Historical Sources on the Loṅkāgaccha- and Sthānakavāsī-Traditions in Johannes Klatt’s Jaina-Onomasticon
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In the absence of extensive archaeological evidence, monastic chronologies and hagiographies, inscriptions and the information in the colophons of handwritten or printed Jaina texts are almost the only sources available for the reconstruction of Jaina religious and social history. This fact was highlighted by Walther Schubring who, in his classical work on the Śvetāmbara doctrines of the Jainas, emphasised that ‘[a]ll history of literature, a building, as it were, has for its ground-floor the bio-bibliographical materials.’ Schubring lamented the early demise of Johannes Emil Klatt (1852-1908) who had dedicated his short life to the study of the historical records of the Jainas. Klatt left behind the nearly completed manuscript of his monumental *Jaina-Onomasticon*, a collection of proper names (Greek: *onoma*) of Jaina authors, legendary figures, texts and place names with explanatory historical notes, handwritten in English, which is still unpublished. ‘Jain research would have enjoyed the great luck of having them [the Jaina bio-biographical materials] at its disposal, if KLATT’s Onomasticon had been completed and printed’, Schubring wrote. ‘Eight volumes from his own hand in alphabetical order contain what was within his reach to collect data concerning Jain authors and works. But he fell severely ill and never recovered. The work was estimated to fill some 1,100 pages in print, but no more than 55 pages have been printed as a specimen thanks to WEBER and LEUMANN.’

Few biographical details are known about Johannes Klatt. The only sources are brief notes in academic publications of his teacher and colleagues and in the autobiography of his son Fritz Klatt. He was born on 31.1.1852 in Filehne, Posen, and died after a long illness in Bonn on 28.8.1908. He studied Indology under Albrecht Weber (1825-1901)

---

1 The introductory part of this article was first published in *Jaina Studies – Newsletter of the Centre of Jaina Studies* no. 6 (2011: 58-61).
3 Ibid.
4 F. Klatt (1965: 189; cf. 1977: 710). I am indebted to Klaus Karttunen, University of Helsinki, for
in Berlin between 1868 and 1872 and in 1873 completed his doctorate at the University of Halle with a dissertation entitled De trecentis Cāṇakyae poetae indici sententii. Klatt worked at the Royal Library in Berlin, part-time from 1872, as assistant from 1874, then as Kustos (custodian) from October 1880 and finally as Bibliothecarius (librarian) from April 1889. He was married to Margarete née Patzig (1861-1928) with whom he had two sons, the pedagogue Fritz Klatt (1888-1945), who pioneered adult education in the Weimar Republic, and the painter Albert Klatt (1892-1970). Klatt’s published research focused on Jaina manuscripts and on the history of Jaina monasticism, based on the available chronologies and biographies. In his preface of 15 October 1892 to the fifty-five page revised edition of a sample of Klatt’s magnum opus, Klatt’s teacher Albrecht Weber (1892: iii) referred to the ‘tragic catastrophe’ that prematurely ended Klatt’s efforts of ten years to complete his Jaina-Onomasticon, apparently because he had ‘unduly exerted himself’ for this ‘grandiose’ achievement, and in future would probably never be able to work again ‘at the same speed.’ At the time, Weber still expressed his hope that Klatt would recover, which he never did. Yet, already on 21 April 1892, because Klatt was no longer able to do so himself, Weber had presented to the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences a specimen of Klatt’s work, featuring information on important Śvetāmbara commentators such as Abhayadeva, Umāsvāti, Haribhadra, Jinabhadra and all other names beginning with Jina.

A biographical note on Klatt was published during his lifetime by Klatt’s ‘gurubhāī’ and friend Ernst Leumann (1859-1931). It took the form of a mock paṭṭāvalī, which turned out to be one of the main sources of our meagre knowledge of the great chronographer’s own life:

sharing his records on Johannes Klatt. They include the name of Klatt’s son Fritz and pointed me to the photograph in Rau (1982). Rau’s caption of the photo gives different biodata than F. Klatt: birth Filehne 31.10.1852, death Berlin 27.8.1903.

5 On Three Hundred Maxims of the Indian Poet Cāṇakya (Kautalya).

6 Hartwig & Schulz (1884: 25, 1889: 510, 1891: 31). See Klatt (1891) on the manuscript collections of the library.

7 For autobiographical notes, see F. Klatt (1965). Since Fritz was older, his brother Albert could not have been born in 1880 as suggested in the appendix of the book and by Böhm (1977: 710).

