

JAIN PERCEPTIONS OF ISLAM IN THE EARLY MODERN PERIOD

The vigorous scholarly response to the version of the South Asian past which has been produced in the last decade or so to serve the political purposes of various Hindu nationalist organisations has proved to be one of those seemingly rare occasions when Indological expertise, both philological and historical, has been put at the service of an important modern issue. The main direction of this response has been to highlight the artificiality of envisaging Hindu-Moslem relationships from the twelfth century onwards in exclusively confrontational terms. Metcalfe has argued that the categories of historiography developed by the British during the early – modern period have continued, often to pernicious effect, to provide the framework for this style of interpretation of Hindu-Moslem interaction and she also points out that an earlier shared idiom of religiosity and aesthetic and cultural response has been erased in favour of a model of stereotyped mutual antagonism and the consequent privileging of one group to the detriment of the other.¹ This model can be shown to be simplistic even in an apparently unambiguously confrontational context. So Talbot has demonstrated on the basis of inscriptional evidence that in the case of the frontier between the Delhi Sultanate and the Kākatiyas and their successors in Andhra during the fourteenth century and after, Hindu perceptions of the Moslems involved not just hostility but also elements of ideological accommodation and integration contingent upon the particular political and military circumstances prevailing in the region.²

It is, however, a banal truism, hardly bearing repetition, that any generalisation or interpretation should, in order to have a degree of cogency, be based on as wide a sample of available evidence as possible. Consequently, the failure of recent analyses of early modern interaction between Hindus and Moslems to draw on Jain sources must be regarded as a weakness.³ This has led to a presentation of the term “Hindu” as a completely unproblematic designation, apparently corresponding to the undifferentiated “indigenous” inhabitants of the subcontinent who were unconverted to Islam, and any fluidity of reference, which

Indo-Iranian Journal 42: 35–46, 1999.

© 1999 Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in the Netherlands.

informs at the most basic level so much recent revisionist discussion of Hindu-Moslem relations, is completely denied by it.⁴

The specific interest of Jain evidence in this area can be seen by applying it to a particularly useful characterisation of Hindu perceptions of the Moslems provided in a seminal paper by Sheldon Pollock.⁵ Drawing on textual material in the widest sense by including epigraphical and architectural evidence, Pollock has convincingly shown how the narrative of the Rāmāyaṇa, “profoundly and fundamentally a text of ‘othering’”⁶ and, from the eleventh century, the ensuing development of the cult of Rāma led to the Hindu demonisation of Moslems as latter-day equivalents of the *rākṣasa* foes of Rāma.⁷ That this was not purely political or poetic rhetoric is corroborated by the Śvetāmbara Jain poet Devavimāla Gaṇin who provides in the autocommentary to the *Hirasaubhāgya*, his huge poetic biography of the famous monk Hīravijaya Sūri (to be discussed further below), specific testimony to Pollock’s general point. Explicating his description of the Moslem sheikh and minister of the Moghul emperor Akbar, Abū’l Fazl, as the Śukra of the world, that is to say the guru of the earthly demons, Devavimāla confirms that the current vernacular designation for the Moslems was indeed “demons” (*idāniṃ ca lokabhāṣayā yavanā asurā ucyante*).⁸ However, a possible lack of general applicability of this characterisation can be seen by reference to another Jain poetic biography of Hīravijaya Sūri, the *Jagadgurukāvya* written by Padmasāgara in 1589,⁹ for, in the first half of this work which describes the military exploits of Akbar, it is the Hindus opposed by the Moghul forces who are described in demonic terms (v. 41c: *mudgalalakṣam akṣatabalaṃ Hindvāsura-rāsakam*; and v. 87cd: *eṣa śrīmad Akbararāḥ kṣītitala keṣāṃ na Hindvāsura-lkṣmāpānām hṛdaye camatkṛitkaro ’sty ādarśayan dorbalam*).

Pollock’s concern is with the larger South Asian political-military world in which the Jains had ceased to participate in any meaningful manner by about the fifteenth century. Fourteenth and fifteenth century Jain texts contain many descriptions of Moslem depredations, not dissimilar to those found in Hindu literature, which are intended to highlight the resilience of the Jain religion and the miraculous power of the images of the great teachers.¹⁰ However, the tone began to change as the Jain community gradually attempted to throw in its lot with what had become by the time of Akbar the hegemonous Moghul empire. The continuing visits by Jain monks, most notably Hīravijaya Sūri, to the Moghul court are presented in Jain literature as indicative of their charisma and imperial fascination with their teachings, but they are no doubt equally suggestive of the Jain community’s wish

to enter into a formal relationship with the political authorities.¹¹ It might therefore be argued that Jain literature such as the poems of Padmasāgara and Devavimāla was produced in the courtly context of patronage and flattery and thus intended to promote the economic interests of the Jain community, (although it is highly improbable that the *Hirasaubhāgya*, perhaps the last great mahākāvya, was actually composed for consumption in the Moghul court).¹² Nonetheless, it cannot be denied that these Jain writers were “indigenous” non-Hindus, whatever problems of identity designations like “Hindu” and “Jain” may have caused in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries,¹³ and that they more than likely had a particular nuanced perspective on the Moslem presence in north and west India. Certainly, Padmasāgara’s startling comparison of Hīravijaya Sūri to *śrīmatkhudā*, that is to say the Moslem god (found at *Jagadgurukāvya* v. 139; *ete nihsprhapuṅgavā yativarāḥ śrīmatkhudārūpiṇo l drśyante ’ra na cedrśāḥ kṣītitala drṣṭā viśiṣṭāḥ kvacit*) suggests the adaptation of an ancient tradition of hagiographical simile to radically changed circumstances.¹⁴

