

# Who is The Author of the Pañcasūtra : Cirantanācārya or Yākinisūnu Haribhadra ?

Ācārya Vijayaśīlacandra sūri

The *Pañcasūtra* is a concise treatise enjoying considerable respect among the Śvetāmbara Jaina *munis* for several centuries past. It contains an essential spiritual experience and systematic presentation of the matter meant for the sublimation of soul and purification of mind. It is charmingly composed in succinct, elegant, and meaningful *sūtras* in Prakrit. Despite its small size, it enjoys popularity to an appreciable degree.

Ācārya Haribhadra sūri has also written a terse, well-composed, and facile commentary on this small work, of which several editions have appeared in print. Its critical edition, however, has been only recently published by the B. L. Institute of Indology, Delhi, competently edited by Munirāja Jambūvijaya<sup>1</sup>.

Up to this date, no reference as to its author has been encountered in existing sources. In point of fact, no one has tried to investigate it. On the contrary, all so far have accepted the authenticity of the traditionally floating information that some Cirantanācārya has composed this work. The term 'Cirantanācārya' has two plausible explanations : First, *cirantana* means ancient (and hence the work by some ancient *ācārya*) : Second, it may mean the appellation proper of the *ācārya* who composed it. Out of these two views, the former view has been universally accepted.

Indeed, few critical discussions about the authorship of this treatise have been done; yet all contemporary writers on it concluded : *The author of this work is unknown*. Let us first notice these opinions.

1. In his introduction to the *Pañcasūtra*, V. M. Shah offers two views :

(1) It is composed accordingly by चिस्तनाचार्य meaning ancient preceptors or preceptor having the name चिस्तन. The first meaning is more likely. It is difficult to assign individual authorship to works like this<sup>2</sup>.

(2) The term चिस्तनाचार्यः is unhelpful in deciding the authorship. The plural form can be used out of respect (*mānārthe bahuvacanam*) for the author. At the same time, it is very likely that ancient authors might have composed the *sūtras* and Haribhadra sūri might have put them together<sup>3</sup>.

2. Writes K. V. Abhyankar : “The *Pañcasūtra* which is a small elegant treatise written by some old writer whose name has still remained unknown.”<sup>4</sup>

3. A. N. Upadhye categorically records : “It is not possible to talk of [an] individual authorship with regard to works like [the] *Pañcasūtra*. The basic contents of this book are as old as Jainism. They are a literary heirloom preserved in the memory of Jain monks.”<sup>5</sup>

4. And the considered opinion of V. M. Kulkarni is :

“The language of the post-canonical Jaina works is partly Prakrit—the so-called Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī—and partly Sanskrit.’ (M. Winternitz). The language of the known Prakrit works of Haribhadra is Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī whereas the present work is written in Ardhamāgadhī prose; and this prose shares quite a few peculiarities of the diction and style of the canonical works. This fact suggests that Ācārya Haribhadra was possibly not its author. It is not unlikely that the author of [the] *Pañcasūtra* regarded the contents of the text as the property of the entire Jain Saṃgha and preferred to remain anonymous. It is also suggestive of its early date of composition. How early it is difficult to say. Since Haribhadra does not know who its author was we may not be far wrong in saying that it was composed about a century or so before Ācārya Haribhadra flourished.”<sup>6</sup>

The gist of the aforementioned four opinions is this : these unanimously proclaim that *Ācārya Haribhadra sūri* is not the author of the *Pañcasūtra*. Besides this, Munirāja Jambūvijaya, the editor of the dependable critical edition of the *Pañcasūtra*, is inclined to opine that Ācārya Haribhadra sūri

probably may be the author of the *Pañcasūtra*. Inspite of this sensing, in the absence of definite evidence, Munivara Jambūvijaya did not commit to any positive statement but conceded to the tradition, and prefixed the title of the work with the phrase चिन्तनाचार्यविरचितम्<sup>7</sup>.

It should, however, be clear that, as against this established tradition and the opinions of the aforementioned scholars, the author of the *Pañcasūtra* is definitely Haribhadra sūri himself, indeed to the total exclusion of any other more ancient author. To corroborate my statement, I shall produce evidence searched out by critically examining some internal and external aspects of the text of the *Pañcasūtra*.

1. There are three significant sentences at the end of the commentary of the *Pañcasūtra* : प्रब्रज्याफलसूत्रं समाप्तम् । एवं पञ्चमसूत्रव्याख्या समाप्ता ॥ समाप्तं पञ्चसूत्रकं व्याख्यानतोऽपि<sup>8</sup> ॥

Among these, the third sentence deserves special consideration. It comes from the pen of the commentator and therefore implicitly written to mean समाप्तं पञ्चसूत्रकं व्याख्यानतः<sup>9</sup> Had the commentator and the author of the *Pañcasūtra* been different, the phrase in question, ought to have been in the form समाप्ता पञ्चसूत्रकवृत्तिः, while here it is समाप्तं पञ्चसूत्रकं व्याख्यानतोऽपि and the last word of the phrase, अपि, holds a suggestive significance. The term अपि implies that the *Pañcasūtra* has been completed in the sense of “together with the commentary.” If अपि is deleted from this sentence, it would mean that the *Pañcasūtra* is completed ‘in the form of commentary.’ The addition of only one word ‘अपि’ changed the entire contextual meaning. This would then suggest that, had the commentator and the author of the *Sūtra* been different individuals, such a phrasing would never have been possible. Now, who the commentator was, is of course quite certain. And, therefore, in light of the aforementioned phrasing, if we regard him as the author also of the *Sūtra*, it would be thoroughly compatible.

Predictably, some scholar may say : ‘At the end of the original text, the author of the text has employed the sentence ‘समत्तं च पंचसूत्रं’<sup>9</sup> to indicate the completion of the original text. In the same way, in the continuation of that sentence, the commentator has employed this sentence to indicate the completion of the commentary and, therefore, it is not proper to connect the latter with the original text and hence to its unknown author.’ By way of response to this objection, it may be said : If the argument referred to in

the preceding paragraph may be valid, the commentator would have put either 'समाप्तं पञ्चसूत्रकं व्याख्यानतः' or the sentence 'समाप्ता पञ्चसूत्रकवृत्तिः'. And this could then be regarded as a proper ending. Moreover, after this, there is a positively independent sentence पञ्चसूत्रकटीका समाप्ता<sup>10</sup>, which has been written by the commentator. As a result of this phrase, the whole contextual reference of the sentence समाप्तं पञ्चसूत्रकं व्याख्यानतोऽपि, is altogether changed and this sentence written by the commentator himself, clearly establishes the oneness of the commentator and the author of the original text. Nevertheless, with reference to the points to be later discussed, if we critically consider this matter, the doubt, if any still remains, will be cleared.

