

INTRODUCTION

1. Tiloyapaṇṇatti: Form etc.

The Tiloyapaṇṇatti, Sk. Triloka-prajñaptiḥ (TP) is an ancient Indian text, in Prākṛit, dealing primarily with Jaina Cosmography and incidentally including many other topics of religious and cultural interest. According to the enumeration of the Author himself the entire text is divided into nine Mahādhikāras (I. 88-9): 1) General Nature of the Universe; 2) Hellish Regions; 3) Bhavanavāsi Regions; 4) Human World; 5) Sub-human World; 6) Vyantara Regions; 7) Jyotiṣka Regions; 8) Heavenly Regions; and 9) The Realm of Liberation. The form of the work is well planned. Every Mahādhikāra is subdivided into Adhikāras, dealing with different topics and sometime further split into subdivisions. Now and then there are numerical representations of the contents of some of the gāthās. The major bulk of the text is in verse; there are a few prose passages; and some detached words and sentences introduce a few verses.

The First Mahādhikāra falls into two broad divisions: Introductory, and General Description of the Universe: it contains in all 283 gāthās and a few prose passages. The Second M has 15 Sections (II. 2-6); and of the total of 367 verses, all are gāthās excepting five, namely, 4 Indravajrā (362, 364-6) and 1 Svāgatā (363). The Third M has 24 Sections (III. 2-6) with 243 verses of which 2 are in Indravajrā (228 and 241), 4 in Upajāti (214-15, 229 and 242) and the rest in gāthā metre. The Fourth M contains 16 Sections (IV. 2-5), some of which have further subsections, with 2961 verses (and some prose passages) of which 7 are in Indravajrā (162-3, 550-51, 578, 941-42), 2 in Dodhaka (552 and 1275), 1 in Śārdūlavikṛīḍita (704), 2 in Vasantatilaka (940 and 1211) and the rest in gāthā metre. The Fifth M has 16 Sections (V. 2-4) with 321 gāthās and plenty of prose passages. The Sixth M (VI. 2-4) contains 17 Sections (the last three of which being similar to those in M 3) with 103 gāthās. The Seventh M (VII. 2-4) has 17 Sections (the last nine being similar to those in M 3) with 619 gāthās and some prose passages. The Eighth M (VIII. 2-5) contains 21 Sections (some of which are not clearly specified, or are perhaps missing, for instance 11-12 etc.) with 703 verses of which 1 (702) is Śārdūlavikṛīḍita and the rest are gāthās, and a few prose passages. The Ninth or the last M has 5 Sections in 77 verses of which 1 is Mālinī (74) and the rest are gāthās.

The ms. material from which this text is edited was limited, and the editors have been able to detect apparent drawbacks in the text presented here: many readings are awfully corrupt, though generally it is not difficult to surmise their approximate sense; now and then lines are missing (pp. 33, 228-9, 442, 448, 489, 571, 576, 627-8, 630 etc.); numerical representations contain errors and are often misplaced (pp. 60, 64 etc.); the titles of subsections are not always and consistently found, and at certain places they are obviously missing (see Mahādhikāra 8). Many of these drawbacks can be removed hereafter, if this printed text, which is quite authentic within the limits of the material used, is compared with still earlier MSS. that might come to light later on.

Apart from the above drawbacks arising out of defective ms-tradition, the TP as a whole is based on sufficiently ancient tradition and shows, on the whole,

a compact form which has been given to it by a single author. At the close of every Mahādhikāra, the author clearly specifies that the contents of TP have been received by him through a succession of teachers; and at times there is a reference to Gurūpadeśa (see for instance, VII. 113, 162). He refers to and quotes the opinions of ancient texts (see below) like the Agrāyaṇī, Parikarma and Lokavinīścaya which are no more available to us. He is frank enough to admit in a number (more than twentyfive) of places (see for instance, III. 13, 118, 161, IV. 48, 750 (note the simile), 847, 1572 etc.) that the information or traditional instruction about a specific point had not traditionally reached him through his teachers or is lost beyond recovery. Throughout the text one gets the impression that such an obscure subject like cosmography with all its calculations etc. was studied by different lines of teachers, some of them holding varying opinions. In more than forty places we get gāthās called Pāṭhāntaram, and there are even some alternative views indicated by *athavā* (see pp. 51, 71). The author's aim is to record the tradition as faithfully and exhaustively as it is possible for him to do.

The form and contents of TP clearly display the hand of a single author, though omissions and additions of minor character by intelligent readers and copyists can never be ruled out till many more MSS. are collated. After a clear statement at the beginning, the entire work is divided into nine Mahādhikāras, each one of them further into sections, duly enumerated at its opening. Thus there is a plan for the whole work. At times the reader is referred to an earlier chapter for the details required in a subsequent chapter (VI. 101). Sometime we get phrases like *puvvaṃ va vattavvaṃ* (IV. 261, 274 etc.) which indicate that the author is handling the subject matter continuously. The opening Maṅgala consists of salutations etc. to five Parameṣṭhins, enumerating however Siddha first and then Arhat. Then starting with the end of the first Mahādhikāra, both at the beginning and end of subsequent Mahādhikāras, salutations are offered to Tirthakaras in their settled order: Nābheya, 2 Ajita and Sambhava, 3 Abhinandana and Sumati, 4 Padmaprabha and Supārśva, 5 Candraprabha and Puṣpadanta, 6 Śītala and Śreyāṃsa, 7 Vāsupūjya and Vimāla, 8 Ananta and Dharma, and 9 Śānti and Kunthu. Then the salutations to remaining Tirthakaras, Ara to Vardhamāna, come as a part of the conclusion of the last Mahādhikāra (IX. 67-73). The arrangement and location of these salutations have not only a plan but also clearly show the hand of one author.