In fact, this reference to *khudā* highlights another conspicuous omission in the recent scholarly treatment of South Asian perceptions of Moslems: no sense is conveyed of how Islam, as opposed to its adherents, was understood as a religious tradition. It is this omission that I wish to address in this short paper. The Moslems themselves developed from a relatively early period some sort of reasonably accurate understanding on Indian religions, or at least Hinduism,¹⁵ but despite there being a Moslem presence in South Asia from the eighth century when the Arab invasions of Sindh began, there seems to be little evidence in Sanskrit texts from the late medieval period of any Indian knowledge of or interest in Islam proper as a soteriological path with its own set of theological and eschatological assumptions. The eleventh century Buddhist *Kālacakra Tantra* is effectively unique in providing some form of information about Islam, but most likely this was as much to add point to the text’s prophecy of the apocalyptic battle in which the Buddhists, with Hindu aid, would destroy the barbarian and heretical Moslem invaders.¹⁶ It appears to be not until the very end of the sixteenth century with the *Hirasaubhāgya* that there is substantive evidence expressed in Sanskrit of some sort of familiarity with Islam.

The *Hirasaubhāgya* is a biography of Hīravijaya Sūri (1527–1595), the leader of the Tapā Gaccha lineage of the Śvetāmbara Jain *mūrtipūjaka*s. His historical prestige derives from his prevailing upon the Moghul emperor Akbar to desist from practices such as hunting and meat-eating, if only temporarily, and practice *ahimsā*, the touchstone of true

religion. The general perception of Akbar is that he was a genuine religious pluralist.¹⁷ However, admiration of Akbar's open stance can lead to forgetfulness of the exclusivist tendencies of the many religious authorities he consulted, the Jains being no different in this respect, as can be seen from the portrait of Islam given in the *Hirasaubhāgya*.

The most significant portions of the *Hirasaubhāgya* (henceforth HS) with regard to the Jain understanding of Islam are to be found in chapters thirteen and fourteen. Hiravijaya, having been summoned by two emissaries to Agra in order to pass the monsoon period there (this is a variation on a standard mahākāvya theme); takes part, prior to his appearance in Akbar's court (HS 13.126), in a *goṣṭhī* or learned assembly in the house, near the palace of the emperor (HS 13.133), of the great scholar Abu'l Fazl, to whom he demonstrates the superiority of Jainism to Islam.¹⁸ Abu'l Fazl is described as one who knows "the inner secret (*upanīṣad*) of all the *śāstras* of the Yavanas", glossed by Devavimala as referring to the Qu'ran,¹⁹ and as engaging in the debate because he is plagued with doubt because of his study of religions (HS 13.134).

Devavimala has the sheikh presenting his account of Islam as follows (HS 13.137-43):²⁰

"The ancient prophets (*paigambara*) of our religion have stated in the scriptures (*samaya*) that whoever belongs to the Yavana race is placed on earth as a deposit, like a guest of Yama the god of death, o sūri.

All people, having risen up from the earth at the time of destruction (*parivarta*), will approach the supreme lord (*paramēśvara*) called God (*khudā*), who is like a worldly king in the midst of his assembly (*āsthānī*).

He will convey good and bad onto his own pure mind as if it were a mirror and allot his judgment properly in that assembly, abandoning any consideration of religious affiliation (*svaparānurodha*).

Having considered, he will then bestow reward appropriate to the good and bad behaviour of an individual, just as the earth yields an abundance of crops from the seeds of various grains.

Some will be taken to heaven (*bhīṣṭi*) by him, as ships reach shore with a favourable wind. Then they will enjoy happiness, delighted at the extraordinary variety of pleasures to be experienced there.

Others will through their sin be taken by him to hell (*doyaki*) and, like sparrows being attacked by hawks or pots being fired by potters, will experience misery at the hands of the guards there.

O sūri, is this pronouncement of the Qu'ran true, like the pronouncements of great-souled men? Or does it appear untrue, like a flower growing in the sky?"

The inevitable outcome of the debate is made clear before it is described when Devavimala in his autocommentary characterises Islam and Jainism as being at variance with one another through their involving violence and compassion respectively (*himsādaye ... virodhidharme*), with the former leading only to hell and the latter leading to heaven and

ultimate spiritual release (HS 13.135 with autocomm.).²¹ Hiravijaya's reply to the Moslem (HS 13.146-51) relates to the impossibility of a creator god presiding over an assembly and allotting reward or punishment, and instead he invokes karma as the element determining man's destiny.²²

"Resorting to what form (i.e. divine or human) does he (God) attend an assembly, like a mortal creature who wanders through various forms of existence? For what reason (e.g. hatred and passion) will he assign people in this world (*iha*) to heaven and hell?"

