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

Ācārya Vijayaśilacandragūra 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 Jambūvijaya¹.

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 चिर्स्तनाचार्य meaning ancient preceptors or preceptor having the name चिर्स्तन. The first meaning is more likely. It is difficult to assign individual authorship to works like this.\(^3\)

(2) The term चिर्स्तनाचार्य: is unhelpful in deciding the authorship. The plural form can be used out of respect (मानार्थों बहुवाचनाम) for the author. At the same time, it is very likely that ancient authors might have composed the *sūtras* and Haribhadra sūrī might have put them together.\(^3\)

2. Writes K. V. Abhyankar: "The *Pañcasūtra* which is a small elegant treatise written by some old writer whose name has still remained unknown."\(^4\)

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."\(^5\)

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

"The language of the post-canonical Jaina works is partly Prakrit—the so-called Jain a Māhāraṣṭri—and partly Sanskrit." (M. Winternitz). The language of the known Prakrit works of Haribhadra is Jain a Māhāraṣṭri 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 Samgha 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."\(^6\)

The gist of the aforementioned four opinions is this: these unanimously proclaim that Ācārya Haribhadra sūrī 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 sūrī
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 चिन्तनाचार्यविविधितम्?

It should, however, be clear that, as against this established tradition and the opinions of the aforesaid 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*: प्रदर्शणाक्षरसूत्र समासम्। एवं पञ्चसूत्रच्छाया समासम्॥ समासं पञ्चसूत्रकेव व्याख्यान्तोऽस्य॥

Among these, the third sentence deserves special consideration. It comes from the pen of the commentator and therefore implicitly written to mean समासं पञ्चसूत्रकेव व्याख्यान्तोऽस्य । Had the commentator and the author of the *Pañcasūtra* been different, the phrase in question, ought to have been in the form समासं पञ्चसूत्रकः, while here it is समासं पञ्चसूत्रकेव व्याख्यान्तोऽस्य and the last word of the phrase, अथि, holds a suggestive significance. The term अथि implies that the *Pañcasūtra* has been completed in the sense of “together with the commentary.” If अथि is deleted from this sentence, it would mean that the *Pañcasūtra* is completed ‘in the form of commentary.’ The addition of only one word ‘अथि’ 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 aforesaid 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 ‘समासं च पञ्चसूत्रं’ 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 'समालं पञ्चसूत्रकं व्याख्यानतः' or the sentence 'समालं पञ्चसूत्रकवृत्ति. And this could then be regarded as a proper ending. Moreover, after this, there is a positively independent sentence पञ्चसूत्रकटीका समाला, which has been written by the commentator. As a result of this phrase, the whole contextual reference of the sentence समालं पञ्चसूत्रकं व्याख्यातोपि, 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, it any still remains, will be cleared.

Second, had the original author employed the phrase समालं पञ्चसूत्रं, it would imply the completion of the पञ्चसूत्र and not the पञ्चसूत्रकं; but the commentator writes समालं पञ्चसूत्रकं. Elsewhere also in the commentary, the commentator recognises this composition definitely as पञ्चसूत्रकं. 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 पञ्चसूत्रं 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 समालं पञ्चसूत्रकं व्याख्यातोपि, the commentator had also put some devotional sentences: "नमः श्रुतेदेवताय भगवते। सर्वनमस्तेवर्द्धिहृद्योऽनन्त:। सर्वसानंदनानां बन्दे। सर्वोपकार्यामितिच्छात्रो वैयक्तवाम्। सर्ववृक्षेऽवकार्यार्दिशिते भूते।। यात्रा सत्त्वा। सुखिन: सन्तु। सर्वं सत्त्वा। सुखिन: सन्तु। सर्वं सत्त्वा। सुखिन: सन्तु।।"13

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 Yogadrośṭisamuccaya and the Pañcasūtra or for that matter in the commentary of the text the Sodāṣaprakaraṇa. 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, Haribhadṛācārya 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 नंवनमिविवाण्याौ etc. in the final 15th prose section of the first परप्रतिवातसूत्र 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, सर्वनन्दस्वाहेंः नमः: 15 and सवें सत्यः सुङ्खिणः सत्यैः 16 [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 नमोःसेस, it would appear more consistent and more pleasing) नमोक्राष्टिव्राण्याौ, and सुहिणो भवः जीयाौ 18 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 धर्मपरिषेध, includes the following phrases :-

