

## **The Unknown Loṅkā Tradition and the Cultural Unconscious**

PETER FLÜGEL

In the last two decades, the main focus of Jaina research has shifted from the effectively a-historical exploration of the language, content and form of the Śvetāmbara canon in particular, to the historical and anthropological investigation of “strategies of transmission” of tradition, including “canonisation” and “transformation” (Bruhn 1987: 107f.). The guiding question in this research is how to conceptualise the relationship between continuity and change within the “Jaina tradition” (Carrithers 1990: 142). The investigation of this question became imperative after the philological deconstruction of earlier notions of a Jaina “ur-canon” and the “dogmatic immutability” of the Jaina doctrine (Bruhn 1987: 104, 107), as a consequence of which even the core principles of “true Jainism” (Dundas 1993: 253) and the term “Jaina” itself (Flügel 2005: 2-5) became problematic.

### **THE PRESENT IN THE PAST**

In current academic studies, the history of the Jaina tradition is predominately presented as an interactive process between texts and practices through time (Cort 1990: 59). The emphasis is on the continuity of canonical histories, monastic traditions, and religious properties,<sup>1</sup> which offer alternative points of connection for the for-

---

<sup>1</sup> See the empirical studies on Jain laity in Carrithers & Humphrey 1991.

mation of variable group identities. In this model, scripture,<sup>2</sup> lineal descent, and the direct link to a charismatic teacher function as alternative sources of authority and legitimation as Granoff (1991: 76f.; 1993: 315), Dundas (1993: 250), Qvarnström (1998: 33f., 46) and Balbir (2003a: 267-269) have shown in their studies of late medieval Jaina sectarian traditions. Practice is not seen anymore as a mere enactment of rules, but also as an impetus for re-interpretation of rules or for the creation of new rules. Examples of such processes are particularly visible in the context of sectarian rivalry “expressing the stiffening of group identity, rather than the persevering of an archaic tradition” (Balbir 2003a: 267). Neither textual traditions nor descent constructs are now seen as static, despite the fact that innovations are within the Jaina tradition commonly introduced as “views well-rooted in the scriptural tradition” (Balbir 2003a: 263).

Although earlier views of the unchanging nature of the principal features of Jainism are being replaced by this new approach, the dominant lines of influence still run from the past to the present, from text to practice. Yet, with growing historical and ethnographical information, it seems both possible and necessary to reverse the perspective. After all, in any situation, the choice is not whether to obey or to disobey transmitted rules, but which rule to obey, as the anthropologists M. Gluckman and E. Leach both noted.<sup>3</sup> In the Jaina context, this is a truism. The amorphous nature of the canonical scriptures alone, not to mention the commentaries and imports from non-Jain traditions, forces strategies of selection and reduction of complexity on everyone who refers to them, even disregarding instrumental interests. The question is not whether to obey or to disobey the scriptures, but which scripture to obey, and how to interpret it.

---

<sup>2</sup> Used in a wider sense, including commentary, and ritual literature.

<sup>3</sup> See Bloch 1989: 5; Bourdieu 1992: 53. See also Carrithers' (2000: 834) investigation of eclecticism or “polytropy” in the Jain tradition.

W. C. Smith's (1962/1991: 168) concept of "cumulative tradition" already highlighted that "a tradition" presents itself not as an entity but as "a growing congeries of items" of diverse nature, which is only "unified in the conceptual mind, by processes of conceptual abstraction". J. Assmann's (2000: 39f.) notion of "cultural memory" covers similar ground. Yet, it puts less emphasis on processes of conscious transmission and re-vitalisation of a tradition through the faith of individual participants, as Smith's notion does, or the selective instrumentalisation of the past through the "connective memory" of particular groups, as current reconstructions of Jaina sectarian histories do, but focuses on the latent function of the entire "archive" (Derrida) of the amorphous "cultural unconscious". In Assmann's view, the interesting aspects of "cultural memory" are the forgotten, ignored, obsolete, hidden, excluded, suppressed or disrespected elements of a tradition, which are still accessible but unutilised and therefore "freely at one's disposal".<sup>4</sup> The term "cultural memory" is wider than the term "tradition", which in its restricted sense refers to a consciously constructed instrumentalisation of the past in terms of present needs and interests. Though inspired by Freud's notions of repression and latency, the "cultural unconscious" in this sense must be distinguished both from inferred processes of "unconscious thought" and "deep motivations" (Goonasekere 1986: 7), and from spheres of value within the realm of ideology which are not systematically expressed (Laidlaw 1985: 51f.), and in this sense "unconscious" (Cort 1990: 60). It overlaps, however, with the sphere of pre-