Previous karma coming to fruition (*pacelima*) has the power to allot pleasure and pain. Let it be karma which is the effective cause of the world. What is the point of a creator god who is like an udder on the throat of a she-goat?"

When the lord of monks had ceased after saying this, the sheikh (Abu'l Fazl) once more uttered this speech: "Is falseness (*tathyetaratā*) understood (by you as being) in the utterance of that (Qu'ran), as in the words of a speaker who is exceptionally reprehensible?"

The lord (Hiravijaya) spoke to him again: "(If) a creator first (*pūrvam*) brings this world into being and then destroys it as if he were fire, then even he must experience unequalled vexation (for destroying what he has brought into being).

There is no creator or destroyer of that world whose variety is brought about by its own karma. The existence of such a being, like the son of a barren woman, appears to my mind as impossible (*asat*)."

Having thus with words of the Jain doctrine (*siddhānta*) enlightened that sage who adumbrated the opposing position (*pūrvapakṣa*), the sūri fixed the (Jain) religion in his mind, as a farmer places seeds in the ground.

While a genuine historical event, namely a debate between a Jain monk and a representative of Islam, would seem to be described here, it must be recognised that the HS, as well as being a Jain version of history in the form of hagiography, also belonged to what was by Devavimala's time the millennium-old genre of mahākāvya or court-epic.²³ It seems likely that a broader artistic motive may well underpin the above passage, as is made clear by Devavimala at the end of his autocommentary on the debate, when he hints that his model is an episode in another mahākāvya, the *Naiṣadhacarita*, the massive retelling by Śrīharṣa (twelfth century) of the epic story of Nala and Damayanti, in which orthodox Hinduism is defended by four Vedic gods (Agni, Varuṇa, Yama and Indra) against heretical doctrine.²⁴ Devavimala thus might best be regarded as filtering genuine events and encounters through the grid of the themes and conventions of a complex preexistent literary tradition.

Nonetheless, descriptions of such a *goṣṭhī* appear to be unknown in Sanskrit literature. The sixteenth century devotional poet Eknāth did write in the Marathi vernacular an imaginary debate between a Turk and a Hindu but, for all the mutual recrimination expressed in this short work, the end conclusion is harmonious.²⁵ This is hardly the case

in the HS where Jainism is portrayed as triumphing, as admitted by Akbar himself later on in the poem (HS 14.12). A non-Jain reader might well question whether Abu'l Fazl would have surrendered his religious principles so easily and, for all Devavimāla's approximate familiarity with some of the elements of Islamic theology and Arabic and Persian vocabulary,²⁶ it is noteworthy that in the HS's autocommentary the sheikh's statements about Islam are put in a framework that would have been more familiar to a Jain or a Hindu. So the Moslem notion of the day of judgement is explained in terms of the ending of a *yuga*; the sheikh's claim about the supposed impartiality of God towards those being judged (HS 13.139) is interpreted by Devavimāla in his autocommentary by reference to the famous Sanskrit verse, found for the first time in the *Hitopadeśa*, which concludes with the words "the world is a family" (*vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam*);²⁷ the Moslem god, described by Abu'l Fazl as *paramēśvara*, is equated with the god meditated upon by all Hindus (HS 13.137 autocomm.: *samagrahinduvargair dhyāyamānasya jagadīśvarasya* . . .); and, broadly speaking, Hiravijaya's riposte to his opponent is no different from the time-hallowed Jain refutation of Hindu teachings about a creator deity who could only be operating under the influence of the passions (HS 13.146 autocomm.).

There are occasional hints from a later period that not all Jains perceived Islam exclusively as a religion of *himsā*, as can be seen from the *Senaprasāna*, a Sanskrit text comprising the often very detailed responses given by Vijayasena Sūri (1547–1614), appointed successor to Hiravijaya Sūri as chief ascetic of the Tapā Gaccha in 1595, to a series of questions posed by members of the Jain community.²⁸ The monk Paṇḍit Bhaktisāgara Gaṇin enquires whether any one carrying out action (*kriyā*) with a view to gaining spiritual deliverance can be regarded as falling into the ancient category of *kriyāvādin*; for if that were to be the case, followers of false paths (*mithyādr̥ṣṭi*), such as the Moslems (*turuṣka*) and the Christians (*phiraṅgika*) who carry out acts of killing (*jīvaghāta*) to gain deliverance, would have to be regarded as *kriyāvādin*.²⁹ The main target of this question is in fact the "Searchers" (*dhunḍhika*), an appellation of the Śvetāmbara Jain sect, later to be called Sthānakvāsī, which advocated radical conformity to the scriptural tradition and the rejection of image worship, and their supposed advocacy of applying the term *kriyāvādin* only to those who have correct religious insight (*samyagdr̥ṣṭi*) or are striving towards it. Vijayasena Sūri gives a conciliatory response with reference to Islam, although making no reference to Bhaktisāgara's equating of it with Christianity.³⁰ He states that it is perfectly correct to designate those who regard deliverance

as to be gained through religious action as *kriyāvādin*, but adds that nobody claims that killing is a means of effecting this, for the main scriptures of even the Moslems forbid the taking of life (*turuṣkāṇām api mūlaśāstreṣu jīvavadhasya niṣiddhatvāt*).³¹

Nonetheless, that a largely negative view of Islam most likely was the norm amongst Jains can be seen a century or so after Vijayasena Sūri in a text still authoritative amongst most elements of the Digambara sect in north India, the *Mokṣamārgaprakāśaka* of the lay scholar Ṭoḍar Mal (1719–1766).³² A section of this work (p. 123–4), which is written in Rājasthānī, is given over to an examination of Islam in the context of other, for Ṭoḍar Mal, inadequate approaches to *mokṣamārga*, the path to spiritual deliverance.

