

## What were the contents of the Dr̥ṣṭivāda ?

Jaina tradition is unanimous as to the complete and irretrievable loss of the twelfth Anga, the Dr̥ṣṭivāda, at an early date-yet it is able to furnish surprisingly exact and detailed particulars about its divisions, subdivisions, and contents. A good deal of these statements are obviously fictitious : nobody is likely to believe that e. g. the Nānapavāya-puvva consisted of 9999999, or the Saccappavāya-puvva of 10000006 (or 10000060) words <sup>1</sup> But even apart from such monstrosities, it is quite generally speaking the very exactness and detailedness of the statements concerning an avowedly long lost text that renders those statements suspicious; as A. Weber aptly put it as early as in 1883<sup>2</sup>, “one can indeed give very rich details if one consults only one’s imagination”. Actually Western scholars have come to regard the tradition about the contents of the Dr̥ṣṭivāda as spurious in that sense that, though the (partly unintelligible) titles of some sections and sub-sections may be genuine, the lost Anga did not contain what is ascribed to it by the canonical table of contents and by the claims of a great number of most diverse texts and subjects to be derived from or based on the Dr̥ṣṭivāda; in the words of Schurbring <sup>3</sup> : ‘The 12th Anga, under the title of a ‘discourse on (heterodox) views’....., was an instruction to apology and quite naturally fitted closely in the doctrine laid down in Angas 1-11. In the course of time it was lost. Jacobi (SBE 22, XLV) explains this fact by saying that later generations thought the discourses of their early predecessors not to be important any longer. It is more likely that their preservation appeared to be undesirable since the study of such disputes was apt to arouse heretical thoughts and activities.’

The traditional claims to descent from the Dr̥ṣṭivāda include those of the (post canonical) Svetāmbar Karmagranthas and of their Digambar counterparts, the famous “Siddhānta” texts of Mudbidri, the Śakṭhaṇḍāgama and the Kaṣayaprabhṛta. When

- 
- 1) No less fantastic, completely unreal figures are given in Samavāyanga and Nandī for the existing Angas 1-11.
  - 2) Indische Studien vol. 16, p. 358.
  - 3) The Doctrine of the Jains, p. 75.

these texts were at last made accessible through the indefatigable endeavours of Hiralal Jain, they were hailed by him on the title-page of his first edition as “throwing light for the first time upon the only surviving pieces of the lost *Dr̥ṣṭivāda*, the 12th Anga of the Jain canon.” His opinion is shared by another leading Jain scholar of India, A. N. Upadhye. In a paper read at the XXVI International Congress of Orientalists in Delhi and entitled “The problem of the Purvas : their relics traced”, he accepts the claim of the Mudbidri texts to be based on portions of the 2nd and 5th Purvas and ascribed the loss of these Purvas to the intricacy of their subjects : “The details contained in these works are highly elaborate and difficult and deal with the intricacies of the Karma doctrine.....Even from these relics, of which only one or two (allied) Mss. are preserved only in one locality, it can be justly surmised that such Purva texts were not studied on a very large scale, because they dealt with dry details of the Karma doctrine which were not of general interest and the study of which was even denied to many. In course of time the number of monks studying such texts gradually dwindled down; and when the Sangha pooled together the entire canonical literature, this minority of monks perhaps did not cooperate in this work with the result that even these relics of Purvas remained in isolation and were studied in a very small circle.”

I must confess that I am not convinced by these arguments. The very intricacy of the Mudbidri texts speaks against, not for their high antiquity. In contents and style, they are typical products of later scholasticism, far removed from the much simpler language and spirit of old canonical texts.<sup>1</sup> Further, though these Digambar Karman texts actually ceased to be studied in modern times and were kept secret, the same is by no means true of their counter-parts and very close relations, the Śvetāmbar Karma-gran̥thas (which have actually a number of stanzas in common with them), they were always known and accessible and never ceased to be read and studied though they are certainly no less intricate and technical than the Mudbidri texts. The intricacy and technicality of these late scholastic works can have nothing to do with the early loss of the ancient *Dr̥ṣṭivāda*.