Second, had the original author employed the phrase समत्तं पञ्चसुत्तं, it would imply the completion of the पञ्चसूत्र and not the पञ्चसूत्रक; but the commentator writes समाप्तं पञ्चसूत्रकं<sup>11</sup>. Elsewhere also in the commentary, the commentator recognises this composition definitely as पञ्चसूत्रक<sup>12</sup>. Is it possible for a master commentator like Haribhadra sūri to take liberty of this kind with the phrase employed by the original author at the end of the original text? And, can such a liberty be deemed proper or in the fitness of things? On the contrary, an ancient commentator like Haribhadra sūri would proceed in his commentary remaining thoroughly faithful to each and every word of the original author and on this very account an inference can be advanced that, had the commentator been the original author of the text, he would make any desired addition in the matter of the original text. From this standpoint, if he himself had coined the title पञ्चसुत्तं for the original text, then alone in the commentary (and at the end of the commentary) he would employ the appellative term पञ्चसूत्रकं.

2. After the sentence समाप्तं पञ्चसूत्रकं व्याख्यानतोऽपि, the commentator had also put some devotional sentences : “नमः श्रुतदेवतायै भगवत्यै । सर्वनमस्कारार्हंभ्यो नमः । सर्वबन्दनार्हान् वन्दे । सर्वोपकारिणामिच्छामो वैयावृत्यम् । सांवातुभावादौचित्येन मे धर्मे प्रवृत्तिर्भवतु । सर्वे सत्त्वाः सुखिनः सन्तु, सर्वे सत्त्वाः सुखिनः सन्तु, सर्वे सत्त्वाः सुखिनः सन्तु ॥<sup>13</sup>

It has been an established tradition of the commentators that their dutiful work is to provide word by word elucidation of the matter discussed by either the original author or the सूत्रकार. When their work is finished, the commentators end the text after writing either a verse or verses or some prose lines indicating the completion of the treatise. But, thereafter, the commentators never made any addition of their own to the commentary.

Even Ācārya Haribhadra sūri has not taken such a liberty in the commentaries on his own works, the *Yogadṛṣṭisamuccaya* and the *Pañcavastuka* or for that matter in the commentary of the text the *Ṣoḍaśaprakaraṇa*. Other great commentators also have not taken such a liberty. From this we may get an idea of the established convention as indicated above.

Quite contrary to this established tradition, after the completion of the commentary of the *Pañcasūtra*, Haribhadrācārya has put nearly six sentences : Granted that they are in Sanskrit, but they have been inserted in such a way that they can be ranked with the original *sūtras*. If these sentences are compared with the sentences नमो नमियनमियाणं<sup>14</sup> etc. in the final 15th prose section of the first पापप्रतिषातसूत्र of the *Pañcasūtra* barring the difference of language—the *Sūtra* text being in Prakrit, the commentary in Sanskrit—there is no difference at all in the style and presentation of the two. Further, with reference to this, the sentences, सर्वनमस्कारहेभ्यो नमः<sup>15</sup> and सर्वे सत्त्वाः सुखिनः सन्तु<sup>16</sup> [repeated three times] incorporated in the prose section of the commentary, positively appear to be the respective reflections of the sentences नमो सेस (here, had it been नमोऽसेस, it would appear more consistent and more pleasing) नमोऽकारिहाणं<sup>17</sup>, and सुहिणो भवंतु जीवा<sup>18</sup> found in the prose section of the original text.

The aforementioned situation clearly, indeed positively, leads us to believe, indeed on firm grounds, that Haribhadra sūri is also the author of the *Sūtra* text and for that very reason, during the process of repeatedly experiencing the devotionally emotionalised moments, he might have incorporated this small prose section in the commentary. It does not sound superfluous when he says that. He would not have taken such a liberty had he been just the commentator and not the author of the original text.

3. The great epistemologist Yaśovijaya Gaṇi of the 17th century, on whom was bestowed upon the title लघु हरिभद्र, at the time of referring to the *Pañcasūtra* in the धर्मपरीक्षा, includes the following phrases :-

पापप्रतिषातगुणबीजाधानसूत्रे हरिभद्रसूरिभिरप्येतद्भव-सम्बन्धि भवान्तरसम्बन्धि वा पापं यत्-  
तत्पदाभ्यां परामृश्य मिथ्यादुष्कृतप्रायश्चित्तेन विशोधनीयमित्युक्तम् । तथा हि “सरणमुवगओ अ एर्हिसि.....इत्थ  
मिच्छामिदुकडं ३”॥<sup>19</sup>

Having considered the sins committed either in this birth or in the past existences, by the term यत्-तत्, Haribhadra sūri also has stated to undergo the expiatory purification in the form of मिथ्यादुष्कृत. After having stated this, he has inserted a prose section of the first sūtra of the *Pañcasūtra* and thereafter Upādhyāya Yaśovijaya has offered its explanation in his own style.

In the aforementioned Sanskrit sentences, Yaśovijaya clearly has stated पापप्रतिघातगुणबीजाधानसूत्रे श्रीहरिभद्रसूरिभिरप्युक्तं, but not पापप्रतिघातगुणबीजाधानसूत्रवृत्तौ or पञ्चसूत्रवृत्तौ. This is a noteworthy point. This indicates that Yaśovijaya may have possessed some credible tradition wherefrom a clear conviction of attributing the authorship of the *Pañcasūtra* with assuredness to Haribhadra sūri could be had. Otherwise, without the tradition before him, he could not have believed it nor would he have employed such a definitive sentence. With reference to such minor matters, we may take a single example of his rational vigilance. The षोडशक is also a product of Haribhadra sūri, and Yaśovijaya wrote a commentary upon that work as well. Therein, in the last षोडशक, there are 17 verses instead of 16. In the 17th verse, there is a clear indication of the author's name as वचनं ननु हरिभद्रमिदं<sup>20</sup>. From this statement we can naturally conclude that only Haribhadra sūri is the author of that verse and, by extension, of the षोडशकप्रकरण. But, in the mind of Yaśovijaya, there might have arisen another optional thought about this 17th verse, on account of which, at the end of the commentary on that verse, he has inserted a sentence as 'शिष्यकर्तृकेयमार्येत्यन्ये<sup>21</sup>. From only this much context, it can be understood that it was not possible for him to put the sentence पाप.....सूत्रे श्रीहरिभद्रसूरिभिरप्युक्तं according to blind following. He had a firm conviction that the author of the *Pañcasūtra* is Haribhadra sūri and for that reason he has employed such a phrase. From this testimony, too, it can be deduced that Haribhadra sūri is the author of the *Pañcasūtra*.