Ṭoḍar Mal describes Islam as a false religion which evinces many of the erroneous and contradictory theological characteristics of Hinduism.³³ Thus he claims that it subscribes to the idea of a unified, all-pervasive creator and destroyer god who can bestow deliverance, with a prophet (*paigambar*) performing the same role as an incarnation (*avatāra*).³⁴ Ṭoḍar Mal also asserts that Islam, like Hinduism, is ambivalent in its general ethical stance, sometimes manifesting a compassionate attitude towards living creatures, sometimes one in which killing is justified,³⁵ sometimes insisting on abstinence from eating meat, drinking wine and hunting, at other times enthusiastically advocating these pursuits. The two religions also, he claims, oscillate between the practice of austerities and sensuality, unlike Jainism which promotes an unalloyed form of asceticism. Thus, although the outward characteristics, such as basic nomenclature, of each religion are different, Islam and Hinduism can be regarded at the fundamental level as being the same.³⁶

Ṭoḍar Mal ends his account of Islam by reflecting upon the reasons why such an obviously false religion has become so prevalent amongst prominent people in the India of his time. His answer is partly based on doctrine, namely that the soul (*jīva*) which has been transmigrating through beginningless time has continually been developing falsity and a passionate attachment to the objects of the senses, so that it is very difficult for it not to become attached to a religion such as Islam, although knowing it to be evil. However, it is predictable that in the last resort Ṭoḍar Mal ascribes the dominance of Islam and the increasing marginalisation of Jainism to temporal decline; the baser the times, the more degraded becomes religious practice. He concludes:

Look! in this period the Moslems have become predominant and the Hindus have declined. But (if the reckoning is) with regard to the Hindus (and the Jains), then

the former have increased and the latter have declined. That is the fault of the times at this particular moment.³⁷

There is a certain grim irony in the fact that Ṭoḍar Mal, the denouncer of both Hinduism and Islam as false religions, seems to have been executed as a sectarian leader in the aftermath of what would today be described as a "communal disturbance".³⁸

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank John Cort and Steve Heim for discussing some aspects of this paper with me.

NOTES

¹ See Barbara D. Metcalf, "Presidential Address: Too Little and Too Much: Reflections on Muslims in the History of India", *Journal of Asian Studies*, pp. 958 and 961–962. Cf. Muzaffar Alam, "Competition and Co-existence: Indo-Islamic Interactions in Medieval North India", in J.C. Heesterman et al., *India and Indonesia: General Perspectives*, Leiden/New York/Köln: E. J. Brill 1989, pp. 37–59 for the tensions at work in Hindu-Moslem interaction, and also Peter Manuel, "Music, the Media, and Communal Relations in North India, Past and Present", in David Ludden (ed.), *Contesting the Nation: Religion, Community and the Politics of Democracy in India*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press 1996, pp. 120–121 for Hindu-Moslem cultural synthesis, with particular reference to music.

² See Cynthia Talbot, "Inscribing the Other, Inscribing the Self: Hindu-Muslim Identities in Pre-Colonial India", *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 37 1995, pp. 692–721.

³ I use "early modern" approximately in the sense found in European historiography. Alternative expressions such as "late medieval" and "pre-British" are not much more helpful when referring to the late sixteenth to mid-eighteenth centuries, the period covered in this article.

⁴ For an extreme example of this, described in terms of a "Moslem epic of conquest and a Hindu epic of psychological rejection", see Ahmad Aziz, "Epic and Counter-Epic in Medieval India", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 83 1963, p. 470.

⁵ Sheldon Pollock, "Rāmāyana and Political Imagination in India", *Journal of Asian Studies* 52 1993, pp. 261–297.

⁶ Ibid. p. 282.

⁷ Ibid. Cf. Hans Bakker, "Ayodhya: A Hindu Jerusalem. An Investigation of 'Holy War' as a Religious Idea in the Light of Communal Unrest in India", *Numen* 38 1991, p. 102.

⁸ *Hirasaubhāgya* 13.30 autocomm. I have used the reprint of the edition of Shivadatta and Kashinath Sharma, Kalandri: Śrī Kalandri Jain Śve. Mū Saṅgh v.s. 2041.

⁹ Ed. Hargovinddas and Becardās, *Yasovijaya Granthamālā* vol. 14, Benares: Shah Harakhchand Bhurabhai n.d.

¹⁰ See Phyllis Granoff, "Tales of Broken Limbs and Bleeding Wounds: Responses to Muslim Iconoclasm in Medieval India", *East and West* 41 1991, pp. 189–203. For some general remarks about Jain attitudes to Moslems (as opposed to Islam), see Paul Dundas, *The Jains*, London and New York: Routledge 1992, pp. 124–127.

