

## EDITORIAL

The Śaṅkhaṇḍāgama-sūtras of Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali and the Dhavala Commentary thereon by Virasena occupy a unique position in Jain literature. Their palm-leaf Mss. were preserved only in the Jain Bhaṇḍāras (or Mss.-Collections) at Moodabidri in South Kanara. They were not studied there for centuries together but remained only as objects of reverence and worship. How the transcripts of these great works, looked upon as Paramāgama, came out is a thrilling episode; it has been narrated in the Introduction to the Vol. I of the first edition; and it is reproduced in this revised edition as well.

The late lamented Sheth Shitabrai Laxmichandji of Bhelsa (Vidisha) gave a donation for the publication of these great scriptures; and consequently, when we took up the study and critical editing of them, the society showed a variety of reactions. The sensible scholars of the new generation heartily welcomed it; and even some Paṇḍitas and Śāstris of the older generation, such as the late Pt. Devakinandanaji, Pt. Hiralalaji Shastri, Pt. Phoolachandaji Shastri and Pt. Balachandaji Shastri offered active co-operation. But a section of scholars expressed severe opposition. Their contention was that to print the scriptures like the Śaṅkhaṇḍāgama was a sacrilege, a disrespect of the scriptural knowledge. It was also argued that the house-holder (Gṛhastha or Śrāvaka) is not entitled even to read the Siddhānta texts; only the monks (who have relinquished the worldly ties) can read them. Some Paṇḍitas even doubted the ability of English-educated Babus (a term used as against Paṇḍitas, in those days), like us to understand and critically edit difficult Siddhānta texts. Despite all this opposition, we, along with our colleagues, firmly pursued our project; and when, within a year, the first Volume, namely, the Satprarūpaṇa, was published, it was a surprise to all. The function of the publication of the first Volume was celebrated with great eclat by the Jain community of Amraoti under the leadership of the late Singhai Pannalalaji. Thereafter, the Paṇḍitas began to take more interest in these texts; and then followed almost waves of competition to publish them. The late Pandit Bansidhar Shastri, Sholapur, started its publication in his own printing Press; but he could not progress beyond two or three fascicules. A little later, the Jain Śāstrārtha Saṅgha, Mathura, undertook the publication of the Kaṣāyaprabhṛta (Jayadhavala-Siddhānta);

and the publication of the Mahābandha (Mahādhavala-Siddhānta) was started by the Bhāratiya Jñānapīṭha. Afterwards Pt. Br. Sumatibai Shaha, Sholapur, brought out an edition containing only the Sūtras and Hindi Translation; and Pt. Hiralalji Shastri edited the Kaṣaya-prabhṛta along with Cūrnīsūtras and Hindi paraphrase. In this way, the famous Siddhānta texts, Dhavala, Jayadhavala and Mahādhavala, which had remained only objects of worship for centuries together, became easily available for study to the entire world of inquisitive scholars. Thus was ushered in what may be called a renaissance in the history of (the study of) Jaina Literature.

On behalf of the Jaina Sahityoddhāraka Fund, established by the late Sheth Laxmichandji, the critical editing-cum-publication of the Ṣaṅkhaṇḍāgama with its Tīkā, Hindi translation, etc., was completed in Sixteen Volumes during the period of twenty years, from 1939 to 1959. Even before the last Volume was published, the copies of some of the earlier Volumes were exhausted; and there was a demand from the readers for their republication. But the Board of Editors was determined not to expend their energy and time on reprinting the earlier Volumes unless all the Volumes were out once. There was also the idea that, when the second edition is taken up, every effort should be made to check the printed text in the light of the readings of the palm-leaf Mss. preserved at Moodabidri. The text adopted in the first edition was based on the Nāgarī copies of the Kannaḍa transcript (of the palm-leaf Mss.) which was secretly smuggled out. Right from the start, we were aware of our limitations; and repeatedly we were urging the Bhaṭṭāraka Mahārāja of Moodabidri to help us in correctly presenting the text; but, to begin with, there was no response. Still, after the publication of the third Volume, there was a significant change in his attitude. He indicated to us that, if we so wished, facilities would be made available for verifying the text in comparison with the palm-leaf Mss. We looked upon this as a great blessing (puṇyopalabधि) and a boon. The palm-leaf Mss. are written in Old-Kannaḍa script which could be read by few scholars (now-a-days). Luckily we got the co-operation of the late Pandit Lokanath Shastri in this direction; and the variant readings received from him were included in an Appendix of the Third Volume. The readings supplied by him were used while fixing the text itself in subsequent Volumes.

