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MORE LIGHT ON THE YĀPANIYA SANGHA

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 Pasāvaccijja, 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.

The Samāgamasutta mentions that Buddha had already scented dissensions in the Jaina church soon after the death of Mahāvīra, or Nigantha Nātaputta, and exhorted his disciples not to fall a victim to such schismatic impulses. During the lifetime of Mahāvīra, the doctrinal differences like the Bahurata started by Jamāli, the son-in-law of Mahāvīra, and Jivapradesa by Tīṣyagupta etc. were already there. After the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvīra, 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. The schisms started by Āryāśādha (214 years after the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvīra) etc. did not survive long to perpetuate any division in the church.

From the Mathurā inscriptions of the early centuries it is clear that ascetic groups like Gaṇa, Kula, Śākhā and Sambhoga were already current in the Jaina church. Among the Digambaras there were such
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divisions as Sangha (Mūla, Drāvida etc.), Gaṇa (Deśi, Sena, Kāṇḍūr etc.), Gaccha (Pustaka etc.), Anvaya (Kundakunda etc.). Among the Śvetāmbaras there are Gacchas like Kharatara, Tapā, Añcalā, etc.²

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); Drāvida 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., Gaṇabhedha, more prominence is given to Gaṇas than to Sanghas. Four Gaṇas are recognised; and they are linked with certain Sanghas: ¹ Senagaṇa (Mālasangha); ² Balavatkara-gaṇa⁵ (Nandisangha); ³ Desigaṇa (Simhasangha); and ⁴ Kālogragaṇa (Yāpaniya-sangha).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.

¹ See the Introduction to Repertoire D'Épigraphics Jaina by A. Guerinot, Paris 1908.
³ Vasunandi's Sanskrit commentary on the Mālācāra, IV, 52, Bombay 1920.
⁴ Kuvadagamanā, p. 80, lines 17t., Bombay 1959.
⁵ Balavatkara = Balatkara, cf. Kannada Balla (e) gāra.
⁶ Kālogra-gaṇa seems to be hyper Sanskritisation of Kaṇḍūra- or Kāṇūr-gaṇa which is associated with the Yāpaniya Sangha.
Ratnanandi (later than 15th century A.D.) narrates, in his Bhadrasbāhucharita, the origin of the Yāpaniya 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 Buddhīśāgara 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 Yāpaniya-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 Karhāḍ in Satara district of Mahrashtra. The Yāpaniyas are looked upon as a Śvetāmbara schism by both Devasena and Ratnanandi, though they had an outward appearance of Digambara monks.

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

Gopucchikāḥ Śvetavāsā Drāvido Yāpaniyakāḥ
Nihpiṅchaśceti pāṇcaite Jainābhāsāḥ prakritītāḥ

The basic meaning of the term Yāpaniya is a question by itself. Various spellings are available for it: Yāpaniya, Jāpaniya, Yāpanī, Āpaniya, Yāpuliya, Āpuliya, Jāpuli, Jāvuliya, Jāviliya,

1 Bhadrasbāhucharita of Ratnanandi, Kolhapur 1921, Ch. IV, 135–54; H. Jacobs: Über die Entstehung der Śvetāmbara und Digambara Sektien, ZDMG, XXXVIII, pp. 1–42; H. Lüders: E. I, IV, p. 338.

Jāvalīya, also Jāvalīgeya. 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-daśyaga and nijjāvaga. The duty of the nijjāvaga 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 javanījja is used in more than one sense in early Jaina texts. In the Nāyādhhammakahāna, there is the expression ānādiya-javanījja. Here javanījje cannot be from yāpanīya, but from yamaniya, going back to the root yam to control. We may compare also thavanījju standing for sthāpanīya. So yāpanīya is not the correct Sanskritisation, though a catching back-formation. So the javanījja monks (called Yāpaniya) are those who lead life of yama-yāma; compare in this context the cāujjāma-cūturyāma dharma of Pārśva.\(^3\)

It is necessary that we gather some details about the Yāpaniya 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 Hathigumpha inscription of Khāravela has a reading (uncertain) yāpo-nāvakehi (line 14). Some suspect here a reference to Yāpaniyas, but one cannot be certain.\(^4\)