¹¹ See Surendra Gopal, "The Jain Community and Akbar" in N. N. Bhattacharyya, *Jainism and Prakrit in Ancient and Medieval India: Essays for Prof. Jagdish Chandra Jain*, New Delhi: Manohar 1994, pp. 421–430.

¹² I intend to publish a study of the *Hirasaubhāgya* as a mahākāvya elsewhere.

¹³ See Dundas, *The Jains*, pp. 3–4.

¹⁴ The *Jagadgurukāvya* uses the term "Hindu" in what is, broadly speaking, a political sense. See vv. 88, which refers to daughters being given in marriage to Akbar by Hindu kings, 89 and 90, which contrast Hindus and *mlecchas*, and 92. *Hirasaubhāgya* 14.273 also contrasts *Hindu* and *mleccha*.

Pollock op. cit., p. 287 notes how Moghul artists attempted "to neutralize by appropriation the meaning system of the Rāmāyana" by portraying Akbar as Rāma. Cf. *Hirasaubhāgya* 1.129–137 for a description of the Moslem governor of Gujarat as a second Rāma protecting the earth from the Kali Yuga and attendant demons, and also 11.153 where Akbar is compared to Rāma and 11.155 where Akbar is described as receiving a blessing from Hiravijaya as Rāma did from Hanumān. Note that Devavimāla, in commenting on HS 11.53, refers to the Vaiṣṇava tradition of Nārāyana and Lakṣmī incarnating themselves as Rāma and Sītā respectively as "Śaivasamaya".

¹⁵ See Alam op. cit., pp. 44–49 and Yohanan Friedmann, "Medieval Muslim Views of Indian Religions", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 95 1975, pp. 214–217.

¹⁶ See Günter Grönbold, "Heterodoxe Lehren und Ihre Widerlegung in Kālacakra-Tantra", *Indo-Iranian Journal* 35 1992, pp. 277–278 and John Newman, "Eschatology in the Wheel of Time Tantra", in Donald S. Lopez, Jr. (ed.), *Buddhism in Practice*, Princeton: Princeton University Press 1995, pp. 284–289. A full treatment of this subject will appear in Professor Newman's paper "Islam in the Kālacakra Tantra", forthcoming in *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*.

¹⁷ Cf. Wendy Doniger, "Pluralism and Intolerance in Hinduism", in Werner G. Jeanrond and Jennifer L. Rike (ed.), *Radical Pluralism and Truth: David Tracy and the Hermeneutics of Religion*, New York: Crossroad 1991, pp. 227–228.

¹⁸ For Abu'l Fazl, see S. A. A. Rizvi, *Religious and Intellectual History of the Muslims in Akbar's Reign: with Special Reference to Abu'l Fazl (1556–1605)*, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal 1975, especially pp. 128 and 137–138. For the *goṣṭhī* and Jain views about the etiquette and intellectual technique to be used by monks when debating with brahmins, see the remarkable *Traividyagoṣṭhī*, Mumbai: Śa Devkaran Mulji 1909, written while only a teenager by Munisundara Sūri (c. 1379–1446), the fifty-first chief ascetic of the Tapā Gaccha.

¹⁹ HS 13.130 autocomm: ... sarveṣāṃ śāstrāṇāṃ Kurāṇādīyavanāgāmānām upanīṣadī rahasye adhitam ..., and cf. HS 13.120: samasti śekho 'balphaijanāmā turuṣkaśāstrāmbudhipārādrśvā, with autocomm.

²⁰ paigambarair naḥ samayeṣu sūre purāṇanair vyāhṛtam āste niḥśipyate nyāsa iva kṣamāyām Yamātithir yo yavanasya vaṃśyāḥ khudāhvayaśrī paramēśvarasyāsthānīm śhīṭasyādhipater ivorvyāḥ uthāya prthvyāḥ parivartakāle gamtā samagro 'pi janah purastāt ādarśikāyām iva punyapāpe saṃkrāmya saṃśuddhanijopalabdhai vidhāsyate sādhu sa tatra tasya nyāyam nīrasya svaparānurodhām vimśya viśrāṇayitā phalaṃ sa śreyoṃhasos tasya tato 'murīpam masīragodhūmayavādīdhānyabījasya sasyotkaram urvareva nāvo 'mbudheḥ kūlam ivānukūlavātena bhistīm gamitā anena bhokṣyanti bhogyādbhutabhogabhanīgītaraṇīṭāḥ ke 'pi tataḥ sukhāni syenaiḥ śakuntā iva piḍyamānāḥ kumbhāḥ kulālair iva pacyamānāḥ tadgopīrbhir doyakim enasānye prāpsyanti duḥkhāny apti tena nīlāḥ Kurāṇavākyam kim idaṃ yathārtham mahātmanām vākyam ivāsti sūre iva prasūne gaganasya tasmīn utābhyudeti vyabhicāribhāvah.

²¹ The HS 14.197–199 associates Moslems with carnivorous behaviour. According to Rizvi op. cit., p. 201, Akbar became a vegetarian.