Even before the entire work was published, there shot up another controversy. In the first Volume, in order to interpret Sūtra No. 93 in a consistent manner, it was felt necessary that the word 'saṃjada' be added on to the available 'saṃjadāsaṃjada'; but the consequent doctrinal implications disturbed the minds of some Paṇḍitas; and they started saying that such an addition was unjustified. There were sessions of oral discussions, followed by a chain of writings covering replies and counter-replies; some of them were published in the form of independent books too. In order to have a conclusive satisfaction, we got carefully scrutinised the readings on the palm-leaves; and it was found that the two different Mss. had the word 'saṃjada' proposed to be added by us. Thus the two points were clear: first, our critical editing was based on (principles of) sound judgment and sensible understanding; and secondly, still there remains the urgency of consulting the palm-leaf Mss. directly, because the

varlant readings received from Moodabidri' and included at the end of the third Volume did not present the additlonal 'saṃjada'.

In the meanwhile, there was a programme of inscribing these works on copper-plates; and, in that connection, there too arose a controversy whether the term 'saṃjada' be added or not, even though the presence of that-term in the palm-leaf Mss. was already confirmed. Further, efforts were made to take photographs of all the palm-leaves of these works. This was also successfully done; and all these photographs are now preserved in the Śastra-Bhaṇḍāra at Phaltan (Maharashtra).

When the publication of the Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama was completed in Sixteen Volumes in 1959, the Editors felt anxious about the arrangements of finally editing the text critically, especially of those Volumes which were no more available, after collating it with the photographs. After much thought and deliberation, it was decided that the responsibility of bringing out the second edition be entrusted to the Jaina Sanskrit Saṃrakshaka Sangha, Sholapur. This proposal of ours was heartily accepted by Sheth Laxmichandji and other members of the Managing Committee before whom it was put. The details of the agreement reached between the Institutions of Bhelsa (Vidisha) and Sholapur are given in the Prakāśakiyā Vaktavya or the Publishers' Note.

### *Pañca-ṇamokāra-mantra*

Lately, the Paṇṇavaṇa-sutta is nicely edited and published (Jaina Āgama Granthamālā-9, Parts 1-2, Śri Mahāvira Jaina Vidyālaya, Bombay-26, 1969-1972). It is an important text belonging to the Upāṅga category of the Ardhamāgadhī canon; and it bears a good bit of resemblance with the Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama-sūtra in contents and style. The detailed Introductions in English and Gujarati by the Editors: Muni Śhri Punyavijaya, Pandit Dalsukh Malvanīa and Pandit Amṛtīlal M. Bhojaka are quite important. Two topics, which are relevant in the present context, deserve to be noticed here. On page 235 of the Introduction in English, there is a discussion about the Maṅgalācaraṇa of the Prajñāpāra and about the Pañcanamaskāra-mantra; and it purports, in short, to say that, in the earliest Jaina works, the entire Mantra is not mentioned. In later literature it is employed in its entirety; still, nowhere, there is any specific mention of its author. The Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama-sūtras open with this Pañcanamaskāra-mantra; and it is indicated by Virasena in his Dhavaḷā Commentary that its first author is Puṣpadanta himself. In the Introduction of the Second Volume and elsewhere, it has been already stated, on the authority of the Commentary on the First Sūtra, that Virasena held the view, without any doubt, that this (Pañcanamokāra) Mantra was an inseparable part of the Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama-sūtra and its author is Puṣpadanta himself. According to the Commentator (i.e., Virasena), the Maṅgala 'is of two types, one *nibaddha* and the other *anibaddha*; and their definitions are thus explained. When the author of the Sūtras composes the Maṅgalācaraṇa himself, that is called 'nibaddha-maṅgala'; and

when he adopts the Maṅgala-pāṭha composed by others, it is named as 'anibaddha-maṅgala'. In view of this distinction, the Commentator describes the Pañcanamaskāra-mantra used here as 'nibaddha-maṅgala', and the longish Maṅgala-pāṭha, 'namo Jīṇāṇam', etc., given at the beginning of the Fourth Khaṇḍa, Vedanā, as 'anibaddha-maṅgala', because this latter was not composed by the Sūtrakara himself but was composed by Gautama Gaṇadhara and has been reproduced here. So there is no scope for doubt so far as the opinion of the author of Dhavala is concerned.