Mrgeśavarman (475 to 490 A. D.) of the Kadamba dynasty has given a grant to Yāpaniyas, Nirgranthas and Kūrakas: the teacher mentioned in the plate is Dāmakirti. 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 Yāpaniya ascetics to be fed for four months. The teachers mentioned here are: Dāmakirti, Jayakirti, Bandhusena and Kumāradatta, possibly all of them Yāpaniyas. Further Devavarman, the son of Kṛṣṇavarman (475–80 A. D.) made a donation of a village to the members of the Yāpaniya Sangha in favour of their temple for its maintenance.\(^5\)

The Kadamba plates of A. D. 812 give the following details. The Rāstrakūṭa king Prabhūtavarṣa himself made a donation in favour of a temple presided over by Arkakirti, disciple of Kūchi (li)-ācārya, who
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1. See I. A., VII, p. 34, footnote.
2. See my paper ‘On the meaning of Yāpaniya’ in the Śrīkaṇṭhikā, Mysore 1972.
3. Otherwise the expression in the Nāyādhhammakahāna cannot be properly explained.
descended from (with a gap of many teachers in between) Śrīkīrti-
ācārya of the Yāpaniya-Nandisangha, Punnāga-vrksamūla-gaṇa.
Arkkīrti successfully treated Vimalāditya, the Governor of Kunnigila
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 Jīna-temple, Desavallabha by name. It was constructed by
Amalamudalguru, the pupil of Mahāvīraguru of the Yāpaniya 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 Jīnanandi of the Yāpaniya Sangha, (Koṭi )
Maḍuva-gaṇa and Punyāruha (possibly equal to Punnāgavrīksa) Nandi
Gaccha.³ Then there is the Saudatti (Sugandhavarttī) 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 Yāpaniya-
sangha and Kaṇḍūrgaṇa; and their names are: Bāhubali-deva (bhattā-
rakah) (who is compared with moon, lion etc.); Ravicandrasvāmi,
Arhanandi, Śubhacandra-Siddhāntadeva, Maunideva and Prabhāc-
candradeva.⁴ Dr. P. B. Desai refers to another inscription from Hosur
(Saudatti, Dt. Belgaum) in which the preceptors belonging to the
Kaṇḍūrgaṇa of the Yāpaniya 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 Dodda
Basadi at Belgaum, once belonged to a temple in the fort. The in-
scription on it says that Pārisayya of the Yāpaniya Sangha constructed
the temple in A.D. 1013 to which Kattayya and Jakkavve, the mother
of Sāhanādhipati (perhaps the same as the Daṇḍanāyaka of the Kadamba
ruler Jayakesī) made the gift of land at Kallahalli (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.
³ E. L., IX, No. 6.
⁵ Jainism in South India, p. 165.
⁶ Jinavijaya (Kannaḍa), January 1931.
by Dañdanāyaka Dāsimarasa to the illustrious preceptor Kumārakirti-paṇḍītadēva of the glorious Yāpaniya-saṅgha, Punnāgavrksamulagaṇa.1 The Hosur (Dharwar Dt.) inscription of A.D. 1028–29 records the grant of an areca-nut garden and house sites made by Āycha-Gauṇḍa of Posavūra to the Basadi. Here are mentioned the Yāpaniya Sangha and (Punnāgavrksamulā, not fully readable) the teacher is Jayakīrtī.2 The Hūli record is found in two parts, the first belonging to the Cālukya Āhavamalla Someśvara (A.D. 1044) and the second to Jagadekamalla (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-bhaṭṭāракakadeva of the Yāpaniya Sangha Punnāgavrksamulā is mentioned, and in the second is specified Rāmacandradeva.3 The Mugada inscription of A.D. 1045 refers to Yāpaniya Sangha and Kumudigaṇa. It is the latter that is better specified and a number of teachers are mentioned: Śrīkīrtī goravāḍa, Prabhāsāśāṇa, Nāyakīṛṇī, Ekavīra, Mahāvīra, Narendra kīrti, Nāgabiki-vratīndra, Niravadaya kīrti-bhaṭṭāraka, Madhavendu, Bālacandra, Rāmacandra, Municandra, Ravi kīrti, Kumārakīrti, Dāmanandī, Traividiya-govardhanā, Dāmanandī, Vaddacārya. 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 Samādi-maraṇa of Nāgacandra Siddhāntadeva, the pupil of Jayakīrtideva of the Yāpaniya Sangha. Kanakāsakti 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-traivīdyā Bhaṭṭāraka of the Yāpnisanga-vrksamulagaṇa. Dāyimāyya, the pupil of Municandra Siddhāntideva, wrote the record.6 The Dharmapuri inscription (Dt. Bhīr, Maharashtra) records the grant of income from different taxes for the worship of god and for the feeding of ascetics by the Paṅcāpaṭṭana of Potṭalakere, the Kāncnugāras and Telunganagaras. The grant was entrusted to Mahāvīra Paṇḍita, the Ācārya of the Basadi, of Yāpaniya-saṅgha and Vāndiyūragaṇa.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

