

MORE LIGHT ON THE YĀPANĪYA SANGHA¹,
A JAINA SECT*

By

A. N. UPADHYE

The religious and ascetic organisation headed by Nigantha Nātaputta, or Mahāvīra, was led earlier by Pārśva; and Mahāvīra was a Pāsāvaccijja, i. e., he belonged to the line of Pārśva. Still the *Uttarā-dhyayana*, XXIII, depicts a situation in which the pupils of Pārśva and of Mahāvīra try to patch up some of the differences in their ascetic practices. It is such differences that might have created schisms and sects in the Jaina church in due course of time.

Reprinted from the *Annals* (B. O. R. Institute)

Vol. LV

POONA

1974

* This paper was submitted to the 29th International Congress of Orientalists, Paris, and read by me at the Southeast Asia (Indian) Section on July 17, 1973.

¹ For earlier studies see : *Indian Antiquary*, VII, p. 34; H. LÜDERS : E. I., IV, p. 338; N. PREMI : *Jaina Hitaiṣṭh*, XIII, pp. 250-75; A. N. UPADHYE : *Journal of the University of Bombay*, I, vi, pp. 224 ff.; N. PREMI : *Jaina Sāhitya aurā Itihāsa*, 2nd ed., Bombay 1956, pp. 56 f., 155 f., 521 f.; P. B. DESAI : *Jainism in South India*, Sholapur, 1957, pp. 163-66, etc.

² Nalinaksh DATTA : *Early History of the Spread of Buddhism and Buddhist Schools*, p. 200.

³ E. LEUMANN : *Die alten Berichte von den Schismen der Jaina*, I, S., XVII, pp. 91-135.

⁴ Dr. HOERNLE quoted in *South Indian Jainism*, pp. 25-27.

⁵ See *Vīṣeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya*, Gāthās 2304-2548,

² [*Annals*, B. O. R. I.]

MORE LIGHT ON THE YĀPANĪYA SANGHA¹

A JAINA SECT*

By

A. N. UPADHYE

The religious and ascetic organisation headed by Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta, or Mahāvira, was led earlier by Pārśva; and Mahāvira was a Pāsāvaccijja, i. e., he belonged to the line of Pārśva. Still the *Uttarā-dhyayana*, XXIII, depicts a situation in which the pupils of Pārśva and of Mahāvira try to patch up some of the differences in their ascetic practices. It is such differences that might have created schisms and sects in the Jaina church in due course of time.

The *Samāgamasutta* mentions that Buddha had already scented dissensions in the Jaina church soon after the death of Mahāvira, or Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta, and exhorted his disciples not to fall a victim to such schismatic impulses.² During the life-time of Mahāvira, the doctrinal differences like the Bahurata started by Jamāli, the son-in-law of Mahāvira, and Jivapradeśa by Tiṣyagupta etc. were already there.³ After the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvira, possibly due to the migration of certain monks to the South, there arose the division of Śvetāmbara and Digambara by laying more or less stress on certain ascetic practices which must have been there in the church even earlier.⁴ The schisms started by Āryasādhā (214 years after the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvira) etc.⁵ did not survive long to perpetuate any division in the church.

From the Mathurā inscriptions of the early centuries it is clear that gscetic groups like Gaṇa, Kula, Śākhā and Sambhoga were already current in the Jaina church. Among the Digambaras there were such

* This paper was submitted to the 29th International Congress of Orientalists, Paris, and read by me at the Southeast Asia (Indian) Section on July 17, 1973.

¹ For earlier studies see : *Indian Antiquary*, VII, p. 34; H. LÜDERS : E. I., IV, p. 338; N. PREMI : *Jaina Hitaiṣi*, XIII, pp. 250-75; A. N. UPADHYE : *Journal of the University of Bombay*, I vi, pp. 224 ff.; N. PREMI : *Jaina Sāhitya aurā Itihāsa*, 2nd ed., Bombay 1956, pp. 56 f., 155 f., 521 f.; P. B. DESAI : *Jainism in South India*, Sholapur, 1957, pp. 163-86, etc.

² Nalinaksh DATTA : *Early History of the Spread of Buddhism and Buddhist Schools*, p. 200.

³ E. LEUMANN : *Die alten Berichte von den Schismen der Jaina*, I. S., XVII, pp. 91-135.

⁴ Dr. HOERNLE quoted in *South Indian Jainism*, pp. 25-27.

⁵ See *Viśeṣāvaśyukabhāṣya*, Gāthās 2304-2548.

divisions as Sangha (Mūla, Drāviḍa etc.), Gaṇa (Deśī, Sena, Kāṇūr etc.), Gaccha (Pustaka etc.), Anvaya (Kundakunda etc.). Among the Śvetāmbaras there are Gacchas like Kharatara, Tapā, Añcala, etc.¹

The *Darśanasāra* of Devasena (9-10th century A. D.) gives a few details about the Sanghas some of which may be noted here. The Yāpaniya Sangha was led by Śrīkalaśa (205 years after the death of Vikrama); Drāviḍa Sangha by Vajranandi (526 years after the death of Vikrama); Kāṣṭhā Sangha by Kumārasena (753 years after the death of Vikrama); and Māthura Sangha led by Rāmasena (953 years after the death of Vikrama).² Such divisions, due to differences in practices, were unavoidable, because groups of ascetics lived and moved in different parts of the country.