परप्रतिवातगुणवीज्ञानसूत्रे हरिभद्रसूर्वित्वातदयतदभव–सम्बन्धः प्रज्ञातिस्वरूपात्त्यत्तुतत्त्वस्तदभवत् धर्मपरिषेध जा पार्ष यत्तत्त्वस्तदभवः प्रज्ञातिस्वरूपात्त्यत्तुतत्तुति अत्रविष्कृतत्रापेक्षेत्रेन विशेषज्ञानीयांमित्वकृतः। तथा हि ’’सर्वमुनि एको एको एको एको...’’ इत्य मित्यमित्यमत्यमत्यादि। १९
Having considered the sins committed either in this birth or in the past existences, by the term बल्ल-दल्ल, Haribhadra sūri also has stated to undergo the expiatory purification in the form of मिथ्यादृष्टिक. 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 पापप्रतिघातपुण्यबीजाधानस्वभ, but not पापप्रतिघातपुण्यबीजाधानसुत्तरत् or पापसुत्तर. 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 योजक is also a product of Haribhadra sūri, and Yaśovijaya wrote a commentary upon that work as well. Therein, in the last योजक, there are 17 verses instead of 16. In the 17th verse, there is a clear indication of the author's name as वर्णः नतु हारिध्रमिद्व। From this statement we can naturally conclude that only Haribhadra sūri is the author of that verse and, by extension, of the योजकप्रकरण. 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 षयक्रुद्धमार्गयतेनौ। From only this much context, it can be understood that it was not possible for him to put the sentence पापसुत्तरसुत्तरत् 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. प्रतिम्, प्रतिगु, अप्रतिम, योजक, विशिष्ट—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 प्रतिम or प्रतिगु. The name प्रतिम may flash in the understanding of only Haribhadra sūri. While offering guidance regarding the etymological interpretation of the term प्रतिम, Munirāja Jambūvijaya has observed as under: “The title of the work written by Ācārya Haribhadra sūri is प्रतिम्
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.”

This perceptive observation lends a positive encouragement to my above arrived deduction that such topical appellations characteristically were designed by Haribhadraśārya.

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 विशेषतिविशिष्ट, the धर्मविन्दु, the योगाहत्सपुमुच्यत, and the षोडशक, all by Haribhadra sūri.

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

‘वाहितसुकिक्रियात्थानाः, सो जहा केवल गहायाहिनहिंद, अणुपूर्वातुसेवेन विणाया सरुदेण, निविन्तने तदान, सुवेंज्ववरणेव स्मरण तं मम प्रपणित्य कालाविधिर्मोणि, निरहुन्ता संवर्तित्य कालाविधिर्मोणि। तुणाहोति परान्त: तुणाहोति परान्त: तुणाहोति परान्त: तुणाहोति परान्त: सरुदेण वाहितसुकिक्रियात्थानाः सुवेंज्ववरणेव स्मरण तं मम प्रपणित्य कालाविधिर्मोणि, निरहुन्ता संवर्तित्य कालाविधिर्मोणि। तुणाहोति परान्त: तुणाहोति परान्त: तुणाहोति परान्त: तुणाहोति परान्त: सरुदेण वाहितसुकिक्रियात्थानाः सुवेंज्ववरणेव स्मरण तं मम प्रपणित्य कालाविधिर्मोणि, निरहुन्ता संवर्तित्य कालाविधिर्मोणि। तुणाहोति परान्त: तुणाहोति परान्त: तुणाहोति परान्त: तुणाहोति परान्त: सरुदेण वाहितसुकिक्रियात्थानाः सुवेंज्ववरणेव स्मरण तं मम प्रपणित्य कालाविधिर्मोणि, निरहुन्ता संवर्तित्य कालाविधिर्मोणि। तुणाहोति परान्त: तुणाहोति परान्त: तुणाहोति परान्त: तुणाहोति परान्त: सरुदेण वाहितसुकिक्रियात्थानाः सुवेंज्ववरणेव स्मरण तं मम प्रपणित्य कालाविधिर्मोणि, निरहुन्ता संवर्तित्य कालाविधिर्मोणि। तुणाहोति परान्त: तुणाहोति परान्त: तुणाहोति परान्त: तुणाहोति परान्त: सरुदेण वाहितसुकिक्रियात्थानाः सुवेंज्ववरणेव स्मरण तं मम प्रपणित्य कालाविधिर्मोणि, निरहुन्ता संवर्तित्य कालाविधिर्मोणि। तुणाहोति परान्त: तुणाहोति परान्त: तुणाहोति परान्त: तुणाहोति परान्त: सरुदेण वाहितसुकिक्रियात्थानाः सुवेंज्ववरणेव स्मरण तं मम प्रपणित्य कालाविधिर्मोणि, निरहुन्ता संवर्तित्य कालाविधिर्मोणि।