8 F. Klatt (1965: 11f.) characterizes his father, who was hospitalized in 1892, as ‘an extremely quiet earnest man, with a pale face … [who] lived entirely for his work and disliked going to social events … [and] had to die so early, because he kept the dark manner in which he perceived life locked inside himself and did not find an expression for it. He felt so much within and took refuge in his studies, and frantic work.’

‘The chronology of his life, presented by way of one of the Paṭṭāvalîs so happily brought to light by his researches, is as follows: - Johannes Klatt: born 1852 A.D. as the son of the postmaster of Filehne (in the Prussian province of Posen); dikshâ (matriculation) at the Berlin University 1868; after four years’ study there, he took his Doctor’s degree by presenting (see Boehlingk’s Indische Sprüche, 2nd ed., Part III, Preface) a paper on “Châṇakya’s Sentences” to the University of Halle; 1873 ‘Volunteer’ at the Berlin Royal Library (still earning his living for a couple of years as official stenographist in the Prussian House of Commons), 1880 ‘Custos,’ 1882-92 (nominally also 1893) “Librarian.”

In his note, published as a footnote to Klatt’s last published work, Leumann also mentioned that no further contribution of Klatt ‘can come from his pen’, and noted the ‘irreparable loss’ caused by the sudden ‘disappearance from literature’ of ‘the eminent Indianistic Chronicler and Bibliographist’ ‘as a year or two more of work would have allowed him to complete what has been slowly growing into shape in his study during the past ten years’ (ibid.). Leumann was familiar with Klatt’s work. Over many years, he supplied his friend with supplementary information for the Jaina-Onomasticon. In addition to editing the last fifteen pages of the Specimen, which Klatt had prepared before his progressing illness rendered work impossible, Leumann also brought Klatt’s last article to publication, and in 1893 took over the task of arranging the parts of the text that Klatt left behind. He had them ‘bound into eight stately volumes’ (ibid.), which his student Schubring later deposited in the library of the Seminar für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens, which is now integral to the library of the Asien-Afrika-Institut of the University of Hamburg.

Klatt’s encyclopaedic compilation of literary-bibliographical information on Jaina authors, texts and biographies is still without parallel. Mehta and Chandra’s (1970-72) work Prakrit Proper Names covers somewhat similar ground. But Mehta and Chandra focus exclusively on the Śvetāmbara Āgamas and their commentaries however, while Klatt concentrates on post-canonical sources from both Digambara and Śvetāmbara.

---

10 Leumann (1894: 169, n. 2).
authors. Klatt based his work on the lists of Jaina manuscripts published by Weber (1853-
1892), Bühler (1869-1880), Bhandarkar (1882-1897), Kielhorn (1869-1882), Peterson
(1882-1899), Khatavate (1891-1901) and all other relevant textual, bibliographical and
epigraphic sources at hand. His search for information motivated family holidays, for
instance in Italy, where he conducted research on the manuscript collections of Florence,
Milan, and elsewhere.

Even without updates, for the historian of Jainism Klatt’s Jaina-Onomasticon is an
invaluable resource. This was recognised by his contemporaries. Klatt’s text was praised
both by A. Weber, E. Leumann and W. Schubring as one of the landmarks of modern
scholarship in this field. They all agreed that the 4,132 pages long manuscript, starting
with <Aikāya> and ending with <Saṃgrāmasiṃha>, was ready for publication, albeit
with two or three years of editing work remaining. On 15 October 1892, A. Weber (1892:
iii-iv) estimated the size of the printed Onomasticon at ca. 1120 pages, twenty times the
size of the Specimen, if a system of abbreviations is used to save space, while conceding,
because Jaina Studies was still in its infancy, that additions could have been made already
half a year later, even to the published Specimen. Schubring (1935 § 4: 8, n. 2) concurred
with Weber’s verdict that the manuscript was basically ready for publication (albeit in need
of supplementation): ‘At the time, the manuscript would presumably have been ready for
the press, given a practicable technique of abbreviation and onesided type.’ Yet, though the
work deserves to be accessible to the wider world of scholarship, Johannes Klatt’s Jaina-
Onomasticon remains unpublished to this day. The task to prepare the manuscript for the
press is still a desideratum for modern Jainology.