Some definitions of these terms are available. A group of three monks was called a Gaṇa; a band of seven monks was designated as Gaccha; and regular community of monks was known as Sangha.³ But these definitions cannot be taken as universal: in fact there are instances of the interchange of Gaṇa and Sangha. According to Uddyotana (779 A. D.), the term Gaccha seems to have originally indicated a travelling group of monks under its head.⁴ The traditional meanings have to be collected from the leading monks among Śvetāmbaras and Digambaras.

In a Kannada Ms., *Gaṇabheda*, more prominence is given to Gaṇas than to Sanghas. Four Gaṇas are recognised; and they are linked with certain Sanghas: i) Senagaṇa (Mūlasangha); ii) Balavatkāragāṇa⁵ (Nandisangha); iii) Deśigaṇa (Śiṃhasangha); and iv) Kālogragāṇa (Yāpaniyasangha).⁶

Sufficient attention has not been paid to the Yāpaniya Sangha, partly because there were certain prejudices against the Yāpaniyas, and because they do not exist today under that name like Digambaras and Śvetāmbaras. There are various traditions about the origin of the Yāpaniyas. Devasena, who compiled his *Darśanasāra* in the year 909 or 990 years after the death of king Vikrama, records a tradition that Śrīkalaśa, a Śvetāmbara monk, started the Yāpaniya Sangha in the town of Kalyāṇa in the year 205 after the death of king Vikrama. Then

¹ See the Introduction to *Reportoire D'epigraphie Jaina* by A. GUERINOT, Paris 1908.

² *Annals of the B. O. R. I.*, XV. iii-iv, pp. 198 ff., Poona 1934.

³ Vasunandi's Sanskrit commentary on the *Mūlācāra*, IV, 32, Bombay 1920.

⁴ *Kuvalayamālā*, p. 80, lines 17f., Bombay 1959.

⁵ Balavatkāra = Balātkāra, cf. Kannada Bala (e) gāra.

⁶ Kālogra-gaṇa seems to be hyper Sanskritisation of Kaṇḍūra- or Kāṇūr-gaṇa which is associated with the Yāpaniya Sangha.

Ratnanandi¹ (later than 15th century A. D.) narrates, in his *Bhadrābāhucarita*, the origin of the Yāpanīya Sangha in this manner. King Bhūpāla was ruling at Karahāṭaka. He had a favourite queen Nṛkulādevī, by name. She once told her beloved that there were her teachers in her paternal town and that they should be requested to come over there for the glorification of the religious rites. The king, accordingly, sent his minister Buddhisāgara who brought those monks after great entreaties. After their arrival, the king went forth to receive them in a great pomp ; but when he saw them from a distance and found that they were not naked monks, he began to wonder who were those new monks equipped with clothings, a bowl and a stick. He returned home without offering respects to them ; he told his wife that her teachers were heretics ; and he was not ready to respect them, because they were not Jaina monks. The queen understood what her beloved meant. She hurried to those monks and requested them to give up their white clothes and accept the Nirgrantha asceticism. They gave up accordingly their old robe and went naked with a water-gourd and a bunch-of-feathers. Then the king approached and received them with due decorum. The monks, though Digambara in form, continued the practices of Śvetāmbaras : it is they who formed the Yāpanīya-sangha.

The tradition being very late in time, one has to be cautious in accepting it wholesale and literally. There are some implications of this tradition. The queen perhaps belonged to the Śvetāmbara community, and the Śvetāmbara monks do not appear to have been very popular in the South, if this Karahāṭaka were to be identified with modern Karhād in Satara district of Maharashtra. The Yāpanīyas are looked upon as a Śvetāmbara schism by both Devasena and Ratnanandi, though they had an outward appearance of Digambara monks.

Yāpanīyas have been looked upon as a heretic creed by some Digambara writers. Indranandi, in his *Nītisāra*, (verse 10)² includes them under five false sects :

Gopucchikāḥ Svetavāsā Drāviḍo Yāpanīyakāḥ |
Nihpiñchaśceti pañcaite Jainābhāsāḥ prakīrtitāḥ |

The basic meaning of the term Yāpanīya is a question by itself. Various spellings are available for it : Yāpanīya, Jāpanīya, Yapanī, Āpanīya, Yāpuliya, Āpuliya, Jāpuli, Jāvuliya, Jāviliya,

¹ *Bhadrābāhucarita* of Ratnanandi, Kolhapur 1921, Ch. IV, 135-54 ; H. JACOBI : *Über die Entstehung der Śvetāmbara and Digambara Sekten*, ZDMG, XXXVIII, pp. 1-42 ; H. LÜDERS : E. I., IV, p. 338.

² *Tattvānuśāsanaḍi-saṃgrahaḥ*, in M. D. J. G., Bombay, Saṃ. 1975, pp. 58 ff.

Jāvaḷiya, also Jāvaḷigeya. Different interpretations are already offered, tracing it back to the root *yā* with the causal suffix. TELANG explained the term 'as those who wandered about without being stationary'.¹ In early texts like the *Pravacanasāra* (III. 10) two types of Teachers are mentioned : *pavvajjā-dāyaga* and *ñijjāvaga*. The duty of the *ñijjāvaga* is to re-establish a defaulter-monk in the correct behaviour. His function is that of controlling and correctly piloting a novice : the Sanskrit equivalent should be *nir-yāmaka* rather than *nir-yāpaka*.² The term *javanijja* is used in more than one sense in early Jaina texts. In the *Nāyādhammakahāo*, there is the expression *imḍiya-javanijje*. Here *javanijje* cannot be from *yāpanīya*, but from *yamānīya*, going back to the root *yam* to control. We may compare also *thavanijja* standing for *sthāpanīya*. So *yāpanīya* is not the correct Sanskritisation, though a catching back-formation. So the *javanijja* monks (called Yāpanīya) are those who lead life of *yama-yāma* ; compare in this context the *cāujjāma-cāturyāma dharma* of Pārśva.³

It is necessary that we gather some details about the Yāpanīya Teachers, so that we can have a better picture of this Sangha and of the Teachers associated with it in different localities and contexts of events.