4. पञ्चवस्तुक, पञ्चसूत्रक, अष्टक, षोडशक, विंशिका, पञ्चाशक—such titles available in the domain of Jaina literature are thanks to the special predilection of naming the works; it is, moreover, characteristic of Haribhadra sūri alone. Any other author might have entitled the work as पञ्चसूत्र or पञ्चसूत्री. The name पञ्चसूत्रक may flash in the understanding of only Haribhadra sūri. While offering guidance regarding the etymological interpretation of the term पञ्चसूत्रक, Munirāja Jambūvijaya has observed as under : “The title of the work written by Ācārya Haribhadra sūri is पञ्चवस्तु

in the practical convention, still he has given **पञ्चवस्तुक** as a title for it and he has shown its etymological interpretation in the same, refer to page No. 80, foot note No. 5 in this very work. The etymological interpretation and the meaning of the term **पञ्चसूत्रक** should be understood in the same way.”<sup>22</sup> This perceptive observation lends a positive encouragement to my above arrived deduction that such topical appellations characteristically were designed by Haribhadrācārya.

5. The more important on the score of procedure will be to scrutinize the significant words, phrases, clauses, and sentences available in other works composed by Haribhadra sūri and those paralleled in the *Pañcasūtra*. Let us institute a comparison of some of the portions of the **पञ्चसूत्र** with those of other works such as the **विंशतिविंशिका**, the **धर्मबिन्दु**, the **योगदृष्टिसमुच्चय**, and the **षोडशक**, all by Haribhadra sūri.

[1] In the fourth *sūtra* of the **पञ्चसूत्रक**, there appears a phrase **व्याधितसुकियाज्ञात**, it is as follows :-

‘वाहियसुकिरियानाएणं, से जहा केइ महावाहिगहिए, अणुभूयतव्वेयणे विण्णाया सरूवेण, निव्विण्णे तत्तओ, सुवेज्जवयणेण सम्मं तमवगच्छिय जहाविहाणओ पवत्रे सुकिरियं, निरुद्धजहिच्छाचारे, तुच्छपस्थभोई मुच्चमाणे वाहिणा नियत्तमाणवेयणे समुवलम्भारोग्गं पवड्डमाणतम्भावे, तल्लभनिव्वुईए तप्पडिबंभाओ सिराखाराइजोगे वि वाहिसमारोग्गविण्णाणेण इड्ढनिप्फत्तीओ अणाकुलभावयाए किरिओवओगेण, अपीडिए, अव्वहिए, सुहलेस्साए वड्डइ, वेज्जं च बहु मन्नइ’<sup>23</sup> etc.

This very **व्याधितसुकियाज्ञात** is to be met with in the verses of the 12th **विंशिका** of the **विंशतिविंशिका**, in a slightly different phraseology and context :

‘नो आउरस्स रोगो नासइ तह ओसहसुईओ ॥१२॥

न य विवरीएणेसो किरियाजोगेण अवि य वड्डेइ ।

इय परिणामाओ खलु सव्वं खु जहुत्तमायरइ ॥१३॥

थेवोऽवित्थमजोगो नियमेण विवागदारुणो होइ ।

पागकिरियागओ जह, नायमिणं सुप्पसिद्धं तु ॥१४॥

जह आउरस्स रोगक्खयत्थिणो दुक्करा वि सुहहेइ ।

इत्थ चिगिच्छाकिरिया तह चेव जइस्स सिक्खन्ति ॥१५॥<sup>24</sup>

And this very fact is more clearly discernible in the 16th verse of the 12th **षोडशक** :

‘व्याध्यभिभूतो यद्वन्निर्विण्णस्तेन तत्क्रियां यत्नात् ।  
सम्यक्करोति तद्वद् दीक्षित इह साधुसञ्चेष्टाम् ॥’<sup>25</sup>

[2] In the fourth *sūtra* of the *Pañcasūtra*, a group of sentences occurs as undernoted :

‘से समलेट्टुकंचणे समसत्तुमिते नियत्तगहदुक्खे, पसमसुहसमेए सम्मं सिक्खमाइयइ, गुरुकुलवासी, गुरुपडिबद्धे, विणीए, भूयत्थदरिसी, न इओ हियतरं तिं मत्तइ, सुस्सूसाइगुणजुत्ते तत्ताभिनिवेसा विहिपरे परममंतो ति अहिज्जइ सुत्तं ॥’<sup>26</sup>

The verses of the 12th *विशिका*, partly bearing verbal similarity and reverberating the significance of those sentences are as follows :

‘इत्थं वि होदइगसुहं तत्तो एवोपसमसुहं ॥४॥  
सिक्खादुगंमि पीई जह जायइ हंदि समणसीहस्स ।  
तह चक्कवट्टिणो वि हु नियमेण न जाउ नियकिच्चे ॥५॥  
गिण्हइ विहिणा सुत्तं भावेण परममंतरूव ति ॥’<sup>27</sup>

[3] In the fourth *sūtra* of the *Pañcasūtraka*, there are sentences ‘आयओ गुरुबहुमाणो अवञ्जकारणत्तेण । अओ परमगुरुसंजोगो । तओ सिद्धी असंसयं ।’<sup>28</sup> Now, the following verse of the second *षोडशक* bears complete similarity with the above sentences :

गुरुपास्तन्यमेव च तद् बहुमानात् सदाशयानुगतम् ।  
परमगुरुप्राप्तेरिह बीजं तस्माच्च मोक्ष इति ॥१०॥<sup>29</sup>

The significant point here is that the phrase अवञ्जकारणत्तेण appearing in the text of the *Pañcasūtra* has been explained as मोक्षं प्रत्यप्रतिबद्धसामर्थ्यहेतुत्वेन<sup>30</sup> in its commentary and the phrase सदाशयानुगतं appearing in the verse of *षोडशक* has been also explained as सदाशयः संसारक्षयहेतुर्गुरुयं ममेत्येवंभूतः कुशलपरिणामस्तेनानुगतं गुरुपास्तन्यं<sup>31</sup> by its commentators. On this account, not only the verbal agreement but also the similarity of the reading of these two separate treatises becomes evident.