In 2010, the Centre of Jaina Studies at SOAS initiated the first steps towards the
publication of Klatt’s work. With the support of the Library of the Asien-Afrika-Institut
in Hamburg, which kindly made the original manuscript available, the text is currently

---

12 See Weber (1892 II.3: xvii) on Klatt’s contribution to his pioneering catalogue of Jaina Mss.: ‘Klatt
besonders durch eine grosse Zahl bibliographischer und literargeschichtlicher Daten aus seinen reichen
Sammlungen der Art, in welchen er das einschlagende Material aus den trefflichen Reports von Bühler,
Kielhorn, P. Peterson, R. G. Bhâṇḍârkar, Râjendra Lâla Mitra etc. vollständig eingetragen hat, für die
ausserhalb des siddhânta stehende Jaina-Literatur, zu ganz besonderem Danke verbunden. Beide Gelehrte
[Leumann & Klatt] haben damit diesem meinem Werke ihrerseits so wesentliche Dienste geleistet, dass
ich ihnen dafür die wärmste Anerkennung schuldig bin.’
13 F. Klatt (1965: 9ff.).
14 Leumann also in Plutat (1998: 42).
15 See Schubring (1944: VII) on formal imperfections of the Specimen of Klatt’s ‘unique guide.’
being transcribed and prepared for editing. An initial trial for its transcription has been
funded through the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) Grant AH/I002405/1
and Leverhulme Trust Research Project Grant RPG-2012-620 has funded the production
of a print edition of Klatt’s text. It is hoped that the English text, once published both in
print and in an expandable electronic format, will serve as a valuable research tool to future
generations of scholarship.

‘Luṅkā’ and ‘Ḍhuṇḍhaka’

The remainder of this article is devoted to a brief illustration, at the hand of two examples,
the terms ‘Luṅkā’ and ‘Ḍhuṇḍhaka’, of the difficulties faced by the editors of this
text, and an analysis of the implications of the sources available to Klatt on his text.
To assess the feasibility of the project, selected texts from Klatt’s Vol. III and IV have
been transcribed by Christopher Gibbons and the present writer. Klatt’s text and the
references mentioned therein were checked (as far as possible) and, in parts, corrected
and re-formatted; sometimes following suggestions by Klatt, who structured his text
occasionally according to the historical sequence of his primary sources, that is, mainly
catalogues and reports on manuscript collections. Nāgarī keywords were transliterated
into Roman script. To make the text more accessible, indentations, italics and small
caps were added. For Klatt’s abbreviation ‘S.’ (Saṃvat), ‘VS’ (Vikram Saṃvat) is used.
Abbreviations such as ‘Ḍh.’ (Ḍhuṇḍhaka), ‘a.’ (anna), fr.b. (from bottom), ‘l.’ (line[s], or
leave[s]), n. (catalogue number, or note), s. (see), and acronyms for references have been
spelled out in this article to enhance readability. Others, like p. (page), Guj. (Gujarāṭī), and
others such as rg. possibly referring to an officially ‘registered’ nineteenth century print
publication, have been maintained. Missing diacritics, for instance in ‘Lálaji’ (Lālajī),
have also occasionally been supplemented. The aim of consistency could however not be
accomplished. Systematically imposing new editorial conventions to disambiguate Klatt’s
use of abbreviations and acronyms will obliterate much of the historical information
preserved in the text. Klatt generally accepted the diverse methods of transcribing Indic
words used in his sources and merely added analytical word-divisions. This makes his
manuscript stylistically incoherent. At the same time, it offers valuable insights in the fluid
state of knowledge amongst leading scholars of the period confronting a flood of entirely
new information. ‘Ḍhuṇḍhaka’, for instance, is rendered as ‘Ḍhuṇḍhakar’, ‘Dhundhiā’ or
‘Dhundiā’, though only the category ‘Ḍhuṇḍhaka’ is listed. Instead of the now preferred term ‘Loṅkā’, ‘Luṅkā’ is used. However, another entry designating the same individual is ‘Laukā.’