The Hāthigumphā inscription of Khāravela has a reading (uncertain) *yāpa-ñāvakehi* (line 14). Some suspect here a reference to Yāpanīyas, but one cannot be certain.⁴

Mṛgeśavarman (475 to 490 A. D.) of the Kadamba dynasty has given a grant to Yāpanīyas, Nirgranthas and Kūrcakas : the teacher mentioned in the plate is Dāmakīrti. Further, his son (497-537 A. D.) also made a grant of a village, out of the income of which the Pūjā etc. were to be performed and the Yāpanīya ascetics to be fed for four months. The teachers mentioned here are : Dāmakīrti, Jayakīrti, Bandhuseṇa and Kumāradatta, possibly all of them Yāpanīyas. Further Devavarman, the son of Kṛṣṇavarman (475-80 A. D.) made a donation of a village to the members of the Yāpanīya Sangha in favour of their temple for its maintenance.⁵

The Kadamba plates of A. D. 812 give the following details. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Prabhūtavārṣa himself made a donation in favour of a temple presided over by Arkakīrti, disciple of Kūchi (li)-ācārya, who

¹ See I. A., VII, p. 34, footnote.

² See my paper ' On the meaning of Yāpanīya ' in the *Sṛikaṇṭhikā*, Mysore 1972.

³ Otherwise the expression in the *Nāyādhammakahāo* cannot be properly explained.

⁴ E. I., XX, No. 7, p. 80.

⁵ I. A., VI, pp. 24-7, VII, pp. 33-5.

descended from (with a gap of many teachers in between) Śrīkīrti-ācārya of the Yāpanīya-Nandisangha, Punnāga-vṛkṣamūla-gaṇa. Arkakīrti successfully treated Vimalāditya, the Governor of Kunṇigila Deśa, who was suffering from the evil influence of Saturn.¹ The Kirai-ppākkam (Chingalpet, Tamil Nadu) inscription of c. 9th century A. D. refers to a Jina-temple, Deśavallabha by name. It was constructed by Amalamudalguru, the pupil of Mahāvīraguru of the Yāpanīya Sangha and the Kumilagaṇa. The donation makes provision for feeding the monks of the Sangha.²

Amma (II) of the Eastern Cālukya family made a grant of the village Maliyapundi (in Andhra) for the benefit of a Jaina temple. The teacher in charge of it was Śrīmandiradeva, the disciple of Divākara and grand-disciple of Jinanandi of the Yāpanīya Sangha, (Koṭi) Maḍuva-gaṇa and Punyāruha (possibly equal to Punnāgavṛkṣa) Nandi Gaccha.³ Then there is the Saudatti (Sugandhavartti) inscription of A. D. 980. It opens with the mention of Tailapadeva of the Cālukya dynasty. Śāntivarma and his queen Candakabbe are specified. The donation of the land is made by Śāntivarma for the Jaina temple built by him. Here some of the teachers mentioned belonged to the Yāpanīya-sangha and Kaṇḍūrgaṇa ; and their names are : Bāhubali-deva (bhāṭṭa-rakāḥ) (who is compared with moon, lion etc.); Ravicandrasvāmi, Arhanandi, Śubhacandra-Siddhāntadeva, Maunideva and Prabhācandradeva.⁴ Dr. P. B. DESAI refers to another inscription from Hosur (Saudatti, Dt. Belgaum) in which the preceptors belonging to the Kaṇḍūrgaṇa of the Yāpanīya Sangha are mentioned. Their names are Śubhacandra (I), Candrakīrti, Śubhacandra (II), Nemicandra, Kumāra-kīrti, Prabhācandra and Nemicandra (II).⁵

It is reported that the image of Neminātha now in the Dodḍa Basadi at Belgaum, once belonged to a temple in the fort. The inscription on it says that Pārisayya of the Yāpanīya Sangha constructed the temple in A. D. 1013 to which Kattayya and Jakkavve, the mother of Sāhaṇādhīpati (perhaps the same as the Daṇḍanāyaka of the Kadamba ruler Jayakeśi) made the gift of land at Kallahaḷli (near Gokak). It may be noted that Pārisayya seems to be a layman and not a teacher, and his affiliation to the Sangha is specified.⁶ The Raybag inscription (A. D. 1020) records the gift of land at Hūvinabāge (modern Raybag)

¹ E. C., XII Gubbi 61.

² A. R. S. I. E., 1934-35 N. 22, p. 10, Delhi 1938.

³ E. I., IX, No. 6.

⁴ *Journal of the B. B. R. A. S.*, X, 71-72, text pp. 206-7.

⁵ *Jainism in South India*, p. 165.