---

<sup>4</sup> Assmann 2000: 34. His definition contrasts "cultural memory", based primarily on the medium of writing, with "communicative memory", the social aspect of individual memory, and with "collective" and "connective memory", which is primarily ritually constituted: "Das kulturelle Gedächtnis umfasst im Gegensatz zum kommunikativen Gedächtnis das Uralte, Abgelegte, Ausgelagerte und im Gegensatz zum kollektiven und Bindungsgedächtnis das Nichtinstrumentalisierbare, Häreische, Subversive, Abgespaltene" (p. 41). He uses the term "unconscious transmission" (p. 40).

conscious habits, dispositions and practices (Bourdieu 1992: 52ff.) in a yet to be explored way.

In this article, I will utilise this perspective for the analysis of the modern historiography of Loṅkā and the Loṅkāgaccha, by focusing on processes of canonisation and repression of memory, and on techniques of selective citation and re-combination of transmitted elements of the Jain tradition<sup>5</sup> through which authority was claimed both by Loṅkā and his successors and by modern authors who tried to establish Loṅkā as an ancestral figure for competing factions of the aniconic Jaina tradition, which Loṅkā is said to have founded on the basis of the scriptures alone. I will first explore the ways in which the teachings of Loṅkā and the Loṅkāgaccha tradition have been depicted in modern literature, and how the scant information on Loṅkā was compiled and redacted by different interested parties, and then turn to some of the texts which have been attributed to Loṅkā himself to delimit the scope of his influence on the still existing but ignored Loṅkāgaccha tradition, which has lost all memory of its own past and on the Sthānakavāsī and Terāpanth traditions. I am not trying to solve the presently unanswerable question of the accuracy of the transmitted historical knowledge on Loṅkā's biography and beliefs but will focus primarily on the analysis of the effective history (*Wirkungsgeschichte*) of his ideas.<sup>6</sup>

### THE UNKNOWN LOṅKĀ

The true nature of the biography and teachings of Loṅkā is still disputed within the Jaina tradition, even now, more than five hundred

---

<sup>5</sup> "Source quotations play an essential part in the demonstration" (Balbir 2003a: 263). Important in this context is J. Leslie's distinction between authority and meaning (Leslie 2003: 74f.). Pioneering works on the use of quotations (*uddharāṇa*) in the Jaina scriptures itself are the *Berliner Konkordanz* of K. Bruhn and C. B. Tripathi, and the recent publication of K. K. Jain (2003). The re-combination of elements always involves aspects of creative invention.

<sup>6</sup> See Gadamer 1990: 305ff.; also Bruhn 1981: 18; 1987: 111; Gombrich 1988: 21. For an analysis of the institutional conditions of this history see also Flügel 2000; 2003a; forthcoming (c).

years after his death.<sup>7</sup> It is commonly accepted that Luṅkā or Loṅkā<sup>8</sup> was a layman who lived in Gujarāt sometime between 1415-1489. Because of his access to the Śvetāmbara scriptures, he was able to articulate a powerful, text-based critique of the laxity, *śithilācāra*, of contemporary Jaina mendicants, and to reject the prevailing practice of image-worship as “uncanonical”, since, in his view, it was predicated on violence and attachment to property.<sup>9</sup> No consensus exists, however, on the nature of Loṅkā’s influence on the formation of the aniconic mendicant traditions which emerged in the aftermath of his protest: the Loṅkāgaccha tradition,<sup>10</sup> which was founded by Bhāṇā in the 1470s, and the Sthānakavāsī traditions, which were established in the early 17th century by different groups of dissenting *sādhus* of the Loṅkāgaccha who objected to the re-emergence of image-worship within the tradition. Due to a lack of reliable sources,<sup>11</sup> nothing certain can be said at present

<sup>7</sup> On the history of research of the aniconic Śvetāmbara traditions see Flügel 2000: 40-46; Jain & Kumār 2003: 109-115.