²² *bhavaḥbhamibhauṅgibharo bhaviva kiṃ rūpam ādhāya sabhāṅgamī kṣepā punar doyakibhistigatyor janasya kaṃ hetum iha pratītya sukhāsukhāni prabhaviṣṇu dātum pacelinamī prāktanam eva tasyaiva tatkāraṇatāstu mañjāgalastaneneva kim atra tena idaṃ gaditvā virate vratindre sekhaḥ punar vācam imām uvāca vijñāyate tadbahugarhyavācī[vā]civa tathyetaratā taduktau babhāna bhūyāḥ prabhur etatsraṣṭā jagat pūrvam idaṃ vidhatte tat ketuvāt saṅgharate sa paścāt tato 'sti tasyāpy asamaśramo 'sau kartā ca hartā nījakarmajanyavaicitryaviśvasya na kaś cid asti vandhyātmajanneva tadastibhāvo 'sann eva citte pratibhāsate tat sekhaṃ tam itthaṃ kṛtapūrvapakṣam sambodhya siddhāntavacobhir eṣaḥ dharmam nidhatte sam tadtyacitte kṣīvala bijam ivorvarāyām*

²³ Cf. John E. Cort, "Genres of Jain History", *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 23 1995, pp. 469–506. Dharmasāgara, the main chronicler of the early Tapa Gaccha, states in his *Tapāgacchapaṭṭāvalī* that the HS should be used as a source for many of the details of Hīravijaya Sūri's life. See Darśanavijaya (ed.), *Śrī Paṭṭāvalī-Samuccayaḥ*, Vīraṅgām 1933, p. 73.

²⁴ *Naiṣadha-carita* 17.84–106, for which see the translation by K. K. Handiqui, Poona: Deccan College 1956. Devavimāla seems to be alluding to this in his autocommentary on HS 13.150.

The *Naiṣadha-carita* is perhaps the dominant literary presence lying behind the HS and, as the last of the half-dozen canonical mahākāvya, it exerted a fascination upon more writers than Devavimāla. Cf. Phyllis Granoff, "Sarasvatī's sons: Biographies of Poets in Medieval India", *Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques* 49 1995, pp. 352–353. Cf. also *Traividyagosthī* (see note 18) p. 1, which, in the context of describing how brahman debaters should be greeted, quotes a line from the *Naiṣadha-carita* in which Nala welcomes the messenger-goose. Later court poets seem to have attempted to emulate the *Naiṣadha-carita* as a means of establishing their literary credentials. A Jain predecessor of Hīravijaya at Akbar's court, Padmasundara, wrote around 1577 to 1581 a scaled-down version of the *Naiṣadha-carita* called the *Yadusundaramahākāvya*, a title which is presumably recalled in Devavimāla's short early version of Hīravijaya's life entitled the *Hirasundarakāvya*. For this, see Satya Vrat, *Studies in Jaina Sanskrit Literature*, Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers 1995, pp. 61–95 and, for the HS's indebtedness to the *Naiṣadha-carita*, pp. 157–163.

²⁵ See Narendra K. Wagle, "Hindu-Muslim Interaction in medieval Maharashtra", in Günther D. Sontheimer and Hermann Kulke (ed.), *Hinduism Reconsidered*, New Delhi: Manohar 1989, pp. 55–56.

²⁶ Such vocabulary includes *khudā*, *paigambarā* (< Persian *paigambar*), *bhisti* (< Persian *bihisti*) and *doiyaki* (< Persian *doiyakh*). The HS consistently spells *Kurāna* without the retroflex "n" which Sanskrit phonetics would otherwise require. Cf. also autocomm. on HS 11.25 for *taslim* (... *yavanaprasiddhena nāmnā prañānapūrvam* ...) and on HS 14.107 for an equation, not entirely accurate, between Sanskrit *pustaka* and Arabic *adāb*. Rizvi op. cit., p. 273 points out that Abu'l Fazl did not know Sanskrit. Earlier Jain monks had familiarised themselves with Persian. For the text of the *Pārasībhāṣayā Śrī Ṛṣabhajinastavana*, a Jain hymn written in Persian by Jinaprabha Sūri (thirteenth/fourteenth century), see Caturavijaya, *Sotrasamuccayaḥ*, Mumbai: Nirṇayasāgar 1928, pp. 247–251. Note also Mary Whitney Kelting, "Hearing the Voice of the Sravika: Ritual and Song in Jain Laywomen's Belief and Practice", Ph.D. dissertation submitted to the University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1996 p. 219 for a devotional *stavan* using the Arabic word "*miṇāro*" to compare the Jina to a tower.

²⁷ See Brian K. Hatcher, "The Cosmōs is One Family (*Vasudhaiva Kuṭumbakam*): Problematic Mantra of Hindu Humanism", *Contributions to Indian Sociology* 28 1994, pp. 149–162.

²⁸ Subhaviyaya Ganin (compiler), *Praśnaratnākārābhīdhaḥ ŚrīSenaprasnaḥ*, Devchand Lalbhai Series vol. 51, Mumbai: Shah Naginbhai Ghelabhai Javeri 1919.

²⁹ For the *kriyāvādīn* as subscribing to a variety of views, such as the existence of the soul, see Kendall W. Folkert, *Scripture and Community: Collected Essays on the Jains*, edited by John E. Cort, Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press 1993, pp. 239 and 329.