2. Yativr̥ṣabha: The Author

In the past many scholars have discussed about the Authorship and Date of TP. It is just possible that my Bibliography is not exhaustive. However, as far as I know, the following are the important articles and essays (in Hindi) on this topic; and they have been used by me in preparing this Introduction: 1) Pt. Nathuram Premi: Lokavibhāga and Tīloyapannaṭṭi, Jaina Hitaiṣi 1917; Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihāsa, Bombay 1942, pp. 1-22. 2) Pt. Jugalkishore: Kundakunda and Yativr̥ṣabh, Anekānta II, p. 1-12; A MS-copy of his essay on TP and Yativr̥ṣabha in which he has reviewed the earlier views, especially those of Pt. Phulachanda noted below. 3) Pt. Phulachanda: Present TP and its Date etc., Jaina Siddhānta Bhāskara, Vol. 11, pp. 65-82. 4) Pt. Mahendrakumāra: Jayadhavalā, Mathura 1944, Intro. pp. 15-25, 39-69 etc. Whenever I mention the names of these scholars I have in view their contributions listed above. All the sources are in print except the essay of Pt. Jugalkishore. Words are inadequate to

express my sense of gratitude to Pt. Jugalkishoraji who readily sent his MS.-copy for my use.

According to the TP itself, the authorship is twofold: with reference to the *artha* or contents and *grantha* or text. Lord Mahāvira, who is endowed with supernatural gifts and merits is the *kartā* with reference to the *artha* or contents. After him these contents have been inherited through Gautama and other eminent Ācāryas (I. 55 ff.). The credit of shaping the text of TP is to go to some or the other Ācārya, and we have to see whether we get any information about him in this text. At the beginning or in the colophons the author mentions neither his Teachers nor his name; and in this context the following two gāthās (TP IX. 76-77) attract our attention:

पणमह जिणवरवसहं गणहरवसहं तहेव गुणवसहं । ददूण परिसवसहं जदिवसहं धम्मसुत्तापण वसहं ॥
चुण्णिस्सरूवळकरणसरूपमाण होइ किं जं तं (?) । अट्टसहस्सपमाणं तिलोयपणत्तिणामाण ॥

These verses present some difficulties of interpretations. In the first verse, though it is a salutation to Jinavara-vṛṣabha, one can easily suspect that the author is mentioning his name Jativṛṣabha or Yativṛṣabha; and in the next verse, to indicate the extent of TP, two other works, Cūṇī-svarūpa and (ṣaṭ-) Karaṇa-svarūpa, (possibly composed by himself) are being mentioned. This interpretation is to a great extent corroborated by what we know from other sources.

While describing how the study of Kaśāya-prābhṛta was handed down through generations of teachers, Indranandi, the author of Śrutāvatāra, adds these two Āryās: (155-56):

पाथे तयोर्द्वयोरप्यधीत्य सूत्राणि तानि यतिवृषभः । यतिवृषभनामधेयो बभूव शास्त्रार्थनिपुणमतिः ॥
तेन ततो यतिपतिना तद्व्याख्यातिसूत्ररूपेण । रचितानि षट्सहस्रग्रन्थान्यथ चूर्णिसूत्राणि ॥

Thus Yativṛṣabha (note the *s'leṣa* on this word which reminds us of the gāthās of TP quoted above) studied the Sūtras (of the Kaśāyaprabhṛta) from Nāgahasti and Ārya-maṅkṣu and acquired special proficiency; then by way of commentary on the same he wrote Cūṇīsūtras, six thousand in extent. This is no more a traditional account given to posterity by Indranandi, but now there is clear evidence available to this effect in the Jayadhavalā itself. At its beginning the blessings of Yativṛṣabha (the author of Vṛttisūtra), the disciple of Ārya Maṅkṣu and the close pupil of Nāgahasti are sought; and more than once there are references to his Cūṇīsūtra which stands today indistinguishably absorbed in the Jayadhavalā of Virasena-Jinasena. The facts that TP mentions Yativṛṣabha and also the Cūṇī to describe the extent of TP and that there is a Cūṇīsūtra of Yativṛṣabha on the Kaśāya-pāhuḍa make it highly probable that the author of TP is the same as the author of Cūṇīsūtras on the Kaśāyapāhuḍa.

Pt. Mahendrakumar has already made an intelligent effort to delineate the salient characteristics of this Cūṇīsūtra, incorporated in the Jayadhavalā commentary. It is concise in expression but profound in meaning. That is why Uccāraṇācārya was required to elucidate it further, and Virasena-Jinasena magnified its contents ten times to explain the subject matter fully. Yativṛṣabha shows a traditional method of interpretation and manner of exposition. He refers to the contents of Karmaṇapavāda, the 8th Pūrva, and to Karmaṇaprakṛti, the 4th Prābhṛta of the 5th Vastu of the 2nd Pūrva. He also refers to the difference of opinion between Ārya Maṅkṣu and Nāgahasti, the latter's view being more acceptable as consistent with tradition. The Uccāraṇāvṛtti often explains Cūṇīsūtra though on many points they differed among themselves.

About the other work of Yativṛṣabha, namely, Karaṇasvarūpa or Śatkarana-svarūpa, we do not know anything at all. In the TP, however, he adds certain gāthās which are called Karaṇa-sūtras, or -gāthās, Karaṇa (note the phrase 'those skilled in Karaṇa' at TP I. 116) indicating something like formulae for calculation.