This very व्याहितसुकिक्रियात is to be met with in the verses of the 12th विषंक of the विषंतिविषंक, in a slightly different phraseology and context :

‘नो आउँस्स रेगो नासड़ तह ओसहझुईओ। ॥१५॥
न य तिझविआंशो फिराजोगोण अविय य चब्बँस।
इत्य परिनामाओ खुशु सर्बं खु जहूतमायद। ॥१३॥
शेऊडवित्यतोगो नियमेण विवादादूरणो होइ।
पाणिकिरियाओ जहो, नायरिणो सुप्परिसिं तु। ॥१४॥
जहो आउस्स रेगरखायतिशो दुक्हर विय चेरहौ।
इत्थ चिंगिच्छकिति तह चेर जसस्स सिक्षिति। ॥१५॥ ॥२४॥

And this very fact is more clearly discernible in the 16th verse of the 12th षोडशकः
[2] In the fourth sūtra of the Pañcasūtra, a group of sentences occurs as undernoted:

‘से समलेक्तकस्य समस्तलक्षणोऽपि नियतज्ञानधीरसः, परमसूचिवधमेव सम्म सिद्धबाप्यायः, गुरुवक्षाय, गुरुप्रसादः, विश्वासः, भूतस्वभावाः, न इत्य हिंदुः हि मनः, सुस्पृशासिते तत्तत्त्विनिर्देशः विषये परस्परस्ति अधिनियम सुतः॥'26

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

‘हथ वि होद्धारसूबोद्ध ततो एवोपसमसूहुः भूवी
सिद्धबाप्यायः वि जो हंसे भूवी हंसे समसतयसूहुः ।
तद् विशिष्टत्त्वः वि हु निर्भयो न जात निर्माणवेचे ॥४॥
विषये तद्दृष्टिः सुन्तः भावे शर्मं परस्परतत्त्व ततः भूवी॥’27

[3] In the fourth sūtra of the Pañcasūtrakāra, there are sentences ‘आयो गुरुद्वद्विषादः अवधःक्रणती ते अर्थावरणविखल्या भूवी नित्याशोभायः।’28 Now, the following verse of the second शोकक bears complete similarity with the above sentences:

‘गुरुपालकसंवरेकु व तद् व्याप्यानाँ सदाश्चाःस्तु वृत्ताः।
परमसूचिवधमेव व तस्मान्नः चोलासू॥११०॥’29

The significant point here is that the phrase अवधःक्रणती appearing in the text of the Pañcasūtra has been explained as मोक्षः प्रत्यप्रतिविद्धसमाहायतुत्वते३० in its commentary and the phrase सदाचारनासुगताः appearing in the verse of शोकक has been also explained as सदाश्चाः संसाधृतेऽविकुण्डः परमेश्वरमित्रातु: कुशलपरिनिर्मतनासुगताः गुरुपालकसंवरेकु 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] ‘निर्द्वस्यमेव तु नवर्तम: - सम्बन्धसूचिवधमे सम्बन्धसंस्केतोपर्यं: सब्दमलक्षणस्य जातिसमेव अतीतोऽपिगुणाः भूतमसूचिवधमेव:। रगाइयं भागस्तु: कर्मोदियाः वाहिणोः, परस्त्रीयोः अतिथिः अण्वेबः इत्यः एवतं सुधामेव, न तत्र अवधास्य गमाः, जहितशिवायाः, अस्माताः च वेदायुताः।’32 (In the fifth sūtra of the Pañcasūtra)