³⁰ For roughly contemporary Jain views of Christians, see the *Vijayadeva-Māhātmya* of ŚrīVallabha Upādhyaya, ed. Jinavijaya, Ahmedabad: K. P. Modi 1928, which is a biography of Vijayasena Sūri's successor, Vijayadeva Sūri (1577–1656). According to 6.71, the guru of the Portuguese (*phiraṅgi*) was called in their language "*pādari*" (= "padre"), while 6.81 states that the Portuguese governor (*adhikārin*) of Diu "continually worships Rāma and Sītā [= Jesus and Mary?], not any other deities and never (approves of) another religion except his own" (*RāmaSītārcanaṃ nityam manute nānyadevatā[h] vinā svadharmam anyeṣāṃ dharmam ca na kadāpi sah*). My thanks to Alex Passi for sending me a copy of the *Vijayadeva-Māhātmya*. General Jain relations with the Portuguese are discussed by S. Gopal, "Gujarati Shipping in the Seventeenth Century", *Indian Economic and Social History Review*, 8 1971, pp. 31–39.

³¹ *Senaprasna* p. 81 no. 321: *yo mokṣārtham kriyāṃ karoti sa kriyāvādīti pragoṣo satyo 'satyo vā? yadi satyas tarhi mokṣārtham jivaghātam kurvatsu satv api turuskādiphiraṅgikaparyantasavarnamithyādrṣṭiṣu kriyāvādītvam syāt, tat tu keṣāṃ cid āmaśrāddhānām atratyadhundhikahādhyānām ca cetasi na pratibhāsate, pratyuta dhundhikā itthaṃ kathayanti śrīmatām ye ye gītārthā atra samāyānti te sarveṣāṃ kriyāṃ kurvatām mīthyādrṣāṃ kriyāvādītvam kathayanti, tad asamiccānam śrāddhānām, te tu dhundhikāḥ samyagdrṣāṃ samyaktvābhimukhānām ca kriyāvādītvam kathayanti, nānyeṣāṃ iti praśnaḥ. atrottaram-vo mokṣārtham kriyāṃ karoti sa kriyāvādīti pragoṣaḥ satya eva lakṣyate, na ca ko 'pi mokṣārtham jivaghātādikaṃ karoti, yataḥ turuṣkānām api mūlaśāstreṣu jivavadhasya niśiddhatvāt, yājnīkānām api svargāyartham eva yajñasya prarūpanāt, tathā samyagdrṣā eva samyaktvābhimukhā eva vā kriyāvādīna ity akṣaraṇī śāstre na santi [.] pratyuta Bhagavatīrṣṭāv ity uktam asti-ete ca sarve 'py anyatra yady api mīthyādrṣṭayo 'bhīhitāḥ tathāpihādyaḥ samyagdrṣṭayo grāhyāḥ, samyagastitvavādīnām eva teṣāṃ samāśrayanāt, Bhagavatīśūtram ca viśeṣaparam, tena tatra kriyāvādīpadena samyagdrṣṭayo grhīṭa[h], anyatra tu mīthyādrṣṭayo 'pi, tata ubhaye 'pi kriyāvādīna itī tattvam.*

³² I follow the dating proposed by Hukamchand Bhārill, *Pamdit Tōdarmal: Vyaktitva aur Kartitva*, Jaipur: Pamdit Tōdarmal Smarak Trust 1973, pp. 44–56. For the text of the *Mokṣamārgaprakāśaka*, I have used the edition of 1911 published by the ŚrīJainagranthamālā Kāryālaya, Bombay, pp. 174–176 and have also consulted the Hindi translation by Maganlāl Jain, Songadh: Śrī Digambar Jain Svādhyāy Mamdir Trust 1987, pp. 123–124. The *Mokṣamārgaprakāśaka* is followed by the image worshipping Digambaras and the neo-Digambara Kāñji Svāmī Panth, but not the aniconic Digambara Tāraṇa Panthis.

³³ Tōdar Mal does not, of course, use any term corresponding to English "Hinduism" (although he does use the term "Hindu": see note 37), but rather refers to a wide range of categories, such as belief in creator god and so on, and philosophical schools (*dārśana*).

³⁴ *Mokṣamārgaprakāśaka* p. 174: *bahuri jaisaṃ vai avatār bhae mānai hai taisaṃ e paigambar bhae mānain haim*. This was probably the only indigenous terminology available for Indians to describe the notion of Moslem prophecy and can be seen as early as an eleventh century coin inscription of Mahmud of Ghazni's reign in

which the Moslem declaration of faith is rendered by describing Mohammad as the *avatāra* of the "Unmanifest". See Pollock op. cit., p. 285.

³⁵ *Mokṣamārgaparakāśaka* p. 174: *bahuri vai kaḥim dayā poṣaim kaḥim himsā poṣaim, taisaim e bhī kaḥim mihar karnā poṣaim kaḥim jibahkarnā poṣai haim*. Note Ṭoḍar Mal's use in respect to Islam of the words *mihar* and *jibah* (i.e. < Persian *mehr*, "good, compassionate" and Arabic *zabḥ*, "slaughtering of an animal in accordance with Moslem law" respectively) as equivalent to *dayā* and *himsā*. Maganlal Jain's Hindi translation renders *jibah* by *katal* (< Arabic *qatl*, "kill").