[4] ‘निदंसणमेत्तं तु नवरं - सव्वसत्तुक्खए सव्ववाहिविगमे सव्वत्थसंजोगेणं सव्विच्छसंपत्तीए जारिसमेयं एत्तोऽणंतगुणं खु तं, भावसत्तुक्खयादितो । रगादयो भावसत्तू, कम्मोदया वाहिणो, परमलद्धीओ उ अत्था, अणिच्छेच्छा इच्छा । एवं सुहुममेयं, न तत्तओ इयरेण गम्मइ, जइसुहमिवाजइणा, आरुग्गसुहं व रोगिण ति विभासा ॥’<sup>32</sup> (In the fifth *sūtra* of the *Pañcasūtra*)

जं सव्वसत्तु तह सव्ववाहि सव्वत्थ सव्वमिच्छणं ।  
खय-विगम-जोग-पत्तीहिं होइ तत्तो अणंतमिणं ॥३॥  
रगाईया सत्तू कम्मोदया वाहिणो इहं नेया ।  
लद्धीओ परमत्था इच्छाऽणिच्छेच्छमो य तहा ॥४॥



अणुहवसिद्धं एयं नारुगसुहं व रेगिणो नवरं ।  
गम्मइ इयरेण तहा सम्मभिणं चितियव्वं तु ॥५॥<sup>33</sup>  
(20th विंशिका)

How striking is the correspondence between the two aforementioned references, the first lying in the fifth *sūtra* of the *Pañcasūtra* and the second in the verses of the 20th सिद्धसुखविंशिका.

[5] In the same way, the sentence of the fifth *sūtra* जत्थ एगो तत्थ णियमा अणता<sup>34</sup> can be compared with the sentence जत्थ य एगो सिद्धो तत्थ अणता<sup>35</sup> of the verse 18th of the 20th विंशिका.

[6] Also, there is a sentence in the fifth *sūtra* of the *Pañcasūtra* as न सत्ता सदंतरमुवेइ<sup>36</sup>. This is powerful and regulatively assuming the form of an argument, and as it can be easily compatible in different references, it can be employed there. And, for this very reason, in the 19th verse the of 20th विंशिका, Haribhadra sūri has employed this very argumentative sentence as below :- एमेव भवो इहरा ण जाउ सत्ता तयंतरमुवेइ ।<sup>37</sup>

Here, the reading, which has been traditionally accepted everywhere and which has been incorporated by Abhyankar in the विंशतिविंशिका edited by him, is as below :- एमेव लवो इहरा ण जाउ सत्ता तयंतरमुवेइ ।<sup>38</sup> This reading appears to be faulty after considering the method of the employment of the sentence 'न सत्ता सदंतरमुवेइ' in the *Pañcasūtra*. सत्ता might have been transformed into सत्ता through the mistake of the scribe or it is possible that it might have been incorrectly read and the reading एमेव भवो also positively appears in some manuscripts. Therefore, the very sentence सत्ता न तयंतरमुवेइ appears appropriate and consistent in meaning : and from all these considerations, it *per se* becomes an established truth, indeed beyond any doubt, that the author of the विंशिका and the पञ्चसूत्र is one and the same person.

[7] The discussion, which is carried on in the following sentences of the fifth *sūtra* of *Pañcasūtra* - ण दिदिक्खा अकरणस्स । ण यादिद्धिम्म एसा । ण सहजाए णिवित्ती । ण निवित्तीए आयद्धणं । ण यण्णहा तस्सेसा । ण भव्वत्ततुल्ला णाएणं । ण केवलजीवरूवमेयं ।<sup>39</sup> etc. is the same in a slightly differing manner in the following verses of the second विंशिका, namely लोकाऽनादित्वविंशिका.

‘जह भव्वत्तमकयगं न य निच्चं एव किं न बंधोऽवि ? ।  
किरियाफलजोगो जं एसो ता न खलु एवं ति ॥१४॥

भवत्तं पुणमकयगमणिच्चमो चेव तहसहावाओ ।  
 जह कयगोऽवि हु मुक्खो निच्चोऽवि य भाववइचित्तं ॥१५॥  
 एवं चेव यऽदिक्खा (दिदिक्खा) भवबीजं वासणा अविज्जा य ।  
 सहजमलसद्वच्चं वन्निज्जइ मुक्खवाईहिं ॥१६॥<sup>40</sup>

[8] In the same way, we find the very rational annotation of the sentences—अणाइजीवे अणादिजीवस्स भवे, अणादिकम्मसंजोगणिव्वत्ति<sup>41</sup> in the first *sūtra* and अणाइमं बंधो पवाहेण<sup>42</sup> in the fifth *sūtra*, in nearly initial 12 verses<sup>43</sup> of the second *विशिका*.

[9] A free translation of the sentence सुद्धधम्मसंपत्ती पावकम्मविगमाओ, पावकम्मविगमो तहाभवत्तादिभावाओ<sup>44</sup> of the first *sūtra* is clearly noticeable in the first verse :

‘निच्छयओ पुण एसो जायइ नियमेण परमपरियट्ठे ।  
 तहभवत्तमलक्खयभावा अच्चंतसुद्धत्ति ॥१॥<sup>45</sup>

of the fourth *विशिका* and the first half of the eighth verse, ‘एयंमि सहजमलभावविगमओ सुद्धधम्मसंपत्ती<sup>46</sup> of the selfsame *विशिका*.