That any real knowledge of the contents of the 12th Anga had vanished at a relatively early time is shown with particular clearness by a hitherto unnoticed passage of the *Āvasyaka Cūṛṇi*, that extremely rich but as yet hardly tapped source of early medieval Jain scholarship. It seems interesting enough to be quoted in full and is offered here as a modest contribution to the *Dr̥ṣṭivāda* problem. On p. 35 of the printed edition<sup>1</sup> we read :

1) For the contrast in style and spirit between old canonical and later scholastic texts of. my “Ārya stanzas of the Uttarañjāhāy” (Academy of Mainz, 1966), p. 179 f., 184 ff.

2) Published by the sri R̥ṣabhdevji Keṣṛimalji Śvetāmbar Samsthā Ratlām, Indore 1928.

iyāṇiṃ angapavittṭhaṃ bāhiraṃ co doṇṇaṃ vi bhaṇṇanti angapavittṭhaṃ  
 Āyāro jāva Dittṭhivāo, aṇangapavittṭhaṃ Avassagam tav-vairittam ca. Āvasagam  
 Sāmāya-m-ādi Paccakkhāna-pajjvasāṇaṃ; vairittam kāliyam ukkālīyaṃ ca. tattha  
 ukkālīyaṃ aṇegavihaṃ, tam jahā : Dasa-veyāliyaṃ Kappiyākappiyaṃ evam-ādi.  
 kaliyaṃ pi anegavihaṃ tam jahā : Uttaraṇṇaṇi evam-ādi,

ettha siso āha jahā : Dittṭhivāe savvam ceva vaomayaṃ<sup>1</sup> atthi, tao tassa ceva  
 egassa psrūvaṇaṃ jujjai.” āyario āha : “jai vi evaṃ, tahavi dummeha-appāyua-itthiyā-  
 diṇi ya kāraṇāi pappa sesassa parāvaṇā kirai” tti. tattha bahave dummedhā asattā  
 Dittṭhivāyaṃ ahijjiuṃ; appāyuaṃ ya āyuaṃ ṇe pahuppai; itthiyāo puṇa pāeṇa tucchāo  
 gārava-bahulāo cal ‘indiyāo dubbala-dhilo. ao eyāsiṃje aises’ ajjhayaṇā Aruṇovavāya-  
 Nisiha-m-āṇo Dittṭhivāo ya te na dijjanti! tattha “tucchā nāma puṇvāvarao  
 vakkhāṇe asamattā, ‘gārava-bahulā’ nāma gavvamantio tti, cal ‘indiyāo nāma indiya-  
 vaisaya-niggahe Bhūyāvādaṃ pappa asamattā, ‘dubbala-dhilo’ nāma calacittāo  
 iti mā tam suyaṇṇa laddhiṃ uvajjivissanti, tao tesiṃje aises’ ajjhayanaṇi vārijjanti tti.

“Now will be taught Angapravista and (Anga) bahira. Angapravista is (the  
 Angas from) Ācāra to Drstivāda; non-Angapravista is Āvaśyaka and non-Āvaśyaka.  
 The Āvaśyaka begins with the Sāmāyika and ends with the Prātyākhyāna; non-  
 Āvaśyaka is kālika ( to be studied during regular study hours ) and utkalika ( to  
 be studied outside regular study hours). Of these utkalika is a plurality (of texts)  
 viz. Dasavaikālīka, Kalpikākālpika and so on; kālika, too, is a plurality (of texts),  
 viz. Uttaradhyāyana etc.

Here the disciple raises the following objection : ‘The Drstivāde contains  
 the totality of speech (i. e. all that has ever been, or can ever be, expressed in  
 words), therefore it would have been appropriate (for the Jina) to teach that alone<sup>2</sup>  
 The Ācārya answers ‘That is quite right; yet the rest (of the sacred texts, the  
 srutajñāna) is taught for the sake of the dull-headed, the short-lived, the women,  
 etc. In this (enumeration), there are many dull-headed people who are unable to study  
 the Drstivāda; of the short-lived, the life time would not suffice; and women are as  
 a rule empty, given to haughtiness, sensual and inconstant; therefore the Pre-emi-  
 nent Texts<sup>1</sup> ) such as Aruṇovavāya, Nisiha etc. and Drstivāda are withheld from  
 them. Here ‘empty’ means: unable to interpret coherently; ‘given to haughtiness’  
 means : arrogant; ‘sensual’ means; unable to restrain sensual passions in connection  
 with the Bhutavāda<sup>3</sup> ; ‘inconstant means : fickle-minded; therefore they shall not

(1) Edition wro g : vaogatam (being the “takara”, ga misread for ma); cf. below the quotation  
 from Visesavasyakabhasya.