2 S. I. L., XI i., No. 65, Madras 1940.
3 E. I., XVIII; also P. B. DESAI, Ibidem, pp. 174 f.
4 S. I. L., XI i., No. 78, Madras 1940.
6 S. I. L., II iii, No. 140.
preceptor Devakirti of the Mailāpaṇavaya, Kāreyaṅgana (which are associated with Yāpaniya Sangha in the Bailahongal record). His predecessors mentioned are Śubhakirti, Jinacandra, Nāgacandra and Guṇakirti.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, Punnāgavrksamulagana at the time of Ballājadeva and Gaṅdarāditya (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 Mahāśāmanta Aṅka, Śāntiyakka and Kuṇḍi territory are mentioned. It is a grant to some Jaina temple. Mūlabhaṭṭāraka and Jinadevasūri of the Yāpaniya Sangha, Mailāpa Anvaya and Kāreyaṅgana are specified.³ There is another Huli (Dt. Belgaum) inscription of the reign of Vikramāditya (VI). It refers to Bāhubali, Śūbhacandra, Mānideva and Māgahanandi of the Yāpaniya Sangha and Kaṇḍūrgana.⁴ The inscription at Eksambi (Dt. Belgaum) is found in the Nemināthā Basadi constructed by Kālan(n)ā, the general of Vijayāditya (the son of Śilāhāra Gaṅdarāditya). A land for the temple was given to Vijayakirti (Mahāmaṇḍalācārya) of the Yāpaniya Sangha, Punnāgavrksamulagana. His genealogy stands thus: Municandra, Vijayakirti, Kumārakirti and Trāvīḍya Vijayakirti. The Raṭṭa Kārtivrīya paid a respectful visit to this temple in A.D. 1175.⁵ The Arṣikere (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 Maḍuvagana of the Yāpaniya (Sangha) is praised. The pratiṣṭhā of the image was made by Mānikašetti, a disciple of the Pommāgavrksamulagana and [Yāpaniya] Sangha; and the teacher mentioned is Kumārakirti Siddhānta of the Yāpaniya Sangha and Maḍuvagana. In another inscription there, the donor is Somayya of the Yāpaniya Sangha. Unlike in most of the other records, here the laity are being directly linked with the Yāpaniya Sangha. Secondly, the word Yāpaniya, the editor observes, is erased. Thirdly, a word like Kālāmukha-pratibaddha is added later, but it is redundant. Obviously some prejudice is shown against Yāpaniyas, 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 Yāpaniya for removing inconsistency.⁶

---

² I. A., XII, p. 102.
⁴ E. I., XVIII, pp. 201 f.
⁵ A. R, of the Mysore Arch. Dept., 1916, pp. 48 ff.
⁶ Ed. S. Shettar: 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 Kallagavunda) erected an image of Purudeva under the advice of Ubbaya-Siddhanta-akravarti, the pupil of Sakalendu Siddhantika of the Kanduraganaga of the Yapaniya Sangha. At Tengali (Dt. Gulburga) there is an inscription of c. 12th century A.D. on the pedestal of an image. It was consecrated by Bammadeva, the pupil of Nagadeva Siddhantadeva of the Vadiyura (Vandiyura?) gana of the Yapaniya Sangha. The Manoli (Dt. Belgaum) record of the 12th century A.D. speaks of the erection of Samadhi of Municandradeva of the Yapaniya Sangha. He was the Acarya of the Basadi established by Siriyadevi. There is also a reference to the Samadhimaranaga of Palyakirti, the pupil of Municandra of the Yapaniya Sangha.

The Adaragunci (Dt. Dharwar) record of c. 13th century A.D. marks the boundary of the land given to a Basadi (at Ucchangi) of the Yapaniya Sangha and Kanduranga. The mutilated record at Hukeri (Dt. Belgaum), c. 13th century A.D., mentions the name of Traikirti of some Gana (the name is gone) of the Yapaniya Sangha.