In this connection, it would be proper to explain another point as well. In the Namokāra-mantra, the first expression 'namo Arihaṃtāṇam' has, in some places, also an alternative reading 'Arahaṃtāṇam'. In view of the nature of the Prākṛit language, there is nothing surprising in this. But, as in the Śaṅkhaṇḍāgama, this very reading Arihaṃtāṇam is found at the beginning of the Prajñāpanā-sūtra; and the commentators, Haribhadra and Malayagiri, have accepted the same. Vīrasena, the author of the Dhavala and Jinabhadra, the author of the Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya, have adopted this very reading and explained its etymology in various ways; and finally, they have noted its Sanskrit counterpart Arhat of which too the definition is given. According to the author of Dhavala :

अरिहननाद् अरिहन्ता, रजोहननाद् वा अरिहन्ता रहस्याभावाद् वा अरिहन्ता । अतिशय-पूजाहंसाद् वा अहन्तः ।

Thus the author of Dhavala does not have before him any reading 'arahaṃta' even as an option (Śaṅkha, Vol. I, p. 42 ff.). So it stands proved that the long-standing scriptural tradition is in favour of the reading Arihaṃtāṇam. In the expression Namō Āriyāṇam of this very Maṅgala, *rya* is substituted by *riya*; and likewise we get the changes: ārya > āriya; varṣa > varisa.

### *Śaṅkhaṇḍāgama and Prajñāpanā-sūtra*

In one of the sections of the Introduction (pp. 223 f.) of the Paṇḍavāṇa-sutta, there is a discussion comparing the Prajñāpanā with the Śaṅkhaṇḍāgama. It is pointed out that both these works have got significant similarities: i) The subject matter of both of them is a doctrinal discussion about Jīva and Karman. ii) The basic source for both of them is the Śrūtāṅga Dṛṣṭivāda. iii) They are compiled in the form of Sūtras. iv) Here and there, in both the works, the Sūtras assume the form of Gāthās. v) Some Gāthās are common to both; and they are found also in the Niryuktis and Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya, etc. vi) Both the works are of the nature of compilation and have common words and expressions. vii) The topic Alpabahutva is almost identical and it is called Mahādaṇḍaka. viii) In the discussion on Gatyāgati, there occur, in both, the discussions on the acquisition of the position of Tīrthakara, Cakravartin, Baladeva and Vāsudeva. ix) The topics or Padas (23-27 and 35) Karma, Karma-bandhaka, Karma-vedaka, Veda-bandhaka, Veda-vedaka and Vedanā of the Prajñāpana remind us of the Six Khaṇḍas of the Śaṅkhaṇḍāgama, namely, Jīva-sthāna, Ksudraka-bandha, Bandha-svāmītvā, Vedanā, Vargaṇā and

Mahābandha. These common points between the two works are undisputable; and they indicate a common tradition in view of their meaning and exposition.

