td>
<td>27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.28</td>
<td>32-43</td>
<td>42-43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>76.6-28</th>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Aphorisms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>31Bh. 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakīraṇakas</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhadrābāhu</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saṅghadāsa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinabhadra</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agastyaśimha</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinadāsa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haribhadra</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koṭṭācārya</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śiḷāṅka</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ERRATA</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prakīrṇakas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhadrabāhu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saṅghadāsa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinabhādra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x/x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agastyaśimha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinādāsa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haribhadra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koṭṭācārya</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śilāṅka</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

77.37  it quarts
86.19   3.7
90.25  Śūtrakaṭa I. II. 26–28
92.35  'maṇa-samāharaṇa'
92.37  29.28
94.29  have
95.7   seems to be
96.39  here
104.10 nāṇam
104.29 ascetics,
105.18 13.414–15
105.36 vodāne
106.30 Śūtrakaṭa I.8.486
107.16 6.55
110.2  to be
112.1  siddhi-mūdho
115.25 band
116.14 dedication to
117.3  mercantile
117.25 record is
118.19 Mahādevi
118.29 Orissa
118.31 Mathura
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it is quite
3.27
Śūtrakaṭa I. 11. 26–28
'maṇa-samāharaṇa'
29.58
a have
seems to be
here is
nāṇam āgamitta
ascetics'
13.414–15
vodāne
Śūtrakaṭa I.8.416
6.558
said to be
siddhi-mūlam mūdho
head
dedication of
mercantile
record his
Mahādevi
Orissa
Murunda
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118.38
up aṣa

121.3
functions

122.1
Vaiṣṇīdaśa

123.15
grew

126.29
event

127.11
Yāpaniṣyas,
vindicates

135.10
Vasubandhu, Vyāsa
(980/693 V. N.)

135.13
which

137.6
283–360 A. D.

140.8
h-

153.13
miuggahām

150.35
Sarvadars'anasamuccaya

up of an
functioned
Vṛṣṇīdaśa
but grew
even
2) the Yāpaniṣyas,
indicates
Vasubandhu–Vyāsa
(980/993 V. N.)
which is
280–360 A. D. is
h=
miuggahānaṃ
Ṣaddars'anasamuccaya