Only the proper name ‘Luṅkā’ and the sect-designations ‘Lumpāka-matam’ and ‘Ḍhuṇḍhaka-matam’ and some related names listed in the Onomasticon will be investigated here to probe into Klatt’s methods and sources. Klatt’s manuscript is of considerable value for identifying rare and yet unexplored sources, not least for the study of the aniconic or ‘protestant’ Jaina traditions, which have produced only few original texts in their more than five hundred year long history, since they put a premium on the sole authority of the āgamas. Many of their surviving scriptures continue to be suppressed by their opponents from the image-worshipping Jaina traditions. The aniconic traditions were launched in fifteenth century Gujarāt as a protest movement against the ‘laxity’ of contemporary mendicants by a Śvetāmbara layman known as ‘Loṅkā’ or ‘Lumpaka’, the ‘breaker’ of images or ‘violator’ of tradition, who inspired the creation of the Loṅkāgaccha mendicant orders, from which a variety of new reform movements split in the seventeenth century which are now collectively known as ‘Sthānakavāsī’ or ‘hall-dweller’ traditions. One of the original five of these schismatic aniconic monastic movements are the ‘Ḍhuṇḍakas’, or ‘searchers’, called ‘Ḍhūṁḍhakas’, the ruin-dwellers by their Jaina opponents. This particular ‘Sthānakavāsī’ tradition was created by Lavajī Ṛṣi from Surat sometime between 1648 and 1656. Most of the founders of the other four principal Sthānakavāsī movements, such as Dharmasī̄ha, the founder of the Āṭh Koṭi tradition, and Dharmadāśa, the founder of the Bāīstola tradition, and a few of their successors, are also registered in the Jaina-Onomasticon, and some of their literature.

16 In contrast to the ‘temple-dwelling’ caityavāsins.
17 The second term is also used as a self-designation. It refers to the original rejection by the members of these reformed mendicant orders of residences that were specially constructed for them, with reference to the rules in the āgamas. Later, plain halls (sthānakas = upāśrayas) for mendicants were deemed acceptable. Hence, the members of the reformed mendicant traditions that severed from the Loṅkāgaccha orders were called ‘sthānakavāsins’, or ‘hall-dwellers’. On ‘ḍhūṁḍh-’ and ‘*ḍhūṁḍh-’ see Turner (1973: 391). The term ‘Sthānakavāsī’ was used as a self-designation only in the 20th century. See Flügel (2008:210).
19 Klatt (1893: 1749f.).
20 Klatt (1893: 1717).
21 Flügel (2008: 185 n. 8).
The full real name of ‘Loṅkā’ is unknown. Ācārya Hastīmal notes that Loṅkā is variously called lumpaka (which he interprets as luterā, thief) or luṅgā (which he interprets as luccā, scoundrel), etc., by his opponents. A. Weber and D. D. Mālvaniyā interpret lumpaka as the Sanskrit rendering of luṃkā (laumkā), the ‘breaker’ or ‘destroyer’ of (the worship of) images or of the tradition (from the Sanskrit √ lup, to break, violate; lopaka, violating). See Turner (1966/1973: 643,645) on lupyatē, and for the uncertain meaning of luṅka, which he hypothetically derives from lukka (Sub. lupta). At the time of Klatt, whatever was known about the aniconic Jaina traditions was based on reports from their Mūrtipūjaka critics, such as Dhamasāgara-gaṇin (d. 1596) and Ācārya Vijayānandasūri (1836-1896), also known as Ātmārāma (his earlier Sthānakavāsī name) or Ātmānanda (his Mūrtipūjaka name), with whom many European Indologists communicated via letter and intermediaries. Hence, the polemical term Luṅkā was used to describe the founder of the Lumpaka tradition and the Dḥūṃḍhakas are listed under the name Dḥunḍhaka.

Most of the references to primary sources on Loṅkā and the members and literatures of the Loṅkāgacchas collected by Klatt and others have not yet been systematically studied. The following are the main entries he gives on Loṅkā and the Lumpākamatam:

24 Mālvaniyā (1965: 185).
25 See Weber’s (1882) study.
26 Flügel (2010).
27 For pioneering preliminary work see Mālvaniyā (1963a, 1963b, 1965) and the sources mentioned in footnote 19.
28 Klatt (1893: 3417-3422).
29 See Kharataragaccha Paṭṭāvalīvācanā 57, No. 1989 in Weber (1892: 1050): ‘s. 1508 hamadāvāde Laumkākhyena lekhakena pratimā utthāpitā, tathā s. 1524 Lau(m)kābhīdhaṃ matam jatam.’
30 According to Dharmasāgara-gaṇi’s undated (Tapā-gaccha) Gūrvāvaliśūtram 54, at the time of the Tapā-gaccha Ācārya Ratnaśekharasūri (VS 1457-1517 = 1401-1460), the scribe Loṅkā founded the Luṃkā-mata in 1452, his follower Bhāṇā the Veṣadhara tradition in 1477: ‘tadāniṃ Luṃkākhyāl lekhakat saṃ 1508 varshe jinapratimothāpanaparaṃ Luṃkāmataṃ pravṛttan; tannmate veshadhāras tu saṃ 1533 varshe jatāḥ tatra prathamo veshadhārī ri” Bhāṇākhyo ’bhūt’ (In: Weber II.3 1892: 1013). Section 57 of the text further mentions that the Katuka-mata was founded in VS 1562 = 1506, in VS 1570 = 1514 the Vīja-mata, a ‘Veṣadhara’ splinter group of the Luṃkā-mata led by Vījā, and in VS 1572 = 1516 the creation of the Nāgapuriya Tapāgaṇa (ib., 1015). Section 60 mentions the re-conversion of the Lumpāka ‘matādhipati’ Ācārya Megha to the Tapā-gaccha in Ahamadāvād at the time of the inauguration of Ācārya Hīravijayasūri (VS 1583-1652 = 1527-1596) in 1552: ‘tathā Ahamadāvādanagara eva Lumpāka matādhipati ri” Meghajī svākyasamudāyādhipatyam durgratiharet iti marvā’ (In: ib., p. 1015; footnote reference to ‘Methajī’ in Bhāṇḍārkar 1883/4: 133).

Dharmasāgara’s earlier Kupākṣakauśikāditya of VS 1629 (1477) uses almost identical
LUṆKĀ Lekhaka founded VS 1508 the Luṅkā-matam jine-pratimotthāpana-param, 
INDIAN ANTIQUARY XI 256 n. 52, WEBER II 1013 line 14-5, 
AJÑĀNA-TIMIRABHĀSKARA, kh[ānda]. 2, p. 43.


Rājasiṅha and Raghunātho, VS 1857, of the Vṛihal-lauṅkā-gaccha, see PĀṆÇÂ-JINA-
VARA-MAHIMAN STOTRA, Kāçı 1880, p. 32.

JAINA-TATTVĀDARÇA, p. 583 following succession: rishi Bhāṇā (Bhūṇā, BHĀṆḌĀRKAR 
REPORT 1883/p. 154) VS 1533, Būjajī 1568, Jīvajī-rishi 1578, Vṛiddha-vara-
sinhajī 1649, isa Lumpaka-mata ke tīna nāma hūe, 1 Gujarātī, 2 Nāgorī, 3 
Uttarādhī iti Lumpaka-matotpattiḥ.

MILES, TRANSACTIONS OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY III 346 mentions a Lunca 
Paṭṭāvali.

Origin VS 1527, ZEITSCHRIFT DER DEUTSCHEN MORGENLÄNDISCHEN GESELLSCHAFT 
13. 40.

ČRĪ-LOKA-GACCHĪYA-ČRĀVAKASYA SĀRTHA-PAṆÇA-PRATIKRAMA-NASŪTRA, Bombay,

words: ‘Lūṃpākamatuṃ Vi° 1508 varshe Lumpāka - lekhakāt prarūpanām adhikṛitya pravrīttaṁ, 
tatprarūpaṇā ca jina pratimānishedhamūlikā; tannmate veshadharāḥ punar Vi° sam° 1533 varshe Mārodī 
pratyāsannā’raghaṭṭaka vāstavya prāgyātajnātiya Bhāṇākhyād eva pravrītā, etaduttaviṁśitaras tu 
etanmānā’śhṭama viçrāme rakshyate, ayam ca pracavana(yacana!)bālye bālagopālāmganānām api 
pratiśiḥ’ (In: Weber II.3 1892: 959; see also pp. 960, 967, 971f.).

31 A modern copy of Hemacandrasūri’s Viśeṣāvaśyaka-vṛtti, a commentary on Jinabhadra’s Viśeṣāvaśyaka-
bhāṣya I (sāmāyika), mentioned in Weber’s catalogue was prepared by Ratnacandra as indicated at 
two different places in the manuscript: “saṃvat 1942 (also: A.D. 1886) rā vaiçaḥsha suda 7 tiḥau ḫ ri / 
Ratnacāṃḍa nāgorī Luṃkā Jesalamera ma 4” (fol. 144°) and “Ratnacaṃḍa vṛihanāgari luṃkāgachai” (fol. 