⁶ *Jinavijaya* (Kannāḍa), January 1931.

by Daṇḍanāyaka Dāsīmarasa to the illustrious preceptor Kumārakīrti-
paṇḍitadeva of the glorious Yāpanīya-sangha, Punnāgavṛkṣamūlagāṇa.¹
The Hosur (Dharwar Dt.) inscription of A. D. 1028-29 records the
grant of an areca-nut garden and house sites made by Āyca-Gavuṇḍa of
Posavūra to the Basadi. Here are mentioned the Yāpanīya Sangha and
(Punnāgavṛkṣamūla, not fully readable) the teacher is Jayakīrti.²
The Hūli record is found in two parts, the first belonging to the Cālukya
Āhavamalla Someśvara (A. D. 1044) and the second to Jagadeka-
malla (A. D. 1145). These grants are made for the repairs of the Jina
temple and for the maintenance of the saints (connected with it). In
the first Bālacandra-bhaṭṭārakadeva of the Yāpanīya Sangha Punnāga-
vṛkṣamūla is mentioned, and in the second is specified Rāmacandradeva.³
The Mugada inscription of A. D. 1045 refers to Yāpanīya Sangha and
Kumudigāṇa. It is the latter that is better specified and a number of
teachers are mentioned : Śrīkīrtigoravaḍi, Prabhāśaśāṅka, Nayabṛtinātha,
Ekavīra, Mahāvīra, Narendrakīrti, Nāgabikki-vratīndra, Niravadya-
kīrti-bhaṭṭāraka, Mādhavendu, Bālacandra, Rāmacandra, Municandra,
Ravikīrti, Kumārakīrti, Dāmanandi, Traividya-govardhana, Dāmanandi,
Vaddācārya. Some names are elusive. But all of them are highly praised
with references to their profound learning and exemplary conduct.⁴
The Morab (Dt. Dharwar) record mentions the Samādhi-marāṇa of
Nāgacandra Siddhāntadeva, the pupil of Jayakīrtideva of the Yāpanīya
Sangha. Kanakaśakti was the pupil of Nāgacandra who is called
Mantracūḍāmaṇi.⁵ The Doni (Dt. Dharwar) record belonging to the
reign of Tribhuvanamalla (A. D. 1096) is a grant of a garden to Cāru-
kīrti Paṇḍita, the pupil of Municandra-traividya Bhaṭṭāraka of the
Yāpnīsaṅga-vṛkṣamūlagāṇa. Dāyimayya, the pupil of Municandra
Siddhāntideva, wrote the record.⁶ The Dharmapuri inscription (Dt.
Bhir, Maharashtra) records the grant of income from different taxes
for the worship of god and for the feeding of ascetics by the Pañcapaṭṭāṇa
of Poṭṭalakere, the Kañcugāras and Telunganagaras. The grant was
entrusted to Mahāvīra Paṇḍita, the Ācārya of the Basadi, of Yāpanīya-
sangha and Vamdiyūragāṇa.⁷ The Kalabhāvi record outside the temple
of Rāmaliṅga belongs to c. 11th century A. D. and refers to the period
of Śivamāra of the Western Ganga family. Śivamāra gifted the village
Kumudavāḍa to a Jaina shrine built by him and entrusted it to the

1 *Journal of the Bombay Historical Society*, iii, pp. 192-200.

2 S. I. I., XI. i., No. 65, Madras 1940.

3 E. I., XVIII; also P. B. DESAI, *Ibidem*, pp. 174 f.

4 S. I. I., XI. i., No. 78, Madras 1940.

5 A. R. S. I. E., 1928-29, No. 239, p. 56.

6 S. I. I., II. iii, No. 140.

7 A. R. S. I. E., 1961-62, B 460-61.

preceptor Devakīrti of the Mailāpānvaya, Kāreyagaṇa (which are associated with Yāpanīya Sangha in the Bailahongal record). His predecessors mentioned are Śubhakīrti, Jinacandra, Nāgacandra and Guṇakīrti.¹

The Honnur inscription records the grant for the temple built by Bamma Gavuda, the disciple of Rātrimati-kanti, i. e., a nun by name Rātrimati, of the Mūlasangha, Punnāgavṛkṣamūlagagaṇa at the time of Ballājadeva and Gaṇḍarāditya (of the Śilāhāra dynasty of Kolhapur), c. 1108 A. D.² The Bailahongal (Dt. Belgaum) record is of the time of Cālukya Tribhuvanamalladeva. The Raṭṭa Mahāsāmanta Aṅka, Śāntiyakka and Kuṇḍi territory are mentioned. It is a grant to some Jaina temple. Muḷlabhaṭṭāraka and Jinadevasūri of the Yāpanīya Sangha, Mailāpa Anvaya and Kāreyagaṇa are specified.³ There is another Huli (Dt. Belgaum) inscription of the reign of Vikramāditya (VI). It refers to Bāhubali, Śubhacandra, Maunideva and Māghanandi of the Yāpanīya Sangha and Kaṇḍūrgagaṇa.⁴ The inscription at Eksambi (Dt. Belgaum) is found in the Neminātha Basadi constructed by Kālan(n)a, the general of Vijayāditya (the son of Śilāhāra Gaṇḍarāditya). A land for the temple was given to Vijayakīrti (Mahāmaṇḍalācārya) of the Yāpanīya Sangha, Punnāgavṛkṣamūlagagaṇa. His genealogy stands thus : Municandra, Vijayakīrti, Kumārakīrti and Traividya Vijayakīrti. The Raṭṭa Kārtivīrya paid a respectful visit to this temple in A. D. 1175.⁵ The Arsikere (Mysore) inscription (c. middle of the 12th century A. D.) refers to the grant made to the Jina temple. In one of the opening verses the Maḍuvagaṇa of the Yāpanīya (Sangha) is praised. The *pratiṣṭhā* of the image was made by Mānikasēṭṭi, a disciple of the Ponnāgavṛkṣamūlagagaṇa and [Yāpanīya] Sangha ; and the teacher mentioned is Kumārakīrti Siddhānta of the Yāpanīya Sangha and Maḍuvagaṇa. In another inscription there, the donor is Somayya of the Yāpanīya Sangha. Unlike in most of the other records, here the laity are being directly linked with the Yāpanīya Sangha. Secondly, the word Yāpanīya, the editor observes, is erased. Thirdly, a word like Kālāmukha-pratibaddha is added later, but it is redundant. Obviously some prejudice is shown against Yāpanīyas, but there is no sufficient evidence to show that they had any Kālāmukha leanings, because the word Kālāmukha itself is added later. It is not unreasonable to presume that one who added the expression Kālāmukha-pratibaddha might have tried to erase the term Yāpanīya for removing inconsistency.⁶ The