³⁶ *Mokṣamārgaparakāśaka* p. 175: *bahari jaisaim vai kaḥim tapaścaraṇ karnā poṣaim kaḥim viṣaysevnā poṣaim taisaim hi e bhī poṣai haim ... aisaim anekprakārkari samāntā pāte hai. yady api nāmādik aur aur haim kaḥapi prayojanbhūt arthki ektā pāte hai*. Note that Ṭoḍar Mal seems to think Moslems revere pigs in the same way as Hindus do cows on the grounds that they are animals. See p. 175: *bahuri jaisaim vai gau ādikaṇ pūjya kahai haim, taisaim e sūkar ādikaṇ kahai haim. e sab tiryacādik haim*.

³⁷ *Mokṣamārgaparakāśaka* p. 176: *dekho, is kālviṣai musalmān bahut pradhān ho gae. Himḍū ghaṭi gae. Himḍūniṣai aur badhi gae Jainī ghaṭi gae. so yah kālka doṣ hai*.

³⁸ For Ṭoḍar Mal's death in the wake of one of a series of "sāmpradāyik upadrav" in Jaipur in the second half of the eighteenth century, see Bhārill op. cit., pp. 53–56, who presents the Digambara scholar as having been executed by the maharaja in reprisal for an attack upon the Śaiva community by some Jains who were followers of Paṇḍit Bakhatrām Śāh.

An analysis of modern Jain social and political connections with Hindu supremacist, anti-Moslem nationalist movements such as the RSS, VHP (one of whose founders was a Jain) and the BJP has yet to be written. See for the present C. A. Bayly, "The Prehistory of "Communalism": Religious Conflict in India, 1700–1860", *Modern Asian Studies* 19 1985, pp. 198 and 200 and Christophe Jaffrelot, *The Hindu Nationalist Movement and Indian Politics: 1925 to the 1990s*, London: Hurst and Company 1996, pp. 73 and 140–141. For some recent, purely anecdotal evidence for Jains being influenced by anti-Moslem political rhetoric, see Pankaj Mishra, *Butter Chicken in Ludhiana: Travels in Small Town India*, Penguin Books India 1995, pp. 93–96.

Department of Sanskrit
University of Edinburgh
Scotland, U.K.

AVESTISCH APĀUUAIIA-

Das im Titel genannte Wort ist im erhaltenen Avesta-Corpus zweimal in den bis auf die Negation einander entsprechenden Passagen V. 2,29 und 2,37 bezeugt; die Form des Nom.Sg.mask. *apāuuaīiō* steht dort in einer Aufzählung von Krankheiten und Körperschwächen beziehungsweise Menschen, die mit solchen behaftet sind. Die Bedeutung des Wortes ist bis jetzt nicht sicher ermittelt, weshalb manche Übersetzer auf seine Wiedergabe verzichten. Ansonsten finden sich wiederholt, aber in aller Regel mit Vorbehalt ("?"), Übersetzungen wie "entmannt, kastriert, zeugungsunfähig", die letztlich auf James Darmesteter¹ zurückgehen ("impuissant"), der hinter dem Präverb *apa-* "fern, weg" als zweites Element dieses Bahuvrīhi iran. **āvaya-*, ntr. "Ei, Hoden" vermutet hat. Als Möglichkeit hat dies nachträglich dann auch Christian Bartholomae² eingeräumt. Aber Darmesteters Ansatz von iran. **āvaya-* ist äußerst zweifelhaft, da nicht nur bereits Heinrich Hübschmann³ anlässlich npers. *xāya*, mpers. *xāyag* darauf hingewiesen hatte, daß "v schon im Iranischen verloren" gegangen sei, sondern vor allem auch Walter Bruno Henning⁴ das avestische Wort für "Ei" tatsächlich hat nachweisen können in Akk.Sg.ntr. *aēm* (Yt. 13,2) < **aiam* < **āiam*.⁵ Zur Rechtfertigung dieser Form, die zunächst weiter auf **ōiom* zurückgeht, darf auf Jochem Schindlers⁶ eingehende Untersuchung über "Die idg. Wörter für 'Vogel' und 'Ei'" verwiesen werden.

Die von Jacques Duchesne-Guillemin⁷ vorge schlagene Verbindung mit dem Präsensstamm ved. *vāya-* "ermatten, verlöschen" (der heute zur Wurzel *vā* "dahinschwinden" < idg. **ueh₂*, nicht zu *vā* "wehen" < idg. **h₂ueh₁* gestellt wird) ist eine bloße Denkmöglichkeit, läßt sich aber im Morphologischen nicht im mindesten abstützen.

Angesichts dieses unbefriedigenden Befundes mag es gestattet sein, nach einer anderen Deutung Ausschau zu halten.

Ich erwäge, avest. *apāuuaīia-* in Präverb *apa-* + **āuuaīia-* zu zerlegen, und sehe hierin das iranische Gegenstück zu ved. *āvayā-* "Paarungstrieb, Geschlechtstrieb, Brunst" (AV 8,6,26b), dessen spezifische Bedeutung vor allem durch Ferdinand Sommer⁸ herausgearbeitet wurde. Zu beachten ist auch das negierte Kompositum *ān-āvaya-* AV 7,90,3a, das in