In the under-ground cell at Kagwad (Dt. Belgaum) there is a grand statue of Neminatha. There is an inscription on the Nisidi stone which mentions the names of Dharmakirti and Nag Bommaras. The date given corresponds to A.D. 1394. There are gaps in the record. The teachers of Yapaniya Sangha and Punnagavrkasamulaga are Nemicandra (who is called Tuluvarajya-sthapanaacarya), Dharmakirti and Nagacandra.

There are some undated records. The Sirur (Jamkhandi) record states that the image of Parsvanatha-Bhattarakas was presented by Kaliseetti for the Kusumajinlaya of the Yapaniya Sangha and Vrkasamulaga. The Garag (Dt. Dharwar) record specifies the Samadhimarana of Suntiviradeva of the Yapaniya Sangha, Kumudigana. There is another worn out record which also mentions the same Sangha and Gana. The Rayadurg (Dt. Bellary) record refers to the construction of Nisidi. Of the eight names mentioned there, we have Candrabhuti of Mula Sangha and Candrendra, Badayya and Tammantha of the Apaniya Sangha.

---

1 Kannada Research Institute, Dharwar, 1942–48, No. 47.
6 Jinaivijaya (Kannada), Belgaum, July 1931.
8 A. R. I. E., 1925–26, Nos. 441–42, p. 76.
There are some other inscriptions which have lately come to light. i) One at Sedam of 1124 A. D. refers to Prabhācandra Traividyā of of Māduvagana possibly to be associated with the Yāpaniya Sangha. ii) One from Badali (Dt. Belgaum) of 1219 A. D. refers to the Yāpaniya Sangha, Kāreya Gaṇa. The teachers mentioned are Mādha Bhaṭṭāraka, Vinayadeva, . . . kirti Bhaṭṭāraka, Kanakaprabha and Śrīdhara Traividiyadeva. iii) One from Hannakeri (A. D. 1209 and 1257). Here is reference to Yāpaniya Sangha, Mailāpānvyaya and Kāreyagana. The teachers mentioned are Kanakaprabha (who is called jātarūpadhara-vikhyātam, i. e., known for his nudity or nirgranthathā), Śrīdhara, Kanakaprabha-pandita. iv) On the pitha of the first floor of the temple in the Mangalwar Peth, Kolhapur, there is a record in Kannada which states that Vomiyanṇa got prepared the paṭṭā-śālā; he was the brother of Raviyagana, the pupil of Vijayakirti of the Yāpaniya Sangha and Punnāgavrksa-mulaganā. v) Lately Dr. Gururaj Bhatt sent me a copy of an inscription from the Image at Varang (S. K.) which mentions Kanūranga. He is studying it more closely.

This chronological survey of various inscriptions (from the 5th to the 14th century A. D.) referring to the Yāpaniya Sangha clearly brings out certain broad facts about this Sangha. Yāpaniyas, to begin with, were distinguished from Nirgranthas, Śvetapaṭa and Kūrcaka. The Yāpaniya Sangha is associated with gaṇas like Kumuligana (or Kumudigana), (Kotī) Māduvagana, Kaṇḍur- or Kaṇur-gana, Punnagavrksamūla-gana (also linked with Mulasangha), Vandyura-gana, Kāreyagana and Nandi-gaccha and Mailapānvyaya. 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 Punnāgavrksamulaganā or Kaṇḍūrgana is mentioned without specifying the Yāpaniya Sangha. This should explain how gradually the Yāpaniya 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 Nītisāra (7-8) of Indranandi, the Sanghas were there first: Simha-, Nandi-, Sena-, and Deva-Sangha; and later grew Gaṇa, Gaccha etc.