32 As an example for furtherinformation on this order, that is not cross-referenced in the manuscript, for instance the entry on the following Loṅkāgaccha monk in Klatt (1893: 1793): 

‘Nāgarāja bhikshu, of the Vrihan-nāgapuriya-Lauṅkā-gaccha, honored by the kings, 

N. of the Lauṅkā-gaccha, preceptor of Raghunātha, about VS 1890, see PRAJṆĀPANĀ 
colophon].

N.’s pupil Rāmcandra, author of a padam, PADA-RATNĀVALĪ (Benares), p. 327 l. 1, reg. p. 31’.

33 Miles (1933: 346): ‘Lūṃca Patāvali.’

34 Jacobi (1884: 9), referring to the Bhadrabāhucaritra of Ratnanandin (15th-16th C.E.).

35 Jacobi (1884: 13, line 40), summarizing Ratnanandin: ‘Im Jahre 1527 nach dem Tode Vikramas 
entsteht das Luṅkāmata (156). Ein Čvetāmbara Namens Luṅka aus dem Prāgvāṭakula stürzt die Jinabilder.
Rāmacandra-gaṇi and his pupil Nānakacanda VS 1937, see STHĀNĀṄGA ed. Ben. VS 1937. 
LOŃKAGACCHĪYA-ČRĀVAKASYA SĀRTHA-PAṆCA-PRATIKRAMAṆA-SŪTRA, Bombay 
Jagadiśvar press 1882. 218 p. Re. 1. 4a (CATALOGUE BOMBAY 1882 IV 16-7). 
VS 1572 Rūpacand Sorāṇa of his own accord put on the monks’ garb and originated the 
Nāgorī Lumpaka sect, ĀTMĀRĀMJĪ’S Paṭṭa-vṛiksha (HOERNLE). 
Nāga-purīyāhvā Luṅkā-gaṇe at the end of Anuttaraupapātika, Calc[utta], 
LOKĀ-GACCHĪYA ČRĀVAKASYA SĀRTHA-PAṆCA-PRATIKRAMAṆA-SŪTRA. 3. ed. Bombay, 
Jagadiśvār press VS 1943, 6, 270 p. 

 […]

LUMPĀKAMATAM\textsuperscript{36} INDIAN ANTIQUARY XI 256\textsuperscript{2} n. 55, WEBER II 1013 line 24, 30.\textsuperscript{37}

From it the Vīja-matam arose VS 1570. 

Lumpāka-mukhya-kumata combatted by Vimalaharsha, Ms. Or. Fol. 673 n. 32. 
Lumpākānāṃ pratimā-nishedhalh their principal heresy, BHĀNDĀRKAR REPORT 1883/4 
 p.456 line 7 from bottom. WEBER II 956 note [3]. 
Lumpaka-gaṇopāsaka Rāya [Bāhādur] Dhanapatisiṃha, see SAMAVĀṆGA, ed. 
Ben[ares] VS 1937.\textsuperscript{38} 

Lupaka-gacche cṛ Amṛtacandra-sūri, see AUPAPĀTIKA, ed. VS 1936.\textsuperscript{39} 

Lavajī, grandson of Borā Vīraṇi of the Lumpaka sect originated VS 1709 the

36 Klatt (1893: 3420-3422).
38 See Bhūmika (entry on Dhanapatisiṃha on p. in Klatt 1893 III: 1662).
39 Because the title sūri is used exclusively by Mūrtipūjaka traditions, Amṛtacandra cannot have been a Lumpāka. The work was edited in Calcutta.
40 The unmentioned source must be Muni Ātmārāma, mentioned in Kunte (1882: 3).
41 Bendall (1886: 63) lists this text under ‘Mss. Personally Collected.’ The description on page 63 begins line 19 and the quotation starts line 24: ‘Lumpāka-mata-kuṭṭana is the subscription of a short work (of 21 leaves). Outside is written in a much later hand “Lokāyata-kuṭṭana.” The Lumpāka mata was a school founded in Vikr. Saṃvat 1508 (A.D. 1461). See Dr Klatt Ind. Antiq. XI. 256 (September 1882). The treatise is in the main a compilation from the Siddhānta or canon of the Čvetāmbaras and begins: Natvā ċruta-jñānam-ananta-bhedam | pāraṅgataṃ cetasi sannidhāya | siddhānta-vākyāni karomi samyak |
Ḍhuṇḍhaka sect. Likhārī of the Lumpaka sect originated VS 1734 a sect which rejects the Jina image and the holy scripture.\textsuperscript{40}  

**LUMPĀKAMATAKUṬṬANA** comp. by followers of the Kharatara-gaccha VS 1687, beg[ins] Natvā cruta-jīṉānam-ananta-bhedan, 21 l[eaves] BENDALL JOUR[NEY] p. 47, 63.\textsuperscript{41}[…]