It is unfortunate that we know very little about Yativṛṣabha, the author of Cūṛṇisūtras on the Kaśāyapāhuḍa and of this TP. The verse of TP in which his name is hinted by *s'leṣa* has a similar verse in Jayadhavalā; and both possibly contain a reference to Guṇadhara who propounded the Kaśāyaprabhṛta in gāthās. It implies that Yativṛṣabha held Guṇadhara in great respect. How they were related we do not know: there is no suggestion to the effect that they were contemporaries. It is Virasēna who tells us that Yativṛṣabha was a *s'iṣya* of Āryamaṅkṣu and an *antevāsi* of Nāgahastī. The word *s'iṣya* may mean also a *paraniparā s'iṣya*; but the word *antevāsi*, however, indicates that he was a contemporary and a close pupil of Nāgahastī. Some years back (Intro. to my ed. of Pravacanasāra, Bombay 1935, p. XV, foot note 3) I suggested that Ārya Maṅkṣu and Ārya Nāgahastī appear to be identical with Ajja Maṅgu and Ajja Nāgahatthī mentioned in the Nandīsūtra.

3. Yativṛṣabha: His Date

The date of Yativṛṣabha, and consequently that of TP, is a problem by itself. The evidence available is neither sufficient nor conclusive; and any attempt to settle their age under these circumstances is bound to be tentative. One should take a dispassionate survey of the evidence without being dogmatic; and the date proposed here is at the best a pointer for further investigation.

The method of discussion, constant insistence that the contents are all inherited traditionally, the impersonal presentation of contents and the authorities appealed to—all these indicate that the text of TP shows more kinship with the canonical works than with later treatises bearing the stamp of individual authorship. Yativṛṣabha belongs to the group of authors such as Śivārya, Vaṭṭakera, Kundakunda and others; and his TP belongs to the class of pro-canonical texts which, soon after the canon shaped at Pāṭaliputra was disclaimed by certain schools of Jaina teachers as not authoritative for them, came to be compiled as memory notes based on the traditional knowledge inherited through the succession of teachers.

Remembering this background, we can scrutinise the available external and internal evidence, and shall try to fix broad limits for the age of Yativṛṣabha and his TP.

A. 1) Virasena not only invokes the blessings of Yativṛṣabha, the *s'iṣya* of Ajja Maṅkhu and the *antevāsi* of Nāgahatthī and refers to his Vṛttisūtra but also specifies the TP calling it by the dignified title *sutta* (Dhavalā III, p. 36) and quotes gāthās from it found with minor variations in the present day text of TP (Dhavalā I, pp. 40, 63 etc.) and also reproduces contents from it now and then (Dhavalā I, pp. 16, 31-33, 56-57, 60-2, 63-4 etc.). That a commentator like Virasena inherits contents and quotes from an earlier text is but quite natural: this is exactly what a commentator is expected to do in elucidating the ancient Sūtras. About the date of Virasena we have a clear statement from himself that he finished his Dhavalā commentary in Śaka 738 (+78)=816 A. D. The TP of Yativṛṣabha will have to be put earlier than this date.

2) Pt. Mahendrakumar has shown that Jinabhadra Kṣamāśramaṇa's reference to *ādes'a-kaṣāya* in his Viśeṣaśākyakabhāṣya (Śaka 531, i. e., A. D. 609) has possibly in view Yativṛṣabha's discussion in his Cūṛṇisūtras now incorporated in the Jayadhavalā.

B. 1) Yativṛṣabha has not remembered any earlier authors, though an improved reading in TP IX. 69 may suggest that he is mentioning by *s'leṣa* the name of Guṇadhara along with his name. But this will not help us much to settle his date.

2) At IV. 1211, there is a mention of Bālacandra Saiddhāntika. The first question is whether this verse can be attributed to Yativṛṣabha, the author of TP. My reply is in the negative. The context shows that the verse concerned has no inherent connection with the text. The earlier verse says that all the Tirthakaras, excepting Rṣabha, Vāsupūjya and Neminātha, attained Liberation in the Kayotsarga position. Any intelligent and devoted reader or copyist would feel like invoking the blessings of Tirthakaras at this context; and I do not feel any doubt that Bālacandra Saiddhāntika must have been a close reader, if not a copyist, who added such a verse at that context. The title Saiddhāntika is borne by many teachers like Nemicandra, Viranandi, Māghanandi etc., and it is indicative of their proficiency in Siddhānta. There have flourished many Bālacandras, and we have to find out one who is called Saiddhāntika either in literary or in epigraphic sources. An additional verse like this is a good pointer to give rise to suspicion whether learned readers and copyists might have added elucidatory passages here and there from other sources. Any way this mention of Bālacandra does not and cannot help us to settle the date of Yativṛṣabha.

3) It is interesting to note that TP mentions earlier works and their divergent opinions. We may list them here with critical observations and see how far they would help us to settle the age of Yativṛṣabha.

Aggāyaṇīya (Loyavinicchaya-m-Aggāyaṇī IV. 1982): As I understand it, this is a reference to Agrāyaṇīya, the 2nd of the 14 Pūrvas included in the Drṣṭivāda, the 12th Aṅga. In earlier Prākṛit sources it is spelt as Aggāyaṇīyaṃ or Aggeniyaṃ. If the sandhi-consonant is separated as noted above, the reading Maggāyaṇī really stands for Aggāyaṇī; and I feel that Saggāyaṇī (IV. 217, 1821, 2029), Saṃgāyaṇī (VIII. 272), Saṃgāyī (IV. 2448), Saṃgoyāṇī (IV. 219) Saṃgāhāṇī (VIII. 387) are just corrupt readings arising out of similitude of orthography etc. When this text is being so often referred to with its dissenting views clearly specified, it only means that the Author of TP had inherited a detailed knowledge of the Agrāyaṇīya-pūrva.