[10] The sentences in the third *sūtra* are as under :

‘तओ अणुण्णाए पडिवज्जेज्ज धम्मं । अण्णहा अणुवहे चेवोवहाजुते सिया । धम्माराहणं खु हियं सव्वसत्ताणं । तहा तहेयं संपाडेज्जा । सव्वहा अपडिवज्जमाणे चएज्ज ते अट्ठाणगिलाणो-सहत्थचागनाएणं ।’<sup>47</sup>

Some aphorisms of Haribhadra sūri's धर्मबिन्दु may now be compared with those noted above. These are :- तथा-गुरुजनाद्यनुज्ञेति ॥२३॥ तथा तथोपधायोऽयं इति ॥२४॥ दुःस्वप्नादि कथनमिति ॥२५॥ तथा विपर्ययलिङ्गसेवेति ॥२६॥ दैवज्ञैस्तथा तथा निवेदनमिति ॥२७॥ न धर्मे मायेति ॥२८॥ उभयहितमेतदिति ॥२९॥ यथाशक्ति सौविहित्यापादनमिति ॥३०॥ ग्लानौषधादिज्ञातात् त्याग इति ॥३१॥<sup>48</sup>

The beauty of the situation here is that the translation of certain aphorisms bearing numbers 23, 24, 31 from among the aforementioned is directly met with in the afore-recorded original textual matter, while the sense of the remaining aphorisms is found in the commentary of the *Pañcasūtra*<sup>49</sup>. This fact strongly corroborates the circumstance that Haribhadra sūri positively is the author of the *Pañcasūtra* as well as its commentary.

[11] The context of the two sentences ‘ण दिदिक्खा अकरणस्स’ and ‘ण सहजाए णिवित्ती<sup>50</sup>’ incorporated in the fifth *sūtra* exactly corresponds with the two following verses of योगदृष्टिसमुच्चय :

‘दिदृक्षाद्यात्मभूतं त-न्मुख्यमस्या निवर्तते ।  
 प्रधानादिनतेर्हेतु-स्तदभावान्न तन्नतिः ॥२००॥  
 अन्यथा स्यादियं नित्य-मेषा च भव उच्यते ।  
 एवं च भवनित्यत्वे कथं मुक्तस्य सम्भवः ॥२०१॥’<sup>51</sup>

[12] I guess that the term दिदृक्षा in the Jaina literature is for the first time noticeable in the works of Haribhadra sūri. Out of his works :—

- (i) The term दिदृक्षा is employed in the above-recorded verse, bearing the number 200 of the योगदृष्टिसमुच्चय.
- (ii) The employment of the term दिदृक्षा has been attributed to ancient writers [Patañjali and so forth according to the commentary] by incorporating the clause ‘दिदृक्षादिनिवृत्त्यादिपूर्वसूर्युदितं तथा’ in the verse bearing the number 489 of the योगबिन्दु ।<sup>52</sup>
- (iii) The term दिदृक्षा is again encountered in the phrase ‘एवं चेव दिदिक्खा’ in the 16th verse of the 2nd विंशिका, of the विंशतिविंशिका. The traditionally famous reading ‘एवं चेव यद्विदिक्खा’, which has been accepted by Abhyankar is incorrect and inconsistent. Here, if we accept the reading दिदिक्खा, then alone it sounds appropriate in case of all other situations<sup>53</sup>.
- (iv) The term दिदृक्षा is employed in the eighth verse of the 15th षोडशक of the षोडशकप्रकरण, which is as follows : ‘सामर्थ्ययोगतो या तत्र दिदृक्षेत्यसङ्गशक्त्याख्या । सानालम्बनयोगः ।’<sup>54</sup> Here the term दिदृक्षा does not offer the meaning, which has been attributed to it in other treatises. Here this term is used in the sense of अनालम्बनयोग consistently with its etymological interpretation द्रष्टुमिच्छा दिदृक्षा. Here we can clearly see how intelligently and consistently a Jainācārya employs the term दिदृक्षा, which bears a technical meaning according to the Sāṅkhya school of philosophy. Yet, the application the term, even when the context is changed, does not seem improper.

It is possible that Haribhadra sūri might have employed this term in his other works also. Now, we have to see whether he has employed the term दिदृक्षा in the sentence ‘ण दिदिक्खा अकरणस्स’<sup>55</sup> of the *Pañcasūtra* in the same sense in which he has used this term in the aforementioned three works barring the षोडशक.

[13] The term समंतभद्र<sup>56</sup> is employed in the fourthsūtra of the *Pañcasūtra*. This appears to be a favourite term of Haribhadra sūri, because it<sup>57</sup> appears

also in the **विंशतिविंशिका** [8/3], though in a different contextual sense. There it bears the meaning “Adoration conferring all-sided auspiciousness (सर्वमंगलकारिणी पूजा). In the tenth verse of the ninth **षोडशक** this adoration has been styled **विष्णोपशमनी**, but the commentator Yaśovijaya has suggested that worship to have been published by **समंतभद्र**<sup>58</sup>.

[14] Lastly, let us glance at the sentences in the ending portion of the *Pañcasūtra*. It has been written in the last aphorism that ‘न एसा अत्रेसि देया लिंगविवज्जयाओ तप्परिण्णा । तयणुग्गह्वाए आमकुंभोदगनासनाएण । एसा करुणत्ति वुच्चइ ।’<sup>59</sup> *et cetera*. The sense which is embodied in the above aphorism, appears exactly in the same significance in the concluding portion of the **योगदृष्टिसमुच्चय** :

‘हरिभद्र इदं प्राह नैतेभ्यो देय आदयत् ॥२२६॥  
अवज्ञेह कृताऽल्पाऽपि यदनर्थाय जायते ।  
अतस्तत्परिहारार्थं न पुनर्भावदोषतः ॥२२७॥’<sup>60</sup>

The contents given in these works, if passed to unworthy persons, the persons will become victims in any sort of calamity; therefore, it is a favour to them in not giving them the contents. Such a compassionate attitude, even in different words, can be impartially seen here.

All afore-recorded references unambiguously show that, it is very positively Haribhadra sūri and none else who emerges as the author of the original text of the *Pañcasūtra*. Had it not been so, the content-references of the *Pañcasūtra* cannot bear similarity with the several corresponding references from the many works—Prakrit as well as Sanskrit—of that Ācārya to such an extent.