**LAUKĀ**\textsuperscript{42} lekhāa erected VS 1608 a statue in Ahamadāvāda,\textsuperscript{43} there the Laukā-matam arose VS 1524, INDIAN ANTIQUARY XI 249\textsuperscript{b} n. 57, WEBER II 1050 line 7-8, INDIAN ANTIQUARY VIII 311.\textsuperscript{44}

In contrast to ‘Luṅkā’ and ‘Lumpākatam’, ‘Lumpākatakuṭṭana’ and ‘Laukā’, the main entry on ‘Ḍhuṇḍhaka’ includes references to primary literature of this monastic tradition, in particular a paṭṭāvalī. One text, however, the *Atṭhāvana bolo* was most likely composed by Loṅkā himself.\textsuperscript{45} Textual references are presented by Klatt generally after the historical data related to an author or tradition. However, further additions were simply appended in the manuscript:\textsuperscript{46}

**ḌHUNDHAKA**-matam originated VS 1709 under Vijayaprabha-sūri †VS 1749, JAINA-TATTVĀDARSHA, p. 592.

The Ďhundhakar separated VS 1724 from the Luṅkas, MILES TRANSACTIONS III, p. 365. They do not worship images, according to the Persian work MIRĀTI AHMADĪ, even 355.\textsuperscript{47}


Jeṭhmaljī of the Dhundhiā sect composed before 75 years Samakita-sār, CATALOGUE

---

\textsuperscript{40} Klatt (1893: 3443).

\textsuperscript{41} This is impossible because of the date and because of his rejection of image-worship.

\textsuperscript{42} The original text refers wrongly to: ‘The J a i n a s who followed the L o k ā y ā t a s’ (Logan 1879: 311). The mix up of ‘Loṅkā’ with ‘Lokā’ occurred frequently in 19\textsuperscript{th} century reports. See footnote 26.


\textsuperscript{44} Klatt (1893: 1279-1283).

\textsuperscript{45} The reference could not be located in the English translations of the works by Bird (1835) and Bayley (1886). See Khān, Alī Muhammad.
Ātmārāmjī is said to have been a Dh[uṇḍhaka], ib.

*Dhundhiāno rāsado*, or a poem relating to a sect called Dhundiā. Guj., by Uttama Vijaya. Ahmedābād, Nāran Krishnarām 1869. 12 p. 4\(^\prime\), lith. 2 a[nn]a, see CATALOGUE BOMBAY 1869 III 6.

*Siddhānta-sāranī Dhālo*, or verses giving substance of the established truth, Guj., Ahmedābād 1887. 32 p. 2 a[nn]a (condemns the worship of an image of any of the tīrthaṅkars, as well as pilgrimage to holy places),\(^{49}\) see CATALOGUE BOMBAY 1888 I 24.

*Bṛihad-āloyanā*, or the great work on return from sin, Mārvādī. By Lālājī Sāheb Ranajita-sīnha-jī. Ahmedābād, Union Printing Press, published by Chhaganlāl Behechardās 1888. 48 p. 3 a[nn]a (A tract of the Dhundiā sect), see CATALOGUE BOMBAY 1888 IV 42.\(^{50}\)


In 1709, Lavajī, the adopted son of Phūlā Bāī, the daughter of the Borā Vīrajī, of the Lumpaka sect, together with Dharmadās, the cotton printer, originated the sect (panth) of the mouth-covering Dh[uṇḍhaka]. These divided into 22 sections,\(^{54}\)

COMMUNICATION OF ĀTMĀRĀMJĪ.

Opposite to the Dh[uṇḍhaka] is *Vīra-stuti*, composed VS 1849, PRAKARĀNA-RATNĀKARA III p. 569-696.

Dhūdhūkā-gaccha, name of a gaccha in GACCHA-NĀMĀNUKRAMĀṆIKĀ No. 60.

---

\(^{48}\) Sāthe’s (1888 II: 70f.) entry No. 373 refers to the ‘second translation’ of the Samyaktva Śalyoddhāra (of Ātmārāma 1994/1909) under the name of ‘Bhāvnagar Jain Dharma Prasārak Sabhā, Translators’: ‘The work of Jethmalaji, which has evoked the present refutation of it, is said to be 75 years old and was recently reprinted.’