Ditthivāda, (Drṣṭivāda): There are at least three clear references to Drṣṭivāda (I. 99, 148, IV. 55), and the Author of TP shows positive acquaintance with, if not positive inheritance of, the contents of it. Though the lists of its contents and divisions are preserved, the Jaina tradition is uniform in saying that the knowledge of it became gradually extinct. Some lines of Teachers might be knowing bits of it here and there. It is lately shown by Dr. Hiralal Jain (Dhavalā, vols. I & II Intros., Amraoti 1939-40) that major portions of Jivatthāna etc. have been taken from Agrāyaṇīya-pūrva, the 2nd Pūrva, a subsection of the Drṣṭivāda.

Parikamma (Parikarma): The author discusses his apparent difference from what is stated in the Parikamma (p. 765). Possibly this is a reference to the commentary of that name on the first three Khaṇḍas of the Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama attributed to Padmanandi alias Kundakunda (Dhavalā, vol I, Intro. pp. 31, 46-48). Pt. Mahendrakumar has expressed a doubt whether the Parikarma (Jayadhavalā I, Intro. p. 36) was a work dealing with calculatory sciences.

Mūlāyāra (Mūlācāra): The opinion of this text is quoted at VIII. 532, and we are able to trace it in the present-day text of the Mūlācāra, Paryāyādhikāra, 80.

Loyaviṇicchaya (Lokaviṇiścaya): This work is mentioned nearly a dozen times (IV. 186, 197, 198, 202, V. 69, 129, 167, VII. 230, VIII. 270, 386, IX. 9 as a Grantha). No work of this name has come to light as yet. Possibly it is the title of this work that has served as a model for Akalaṅka who has composed works like Siddhi-viṇiścaya and Nyāya-viṇiścaya etc.

Loyavibhāga (Lokavibhāga): This is mentioned some five times (I. 281, IV. 2448, 2491, VII. 115, VIII. 635). It is being referred to rather along with Aggāyaṇi (IV. 2448) and Loyaviṇicchaya (IX. 9) than as a section thereof. At present there is available a Sanskrit text Lokavibhāga in 11 chapters by Simhasūri. The author tells us that his Sanskrit rendering is based on a similar work in Prākṛit composed in Śaka 380 (+78)=458 A. D. by Sarvanandi in the 22nd year of the reign of Simhavarmā of Kāñci. The work of Sarvanandi is not available at present. Comparing the views mentioned in TP with those in the Sanskrit Lokavibhāga (which quotes a number of gāthās from TP), Pt. Jugalkishore has rightly suggested that the Author of TP had before him the Prākṛit Lokavibhāga of Sarvanandi.

Logāṇi (Lokāyaṇi): This text is mentioned twice (ignoring the difference in spelling) (IV. 244, VIII. 530) with a specific reference to its contents or views. It is called a *grantha-pravara* which indicates its authority and importance.

The facts that the necessary contents referred to in the TP are found in the present-day text of the Mūlācāra and that similar contents are traced in the Sanskrit Lokavibhāga heighten the authenticity of these references. We have to see whether the mss. of works like Lokaviṇiścaya, Loyavibhāga (in Prākṛit) etc. are found in any of the libraries of Gujarāt and Karnāṭaka which have disclosed rare finds in recent years.

Most of these works, mentioned in the TP, belong to the primary stratum of Jaina literature. We are far from being certain about the date of Mūlācāra, though it is looked upon as an ancient Jaina text. As long as it is not shown that there was a still earlier text called Lokavibhāga than the one of Sarvanandi, it is quite reasonable to accept that the TP is later, in its present form, than A. D. 458.

According to Indranandi's Śrutavātāra (verses 160-61), Padmanandi of Kuṇḍakundapura [i. e., Kundakunda] studied the Siddhānta through his teachers and wrote a commentary Parikarma by name on the three Khaṇḍas of the Saṭkhaṇḍāgama. At a time when Dhavalā and Jayadhavalā were not available for thorough study, I doubted the existence of such a commentary. But now with the publication of these works it has been abundantly clear that there was an earlier commentary called Pariyamma which is referred to and quoted in the Dhavalā. Thus there was a text called Pariyamma, and as long as there is no conflict from any other source we may accept with Indranandi that its author was Kundakunda. It is highly probable that TP also is referring to the Pariyamma of Kundakunda. So Yativṛṣabha flourished after Kundakunda whose age lies at the beginning of the Christian era (Pravacanasāra, Intro. Bombay 1935).

4) The TP contains a great deal of historical material in the context of post-Mahāvira chronology: first, about the continuity of the inheritance of scriptural knowledge; and secondly, about the royal dynasties.

After Lord Mahāvira attained liberation (TP IV. 1478 ff.) 3 Kevalins flourished in 62 years; 5 Śruta-Kevalins, in 100 years; 11 Daśapūrvins, in 183 years; 5 Ekā-

daśaṅgadhārins, in 220 years; and 4 Ācārāṅgadhārins, in 118 years. Thus for a period of 683 years after the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvira there was the continuity of Āṅgajñāna, i. e., upto $683 - 527 = 256$ A. D. Incidentally it is noted how Candragupta was the last crowned monarch to accept renunciation. The author of TP (IV. 1496-1504) records different opinions as to when Śaka flourished after the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvira. The fact that so many opinions are recorded clearly shows that either our author flourished long after the Śaka king, or that these opinions have been added by intelligent copyists as time passed on from different sources. There is no sufficient documentary evidence for the second alternative; so, for the present, the first may be presumed, as it does not involve any major contradiction.