Despite this clear internal evidence, if the view of attributing the authorship of the *Pañcasūtra* to an unknown ancient (चिरन्तन) ācārya or the one by name ‘Cīrantana’ who might have flourished prior to Haribhadra sūri be maintained, we will be forced to accept that Haribhadra sūri might have borrowed verbally as well as sensewise all the above-recorded references from ‘the others’ works compared with the references of the *Pañcasūtra* and the contents discussed therein and, simultaneously with this, the originality of Haribhadra sūri observable in the presentation of matter, thoughts, and all of his works would come to nil. A conclusion such as that would amount to doing the gravest injustice to him and to his works.

6. Pt. Bechardas Doshi had observed : "From the linguistic point of view, grammarians have given three types of Prakrit : (1) Prakrit that is based upon Sanskrit; (2) Prakrit that is like Sanskrit : (3) Native Prakrit.....The grammar (of Hemacandrācārya) belongs to the first category."<sup>61</sup>

In consonance with the above-mentioned view, if we examine the language of the original-text of the *Pañcasūtra*, we will be convinced of its being the संस्कृतजन्य प्राकृत language, observing as it does all the later rules of the Hemacandrīya grammar. The language of the works such as the *विंशतिविंशिका* and so forth by Haribhadra sūri is typologically the same. We can understand this phenomenon after taking into consideration the Prakrit words coming from Sanskrit and those bearing the similarity with Sanskrit, employed by the author, in his works. And the same is the situation with the *Pañcasūtra*. For this very reason, there is no difficulty at all in taking Haribhadra sūri as the author of the original text of the *Pañcasūtra*.

Even though some scholars are led to suppose that the language of the *Pañcasūtra* is not Prakrit (Jaina Mahārāṣṭrī) but is Ardhamāgadhī, like the language employed in the *āgamas*, yet they have not put forward convincing reasons or evidence in corroboration of this supposition. It is possible that, having seen the employment of ए in the singular forms of nominative case in construction like अणाइजीवे, भवे, कम्मसंजोगणिव्वतिए, दुक्खरूवे, दुक्खफले<sup>62</sup> etc., those scholars might have been led to stipulate the language of the *Pañcasūtra* as Ardhamāgadhī. But against it, had they taken into account the ओ unambiguously employed in the Prakrit language in the singular forms of the nominative case elsewhere in many places in this very work in the construction such as रागदोसविसपरममंतो, केवलपण्णतो धम्मो, सरणमुवगओ, विवरीओ य संसारो, अणवट्ठियसहावो<sup>63</sup> etc., they would not have arrived at the above supposition. Quoting the view of M. Winternitz, Kulkarni concludes : "The language of the post-canonical Jain works is partly Prakrit—the so called Jaina Mahārāṣṭrī and partly Sanskrit. The language of the other Prakrit works of Haribhadra sūri is Jaina Mahārāṣṭrī, whereas the *Pañcasūtra* is written in Ardhamāgadhī prose. So Ācārya Haribhadra sūri was possibly not its author, but it is a treatise written by some ancient Ācārya prior to Haribhadra sūri."<sup>64</sup> But the striking similarity of the language

discernible in other works of Haribhadrācārya and in the *Pañcasūtra*, as also the similarity of linguistic usages involving संस्कृतसम and संस्कृतभव words as stated above, positively proves that the work in question is composed not in Ardhamāgadhi but in Prakrit.

Also, the argument advanced by Kulkarni that “The treatise in question is in Ardhamāgadhi prose and so it is not written by Haribhadra sūri because his other treatises are in Prakrit” hold no water. Is it not possible that the same author can employ different languages and different dictions ? Is it not possible that the same author can write in versified form as well as in prose ? To the contrary, this situation indicates to a profound and highly erudite genius possessing the knowledge of several languages. If a competent Gujarātī or Mahārāṣṭrīan poet / author can write prose / poetic literature in other languages such as Hindi, English, and so forth as he would in his own native tongue, then what obstacle lies in the way in believing that a master scholar like Haribhadra sūri can write works in different varieties of Prakrit ?

7. The second point of importance is that the *Pañcasūtra* probably is believed to have been the work of Cirantanācārya and until now the tradition continues that the name of the ‘Cirantanācārya’ is unknown. Now, a question arises : This Cirantanācārya is inevitably considered to be चिरन्तन (ancient) for us even today and, therefore, we can take it for granted that, he perhaps may be believed to be unknown even in the past centuries. But how can it be believed that this Cirantanācārya and his name might be unknown to Ācārya Haribhadra sūri ? Kulkarni believed that this Cirantanācārya might have flourished a century or more before Haribhadra sūri<sup>65</sup>. And if we are to proceed on the line that the *Pañcasūtra* is a post-canonical composition, we must accept the above inference of Kulkarni. Could it be consistently rational that the name of Cirantanācārya, who might have flourished a century or two before Haribhadra sūri may be an author unknown or unfamiliar to Haribhadra sūri ? Definitely not. Like this work, its author also (if he were a different person) cannot be unknown to Haribhadra sūri and had he known the author of the original text, he would not have remained silent about his authorship and unhesitatingly revealed his name. This consideration once again leads us to believe that Haribhadra sūri himself was the author of the *sūtra*-work.

The gist of the above discussion is that, just as Haribhadra sūri is the author of the commentary of the पंचसूतक, in the same way he himself is the author of the *Sūtra*-text of the *Pañcasūtraka*. Concomitantly with the establishment of this truth, the traditional belief upheld by four scholars, namely Shah, Abhyankar, Upadhye, and Kulkarni and the arguments they offered for the corroboration of this belief, *per se* become invalid.

A question that now arises is precisely this. Though Haribhadra sūri is the author of the *Pañcasūtra*, yet whence and when arose this confusion / uncertainty about the authorship of this composition ?

From the investigations carried out, it seems that the confusion may have arisen in the 15th century of Vikrama Era or somewhere closer to that date. In the three available ancient palm-leaf manuscripts of the *Pañcasūtra*, which in all probability were written between the 12th and the 14th century of Vikrama Era, as recorded by Munirāja Jambūvijaya, there is no reference anywhere to its author. The only indication there is 'समत्तं पंचसूत्रक'<sup>66</sup>. It can be inferred that, during that period, there might not be any confusion regarding the authorship of this work.