जो सम्बन्धसू तह सन्तवाहिण सन्तव सहस्मिर्याः।
खथा-वियान-जोप-परस्ती होः तत्र अपर्याप्तायी भूमिः।
रगाइयं सन्तव कर्मोदियाः वाहिणा इत्यं नेत्रः।
लहिनं तस्मां तत्र इत्याविक्षेपः त तथा॥५॥
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 vīśīkā.

[5] In the same way, the sentence of the fifth sūtra जत्थ एवो तथं निभयमा अर्जनवाते34 can be compared with the sentence जत्थ य एवो सिद्धो तथं अर्जनवाते35 of the verse 18th of the 20th vīśīkā.

[6] Also, there is a sentence in the fifth sūtra of the Pañcasūtra as न सत्ता सददत्रसुधेवे36. 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 vīśīkā, Haribhadra sūri has employed this very argumentative sentence as below :- एमेव भजो इहरा ज अभु सत्ता तत्वसुधेवे।37

Here, the reading, which has been traditionally accepted everywhere and which has been incorporated by Abhyankar in the विज्ञातविशिक्का edited by him, is as below :- एमेव भजो इहरा ज अभु सत्ता तत्वसुधेवे।38 This reading appears to be faulty after considering the method of the employment of the sentence न सत्ता सददत्रसुधेवे 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 भजो also positively appears in some manuscripts. Therefore, the very sentence सत्ता न तत्वसुधेवे 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 vishikika and the पत्रमृत्युर्म is one and the same person.

[7] The discussion, which is carried on in the following sentences of the fifth sūtra of Pañcasūtra - ए दिनक्खा अकरणस्। ए यदिहानुष्मा एसा। ए सहजापि निम्तती। ए निम्तितीए आयुधाय। ए दण्डाह सत्संसा। ए भव्वतसुधृत्य पाणे। ए चेवलजीवावधेयम्।39 etc. is the same in a slightly differing manner in the following verses of the second vishikika, namely लोकांनार्तविशिक्का.

जह भव्वतार्थार्थ न व निम्त्य एव किं न बंशोधवि।
किरियाशकलजोगो जं एसो ता न खलु एवं ति॥१७॥
[8] In the same way, we find the very rational annotation of the sentences—अणांके अणांके ज्ञात्रेः सभी, अणांधिक्यमंसेष्मुग्गोंमेंमण्डितैः 41 in the first sūtra and अणांके अणांके ज्ञात्रेः पवीणेः 42 in the fifth sūtra, in nearly initial 12 verses 43 of the second विशिष्ट.

[9] A free translation of the sentence सु-धध्मसंपत्ति पावकमणिगतामिह, पावकमणिगतामि तहाभव्यवाविद्विवामिह 44 of the first sūtra is clearly noticeable in the first verse:

‘निच्छयों पुण एसो जायह निमेयं परमगुरुष्ठे।
तह-भव्यत्वमलख्यभावं अव्यतु-सुकुलि ॥ १॥’ 45

of the fourth विशिष्टक and the first half of the eighth verse, ‘एवमि सहजमलावतिगतं सु-धध्मसंपत्ति।’ 46 of the selfsame विशिष्ट.

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

‘तस्य अणन्यापि पथविपृष्ठी धर्मं। अणन्यं अणवहैः चेतसवहाजुः सिद्धं। धम्मसहार्य सु-धध्मसंपत्ति।’ 47

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 48. 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 ‘पतिविपृष्ठी अक्करणस्य’ and ‘पतिविपृष्ठी अक्करणस्य’ 49 incorporated in the fifth sūtra exactly corresponds with the two following verses of योगद्विश्चुम्च्यः:
I guess that the term दिश्य in the Jaina literature is for the first time noticeable in the works of Haribhadra sūri. Out of his works:—

(i) The term दिश्य is employed in the above-recorded verse, bearing the number 200 of the योगद्वस्समुच्छयार.