Turning to the ruling dynasties, TP (IV. 1505 f.) tells us that the coronation of Pālaka, well-known in Āvanti, was simultaneous with the liberation of Mahāvira (i. e., both the events took place on the same day). King Pālaka ruled for 60 years; then followed the Vijaya dynasty for 155 years; thereafter Murudaya (Maurya or Muruṇḍaya) for 40 years; Puṣyamitrā for 30 years; Vasumitra and Agnimitra for 60 years; Gandharva (Gaddabbha = Gardabhilla) for 100 years; Naravāhana for 40 years; Bhatthattḥāṇa (Bhṛtyāndhra?) kings for 242 years; Gupta kings for 231 years; and then lastly Kalki for 42 years; and he was succeeded by his son. This brings us to the total of 1000 years after the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvira, i. e., upto $1000 - 527 = 473$ A. D. According to Guṇabhadra's Utttarapurāṇa (76. 394) Kalki was born after 1000 years after the beginning of Duṣamā period; he lived for seventy years and ruled for forty years. According to TP Duṣamā began three years and eight months after the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvira. Thus the death of Kalki can be placed roughly $1000 + 70 + 3 = 1073$ years after the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvira, i. e., $1073 - 527 = 546$ A. D. According to Nemicandra's Trilokasāra (gāthā 850), the Śaka king was born 605 years and 5 months after the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvira; and Kalki, with a life of seventy years, was born 394 years 7 months after the Śaka king and ruled for 40 years. Thus Kalki died $1000 + 70 = 1070$ years after the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvira, i. e. in $1070 - 527 = 543$ A. D. According to the opinion of K. B. Pathak (Gupta Era and Mihirakula, Bhand. Com. vol. Poona 1919, p. 216) this Kalki is the same as the Hūṇa ruler Mihirakula who was on the throne in 520 A. D. when the Chinese traveller Song Yun visited India. There is no sufficient reason to believe that such details were added later on with the lapse of time. The way in which (see gāthā IV. 1510) they are expressed shows that these details were given by the author himself. They indicate, therefore, that the author of TP, Yativṛṣabha, cannot have flourished earlier than 1000 years after the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvira, i. e., earlier than 473 A. D. As the historical details apparently stop with Kalkin, the composition or compilation of TP must have taken place soon after Kalkin.

In the light of the above evidence, Yativṛṣabha flourished later than Guṇadhara, Ārya Maṅksu, Nāgahasti, Kundakunda and Sarvanandi (458 A. D.); he comes possibly soon after Kalkin (473 A. D.) who is the last of the outstanding kings mentioned by him; and all that is definitely known is that he is earlier than Virasena (816 A. D.) and possibly also Jinabhadra Kṣamāśramaṇa (609 A. D.). So Yativṛṣabha and his TP are to be assigned to some period between 473 A. D. and 609 A. D.

By proposing the above period for Yativṛṣabha and his TP and chronological sequence of authors, my position comes into conflict with the views of some of my predecessors in the field, and it is necessary that I should explain myself.

Some scholars would assign a pretty late date for Kundakunda because it is alleged that he refers to the Lokavibhāga possibly of Sarvanandi and because he refers to Viṣṇu, Śiva etc. The Niyamasāra clearly uses the phrase *loyavibhāyesu*, in the plural; naturally, the reference is not to any specific text as such but possibly indicates traditional contents inherited through teachers and dealing with the divisions of the Universe. It is interesting to note that the very first verse of the Lokavibhāga (Sanskrit) qualifies Jineśvaras with the phrase *lokāloka-vibhāga-jñān*: thus it has a general sense besides being the name of a text. Viṣṇu is not such a modern deity as Muni Kalyanavijayaji (Śramaṇa Bhagavān Mahāvīra, p. 303) wants to presume. He is a pretty ancient deity and a clear reference to him, along with his Garuḍa (pakkhiṣu vā garuḷe Venu-devo, 1. 6. 21) is found in the Sūyagaḍaṁ which is definitely one of the earliest texts of the canon. The same work mentions also Īśvara, Svayambhū (according to the com., identical with Viṣṇu) etc. in another context 1. 1. 3. 7. Other arguments of Muniji are too superficial to be refuted here. Thus hardly any outweighing evidence is there to induce us to put Kundakunda later than Sarvanandi and Yativṛṣabha.

Pt. Phulchandraji has discussed in details the date and authorship of TP, and most of his arguments are criticised by Pt. Jugalkishoreji. A good bit of additional light has resulted from this controversy. Their views are reviewed in short here, with comments wherever necessary. Those who want to go into more details may kindly study the original essays, referred to above.

i) According to Pt. Phulachandra, Virasena, the author of Dhavalā, first established the opinion that the Loka measures seven Rājās north-south throughout. Earlier than him there was no such view as seen from Rājavārtika and other works. The TP adopts this opinion of Virasena, therefore in its present form it is later than him.

Pt. Jugalkishore meets this argument by saying that a similar view was current even earlier than Virasena as seen from the Harivaṁśa of Jinasena, Kārttikeyānuprekṣā and Jambūdvīpaprajñapti. Harivaṁśa describes the *loka* as *caturasra* but it is not explicit about the measurement of seven Rājās. Supposing that this measurement is implied, Virasena is respectfully mentioned in the Harivaṁśa, and even his disciple Jinasena and his Pārsavābhyudaya are referred to. Thus this will not rule out the possibility that the author of Harivaṁśa-purāṇa was acquainted with the opinion of Virasena. The Kārttikeyānuprekṣā gives the same view as that of Virasena. It is looked upon as an ancient text; but still it is necessary to prove on the basis of clear cut evidence that it is earlier than Virasena. The Jambūdvīpaprajñapti clearly gives the same view, but its date is still a matter of conjecture. Pt. Premiji has suggested that, if his proposed identity of Śaktikumār with a Guhila king of that name is accepted, it will have to be assigned to the 11th century of the Vikrama era (Jaina Sahitya aur Itihāsa p. 571).