(2) Cf. Hemacandra’s rendering as atisayanty adhyayanani in his commentry on Visesavasya-  
 kabhasya 552 quoted below.

(3) Bhuvavaya is one of ten names of the Dittṭhivaya enumerated, Thananga sutra 742; Abhaya-  
 deva explains very briefly: bhutah, saddbhutah, padarthas, tesam vado Bhutava dah. If this  
 explanation is correct, the title Bhutavada stresses the refutation of the heretical drstis  
 exclusively named in the ordinary title Drstivāda. Cf. also the two longer explanation of  
 Hemacandra ad Visesavasyakabhasya 551 quoted below.

profit from obtaining that (part of) śrutajñāna. For this reason the Pre-eminent Texts are forbidden to them."

The above passage is versified by Jinabhadra in the two stanzas Viśesava-syaka bhāṣya 551 f. and expatiated upon by Maladhari Hemacandra as follows :

.....Pūrvāṇy abhīdhiyante. teṣu ca niḥśeṣam api vāṇmayam avatarati;  
ātaś caturdaśa-pūrvatmakam dvādaśām evaṅgam astu, kim śeṣaṅga-viracanena  
angabāhya-sruta-racanena vā ? ity āśankyaha :

jai - vi ya Bhūyāvāe savvassa vaomayassa oyāro

nijjūhaṇā, tahavi hu dummehe pappa itthi ya.

551

aśesa-viśeṣanvītasya samagra-vastu-stomasya bhūtasya, sadbhūtasya, vādo,  
bhaṇaṇam, yatrasau Bhūtavādah; athavā: anugata vyāvṛttapriśesa-dharma-Kalāpan-  
vītānām sabbheda-prabhedānām bhūtānām: prāṇinām vādo yatrasau Bhūtāvado,  
Dr̥stivādah, dīrghatvam ca tākarasyarsātvāt. tatra yady api Dr̥stivāde sarvasyapi  
vāṇmayasyavatāro 'sti, tathapi durmedhasām, tad-avādharāṇady-ayogyānām manda-  
matinām, tathā śravakādīnām strīṇam canugrahartham niryūhaṇā, viracana śesa-  
śrutasyeti-

nanu strīṇam Dr̥stivādah kim iti na diyate ? ity āha :

tucchā gārava-bahulā cal indiyā dubbalā dhiē ya

iya aises' ajjhayaṇā Bhūyāvdo ya no 'tthiṇām.

552

yadi hi Dr̥stivādah strīyāḥ katham api diyeta, tadā tucchadi-svabhāvatayā  
'aho aham, yā Dr̥stivādām api pathāmi !' ity evam garvadharmā-mānasasau purusa-  
paridhava disv api pravritim vidhāya durgatim abhigachet. ato nīravādhi-kṛpa-nira-  
nīradhibhiḥ paranugraha-pravṛttair bhagvadbhis tīrthakrair Utthāna-Samutthānā  
śrutadīny atisayavanty adhyayanani Dr̥stivadas ca strīṇam nanu-janataḥ. anugrahar-  
tham punas tāsām api kincic chrutam deyam ity ekādasangadi-viracanam saphalam.

The passages quoted here might at first sight suggest that at the time of their composition the Dr̥stivāda still was a regular object of study for able-minded males; a more attentive reading will soon make it clear that on the contrary they merely testify to a firmly established if somewhat naive belief that "the Dr̥stivāda contains everything" a belief obviously betraying complete ignorance of the real contents of the long-lost text and, on the other hand, conveniently permitting to derive from "the Dr̥stivāda" or "the Purvas" any text or subject which it was desired to invest with canonical dignity. I know of no other passage where the universality of contents of the Dr̥stivāda is claimed so openly and so bluntly, And this bluntness and naivety is no doubt the reason why, significantly; the great Haribhadra in his Āvasyaka Tikā omits our passage altogether : as in many other cases, he eliminates what he feels to be obsolete or what does not come up to his more exacting standard of refined scholarship; he may also have been reluctant to reproduce the somewhat scathing remarks about women, For the modern scholar, just what led him to reject the passage is apt to enhance its interest.