Despite these common points, both the works possess many a speciality of their own. i) The Prajñāpanā contains 36 sections called Padas; and according to the subject matter, their sub-sections like Prajñāpanā, Prarūpaṇā, etc. But in the Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama, the same six Khaṇḍas are there; and under them, the fourteen Jīva-samāsas (Guṇasthānas) and fourteen Mārḡaṇā-sthānas are discussed at length, in their order; all this is completely absent in the Prajñāpanāsūtra. ii) The Prajñāpanā has single authorship, while it is accepted that Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali are the authors of the Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama; and it might be inferred that many of its appendices (cūlikās) were added later on, as in the case of some canonical texts like the Daéavaikalika. iii) The discussion of the subject matter in the Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama is more detailed and profound, systematic and well-planned as against that in the Prajñāpanā. iv) The question-and-answer style is employed more in the Prajñāpanā than in the, Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama. v) The Prajñāpanāsūtra is written in the style of original Sūtra, while the Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama presents a commentarial style employing the Anuyogadvāras. Here the Nikṣepas like Nāma, Sthāpanā, etc., as in the Niryuktis; Anuyogadvāras like Sat, Saṃkhyā, etc., as in the Tattvārtha-sūtra; and such terms like Prarūpaṇā, Nirdeśa, Vibhāṣā, etc., are used: all these are the characteristics of the Bhāṣya style employed here. Further are employed Gati-anuvāda, Indriya-anuvāda, etc., too. vi) The exposition of Alpa-bahutva, under the title Mahādaṇḍaka, in the Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama (VII. 79), is more systematic under 78 Padas with such predicates as 'vattaissāmo', 'kādavvo'; while in the Prajñāpanā such predicates are not used and the exposition is loose presenting 98 Padas, some of which are primary and some secondary divisions. vii) In the Prajñāpanāsūtra, under Sthānapada, the description as to where, in the universe, living beings of various types dwell is loosely discussed at length, but the same in the Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama (VII. pp. 299, etc.) is present in the order of Mārḡaṇā-sthānas, comparatively in short and in a systematic style. viii) In the Prajñāpanā the Alpa-bahutva is described through 26 Dvāras, and therein the topics of Jīva and Ajīva are intermingled in a haphazard manner. In the Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama, however, the same are systematically presented under fourteen Mārḡaṇās. The names of Mārḡaṇās like Gati, Indriya, etc., are found here and there in the twenty-six Dvāras of the Prajñāpanāsūtra, but a clear-cut specification of 14 Mārḡaṇās is absent. The same holds good about the use of Sthiti, Sparśa, Kāla, etc. ix) The Prajñāpanāsūtra has the same three Gāthās (99-101, p. 25), which are found also in the Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama (XVI, Sūtras 122-24). In the Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama these are introduced with the words 'lakkhaṇaṃ bhaṇidaṃ', which indicate that they are quotations. Some of their readings are correct in the Prajñāpanā, but incorrect in the Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama. •

Taking into account the above points of agreement and difference, the authors of the Introduction of the Prajñāpanāsūtra have expressed their opinion that on the one hand both the works agree in their inheritance of traditional doctrines and also, to a certain extent, in their method of treatment; but, on the other hand, in view of

the classification of topics, the style, system and method of exposition and the use of technical terms, the Prajñāpanā is prior to and a work earlier than Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama. To strengthen this view, they have considered the age of the composition of these works. As to the date of composition of the Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama, they have accepted the same as fixed in the Introduction of Volume One, namely 683 after the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvīra or sometime in the second century of the Vikrama era. But, in fixing the date of Prajñāpanā, they have not found any undisputed historical facts and evidence; so they had to depend on certain indications of doubtful validity noted below.

1) In the Prajñāpanā-sūtra, after the benedictory verses, there are two interpolated Gāthas which, after offering salutation to Ajjasama (Ārya-Śyāma), mention that he was the 23rd in the Vācaka lineage and he presented this śruta-ratna from the ocean of scriptural knowledge. From this, it is inferred that Ārya Śyāma is the author of the Prajñāpanāsūtra.

2) According to the Paṭṭāvalis, there flourished three Kālakācāryas, and it is the first Kālaka that was Śyāmācārya.

3) The death of the first Kālaka according to the Dharmasāgarīya Paṭṭāvali, but the birth of him according to the Kharatara-gacchīya Paṭṭāvali, falls in 376 years after the death of Mahāvīra.

Based on these three points, it is concluded that the Prajñāpanāsūtra was composed by Śyāmācārya in the fourth century of the Vīranirvāṇa era, i.e., about one hundred years before the Vikrama era, and accordingly some three hundred years earlier than Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama.