Another point to be taken into consideration is this. Virasena had before him the TP sutta. Then why is it that he has not quoted the TP in proving his opinion but had to depend upon only two ancient gāthās describing the *caturasra* Loka. Taking into consideration his references to TP and the way in which he puts forth his view leaves a doubt how he could have avoided referring to TP in this context, if this view was there before him.

In India much of the ancient knowledge is traditional; naturally the author's claim that it is his view cannot be a safe evidence to be used as a chronological limit. Pt. Phulchandaji's insistence is thus open to a methodological weakness; and on the other side, the works like *Harivamśa*, *Kārttikeyānupreksā* and *Jambūdvīpaprājñapti* are not as yet clearly proved to be definitely earlier than Virasena.

ii) The TP, I. 7-87, has much common with the discussion of Maṅgala in the Dhavalā. The author of TP has taken it from other sources, and is following here Dhavalā.

As observed by Pt. Jugalkishore, this is just a deduction from a presumptive conclusion which is baseless. The meaning of *vivika-gaṁṭha-juttikim* as taken by Pt. Phulchandra is not at all justified. The discussion about Maṅgala must be looked upon as something substantially traditional, and it is not at all proved that Virasena is the author of it. It may be pointed out passingly that similar discussion about the topic of Maṅgala is already found in the *Viśeṣaśāstra*-bhāṣya of Jinabhadra (A. D. 609). Moreover the fundamental nature of the two works, namely TP and Dhavalā, has to be taken into consideration. The TP, as I have shown above, is a well planned unit and discusses its subject-matter quite systematically and independently. It contains, however, a good deal of matter of traditional inheritance, no doubt, as stated by the author himself. On the other hand, Dhavalā is a commentary which incorporates earlier commentaries on the *Satkarma-prābhṛta*. On the very face of it, if any one is required to quote by the very nature of the work he is composing, it is the author of Dhavalā and not that of TP.

iii) TP has taken (see I. 83) a sentence of Akalaṅka which occupies an essential position in his *Laghyastrayam* (iii. 2).

As shown by Pt. Jugalkishore, the facts do not really stand as Pt. Phulchandra presents them. Akalaṅka is a great logician, no doubt; but even his works reflect an enormous output of logical and epistemological studies carried out by Buddhist, Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and Jaina logicians. Earlier Jaina authors like Jinabhadra in his *Viśeṣaśāstra*-bhāṣya and Siddhasena in his *Stutis* show how they were developing clearly polemical style showing their reactions to contemporary thought. Even Pūjyapāda's commentary on the *Tattvārthasūtra* I. 10 deserves our attention in this context. Akalaṅka not only availed himself of all this but also made distinct contribution of his own, thus paving the way for Haribhadra, Vidyānanda and others. The fact is that both Akalaṅka and Virasena are putting into Sanskrit, the language par excellence of polemical discussion of those days, whatever was already discussed by their predecessors in Prākṛit.

iv) A sentence *duḥṣṭa* etc. (Dhavalā vol. III, p. 36) attributed to TP by Dhavalā is not found in the present text of TP. Pt. Phulachandra, therefore, concludes that the TP which Virasena had before him was a different text of the same name.

It is true that this particular wording of the sentence is not traced in the TP the text of which, as argued by Pt. Jugalkishore, is far from being thorough in its collation and perfect in constitution. It may be further added that Virasena, as was usual in early days, is quoting from memory: in fact, that very line appears to be quoted differently by him elsewhere (Dhavalā vol. IV, p. 151). We should not always insist on tracing a particular line; but if we read a major portion of the discussion in Dhavalā (especially where it specifies TP) and compare it (see Dhavalā III, pp. 35-36) with corresponding discussions in TP, one can hardly have any doubt about the fact that Virasena is following the contents of TP which has inherited many of them through *parampara*. The edition of Dhavalā has already quoted the parallel passages from

the ms. of TP. Similarly another passage which Dhavalā specifically attributes to TP (Dhavalā III, pp. 36, second reference with foot-note No. 1) has corresponding contents in TP as shown in the foot-notes of the edition of Dhavalā.

v) Pt. Phulachandra draws the attention of readers to a passage in the TP (p. 766) which mentions TP-sutta; and his conclusion is that the present TP is quoting this passage from Dhavalā (IV. pp. 152-157) which rightly mentions an earlier TP. Pt. Jugalkishore has thoroughly scrutinised this argument; and as he shows, the passage concerned is not quite in its place; and in all probability it is *prakṣipta* and added in TP by some intelligent reader from the Dhavalā. As I have shown above from an evidence casually left in the mss. of TP that eminent Saiddhāntikas (expert in the Siddhānta, namely, Dhavalā, Jayadhavalā etc.) like Bālacandra have handled the text of TP, and there is nothing surprising that some excerpts from the Dhavalā were added on the margin for elucidation, and later on they got themselves mixed with the text of TP. The present text is certainly longer than eight thousand Ślokas; and this extra bulk may have been due to such interpolations, alternative views and elucidatory passages.