<sup>8</sup> Hastīmal (1995: 765) criticises that he is variously called *Lumpaka* (from *luṭerā*, thief) or *luṅgā* (from *luccā*, scoundrel), etc., by his opponents, rather than by his real name. Weber (1882: 807f.) and Mālvaṇiyā (1965: 185) interpret *lumpaka* as the Sanskrit translation of *luṅkā* (*lauṅkā*), the “breaker” or “destroyer” of (the worship of) images, the creator of ruins. The real name of “Loṅkā” remains unknown. The first text which mentions “Śāh” as the family name seems to be the *Loṅkāśāha Siloko*, written in Saṃvat 1600 (1543/4) by the Loṅkāgaccha *yati* Keśavaṛṣi.

<sup>9</sup> Mūrtipūjaka scholars such as Devagupta Sūri (1016 CE) of the Upakeśa-gaccha defined injury to living beings committed during the construction of temples and in the preparation of *pūjā* with flowers, fruits and water as a form of unavoidable or occupational violence (*ārambhajā hiṃsā*) (Williams 1983: 66). Digambaras additionally use the term *udyogī hiṃsā*, violence that is connected with a purposeful (religious) action.

<sup>10</sup> Originally: “Jinamata”.

<sup>11</sup> Apart from Deśāi’s ground-breaking survey of Gujarātī literature (1926-44), only two studies of an exploratory character are available to date on the meagre surviving textual material of the Loṅkāgaccha *yatis*: Ālamśāh Khān 1965, and particularly Muni Kāntisāgara 1965. Judging on the basis of these sources, it appears that most texts of the Loṅkāgaccha traditions are poems or songs of a hagiographic or biographical nature. Given their chronological precedence, it seems that the surviving Loṅkāgaccha *paṭṭāvalīs*, published by Hastīmal (1968),

about the biography of Loṅkā, and even less about the early leaders of the Loṅkāgaccha, although this may change in due course.<sup>12</sup>

The dearth of historical sources is a consequence both of the long-standing suppression of all but the most basic information concerning Loṅkā by his opponents,<sup>13</sup> and of the lack of interest in the creation and transmission of literature by the followers of Loṅkā, who evidently were more concerned with the preservation of his basic ideas (*Sinnpflege*) than of the texts (*Textpflege*).<sup>14</sup> Emptied of historical memory, the modern image of Loṅkā can be painted in almost any colour, like contours on a white canvas. By the beginning of the 20th century, Loṅkā was revered as an ancestral figure not only by the Loṅkāgaccha traditions, but also by the rival Sthānakavāsī and Terāpanth traditions; each claiming to manifest his teaching in its purest form. The premise of this contest, that religious authority is conveyed not only by proper conduct in accordance with the prescriptions of the scriptures (*siddhānta*) but also by either lineal or direct spiritual descent (*paramparā*) from a prestigious ancestor,<sup>15</sup> was not entirely new in the aniconic tradition.<sup>16</sup> In addition to Mahāvīra, Loṅkā is mentioned as a source of

---

were composed on the basis of such earlier sources. See Flügel 2003a: 180f. Jñānsundar (1936: 27) rightly complained that the “unreliable” (*apramāṇika*) *paṭṭāvalīs* of the Loṅkāgacchas do not contain any information on the doctrine of Loṅkā or the Loṅkāgacchas nor on their forms of organisation.

<sup>12</sup> The surviving biographical sources on the Loṅkāgaccha ascetics have not yet been studied.

<sup>13</sup> The early Loṅkāgaccha traditions were opposed by local Mūrtipūjaka and Sthānakavāsī rivals, and to a lesser extent by Dīgambaras. References to Loṅkā were, literally, erased from the few surviving manuscripts which could have been attributed to him (see picture on p. 278). Even today, Mūrtipūjaka libraries are often instructed by the *ācāryas* of their tradition not to permit access to materials relating to Loṅkā.

<sup>14</sup> See Assmann 1987 for the terms *Sinnpflege* and *Textpflege*.