¹ I. A., XVIII, p. 309 ; also P. B. DESAI, Ibidem, p. 115.

² I. A., XII, p. 102.

³ A. R. S. I. E., 1951-52, No. 33, p. 12.

⁴ E. I., XVIII, pp. 201 f.

⁵ A. R. of the Mysore Arch. Dept., 1916, pp. 48 ff.

⁶ Ed. S. SHETTER : *J. of the Karnatak University*, X, 1966, pp. 159 ff. (in Kannada).

Lokapur (Dt. Belgaum) record of the 12th century A. D. notes that Brahma (the son of Kallagāvunda) erected an image of Purudeva under the advice of Ubhaya-Siddhānta-cakravarti, the pupil of Sakalendu Siddhāntika of the Kaṇḍūragana of the Yāpaniya Sangha.¹ At Tengali (Dt. Gulbarga) there is an inscription of c. 12th century A. D. on the pedestal of an image. It was consecrated by Bammadeva, the pupil of Nāgadeva Siddhāntadeva of the Vadiyura (Vandiyūra?) gaṇa of the Yāpaniya Sangha.² The Manoli (Dt. Belgaum) record of the 12th century A. D. speaks of the erection of Samādhi of Municandradeva of the Yāpaniya Sangha. He was the Ācārya of the Basadi established by Siriyādevī. There is also a reference to the Samādhimarāṇa of Pālyakīrti, the pupil of Municandra of the Yāpaniya Sangha.³

The Adaragunchi (Dt. Dharwar) record of c. 13th century A. D. marks the boundary of the land given to a Basadi (at Ucchangi) of the Yāpaniya Sangha and Kāḍūrgaṇa.⁴ The mutilated record at Hukeri (Dt. Belgaum), c. 13th century A. D., mentions the name of Traikīrti of some Gaṇa (the name is gone) of the Yāpaniya Sangha.⁵

In the under-ground cell at Kagwad (Dt. Belgaum) there is a grand statue of Neminātha. There is an inscription on the Nisidi stone which mentions the names of Dharmakīrti and Nāga Bommaras. The date given corresponds to A. D. 1394. There are gaps in the record. The teachers of the Yāpaniya Sangha and Punnāgavṛkṣamūlagāṇa are Nemicaṇḍra (who is called Tuḷuvarājya-sthāpanācārya), Dharmakīrti and Nāgacandra.⁶

There are some undated records. The Sirur (Jamkhandi) record states that the image of Pārśvanātha-Bhaṭṭāraka was presented by Kāḷiṣeṭṭi for the Kusumajinālaya of the Yāpaniya Sangha and Vṛkṣamūlagāṇa.⁷ The Garag (Dt. Dharwar) record specifies the Samādhimarāṇa of Śāntivīradeva of the Yāpaniya Sangha, Kumudigaṇa. There is another worn out record which also mentions the same Sangha and Gaṇa.⁸ The Rayadrug (Dt. Bellary) record refers to the construction of Nisidi. Of the eight names mentioned there, we have Candrabhūti of Mūla Sangha and Candrendra, Bādayya and Tammaṇṇa of the Yāpaniya Sangha.⁹

¹ Kannada Research Institute, Dharwar, 1942-48, No. 47.

² A. R. I. E., 1960-61, No. 511; also P. B. DESAI, *Ibidem*, p. 404.

³ A. R. S. I. E., 1940-41, Nos. 63-65, p. 245.

⁴ A. R. S. I. E., 1941-42, No. 3, p. 255.

⁵ A. R. S. I. E., 1941-42, No. 6, p. 261.

⁶ *Jinavijaya* (Kannada), Belgaum, July 1931.

⁷ A. R. S. I. E., 1938-39, No. 98, p. 219.

⁸ A. R. S. I. E., 1925-26, Nos. 441-42, p. 76.

⁹ A. R. S. I. E., 1919, No. 109, p. 12.