Thus all the arguments advanced by Pt. Phulachandra to show that TP is later than Dhavalā and that the author of Dhavalā had another TP before him contain hardly any strength; and they do not at all prove his position. It is one thing to admit interpolations here and there and it is another to postulate another TP. Further his proposition that Jinasena is the author of the present TP has absolutely no evidence at all.

4. Some Aspects of TP

Here may be reviewed in passing some of the important aspects of the contents of TP which is not only a work of great authority but also of antiquity. It is primarily a text of the Karaṇānuyoga group, dealing with the detailed description of all about and all that is to be known in the three worlds. In the very shaping of this huge text, however, many sections of interesting information have got themselves included in it; and a student of Jaina dogmatics and literature has to search for their earlier and later counterparts and institute a comparative study. Being a work of traditionally inherited contents, the TP might show contact with the contents of earlier works without being directly indebted to them and with those of later works without its being directly used. The contents can be studied comparatively, but the chronological relation and mutual indebtedness require to be ascertained on independent grounds.

So far as the Karaṇānuyoga material (with its requisite details and mathematical formulae of calculation etc.) is concerned the contents of TP are closely allied to the Sūrya- (Bombay 1919), Candra-, and Jambūdvīpa-prajñapti (Bombay 1920) of the Ardhamāgadhi canon, and to other ancient and modern works in Prakṛit and Sanskrit, such as Lokavibhāga, Dhavalā and Jayadhavalā commentaries (referred to above), Jambūdvīpa-prajñapti-saṃgraha (still in ms., see Indian Historical Quarterly, vol. XIV, pp. 188 f.), Trilokaśāra (Bombay 1917) and Trailokya-dīpikā (still in ms.). What Kirfel has presented in his Die Kosmographie der Inder (Bonn u. Leipzig 1920) deserves to be compared in details with the contents of TP.

Turning to the incidental topics, the discussion about Maṅgala, indeed a traditional topic, deserves comparison with what we get in the Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya of Jinabhadra (in two parts, with Gujarāṭi translation, Surāt Saṃvat 1980-83), Dhavalā commentary and in the commentary of Jayasena on the Pañcāstikāya (Bombay 1915) Jinabhadragaṇi's Kṣetrasamāsa and Saṃgrahaṇi also deserve to be compared with TP.

The enumeration of eighteen Śreṇīs and the definitions of terms Mahārāja etc. (I. 43 f.) give us some idea of the royal hierarchy and paraphernalia in ancient India. The definitions of units of matter like Paramāṇu, units of space like Aṅgula and units of time like Vyavahārapalya clearly indicate the attempts at accurate description of contemporary knowledge; and all this is practically used in measuring the universe. These topics are discussed in Dhavalā and Jayadhavalā commentaries as well.

The most interesting section in the Fourth Mahādhikāra is the enumeration of various details about the Śalākāpuruṣas on whom elaborate works have been written in Sanskrit, Prākṛit and other languages by eminent authors like Jinasena-and-Guṇabhadra (Mahāpurāṇa in Sk.), Śīlācārya (Mahāpuruṣa-carita in Pk.), Puṣpadanta (Tisatṭhi-mahāpurisa-guṇālaṃkāru in Apabhraṃśa), Hemacandra (Trisaṣṭi-śalākāpuruṣa-carita Sk.), Cāmunḍarāya (Trisaṣṭi-lakṣaṇa-Mahāpurāṇa in Kannaḍa), the anonymous Śrīpurāṇa (in Tamiḷ) etc. These lives of Śalākāpuruṣas have given rise to a pretty large number of works, some of them including all the great men and some dealing with individual biographies. The Jaina literary tradition has inherited most of these details from a pretty ancient age, and capable authors picked up whatever they liked from this lot and dressed their compositions either in a Purāṇic or poetic format. Details allied to those found in TP we get in other works like the Samavāyāṅga (Sūtra 156 onwards, pp. 139 f., Bombay ed., with Abhayadeva's com.), Viśeṣaśākyabhāṣya (Āgamodaya Samiti ed. with Guj. translation, Surat Samvat 1980, part I, Pariśiṣṭa pp. 545 ff.). The lives of Tīrthakaras include many dogmatical topics and descriptive details like those of Samavasāraṇa, of Ṛddhis, military expedition of Cakravartin etc. which have proved almost a pattern for later authors who deal with these subjects. For easy reference some of these details about Tīrthakaras from the TP are tabulated at the end of this volume. The details from various sources deserve to be compared with a view to note the differences and mark the growth of details.

The post-Mahāvīra Jaina chronology (pp. 338 f.) is highly interesting not only for the history of Jaina church and literature but also for the history of India in view of the dynasties and kings mentioned and periods assigned to them. The alternative views about the relation between the date of the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvīra and that of the Śaka king clearly show how the author of TP had to face different opinions on that problem: quite frankly he presents them as they were. The references to kings like Pālaka, Puṣyamitra, Vasumitra, Agnimitra, Gandharva, Naravāhana, Kalki etc. have a historical value.

The description of different regions with their rivers, mountains and people may not have much value for a student of present-day geography; but to understand the back-ground of Jaina literature in its proper perspective, a careful study of these details is essential, because the Jaina authors were fully imbued with these details. It is equally true with regard to the heavenly and astronomical details in other chapters.

The description of Siddhas, the ways of self-reflection etc. (in the concluding Mahādhikāra) constitute an ancient property of peculiar Jaina ideology; and corresponding ideas, in quite similar terms, are found in the Siddhabhakti in Prākṛit, in the concluding verses of Ovāiyam, and in the various works of Kundakūṇḍa.