The above arguments may be scrutinised here :

1) Not even the name of the Paṇṇavaṇā-sutta occurs in those two interpolated Gāthas. The gift of the śruta-ratna made by Śyāmācārya can imply some other Grantha-ratna. If Haribhadra comments on them, calling them interpolately, it proves only this much that during his time, in the 8th century A.D., Śyāmācārya was already well-known. What evidence have we to ascertain by whom and at what time these were interpolated? The Gāthās specify that Śyāmācārya was the twentythird in the Vācaka lineage. Where is the discussion as to when this lineage started and what would be the period for the 23rd person in that line? The earlier genuine Gāthā clearly says the Paṇṇavaṇā was preached by the revered Jina for the spiritual (nivṛtti) benefit of pious saints; while the interpolatory Gāthās speak of the highly gifted (durdhara, dhīra, etc.) monk Śyāmācārya donating some unspecified śrutaratna to his pupils. Can the authorship specified in the original and interpolatory passages be said to be the same?

2) The tradition of the Paṭṭāvalis is not ancient; the age of their composition and their authority are not beyond doubt; and they are mutually inconsistent as well.

They do not clearly establish with whom of the three Kālakācāryas Śyāmācārya should be identified. Based on these, Dr. U. P. Shaha expressed his inconclusive opinion (p. 232) that Śyāmācārya mentioned eleventh in the line and Kālakācārya, destroyer of King Gardabhilla, became identical, if the first two Kālakas were regarded as one identical person. Thus to identify Śyāmācārya with Kālaka and then to fix his date are attended with many hurdles.

3) When were Dharmasāgarīya and Kharatara-gaccha Paṭṭavalis composed, what are their sources, what is the reason for their mutual contradictions? Unless these questions are satisfactorily explained, how can the dates given by them be authoritative and how can Kālaka be taken as identical with Śyāmācārya.

As far as the evidence is presented, it is not clear where Kālakācārya is called the author of the Prajñāpanāsūtra? To propose an identity of Śyāma Ārya with Kālaka Ācārya is catching, because 'śyāma' and 'kāla' mean black; but such a procedure is methodologically defective. To reach such a conclusion, we need independent sources to specify Śyāmārya as well as Kālakācārya as the authors of the Prajñāpanā: then alone identity can be proposed; and then the question of the date can be tackled.

Really speaking, it would be a great asset for the history of Jaina literature, if the composition of any Jaina work could be assigned to the second or first century before the Vikrama era. There is hardly any work in the available Jaina Prākṛit literature which holds any prospects in this direction, because the linguistic tendencies there do not belong to the first stage of the Middle-Indo-Aryan, but they belong to the second stage which did not come into vogue prior to the second century of the Vikrama era. For instance, we have in the Paṇṇavaṇa: loc. (loke), bhayavaya (bhagavata), suya (śruta), diṭṭhivāya (dṛṣṭivāda) ṭhii (sthiti), veyañ (vedanā); here intervocalic consonants are being lost replaced by ya-sruti. This tendency is not noticed in the Prākṛit languages prior to the second century A.D. The earlier phase of Prākṛits is found in the Pāli Tripiṭaka, in the inscriptions of Aśoka, Khāvela and those of the Śunga and Āndhra dynasties and in the plays of Aśvaghōṣa, where we do not notice the tendency of dropping the medial consonants. This tendency began after the second century, and this indeed became the distinguishing feature of Māhārāṣṭrī (Prākṛit). As it is found in plenty in Jaina prākṛit literature Pischel and other scholars named the dialect of Jaina Prākṛit works as Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī and Jaina Saurasenī. In the light of this linguistic study, the composition of the Paṇṇavaṇa-sutta can in no way be assigned to the period earlier than the second century.

The claim that the Paṇṇavaṇa is older than the Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama is not indisputable. The points of agreement between these two works conclusively prove that both of them have a common heritage. This is true not only of these two works but also of all the canonical (including procanonical) works of the Digambara and Śvetāmbara traditions and schools. Their soul is the same, but their body and

physical structure are different. In this connection, the observation of Virasenācārya, the author of the Dhavala, deserves our attention (Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama, Vol. I, p. 60). There are two kinds of authors, Artha-kartā and Grantha-kartā. So far as the Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama is concerned, the Artha-kartā is the revered Mahāvīra, but the Grantha-kartā stands for Gautama and other saints down in succession to Puṣpa-danta and Bhūtabali. The composition of the Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama is based on the very preachings of Mahāvīra on which that of the Prajñāpanā-sūtra is based. But it was natural that there arose differences in style and classifications, etc., according to the traditions of (different) schools. In texts of fixed traditions; chronological priority or posteriority can be inferred from the development in style, etc.; but in independent traditional inheritance such an inference proves invalid; and, on this point, the editors of the Prajñāpanā-sūtra have themselves laid sufficient stress. They say (Introduction, p. 230):