There are some other inscriptions which have lately come to light.

i) One at Sedam of 1124' A. D. refers to Prabhācandra Traividya of of Maḍuvagaṇa possibly to be associated with the Yāpanīya Sangha.¹

ii) One from Badali (Dt. Belgaum) of 1219 A. D. refers to the Yāpanīya Sangha, Kāreya Gaṇa. The teachers mentioned are Mādhava Bhaṭṭāraka, Vinayadeva, kīrti Bhaṭṭāraka, Kanakaprabha and Śrīdhara Traividya.²

iii) One from Hannakeri (A. D. 1209 and 1257). Here is reference to Yāpanīya Sangha, Mailāpānvaya and Kāreyagaṇa. The teachers mentioned are Kanakaprabha (who is called *jātarūpadhara-vikhyātam*, i. e., known for his nudity or *nirgranthatā*), Śrīdhara, Kanakaprabha-paṇḍita.³

iv) On the pīṭha of the first floor of the temple in the Mangalwar Peth, Kolhapur, there is a record in Kannaḍa which states that Vomiyanna got prepared the paṭṭa-sālā; he was the brother of Raviyanna, the pupil of Vijayakīrti of the Yāpanīya Sangha and Punnāgavṛkṣa-mūlagagaṇa.⁴

v) Lately Dr. Gururaj BHATT sent me a copy of an inscription from the Image at Varang (S. K.) which mentions Kāṇūrgaṇa. He is studying it more closely.

This chronological survey of various inscriptions (from the 5th to the 14th century A. D.) referring to the Yāpanīya Sangha clearly brings out certain broad facts about this Sangha. Yāpanīyas, to begin with, were distinguished from Nirgranthas, Śvetapata and Kūrcaka. The Yāpanīya Sangha is associated with gaṇas like Kumuligaṇa (or Kumudigaṇa), (Koṭi) Maḍuvagaṇa, Kaṇḍur- or Kāṇur-gaṇa, Punnāgavṛkṣamūla-gaṇa (also linked with Mūlasangha), Vandiyūra-gaṇa, Kāreyagaṇa and Nandi-gaccha and Mailapānvaya. This contamination with different Gaṇas indicates that the Sangha gradually got itself expressed through Gaṇas which, as the account of the *Gaṇabheda* shows, were becoming more prominent in Karnataka and round about. The result is that often only the Punnāgavṛkṣamūlagagaṇa or Kaṇḍūrgaṇa is mentioned without specifying the Yāpanīya Sangha. This should explain how gradually the Yāpanīya Sangha was lost and became mixed with others, especially the Digambaras in the South. One of the saints of this Sangha is called *jātarūpadhara*, a term generally used by the Digambara monks. How the saints of this Sangha compromised their practices and creed are matters for further investigation. According to the *Nīṭisāra* (7-8) of Indranandi, the Sanghas were there first : Siṃha-, Nandi-, Sena-, and Deva-Sangha; and later grew Gaṇa, Gaccha etc.

¹ B. P. DESAI : Ibidem. p. 403.

² R. S. PANCHAMUKHI : *Karnataka Inscriptions*, I, Dharwar 1941, pp. 75-6.

³ K. G. KUNDANGAR : *Inscriptions from N. Karnatak and Kolhapur States*, Kolhapur 1939.

⁴ *Jinavijaya* (Kannaḍa), Belgaum 1931 (May-June).

But in later days, as indicated by the *Gaṇabhedā*, Gaṇa division absorbed and superseded the Sanghas. This Gaṇa-pakṣapāṭa is explained in the *Śrutāvatāra* (verse 90) which also indicates how different name-endings like -nandi, -vīra, -deva etc. came into vogue.¹

From the places where the records are found,² it is clear that the Teachers of the Yāpanīya Sangha had their sway mostly in the area of the present-day districts of Dharwar, Belgaum, Kolhapur and Gulbarga. The number of records found in Andhra and Tamil Nadu is very small. That no records of the Yāpanīya Sangha are noticed at Śravaṇa Belgol indicates that this seat possibly developed exclusive of the Yāpanīya Teachers. In Karnataka, it is mainly in the northern part of it that many of the Yāpanīya Teachers are associated with the Temple Institution. (Generally speaking the preference is for the images of Neminātha and Pārśvanātha.). What is striking is that they appear like Trustees managing the temples and also looking after the maintenance of the Sangha by receiving land-grants from kings and other dignitaries in the society. Such functions are more or less the forerunners of those of the present-day Bhaṭṭārakas in these areas. The existence of the institution of nuns (*āryikā*, *kaṁti* or *kṣāntikā*) in the Jaina order has nothing to do with the doctrinal question whether a woman attains liberation in the same birth. This is on par that the doctrine of Ahimsā has never come in the way of the presence of great Daṇḍanāyakas among the Jainas. What is needed is correct understanding of the concepts of Strimukti and Ahimsā. As it appears, the Sangha did not much affect the laity beyond a few individuals and families owing allegiance to some Ācārya or the other.

The terms like Sangha, Gaṇa, Gaccha and Anvaya have their meanings changed; Sangha and Gaṇa are often interchanged; and their exhaustive study, in their relations to each other, is a desideratum.

It is noted above how Indranandi in his *Nītisāra* calls Yāpanīyas as Jainābhāsa; and Śrutasāgara has many remarks to make against them, even going to the extent of saying that the statues installed by them, though they are *nagna*, should not be worshipped.³ In spite of all this, the Yāpanīya Teachers are highly praised in the records for their learning and practice of ascetic virtues; and the Digambaras in the south are worshipping the statues which are obviously of the Yāpanīya Sangha. That shows how the Yāpanīyas became almost one with the Digambaras: at least one instance is there that a Yāpanīya monk is described as *jātarūpadhara*.

¹ See foot-note No. 2 on p. 11; the *Śrutāvatāra* is also included in that volume.