<sup>15</sup> As Dundas (1993: 253) pointed out, the Terāpanth did initially not refer to any predecessors and has still not published an official *paṭṭāvalī* which constructs a direct line of succession back to Mahāvīra or another Tīrthankara. In this respect, the Terāpanthīs present themselves as direct disciples of Mahāvīra, like the Śramaṇasaṅgha. See Bhaṇḍārī 1937: 96; Flügel 2003a: 194ff.

<sup>16</sup> See Balbir 2003a: 268f.

authority in almost all surviving old *paṭṭāvalīs* of the Loṅkāgaccha and Sthānakavāsī traditions. However, although they are amongst the earliest written documents of the tradition, the oldest Sthānakavāsī *paṭṭāvalīs* cannot be dated much earlier than the beginning of the 19th century.<sup>17</sup> Before the modern Jaina revival in the second half of the 19th century, the institutional structures of the aniconic traditions were very rudimentary and, within the five main lines of tradition, in a state of permanent flux. Instead of *paṭṭāvalīs*, which trace the succession of group leaders, the dominant descent constructs were *gurvāvalīs*, that is lists which trace the *guru-śiṣya* lineages, as documented in the colophons of the oldest surviving manuscripts which contain mostly biographical poems and songs.<sup>18</sup> It seems, the perceived need for group organisation and ideological integration through elaborate descent constructs emerged in the Sthānakavāsī tradition only when, facing extinction under conditions of colonial domination, Hindu nationalism and sectarian rivalry, the quest for organisation, reform and competitive re-appropriation of the past had gained a new momentum.<sup>19</sup>

At the time, the sectarian struggle over the definition of the cultural memory of Loṅkā was particularly intense between the Sthānakavāsīs and the reformed “Saṃvegī” Tapāgaccha Mūrtipūjakas. For the Mūrtipūjakas (and the Digambaras) Loṅkā continued to be the prototypical heretic and one of the greatest threats to the survival of their own tradition. In an intriguing role-reversal, the Sthānakavāsīs and the Mūrtipūjakas re-enacted the ideological struggle between Loṅkā (and the Loṅkāgaccha) and his Mūrtipūjaka opponents in the 15th century. Yet, the agenda had signifi-

---

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Hastimal 1968. The fact that the chronologies are relatively young may be seen as confirmation for the general view that the Sthānakavāsī *muni* Jethmal was the first to invoke Loṅkā as the *dharmaguru* of his tradition in 1808. See *infra*.

<sup>18</sup> On the form and function of *paṭṭāvalīs* and *gurvāvalīs* see Flügel 2003a: 177-196.

<sup>19</sup> Purification of the *saṅgha* was already an established motive for institution building in the Śvetāmbara tradition.

cantly changed. At stake was not only the justification of image-worship on the part of the Mūrtipūjakas, but also the quest for legitimacy of a wide variety of new monastic orders and sectarian traditions which, by now, derived their religious identity directly from the layman Loṅkā – either through descent constructs or through the acceptance of his interpretation of the scriptures. At the centre of the controversies were idiosyncratic points of the customary law, *sāmācārī* or *maryādā*, of the monastic traditions<sup>20</sup> which are at the heart of the aniconic sects.<sup>21</sup> Monastic customary law is multidimensional in both form and content. Usually it is transmitted in the form of hand-written lists of proclamations (*bol*) in vernacular prose, often only comprising quotes from the scriptures with or without commentary, but also in form of poems or question-and-answer texts (*praśnottara*). It regulates not only the conduct, but also the doctrinal outlook, organisation and liturgy of a particular group of mendicants.<sup>22</sup> As such, it provides a crucial link between doctrine and practice, scripture and community, and is prone to processes of canonisation.<sup>23</sup> A crucial point of contention between the Sthānakavāsī and the Mūrtipūjaka traditions was whether Loṅkā himself formulated a list of instructions which led to the formation of the Loṅkāgaccha, what exactly these instructions were, and how they related to the customs of the various contemporary Sthānakavāsī traditions. Currently, no records are

---

<sup>20</sup> According to Dundas (1993: 248), one of the principal critics of the Loṅkā tradition, the Mūrtipūjaka monk Dharmasāgara, rejected in his *Pravacana-parīkṣā* the arbitrary basis of customary law with the remark that if custom were an acceptable criterion then even the views of the Loṅkāgaccha would be acceptable. Jñānsundar (1936: 182) also distinguishes between the Jaina *ājñā* and Loṅkā's *maryādā* in order to devalue the latter. On the Jain *maryādā* literature see Flügel 2003b.