“The style of treatment i.e., its simplicity or otherwise, cannot be a determining factor in fixing up the chronological order of these works. This is so because the nature of the style was dependent on the objective of the author and on the nature of the subject-matter, simple or subtle. Hence we would be making a great blunder in fixing up the chronological order of Prajñāpanā and Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama if we were guided only by the fact that the treatment of the subject-matter in the Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama is more detailed and subtle than that found in Prajñāpanā-sūtra.”

It would not be out of place to clarify another point also. The Śvetāmbara scholiasts primarily confined themselves to the Ardhamāgadhī canon and pursued the resurrection, compilation and expansion in their composition. But the Digambara saints, accepting that the original Āgamas were lost, started composing works in a new style with some independence; in this pursuit learned Ācāryas used their intellectual gifts without any restraint (or inhibition). As a result of this, the authors of the Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama acquired the knowledge of the traditional lore (Siddhānta) from Dhārasenācārya; and, on the strength of their intellectual gifts, developed the five-fold Maṅgala from two-fold one, namely, ‘Namo Arahaṃtānaṃ’ and ‘Namo sava sidhānaṃ’ found on the Kharavela inscription. Such efforts must have been made in different regions, in different circles of learned monks and at different ages. When one scrutinises the Cattāridaṅgaka, it has a four-fold Maṅgala. The third item mentioning Sāhu could easily get expanded, along with the organisation of ascetic community, to include Ācārya, Upadhyāya and Sarva-sādhu. One of the early Tamila Kāvya, Jivakacintāmaṇi, adopts the Cattāri-maṅgalaṃ in the benedictory verses instead of five-fold Maṅgala. Likewise possibly, if it is these authors that systematised, for the first time, Jiva-samaśa (Guṇasthāna) Mārgaṇasthāna and the various Anuyoga-dvāras and, on their basis, gave a systematic exposition of the entire Siddhānta. May be, to begin with, their systematisation was naturally met with some opposition or neglect, but gradually this very systematisation, on account of its being more methodical, pervaded the entire gamut of Jaina Siddhānta, and proved acceptable to all. The authors of the Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama have not omitted any item from the Siddhānta inherited by them; and they have

given due place to useful traditional Gāthās in their works. By such introductory words as 'bhaṇidam', etc., they have indicated that these Gāthas are not composed by them but are traditionally inherited: this gives us an idea about their scholarly honesty and scholastic integrity. If any other author just ignores indicating the fact of inheriting such verses and included them along with other verses, this cannot be taken as a proof of his chronological priority. The name of Ārya Syāma occurs in interpolatory verses. He is not the author (in the strict sense of the term) of the Prajñāpanā but only a compiler, putting together traditional material. Thus when the authors of both the Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama and Prajñāpanā are recording and arranging only traditional material, the term 'bhaṇidam' has no chronological value.

The Prajñāpanā has got some traditional Gāthās common with the Uttarādhyayana and Nijjutti, and these are called Saṃgrahaṇī Gāthās (See Prajñāpanā and Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama by D. Malavania, JOR, Vol. 19, pp. 35 ff. Baroda 1969). These cannot be used as evidence for relative chronology. If it is accepted that the Prajñāpanā is posterior to the Uttarādhyayana, the age of the Prajñāpanā remains still more uncertain. The Uttarādhyayana, as it stands today, cannot be, en bloc, assigned to the 3rd-4th century B. C. Some of its dogmatical chapters, which are clustered together at the end of the work, especially the 28th chapter etc. can be legitimately looked upon as pretty late, and, in the opinion of some, nearer the age of the Tattvārthasūtra. In this context another fact also has to be taken into account: the inheritance of scriptural knowledge was primarily oral; and one should not handle this material as if it is recorded in Mss. and copied by different authors. If any Gāthā is more correct in one text than in the other, it might be the result of the carefulness or otherwise of the copyists; it would be improper to impute the mistakes to original authors who were learned Ācāryas. If the readings are more correct in the Prajñāpanā but incorrect in the Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama, one should rather infer from this that the former could not have been the direct source of the latter.