(ii) The employment of the term दिश्य has been attributed to ancient writers [Patañjali and so forth according to the commentary] by incorporating the clause 'दिश्यदिवाद्वत्ताथादिवर्तृसमूदिततं तथा' in the verse bearing the number 489 of the योगद्वस्समुच्छयार.

(iii) The term दिश्य is again encountered in the phrase 'एवं चेव दिश्य' in the 16th verse of the 2nd विशिष्ट, of the विशारदविशिष्ट. The traditionally famous reading 'एवं चेव यदिश्य' which has been accepted by Abhyankar is incorrect and inconsistent. Here, if we accept the reading दिश्य, then alone it sounds appropriate in case of all other situations.

(iv) The term दिश्य is employed in the eighth verse of the 15th शौकसक of the शौकसकमक्कल, which is as follows: 'सामग्योग्दो शत शिखरेंतुस्यशिक्षाकर्त्तव्योः'।

Sanalabhamyog: [54] Here the term दिश्य does not offer the meaning, which has been attributed to it in other treatises. Here this term is used in the sense of अनालब्धयोग consistently with its etymological interpretation द्विप्रभुत्व दिश्य. Here we can clearly see how intelligently and consistently a Jainācārya employs the term दिश्य, which bears a technical meaning according to the Sāṅkhya school of philosophy. Yet, the application of 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 दिश्य in the sentence ‘ज दिश्य आकर्षयस्य’ of the Pañcasūtra in the same sense in which he has used this term in the aforementioned three works barring the शौकसक.

[13] The term स्मरणित्वम् is employed in the fourthsūtra of the Pañcasūtra. This appears to be a favourite term of Haribhadra sūri, because it appears...
also in the विशालिविशिष्टक [8/3], though in a different contextual sense. There it bears the meaning “Adoration conferring all-sided auspiciousness (सत्तमसंकल्पकारणी पूजा). In the tenth verse of the ninth जोड़ाक this adoration has been styled विशोपभषन, but the commentator Yaśovijaya has suggested that worship to have been published by सम्बन्धेन्द्रणेश्वर ॥58.

[14] Lastly, let us glance at the sentences in the ending portion of the Pāñcasūtra. It has been written in the last aphorism that ‘न एसा अभ्यस्ति देया लिङ्गविविविज्ञाया दण्डविण्डा तथयुग्महात्मा अवास्तु भोजणात्मानादेव। एसा करण्ति वुच्चाद ॥59 et cetera. The sense which is embodied in the above aphorism, appears exactly in the same significance in the concluding portion of the योगहस्तिसमुच्चयः:

‘हुशिन्ध संध प्रात्म नैतिथ्यो देवादाराम् ॥२२६॥
अवशेष कुमारस्याधिष्ठितय यदस्तस्य जायदेत। अन्तस्तत्वत्वपरिश्रायं न युन्नषभ्यरस्ते॥२२७॥60

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 Pāñcasūtra. Had it not been so, the content-references of the Pāñcasūtra 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 Pāñcasūtra to an unknown ancient (चिन्तन) ācārya or the one by name ‘Cirantana’ who might have flourished prior to Haribhadra sūri be maintained, we will be forced to accept that Haribhadraācārya might have borrowed verbally as well as sensewise all the above-recorded references from ‘the others’ works compared with the references of the Pāñcasūtra 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. Pr. 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."51

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 sanskritajany prakrut language, observing as it does all the later rules of the Hemacandiya grammar. The language of the works such as the vinśatibīṣṭikā 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 अणाह्वी, भवे, कम्भसंजोगणित्वतिए, दुष्करुवे, दुष्कर्यते 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 रागदोसविससपसमांतो, कैवतिलिपणती धम्मो, सरण्णुपत्राम, चित्तीओ य संसारो, अणावट्टियसहायो62 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."64 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 संस्कृतम and संस्कृतभव words as stated above, positively proves that the work in question is composed not in Ardhamāgadhī but in Prakrit.