\(^{49}\) Original text, Sāthe (1888 I: 25): ‘Mentions the duties of a follower of Jainism and condemns the worship of an image of any of the Tirthāṅkars or sanctified teachers of Jainism, as well as pilgrimage to certain holy places.’

\(^{50}\) No. 255 in Sāthe (1888 IV: 42f.).

\(^{51}\) Original Kunte (1880-81: 48f.): ‘Atthāvan Bola’ (Gujarātī), ‘old and incorrect; prose. Gujarāthī. Very rare.’ The text was attributed to Loṅkā by Mālvanijā (1963a).

\(^{52}\) Original: Rang Lāl (Jain), in Monier-Williams, Lāl and Davies (1888: 286): ‘I must finish now with one more remark, and it is about a sect of Jains called ‘Dhundye,’ but more commonly ‘Munh-bandhe,’ owing to their habit of keeping their mouth covered with a piece of cloth - something very much like a respirator
Concluding remarks

The brief review of the entries on Luṅkāmatam and Ḍhuṇḍhakamatam, etc., shows that a lot could have been learned about the aniconic traditions already more than a century ago had Johannes Klatt’s yet unpublished *magnum opus* been utilized. Since this was not done,
hardly any of the standard textbooks on Jainism offers even basic information on the aniconic traditions, with the exception of the well known work by Paul Dundas, which made a start. Even Klatt’s information stemmed largely from the works of opponents of the protestant traditions. This was unavoidable at the time, since no other information was made available. The state of knowledge on the aniconic traditions reflected in the pages of the Jaina-Onomasticon is still embryonic and in itself unreliable, which probably is the reason why it was shunned by previous generations of indological scholarship. However, it points to yet untapped sources the critical study of which will lead to more certain reconstructions of the history of a tradition which today comprises of about one third of all Jainas.

**SOURCES USED BY KLATT**


—. Samyaktva Śalyoddhāra. Lahore: Ātmānanda Jaina Sabhā Pañjāb, [1885] 1884/1909. [Hindi translation of the original Gujarātī text]


The High Priest of the Shravacas and Jutties [yatis] is called Shree Pooj [śrīpūjya]. The Sripuja of the Lounka Gaccha, or tribe, is at Baroda; this is his principal Station, but their duty is to take a circuit among their dependents every year; the High Priests of the sects are elsewhere.

The Lounka Gatch had four stations (of which one no longer exists) at which Thiveras [sthaviras] were stationed; vizt. Delhi, Ajimere, Jalour. Three Thiveras are Deputies or Legates, who are entrusted with a general superintendence over the Morals of the Yati.

The Sripuja is chosen by adoption, generally from among the Wannias [baniyās] of the Veṣadahara Caste, the most respectable; when the Sripuja is on the point of death, the child is placed on the gaudee [gādi]. His lock of hair plucked out, and the MUntra particularly appropriated for this station is whispered in his Ear, and the assembly of Yatis are desired to obey their future Chief.

About 100 years ago, this sect gave birth to a new description of Yatis, who carry mortifications to great extreme.

It happened that a Yati of the Lounka Gatcha disputed the Mandate o the Sripuja, … and founded the Sect of the Dhoundia …

These [pūja] ceremonies are not performed by the Yatis, and they are wholly rejected both by Shravacas and Yatis of the Lounka Gaccha. …

Altho’ any of the above Castes may become Converts, yet they do not choose their Desciples

BENDALL JOURNEY. See Bendall 1886.


CATALOGUE BOMBAY. See Sāthe.


or Chila’s [chelas] from the Military Class. This is at least the case with the Lounka Gatcha.’

57 Bendall (1886: 24f.) believed to be the first European to have visited the Śvetāmbara Mandir at the ghāts in Benares. He attended a committee meeting of the Bāla Sarasvatībhavana library, started at suggestion of his guide Paṇḍit Dhunḍhirāja Dharmādhikārī.

GACCHA-NĀMĀNUKRAMAṆIKĀ.


Jacobi, Hermann. ‘Üeber die Entstehung der Çvetāmbara und Digambara Sekten.’ *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 38 (1884) 1-42.

Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society I.


—. ‘Mirát-i-Aḥmādī.’ See Bayley 1886.

Kunte, Kāshi Nāth. *Report on Sanskrit Manuscripts for (1) Quarter July to September 1880, (2) Quarter Oct. to December 1880, (3) Year 1880-81, (4) Quarter April to June 1881*. Lahore, 1882. [BL: W 988]


---

58 Including a complete bibliography of Klatt’s publications and manuscripts.
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