² See also P. B. DESAI, *Ibidem*, pp. 164f.

³ His Sanskrit comm. on the *Ṣaṭprābhīṭādisaṁgraha*, Bombay 1920, p. 79.

The Yāpanīyas constituted a Sangha, and its Teachers were in charge of Temples which had lands to support them. It is but natural that these circumstances were quite favourable for cultivating literary activities. Haribhadra (c. 8th century A. D.) refers to Yāpanīya-tantra in this manner :¹

strīgrahaṇam tāsām api tadbhava eva saṃsārakṣayo bhavati iti jñāpanārthan vacaḥ, yathoktam Yāpanīyatantre: no khalu itthī ajīvo, na yāvi abhāvā, na yāvi daṃsaṇa-virohinī, no amāṇṣā, no aṇāriu-ppattī, no asaṃkhejjāvyā, no aikūramaī, no na uvasāntamohā, no na suddhācārā, no asuddha-bomdī, no vavasāya-vajjīyā, no apūvakaṇa-virohinī, no naṇaḡaṇaṭhāṇarakiyā, no ajogaladdhī, no akallāṇabhāya-ṇam ti, kahaṃ na uttamadhamma-sāhiga tti ॥

Śrutasaḡara tells us that they read Kalpa, to be identified with the Kalpasūtra.²

Śakaṭāyana, also known as Pālyakīrti, is described by Malayagiri as Yāpanīya; and the references from his Sanskrit grammar³ to Nirukti, Bhāṣya etc. clearly indicate that some of the texts of the Ardhamā-gadhī canon were acceptable to him. He refers to a number of authors : and at least some of them might have belonged to the Yāpanīya Sangha. The Apabhraṃsa poet Svayambhū belonged to Āpuliya or Yāpanīya Sangha, as indicated by some gloss.⁴ Some scholars hold the view that Vimala also belonged to the Yāpanīya Sangha, but this point needs further investigation, by a close study of the Paūmacariya.

Śakaṭāyana, the grammarian, mentions himself in his colophon thus :⁵

iti śrī-śrutāevali-deśīyācāryasya śakaṭāyanasya kṛtau śabdā-nuśāṣane etc.

This is the way perhaps the Yāpanīya Teachers distinguished themselves. Even the author of the Tattvārthasūtras, namely Umāsvāti, is described thus :

*Tattvārthasūtrakartāram Umāsvāti-muniśvaram ।
Śrutakevalideśīyam vande' haṃ ḡaṇaṇamandiram ॥*

¹ See my earlier paper noted above ; also Hemacandra's *Yogaśāstra*, B. I. ed., p. 652.

² My earlier paper, noted in f. n. 1, on p. 9.

³ *Śakaṭāyana-Vyākaraṇa* (and the Svopajña Amoghavṛtti) with a learned Introduction by Dr. R. BIRWE, Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha publication, Delhi 1971. See the Intro. and also the General Editorial.

⁴ N. PREMI : *Jaina Sāhitya aurā Itihāsa*, 2nd ed., p. 199.

⁵ *Śakaṭāyana-Vyākaraṇam*, Kolhapur 1907.

The Sūtras and the Bhāṣya show some clear-cut differences with the Ardhamāgadhī canon and Puṣyapāda is not happy with the text of the Sūtras in many places. The late Pt. Premi has given some valid reasons why Umāsvāti must have belonged to the Yāpanīya Sangha.¹ He has further suggested that Śivārya and Aparājitasūri might have belonged to the Yāpanīya Sangha. The former is the author of the *Ārādhana*, quite an ancient text in Prakrit, and the latter its commentator in Sanskrit. Some of the contexts in their works are not quite consistent either with the Śvetāmbara or Digambara views.² Likewise Siddhasena Divākara,³ in all probability, was a Yāpanīya; and that is why Haribhadra calls him Śrutakevali. Siddhasena has his differences with the known doctrines of the Digambaras and Śvetāmbaras. With the lapse of time, the temples once presided over by Yāpanīya Teachers as well as the images set up by them are today known as Digambara and are worshipped by Digambaras. Naturally the literary works produced by outstanding Yāpanīya teachers are mostly current in the South. A closer study of the *Paūmacariya* of Vimala, *Padmacarita* of Raviṣeṇa, *Varāṅgacarita* of Jaṭila (who is heavily indebted to Siddhasena and Umāsvāti), *Paūmacariya* of Svayambhū etc. is needed.

I may note here a striking point. According to the *Gaṇabhedā*, modern Kopbal (Koppala) was a seat of the Yāpanīyas; and it is on the Pallakki Guṇḍu there that we have got the foot-prints of Jaṭacārya or Jaṭila.⁴ The Kannada poet Janna, who flourished at the beginning of the 13th century A. D., assigns Jaṭasimhanandi to Kāṇūrgaṇa (see *Anantanātha-purāṇa* I. 17)⁵ which is so closely associated with the Yāpanīyas. When I edited the first chapter of the *Varāṅgacarita*, a controversy was raised whether the author was Digambara or Śvetāmbara.⁶

It is clear from the above details that plenty of references are found to the Yāpanīyas in inscriptions of the South. We have to see whether any references are found in Kannada and allied literature. Following more or less the story of the *Bṛhat-Kathakośa* (No. 131) of

¹ E. C., VIII, Nagar No. 46. Though late in age, it is a valuable record of traditional information.

² N. PREMI : *Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihāsa*, pp. 56 ff., 521 f. of the 2nd ed.