The gist of the above discussion is that, as yet, we have not got any evidence to say that the Prajñāpana-sūtra was composed earlier than the Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama. The age of Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama is 683 years after the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvīra, i. e., about 200 years of the Vikrama Era; and it is accepted by all. It also stands proved that the inscription, etc., discovered in the Baba Pyara Caves near Girnar or Junagad belong to this period; and possibly it is the same Candraguphā in which Dharasenācārya used to dwell, and he might be the same Dharasena whose demise, according to Sallekhanā, is indicated in the record there.

On the other hand, nothing definite can be said about the author of the Prajñāpana-sūtra. The Ācāryas of the Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama tradition do not seem to be aware even of his name: for, if they were, how Virasena, the author of the Dhavala, who has mentioned Twelve Aṅgas and fourteen Aṅga-bāhya texts like the Daśavaikālikā, Uttarādhyayana, Kalpa, Vyavahara, Niśitha; etc. (Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama Vol. I, p. 96), could fail to take note of such an important text like the Paṇḍavāna.

In view of its linguistic features the Paṇṇavaṇā cannot be dated earlier than the 2nd or 3rd century of the Vikrama era. Incidentally it may also be noted that the Śaṅkhaṇḍāgama inclines more towards softening the intervocalic surds (like k and t) than dropping them; according to experts, softening is linguistically an earlier stage than eliding them. This much can be definitely said that the Paṇṇavanā is earlier than its first Commentator Haribhadra (9th century of the Vikram era). And if, on account of its mention in the Nandisūtra, it is to be earlier than the Valabhi redaction, then it may be assigned to a period earlier than Vira Nirvāṇa Saṃvat 993 (Vikrama Saṃvat 523). Another question has to be answered. Why is it that the Prajñāpanā, considered to be so important in view of its contents and assigned to such an early date by the editors, is put under the category of Upāṅga, a division which is quite late and of artificial connection with Aṅgas. The Upāṅga division came into existence perhaps after the Valabhi redaction; and the works under it contained extraneous and residuary traditional matter not included under Aṅgas. This, to a great extent, explains the relatively discursive contents, collected and compiled by Ārya Śyāma : i.e., all the material is not thought out by himself (see p. 229, Introduction). In fine, the Prajñāpanā, though it contains a good deal of old material not properly preserved, its present form cannot be dated earlier than the Valabhi Council when it was put under the category of Upāṅga and interpolatory verses became a source for the name of its so-called author.

Pandit Phoolchanda Siddhanta Shastri has given details about editing the present Volume in his 'Āvasyaka Nivedana.' We are very thankful to him for the pains taken by him in this work. From the table of corrected readings given by him it is clear that he has carefully done the work; and it can be said that the palmleaf Mss. are no more indispensable. It is a matter for satisfaction, taking into account the material on which the first edition was based, that there are not as many wrong readings as they were feared to have been. It is not a surprise if some significant various readings are detected; but what is remarkable is that the set-up of the interpretation of the earlier edition stands vindicated to be quite systematic. We have every hope that other Volumes are also soon published in this way with their readings duly scrutinised. Our hope has a solid basis that Shri Walchand Deochandaji, the Secretary of the Samskriti Sangha and his other colleagues are taking a keen interest in the matter and are giving maximum co-operation.

The late Shri N. Chadraraj had prepared the collations from the photos of palm leaf-Mss. in reading which he was specially trained. In this work he was helped by Prof. J. D. Bhomaj who took down the readings as he read them from one of the Mss. Both Prof. J. D. Bhomaj and Shri Narendra Bhisikar have given valuable co-operation in seeing the work through the Press and in correcting the proofs: our thanks are due to all of them.

24-11-1972

Balaghat, M.P.

Mysore

Editors:

HIRA LAL JAIN

ADINATH NEMINATH UPADHYE