2 R. S. Panchamukhi: Karnataka Inscriptions, I, Dharwar 1941, pp. 75-6.
3 K. G. Kundangar: Inscriptions from N. Karnataka and Kolhapur States, Kolhapur 1939.
4 Jinavijaya (Kannada), Belgaum 1931 (May-June).
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But in later days, as indicated by the Gaṇabheda, Gaṇa division absorbed and superseded the Sanghas. This Gaṇa-pāksapāta is explained in the Śrutāvatāra (verse 90) which also indicates how different name-endings like -nandi, -vira, -deva etc. came into vogue.¹

From the places where the records are found,² it is clear that the Teachers of the Yāpaniya Sangha had their sway mostly in the area of the present-day districts of Dharwar, Belgaum, Kolhapur and Gulburga. The number of records found in Andhra and Tamil Nadu is very small. That no records of the Yāpaniya Sangha are noticed at Śravāna Belgod indicates that this seat possibly developed exclusive of the Yāpaniya Teachers. In Karnataka, it is mainly in the northern part of it that many of the Yāpaniya 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, kaṇṭī or kṣāntikā) in the Jain 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 Strīmuktī 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 Yāpaniyas as Jainābhāsa; and Śrutatasāgara has many remarks to make against them, even going to the extent of saying that the statues installed by them, though they are nagma, should not be worshipped.³ In spite of all this, the Yāpaniya 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 Yāpaniya Sangha. That shows how the Yāpaniyas became almost one with the Digambaras: at least one instance is there that a Yāpaniya 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. 164 ff.
³ His Sanskrit comm. on the Saiprabhdādīsamgraha, Bombay 1920, p. 79.
The Yāpaniyanas 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 Yāpaniya-tantra in this manner:

strīgraḥaṇam tāsāṁ api tadbhava eva saṁsārakṣaye bhavati iti jñāpanārtabhām vacah, yathoktaṁ Yāpaniyatantre: no khalu itthī ajīva, na yāvi abhavvā, na yāvi daṁsaṇa-virohini, no amāṇusā, no anāriṇa-pattī, no asamkhejjāuyā, no aikūramai, no na uvasītāmohā, no na suddhācārā, no avasīta-bondhi, no vavasīya-vajjiyā, no apiśvakaśāra-virohini, no nāvagunaṭhaṇauharīyā, no ajogaladdhīe, no akalāṇabhāyaṇam ti, kahāṁ na uttamadhamma-sāhiga iti.

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

Śakataśaya, also known as Pālyakīrti, is described by Malayagiri as Yāpaniya; and the references from his Sanskrit grammar to Niryuktī, Bhāṣya etc. clearly indicate that some of the texts of the Ardhamāgadhi canon were acceptable to him. He refers to a number of authors; and at least some of them might have belonged to the Yāpaniya Sangha. The Apabhramśa poet Svayambhū belonged to Āpulīya or Yāpaniya Sangha, as indicated by some gloss. Some scholars hold the view that Vimala also belonged to the Yāpaniya Sangha, but this point needs further investigation, by a close study of the Paśmacariya.

Śakataśaya, the grammarian, mentions himself in his colophon thus:

iti śri-trutāaevali-deśiyācāryasya śakataśayanasya kṛtau śabdā-nuśāsane etc.

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

Tatvārthasūtrakarītāram Umāsvāti-muniśvaram
Śrutakevalideśiyam vande' ham guṇaṃandidram

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 Śakataśaya-Vyākaraṇa (and the Svopajña Amoghaśrito) with a learned Introduction by Dr. R. Birw, Bhāratiya Jānasāstra publication, Delhi 1971. See the Intro. and also the General Editorial.
5 Śakataśaya-Vyākaranam, 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 Yāpaniya Sangha. He has further suggested that Śivārya and Aparājitasūri might have belonged to the Yāpaniya 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. Likewise Siddhasena Divākara, in all probability, was a Yāpaniya; and that is why Haribhadra calls him Śrūtakēvali. Siddhasena has his differences with the known doctrines of the Digambaras and Śvetāmbaras. With the lapse of time, the temples once presided over by Yāpaniya 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 Yāpaniya teachers are mostly current in the South. A closer study of the Paumacariya of Vimala, Padmacarītā of Raviṣena, Varāṅgacarītā of Jatila (who is heavily indebted to Siddhasena and Umāsvāti), Paumacariu of Svayambhū etc. is needed.

I may note here a striking point. According to the Gaṇabheda, modern Kopāl (Koppala) was a seat of the Yāpaniyas; and it is on the Pallakki Gaṇḍū there that we have got the foot-prints of Jatācārya or Jatila. The Kannada poet Janna, who flourished at the beginning of the 13th century A.D., assigns Jatāsindhunandī to Kāṇūrgana (see Anantanātha-purāṇa I. 17) which is so closely associated with the Yāpaniyas. When I edited the first chapter of the Varāṅgacarītā, a controversy was raised whether the author was Digambara or Śvetāmbara.