The first record of the type may be sensed in the following statement :

‘पाञ्चसूत्रं प्राकृतमूलम्, सूत्राणि २१०.  
वृत्तिश्च हरिभद्रो ८८०’<sup>67</sup>.

The list of the Jaina works in the बृहट्टिप्पनिका which was prepared by some learned Jain-monk early in the latter half of the 16th century of Vikrama Era, does not refer to this record regarding the author of the *Pañcasūtra* and therein it has been reported that the commentary thereon is ‘*Hārībhadrī*.’ It cannot be denied that the confusion might have arisen from this record. If we focus on this record and read ‘पाञ्चसूत्रं प्राकृतमूलं सूत्राणि २१० वृत्तिश्च हरिभद्रो ८८०’, and if we draw therefrom the meaning—The *Pañcasūtra* in the Prakrit language having 210 *sūtras*, and the *vṛtti* thereon equal in volume to verses 880—with the addition of the particle च, it cannot be denied that the term *Hārībhadrī* is supposed to have covered both the *Sūtra* (original text) and the *Vṛtti* (the commentary). And the term *Hārībhadrī* is in the feminine gender consistently with the feminine gender of the word *Vṛtti*.

Of course, this may be looked upon as a little far-fetched; for all earlier scholars, in view of the fact that author’s name was not specified for

the *Sūtra*-text, were led to believe that the qualification 'Hāribhadri (हरिभद्री) only indicated the name of the commentator since it unambiguously refers to the term वृत्ति. But, it is a noteworthy circumstance that, in this record, regarding the name of the original author there is no statement like चिरन्तनाचार्यकृतं or अज्ञातकर्तृक. And that circumstance corroborates the erroneous interpretation stated above. However, instead of adopting this line of thinking, someone, after noticing the above-noted record, might have taken the work as अज्ञातकर्तृक and thereafter that faulty supposition may have been perpetuated.

After this, from the colophons of the two manuscripts of the *Pañcasūtra*, copied in the 17th century of Vikrama Era, it can be clearly understood that either during that time or a little before it, a misunderstanding that the author of the *Pañcasūtra* and its commentator may have been different persons and that the name of the original author was unknown, may have gained currency. Those colophons are as follows :

‘समतं पंचसूत्रकं ॥ छ ॥ कृतं चिरन्तनाचार्यैर्विवृतं च जाकिनीमहत्तरासूनु श्रीहरिभद्राचार्यैः ॥’<sup>68</sup>

It is probable that, perhaps there may have been such colophons in other manuscripts also, copied during that period. And the tradition reflecting the miscomprehension regarding the identity of the author of the *Pañcasūtra* may have arisen from such misleading records. The direct consequence of such colophons leading to such a misunderstanding was that, instead of taking the sentence ‘कृतिः सिताम्बराचार्यहरिभद्रस्य, धर्मतो याकिनीमहत्तरासूनेः’ put by the commentator (i.e. the author), after the sentence ‘पञ्चसूत्रकव्याख्या समाप्ता at the end of the commentary of the *Pañcasūtra*—in the reference of the original text and commentary, critics of our times may have taken this sentence to apply to the commentary alone.

And the second happening strengthening the above-mentioned misunderstanding is that, at the end of the work composed by Haribhadra sūri, the term भवविह which appears as a signifier of Haribhadra’s work, is not present in the concluding portion of the *Pañcasūtra* text.

Now, when we know that the belief of attributing the authorship of the *Pañcasūtra* text to Cirantanācārya is not older than the late medieval times and we have at some length discussed the evidence regarding Haribhadra’s authorship of the text of the *Pañcasūtra* as well as



the commentary thereon, the sentence 'कृतिः सिताम्बरा' is positively by Haribhadra sūri and it is certain that the phrase is employed here in reference to the original text together with the commentary. Also, granted that the term भवविह does not directly appear, its sense arguably has been conveyed by the author in a different way. भवविह means emancipation from the transmigratory cycle. In the last sentence of the *Pañcasūtra*, the author has suggested the expectation of emancipation, but it is not through the term विह, but through the term निःश्रेयस, employed there either affirmatively or positively. Refer, in this context, the last sentence of the *Pañcasūtra* :

एसा करुण ति वुच्चइ एगंतपरिसुद्धा अविराहणाफला तिलोगनाहबहुमाणेणं निस्सेयससाहिग ति पव्वज्जाफलसुत्तं ॥<sup>69</sup>

If, however, the demand for the term विह is insisted upon, then even in the end portion of the commentary supposed to be written by Haribhadra sūri, the term विह is nowhere noticeable ! And on that ground the authorship of Haribhadra sūri for the commentary can as well be objected, even denied. So, taking the term निःश्रेयस as synonymous with the term भवविह, would allow us in connecting the total composition with Haribhadra sūri.

Regarding the authorship of the *Pancasūtra*, M. A. Dhaky, in his communication some years ago to me, wrote :

"Your Holiness believes this text to be the composition of Haribhadra sūri instead of Cirantanācārya. Examining the original text from the standpoint of matter, diction, and style which are replete with gracefulness and elegance, it also seems to me that it is a post-canonical work : it, moreover reflects the constructions of phrases and sentences which can be called relatively modern. Haribhadra sūri has neither referred to the name of the सूत्रकार nor has he respectfully presented the text as ancient. Also, he has not offered obeisance to the सूत्रकार. Thus comprehending, it may seem that the commentator and the author of the original text is the same person."

Thus, as deduced from the bulk of evidence, internal as well as external, Haribhadra sūri arguably is the author also of the text proper of the *Pañcasūtra*.

The *Pañcasūtra*, a work which may have been composed by him in the evening of his life, appears to be the essence of his life-long study of

the *sāstras*. There can be no denying that this composition happens to be the manifestation of the spiritual ecstasy, his attainment of the higher level in the practice of mystical science. From the ratiocinations discussed in the योगहृदिसमुच्चय which are introduced in the *Pañcasūtra*, probably more charmingly and in brief and pithy sentences as also a quotation from that work<sup>70</sup> at one place in the commentary of the *Pañcasūtra*, this latter work must be subsequent to the composition of the योगहृदिसमुच्चय and his other works. Prior to this, he may have composed several other works covering different topics, including plausibly योग, in the later part of his life. And in that late lot appears the composition of the *Pañcasūtra*.