Also, the argument advanced by Kulkarni that “The treatise in question is in Ardhamāgadhī 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 diction? 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 Gujarāti 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 चित्रस्थ (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. 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 पंचसूत्रक, in the same way he himself is the author of the Sūtra-text of the Pañcasūtrak. 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 'समर्त पंचसूत्रके॥६०'। 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:

पादसूत्र प्राकृतमूलम् सूत्राणि २२०।
बृजिष्ठ हारिप्रदी ८८०॥

The list of the Jaina works in the ब्रह्मदिनिका 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 'Hāribhadri.' It cannot be denied that the confusion might have arisen from this record. If we focus on this record and read 'पादसूत्र प्राकृतमूलम् सूत्राणि २२० बृजिष्ठ हारिप्रदी 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 Hāribhadri is supposed to have covered both the Sūtra (original text) and the Vṛtti (the commentary). And the term Hāribhadri 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 'Hāribhadra (लारिब्ध्रध्र) only indicated the name of the commentator since it unambiguously refers to the term कृति. But, it is a noteworthy circumstance that, in this record, regarding the name of the original author there is no statement like चिन्तनाचार्येवृत्त or अज्ञातकवर्क. 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 अज्ञातकवर्क 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:

'sमन्त्रे पंचसुत्रके || छस || कृत्त चिन्तनाचार्यवृत्तं च ज्ञातिनमहत्तासुतु श्रीहरिभद्राचार्यः ||'68

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 कृतिरि: चिन्तनाचार्येवृत्तं धर्मति ज्ञातिनमहत्तासुतुः put by the commentator (i.e. the author), after the sentence 'पञ्चसुत्रकवर्क्कृतियस्माता समाला 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 भविष्य 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 ‘कृति: सिवाम्बर’ 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 भविष्य does not directly appear, its sense arguably has been conveyed by the author in a different way. भविष्य 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 विरह, but through the term निर्मोच्यस, employed there either affirmatively or positively. Refer, in this context, the last sentence of the Pañcasūtra:

एसा करण ति बुद्ध एवं परिसुद्ध अविरहणाकः तिलोगानाहुब्जाभोजनं निस्तेय्यसाहिन ति पवेश्नापलक्षु।

If, however, the demand for the term विरह is insisted upon, then even in the end portion of the commentary supposed to be written by Haribhadra sūri, the term विरह 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 निर्मोच्यस as synonymous with the term भविष्य, would allow us in connecting the total composition with Haribhadra sūri.

Regarding the authorship of the Pañcasūtra, 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 śāstras. 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 योगद्विषेषमुच्चय which are introduced in the Pañcasūtra, probably more charmingly and in brief and pithy sentences as also a quotation from that work70 at one place in the commentary of the Pañcasūtra, this latter work must be subsequent to the composition of the योगद्विषेषमुच्चय 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 underquoting :-

"एते रचितानां तेषा लेखा ग्रन्थाना कप्रार्थिपादने थैकाय-था: प्राय: प्रथमं रचिता अनन्तरं धर्मकथा रघुवास्तङ्गनम्नमकान्तनपताका-लोकावत्रिनिर्णययथा: प्राधान्यन जैनसंस्काराल्पनिषोपदस्य प्रन्या निःसंविस्तङ्गनन्तरं यहृदयन्समुच्चय-शाखावर्तसमुच्चय-पश्चास्तवादो दर्पान्त्यसाङ्गनततः च योगद्विषेषनिषध्यबिनयु-योगद्विषेषमुच्चय रथिताविति भावति। समस्बादने परिणतप्रसारणगमसमापुत्त: स्वकुम् ग्रन्थप्रतियादितानां विविधनां विषयाणां सकुम्हास्त्यभूतकां विशिष्टिविशिष्टानाम् ग्रन्थो निस्मायिति।" To this we may add : "तदनन्तरं योगमार्गस्तेहैवभिन्नततमतमेव निजे जीवनभागे पश्चायुक्तस्य सतीकस्य रचना सन्तव्यथा स्वायत्ति।"

The aforenoted 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. Pañcāsāka
2. Vimśikā
3. Śodaśaka
4. Aṣṭaka
5. Pañcasūtrakā
In the medieval biographical tradition, Haribhadra sūri enjoys a reputation in the field of Jainism as the author of 1444 Prakaraṇa works. A few Prakarana-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.
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