<sup>21</sup> The foci for processes of identity formation of the image-worshipping sects are both mendicant orders and temples.

<sup>22</sup> Balbir (2003a: 259; 2003b: 53) stresses the difference between “ethics” and “abstract ideas and concepts”.

<sup>23</sup> On the problem of canonisation in the Jaina context see Bruhn 1987: 106.



known on disputes about Loṅkā's teachings amongst Sthānakavāsīs and members of the Loṅkāgaccha.

The key question, to what extent the prescribed<sup>24</sup> customary practices of the different aniconic traditions (and those of the Mūrtipūjakas) actually coincided with canonical prescriptions, triggered a series of heated disputes, which peaked in the 1930s, at the height of the nationalist and religious revivalist movements in India. At the time, the Śvetāmbara revivalist movements competed vigorously with one another and with Hindu revivalist groups, such as the aniconic Ārya Samāj of Svāmī Dayānand Sarasvatī (1824-1883),<sup>25</sup> and with Christian missionaries for support amongst the adherents of the traditional Jaina communities. Particularly virulent were the written exchanges between Sthānakavāsī mendicants and ex-Sthānakavāsī Mūrtipūjaka monks from the Pañjāb and Rājasthān, such as the polemicists Muni Buddhivijay (Būṭerāy) (1807-1882),<sup>26</sup> Ācārya Ātmārām (Vijayānand Sūri) (1837-1897)<sup>27</sup> and his Gujarāt-

<sup>24</sup> Observed behaviour of individual monks was generally not the key point of criticism.

<sup>25</sup> See for instance Dayānand's polemic against the Jains (1882/1908: 439ff.), which Śāstrī (1915) has also written about, the responses scattered throughout Ātmārām's work (1882/1906: 1-162, etc.), and a text of the Sthānakavāsī *sādhvī* Pārvaṭī (1905b), who attacked Dayānand's notions of god (*īśvara*) and *karma* based on the belief in liberation through transmigration. A vivid description of the exchanges from 1874 onwards can be found in P. L. Jain 1913/1923: 38ff. & II, 102-111. Farquhar (1915: 104) surmised that Dayānand's inexplicable rejection of image-worship was influenced by the Sthānakavāsī example in his native Morvī state in Gujarāt.

<sup>26</sup> See Būṭerāy 1878. He was in 1831 initiated into the Sthānakavāsī Jīvarāja Malūkacandra Sampradāya in the Pañjāb. See Upādhyāya Ātmārām 1914: 57, n.; Duggar 1989: 338; Flügel 2000: 80, n. 78.

<sup>27</sup> He was born in the Kṣatriya family of the soldier Gaṇeścandra Kapūr in the village Laharā in the Zīrā Tahasīl near Phīrozpur in the Pañjāb. After coming in close contact with Osvāl Sthānakavāsī Jains, he was initiated on 5.12.1853 (1910 *mṛgasār śukla* 5) by the Sthānakavāsī *muni* Jīvaṇrām (Jīvaṇmal), who probably belonged to the Jīvarāja Gaṅgarāma tradition. In 1874, he was re-initiated by the Mūrtipūjaka *ācārya* Buddhivijay (the ex-Sthānakavāsī monk Būṭerāy) in Gujarāt, and was given the name "Vijayānanda" when he became a *sūri* on 1.12.1886 (1943 *mṛgasār śukla* 5). See Ātmārām 1900a: 72f.; Vallabhvijay 1902: 33-85; 1996: 4ff.; Flügel 2000: 60 (n. 42), 79. Further details on his group affiliations