Abhyankar, too, with reference to this very point, records his own opinion as underquoted :-

“एतै रचितानां तेषां तेषां ग्रन्थानां क्रमप्रतिपादने टीकाग्रन्थाः प्रायः प्रथमं रचिता अनन्तरं धर्मकथा रचितास्तदनन्तरमनेकान्तजयपताका-लोकतत्त्वनिर्णयादयः प्राधान्येन जैनसिद्धान्तप्रतिपादनपरा ग्रन्था निर्मितास्तदनन्तरं षड्दर्शनसमुच्चय-शास्त्रवार्तासमुच्चय-पञ्चाशकादयो दर्शनग्रन्थास्तदनन्तरं च योगदर्शनप्रतिपादकौयोगबिन्दु-योगहृदिसमुच्चयौ रचिताविति भाति । सर्वेषामन्ते परिणतप्रज्ञैरेभिरागमसारभूतः स्वकीयग्रन्थप्रतिपादितानां विविधानां विषयाणां सङ्ग्रहस्थानभूतश्चासौ विंशतिविंशिकानामा ग्रन्थो निरमायीति ।<sup>71</sup>” To this we may add : “तदनन्तरं योगमार्गारूढैरेभिरन्तिममते निजे जीवनभागे पञ्चसूत्रकस्य सटीकस्य रचना सन्दृष्ट्या स्यादिति ।”

The aforementioned criticism leads us to conceive that, here in the field of Jaina literature, perhaps there may have been two methods of composing works :

1. The method of amplifying, in the works that follow in succession, the topics that were elucidated in the earlier works.

2. The method of abbreviating, in the fresh works, the topics elucidatively presented and at some length in the earlier works. With reference to Bhagavān Haribhadra sūri, it can be stated that, out of the above two methods, he might have adopted the second. For getting a clear understanding, it may be stated that he might have composed some of his notable works in the following chronological order :

1. *Pañcāśaka*
2. *Vimśikā*
3. *Ṣoḍaśaka*
4. *Aṣṭaka*
5. *Pañcasūtraka*

In the medieval biographical tradition, Haribhadra sūri enjoys a reputation in the field of Jainism as the author of 1444 *Prakaraṇa* works. A few *Prakaraṇa*-treatises and a few commentaries (on the works earlier composed) written by him, are available. Among these, those that are in our possession—specially, those in whose appellations numeral-words are employed—are available. Thanks to the deduction now reached that Haribhadra sūri is the author of the *Pañcasūtra*, a most notable example has been added to the list of his works and this is a circumstance signifying our good fortune and indeed is a matter of gratification.

#### Annotations :

1. B. L. Series, No. 2; Ācārya Haribhadra sūri Granthmālā, Vol. No. 1, General Editor : V. M. Kulkarni, Ed. Muni Jambūvijaya, Delhi 1986.
2. *Pañcasuttam*, Ed. V. M. Shah, Bombay 1934, "Introduction," p. 17.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 20.
4. *Ibid.*, "Foreword", p. 69.
5. *Pañcasūtrakam*, Ed. Muni Śrī Jambūvijaya, Delhi 1986, "Introduction," p. 33.
6. *Ibid.*
7. *Ibid.*, *Prastāvanā*, pp. 4-5.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 80.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 80.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 81.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 80.
12. *Ibid.*, *Prastāvanā*, p. 3.
13. *Ibid* pp. 80-81.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 24.
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 80-81.
16. *Ibid.*
17. *Ibid.*, p. 24.
18. *Ibid.*
19. *Dharmaparīkṣā*, Ahmedabad V. S. 1998 (A. D. 1942), pp. 23-24.
20. *Ṣoḍaśaka Prakaraṇam*, Bombay 1984, p. 96.
21. *Ibid.*
22. *Pañcasūtrakam*, Jambūvijaya, "Intro.," p. 4.
23. *Ibid.*, pp. 50-53-54.

24. *Viṃśati-Viṃśikā*, Ed. K. V. Abhyankar, Bombay 1932, pp. 38-39.
25. *Soḍaśakaparakaraṇam*, Bombay 1984, p. 70.
26. *Pañcasūtrakam*, Jambūvijaya, pp. 45-46.
27. *Viṃśati-Viṃśikā*, p. 37.
- 28-30. *Pañcasūtrakam*, Jambūvijaya, pp. 57 and 58.
- 29-31. *Soḍaśakaparakaraṇam*, Bombay 1984, p. 10.
- 32-34. *Pañcasūtrakam*, Jambūvijaya, pp. 70 and 75.
- 33-35. *Viṃśati-Viṃśikā*, pp. 61 and 63.
36. *Pañcasūtrakam*, Jambūvijaya, pp. 68.
- 37-38. *Viṃśati-Viṃśikā*, p. 63.
- 39-41-42-44. *Pañcasūtrakam*, Jambūvijaya, pp. 73, 3, 71, 6.
- 40-43-45-46. *Viṃśati-Viṃśikā*, pp. 6, 4-5-6, 11-12.
- 47-48-49-50. *Pañcasūtrakam*, Jambūvijaya, pp. 37-40 and 73.
51. *Haribhadra yoga bhāratī*, Bombay V. S. 2036 (A. D. 1980), p. 123.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 286.
53. *Viṃśati-Viṃśikā*, p. 6.
54. *Soḍaśakaparakaraṇam*, Bombay 1984, p. 85.
- 55-56. *Pañcasūtrakam*, Jambūvijaya, pp. 73 and 76.
57. *Viṃśati-Viṃśikā*, p. 24.
58. *Soḍaśakaparakaraṇam*, p. 85.
59. *Pañcasūtrakam*, Jambūvijaya, pp. 78-79.
60. *Haribhadra yoga bhāratī*, pp. 129.
61. *Prakrit Vyākaraṇa*, Pt. Becharadas Doshi, Ahmedabad 1925, "Praveśa", p. 12.
62. *Pañcasūtrakam*, Jambūvijaya, p. 3.
63. *Ibid.*, pp. 11-13-16.
- 64-65. *Ibid.*, "Intro.," p. 33.
- 66-67-68. *Ibid.*, "Prastāvanā", pp. 4-3-4.
- 69-70. *Ibid.*, pp. 80-66.
71. *Viṃśati-Viṃśikā*, "Prāstāvikaṃ, Nivedanam," p. 7.