It is clear from the above details that plenty of references are found to the Yāpaniyas 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 Brhat-Kathākośa (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 aura Itihāsa, pp. 56 ff., 521 f. of the 2nd ed.
3 See my Introduction to the Siddhasena Divākara’s Nyāyasatārā and other works, Jaina Sāhitya Vikāsa Maṇḍala, Bombay 1971.
4 My Intro. to the Varāṅgacarītā, Bombay 1938.
Hariseṇa (931–32 A.D.),¹ the Vaddarādhane² in Kannada mentions Jāpuli Sangha. The contexts are a bit confused, but both the texts refer to Ardha-phālaka, Kāmbalika, Śvetabhikṣu and Yāpaniya. Janna (1209 A.D.) in his Kannada Anantanaṭhapaṇurāṇa mentions Rāmacandradeva of the Kāṇūrgaṇa (I. 25); and he qualifies Municandra Traividyā by the expression Jāvalīgeya which is not being correctly explained. Possibly the same Municandra with a similar adjective is mentioned in the Kannada Pārśvanāṭhapurāṇa (I. 33) of Pārśvapandita³ (A.D. 1222). In my opinion Jāvalīgeya stands for his Sangha, Yāpaniya. What is more interesting is that Janna assigns Jata-Simhanandi and Indranandi to the Kāṇūrgaṇa which is associated closely with the Yāpaniya 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 inscriptive and literary evidence that the Yāpaniyas 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 Yāpaniyas, 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 Yāpaniya sect, still object to the old images of the Yāpaniya sect being installed and worshipped. Titles like Saiddhāntika, Traividyā used by some Yāpaniya Ācāryas indicate their studies of Śaṅkhāṇḍāgama etc.: this point needs further investigation.

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

Digambarāḥ punar nāgnyā-liṅgā-pañi-pātrāḥ ca te caturdāhā
Kāśṭhāsamgha-Mūlasamgha-Māthurasamgha-Gopyasamgha-bhedāt ।
Kāśṭhāsamgha camurtībālaiś ca pīcchikā, Mūlasamgha mayūrapīcchāiḥ
pīcchikā, Māthurasamgha mālato'pi pīcchikā nādṛtā, Gopyā māyāra-
pīcchikā । ādyas trayo'pi samgā hanyāmānā dharma-vṛddhiṁ

¹ Singhi Jain Series, 17, Bombay 1943.
³ Ed. H. Shrshayyangar, Madras, 1969; Prof. G. Venkatesubbiah, Editor, Kannada Nighanta, Bangalore, drew my attention to this. Shri Hampa Nagaraj tells me that he is not aware of Jāvalīgeya elsewhere in Kannada works.
bhovanī, strīnām muktiṁ kāraṇāṁ bhuktiṁ sadvratasyāpi saći-
varasya muktiṁ ca na manvantera Gopyaṁ tu vandyamānāṁ dharmaṁ
bhovanī, strīnām muktiṁ kāraṇāṁ bhuktiṁ ca manyante gopyaṁ
yāpanipyā ity ucyante.

Thus Gopya was another name of Yāpaniya. He puts it under
Digambara, though Strimukti and Kevalibhukti are accepted by them.
That they accepted these views is borne out by the facts that Śakta-
yana, besides his Sanskrit grammar already referred to above, has
written two Prakaraṇas, Strimukti- and Kevalibhukti-prakaraṇa
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
Yāpaniyas as Jainabhāsa, and gives some details about Gopučchika
Śvetāśā, Drāvida and Yāpaniya. About the last two he says:²

Drāvidāṁ sāvadyāṁ prāsukaṁ ca na manyante, udhaḥjanam
nirākūrvanti Yāpaniyāṁ tu vesara ivohayam manyante, ratna-
trayāṁ pājanyanti, kalpaṁ ca nācayanti, strīnām tadbhave mokṣam,
kevali-jinānāṁ kavalahāram, parasasane sagrañthānāṁ mokṣam ca
kuthayanti.

¹ See the Appendix to the Introduction by Dr. Birke to the Śakṭayana-Vyākaraṇa,
noted above. Muni Śri Jambunāṭayaji is bringing out a new ed. along with the
svapajña commentary.
² Śatprabhātādīsaṅgraha, noted above p. 11.