Not only in contents but also in actual wording of the gāthās or portions of them the TP is allied to many other works. Many of them are ancient, traditional verses incorporated by different authors in their works. Some of the works are earlier and some later in age than TP; so mutual borrowal is possible in some cases of close agreement

I could make only a partial attempt. I hope, others would spot many such verses in various works. These gāthās fall into two broad groups: those that are identical with dialectal variations; and those that nearly or partly agree in contents.

Compare Mūlācāra (Bombay Sam. 1977-80) V. 34 (last pāda slightly different), XII. 81-2 with TP I. 95, VII. 614-15; so also Mū. XII. 37-40, 62, 107-8, 115, 136-37, 150 with TP V. 28-31, IV. 2952, VIII. 685-6, II. 290, VIII. 680-81, III. 186.

Compare Pañcāstikāya (Bombay 1915) 75, 146, 152 with TP I. 95, IX. 20, 21. Compare Pravacanasāra (Bombay 1935) I. 1, 9, 11, 12, 13, 77, II. 69, 70, 103 with TP IX. 73, 56, 57, 58, 59, 54, 29, 30, 50; so also Prava. I. 52, II. 54*3, 68, 99 (also III. 4), 102, 104, III. 39 with TP IX. 64, II. 277, IX. 28, 34, 33, 19, 37. Compare Samayasāra (Bombay 1919) 11*1, 38, 69, 154 with TP IX. 23, 24, 63, 53; so also Samaya. 19, 36, 188, 306 with TP IX. 43, 25, 47, 49.

Compare Bhagavati Ārādhana (Sholapur ed.) 886-87, 916, 922, 1583 with TP IV. 628-9, 634, 635, 618; so also Bhaga. 883-9, 904, 935 with TP IV. 629, 630, 636.

The Paramātma-prakāśa of Joindu (Bombay 1937) is in Apabhraṁśa. One of its verses II. 60 is in a different dialect. Its presence in the Paramātma-p. is sufficiently authentic. But for its last pāda it is identical with TP IX. 52. Possibly Joindu himself has quoted it just putting the last pāda into the first person to agree with the general tone of his composition.

Compare TP I. 95 with Gommatasāra (Jivakāṇḍa, Bombay 1916) 603; so also TP III. 180-81, IV. 2952, VIII. 685 f. with Jiva. 426-27, 82, 429 f. (also Viśeṣāvaśyaka-bhāṣya 695). Compare TP III. 9, IV. 2206, VI. 42-4, 48-9, VII. 530, VIII. 566 with Trilokasāra 209, 687, 265-67, 271-72, 411, 531; so also TP III. 38, IV. 2598 (also 2818) VI. 38-41 with Trilo. 215, 761, 261-63.

The Sanskrit Lokavibhāga, which is not published as yet, contains a large number of gāthās quoted from TP. The Jambuddiṣvapanaṇatti of Pāṇinī also contains a few gāthās inherited from TP which has influenced its format as well.

Māghanandi has written an exhaustive Kannaḍa commentary (Belgaum 1916) on the sūtras of the Śāstrasārasamuccaya. He has richly interspersed it with quotations in Prākṛit, Sanskrit and Kannaḍa, of course without specifying their sources. The Prākṛit ones are printed most corruptly. Even by a casual search I find that the following gāthās from TP are quoted on the pages of the Ś. noted in brackets: TP IV. 1614-23 (pp. 7-8), 1500-1 (p. 28), 1534, 1544 (p. 30), 522-5 (p. 32), 550, 642, 643 (p. 35), 675-78 (pp. 37-8), 901-3, 905, 929 (p. 46), 1472-73 (p. 56); VIII. 168 (p. 107). The gāthās are so corrupt in the printed copy of the commentary that it is often difficult to detect their identity in the TP.

5. Concluding Remarks

The first part of TP was published by the middle of 1943, and we regret that it took seven years to put the second part in the hands of impatient readers. The reasons for delay were manifold and mostly beyond our control. Scarcity of paper and difficulties in the Press not only slowed down our speed but often threatened also to put a full stop to our work for a while. Thanks to the Manager of the Press that the printing went on though slowly. Then the compilation and printing of the Indices involved a good deal of labour. Lastly, the editors (as one of them was seeing the Yaśastilaka and Indian culture by Professor Handiqui through the press) required a bit more time to finish the Introduc-

tions. Any way it is a matter of great relief and satisfaction for the Editors that this long awaited part is out now. The sharing of work by the collaborators has been practically the same as in the first part. The Indices included in this part have been all prepared by Pt. Balachandaji. The presence of two Introductions, one in English and the other in Hindī, by the two Editors needs a little explanation. Both of us, Dr. Hiralalaji and myself, mutually exchanged our notes but separately drafted our Introductions freely using each others material. Naturally there is much common between the two; still here and there slight difference in evaluating the evidence might be felt. As we are dealing with a very important work, we have expressed ourselves independently on certain points so that the path of future studies should be quite open.

The TP is a stiff work and has consequently involved a great deal of co-operative labour on the part of the Editors. Dr. Hiralalaji, as mentioned in the first part, has immensely helped me throughout this work: due to his readiness to help and genial temper I never felt the burden of this work. Pt. Balachandrajī was on the spot and saved much of our trouble in proof-correction especially of the Hindī matter.

The Editors record their sense of gratitude to Br. Jivarajaji, the founder of the Mālā, and sincerely thank the Trustees and the Members of the Prabandha Samiti for their co-operation in completing this volume. The publication of an authentic text is only the first step towards the study of any work; and we hope, many scholars will get themselves interested in TP in view of its rich dogmatical and cultural material.

Kolhapur, }
June 1st, 1950 }

A. N. Upadhye