³ See my Introduction to the *Siddhasena Divākara's Nyāyāvatāra and other works*, *Jaina Sāhitya Vikāsa Maṇḍala*, Bombay 1971.

⁴ My Intro. to the *Varāṅgacarita*, Bombay 1938.

⁵ Ed., Mysore 1972.

⁶ *Annals of the B. O. R. I.*, XIV, i-ii, Poona 1933.

Harīṣeṇa (931-32 A. D.),¹ the *Vaḍḍārādhane*² in Kannada mentions Jāpuli Sangha. The contexts are a bit confused, but both the texts refer to Ardha-phālaka, Kāmbalika, Śvetabhikṣu and Yāpanīya. Janna (1209 A. D.) in his Kannada *Anantanāthapurāṇa* mentions Rāma-candradeva of the Kānūrgaṇa (I. 25) ; and he qualifies Municandra Traividya by the expression Jāvaḷigeṇa which is not being correctly explained. Possibly the same Municandra with a similar adjective is mentioned in the Kannada *Pārśvanāthapurāṇa* (I. 33) of Pārśvapaṇḍita³ (A. D. 1222). In my opinion Jāvaḷigeṇa stands for his Sangha, Yāpanīya. What is more interesting is that Janna assigns Jaṭā-Simha-nandi and Indranandi to the Kānūrgaṇa which is associated closely with the Yāpanīya Sangha. Janna's praise of various Ācāryas clearly shows that separatist tendencies of Gaṇas etc. were not observed by these poets.

It is seen from inscriptional and literary evidence that the Yāpanīyas have lived hand-in-hand with Digambaras ; and some of their temples and images are worshipped to this day by Digambaras in the South. Guṇaratna (A. D. 1343-1418) does not show much acquaintance with the Yāpanīyas, and Śrutasāgara (16th century of the Vikrama era) has hardly any sympathy for them. In fact, even today, some scholars of the orthodox school, not knowing that a few images in the so-called Digambara temples are already of the Yāpanīya sect, still object to the old images of the Yāpanīya sect being installed and worshipped. Titles like Saiddhāntika, Traividya used by some Yāpanīya Ācāryas indicate their studies of *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* etc. : this point needs further investigation.

Guṇaratna, while commenting on the *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya* (beginning of the chapter IV) of Haribhadra, observes thus : ⁴

*Digambarāḥ punar nāgnya-līṅgāḥ pāṇi-pātrās ca | te caturdhā
Kāsthāsaṃgha-Mūlasaṃgha-Māthurasaṃgha-Gopyasaṃgha-bhedāt |
Kāsthāsaṃghe caṃarībālais ca picchikā, Mūlasaṃghe mayūrapicchaiḥ
picchikā, Māthurasaṃghe mūlato'pi picchikā nāḍṛtā, Gopyā māyūra-
picchikā | ādyas trayo'pi saṃghā vandyamānā dharmavṛddhiṃ*

¹ Singhi Jaina Series, 17, Bombay 1943.

² D. L. NARASIMHACHAR, 4th ed., p. 93, Mysore 1970.

³ Ed. H. SHESHAYANGAR, Madras, 1960 ; Prof. G. VENKATSUBBIAH, Editor, *Kannada Nighaṇṭu*, Bangalore, drew my attention to this. Shri HAMPA Nagaraj tells me that he is not aware of *Jāvaḷigeṇa* elsewhere in Kannada works.

⁴ Bhāratiya Jñānapīṭha ed., Varanasi 1970, pp. 160-61.

*bhaṇanti, strīṇāṃ muktīm kevalināṃ bhuktiṃ sadvratasyāpi sacī-
varasya muktīm ca na manvate Gopyās tu vandyamānā dharmalābhāṃ
bhaṇanti, strīṇāṃ muktīm kevalināṃ bhuktiṃ ca manyante | gopyā
yāpanīyā ity ucyante.*

Thus Gopya was another name of Yāpanīya. He puts it under Digambara, though Strīmukti and Kevalibhukti are accepted by them. That they accepted these views is borne out by the facts that Śākaṭāyana, besides his Sanskrit grammar already referred to above, has written two Prakaraṇas, *Strīmukti-* and *Kevalibhukti-prakarāṇa* and these are already published.¹ It is interesting to note that his grammar is more popular with the Digambaras of the South and his two Prakaraṇas are current among the Śvetāmbaras.

Later Śrutasāgara (16th century of the Vikrama era) is not quite tolerant to other sects. He quotes Indranandi's verse which labels Yāpanīyas as Jainābhāsa, and gives some details about Gopucchika Śvetavāsa, Drāviḍa and Yāpanīya. About the last two he says :²

*Drāviḍāḥ sāvadyaṃ prāsukaṃ ca na manyante, udbhojanaṃ
nirākurvanti | Yāpanīyās tu vesarā ivobhayaṃ manyante, ratna-
trayaṃ pūjayanti, kalpaṃ ca vācayanti, strīṇāṃ tadbhave mokṣaṃ,
kevali-jinānāṃ kavalāhāraṃ, paraśāsane sagranthānāṃ mokṣaṃ ca
kathayanti.*

¹ See the Appendix to the Intro. by Dr. BIRWE to the *Śākaṭāyana-Vyākaraṇa*, noted above. Muni Śrī JAMBUNJAYAJI is bringing out a new ed. along with the *svopajña* commentary.

² *Ṣaṭprābhṛtādisaṃgraha*, noted above p. 11.