born disciple Muni Vallabhvijay (1870-1953), who were amongst the driving forces of the revival of the upright (*saṃvegī*) tradition of the Mūrtipūjaka Tapāgaccha in Gujarāt, which had to re-establish itself almost from scratch.<sup>28</sup> One of the fiercest critics of the aniconic tradition in the 20th century, the (ex-Sthānakavāsī) Mūrtipūjaka *muni* Jñānsundar (1936: 131ff.), born in 1880 in Rajasthan,<sup>29</sup> who attempted to revive the Upakeśāgaccha, has argued that contemporary Sthānakavāsī intellectuals such as Ācārya Amolakṛṣi (1877-1936),<sup>30</sup> Vāḍilāl Moṭīlāl Śāh (1878-1931), Muni Maṇilāl (1849-1932?),<sup>31</sup> and Muni Saubhāgyacandra “Santabāḷa” (died 1981),<sup>32</sup> who invoked Loṅkā’s critique of image-worship both in their innovative historiography of Loṅkā and in their polemics against the Mūrtipūjakas, had deliberately fabricated (*kalpita*) an artificial portrait of Loṅkā as their common spiritual ancestor to promote the unification of the multiple strands of their divided tra-

---

before leaving the Sthānakavāsīs, which are not entirely clear in his official biographies, have been highlighted in Mohanlāl Jain’s polemic *Durvādī Mukha-Capeṭikā* (1892), which was summarised by P. L. Jain 1913/1923: 246-249. Accordingly, Ātmārām left his guru Jīvaṇmal already in 1863 to study in Āgrā with Muni Ratnacandra of the Manoharadāsa Sampradāya. Thereafter, he returned to the Pañjāb and joined the Pañjāb Lavjīrṣi Sampradāya of Ācārya Amarsīnha. In Vallabhvijay’s biography (1902: 52) it appears that despite his physical separation, Ātmārām did not formally cut his link with Jīvaṇmal.

<sup>28</sup> See Cort 2001: 46.

<sup>29</sup> See the biographies by S. M. Jain (1929) and Guṇsundar (1938).

<sup>30</sup> See his monumental work *Jaina Tattva Prakāś* which was composed in 1903. The title of this not openly polemical text alludes to Ātmārām’s *Jaina Tattva Ādarśa*. See also *Grantha Karttā kā Saṅkṣipt Jīvan Vṛttānta by Kalyāṇmal Corādiyā* in Amolakṛṣi 1908/1920: 3.

<sup>31</sup> His dates 1849-1932, cited in sources of the Līmbḍī Nānī Pakṣ, are probably wrong, since he was still a young man in a photo published by Amarvijay 1908: 77f. Maṇilāl’s 1934 work was criticised by the Annual General Meeting of the AISJC in Ahmedabad in 19.5.1936 as “insufficient”, because of its incompleteness and lack of proof. See *Jaina Prakāśa* 17.5.1936, p. 342, in Jñānsundar 1936: 16, n.

<sup>32</sup> Saubhāgyacandra “Santabāḷa” had publicised his views already in 1935 in the journal *Jaina Prakāśa*, the mouthpiece of the All India Sthānakavāsī Conference, and probably earlier in a book called *Viśvavandya Prabhu Mahāvīr* (Ed. Ghīrajāl Tōkarśī Śāh), which is listed in Maṇilāl’s bibliography (1934).

dition.<sup>33</sup> According to Jñānsundar, who perceived a unified Sthānakavāsī Śramaṇasaṅgha as a threat to the revival of the Mūrtipūjaka tradition, there was not a shred of evidence for Loṅkā's instructions to his followers in the literature of Loṅkāgaccha, the Sthānakavāsīs and the Terāpanthīs, except for one unspecific reference to Loṅkā's *upadeśa* in a Loṅkāgaccha text which was composed thirty-eight or forty-six years after Loṅkā's death and could, in his view, therefore not be trusted.<sup>34</sup>

The critique of the “lack of evidence” in the Sthānakavāsī literature on Loṅkā is a modern *topos* of the Mūrtipūjaka *praśnottara* literature. It was already articulated by Ātmārām (1884/1903) and repeated again by Jñānsundar (1936: 97) and Śeṭh (1962: 342), to name but a few. Proof and evidence (*pramāṇa*) are long-established criteria in Jaina scholasticism. However, the increasing influence of European historicism and academic jargon on modern Jaina vernacular historiographies cannot be underestimated.<sup>35</sup> The Jainas encountered the power of “scientific truth” and of historical “facts and figures” first in the colonial courts of law in the 19th century.<sup>36</sup> Its rhetoric quickly filtered into their internal sectarian and communal disputes soon after the introduction of the printing press and of modern means of communication and transportation which transformed Indian intellectual culture. Almost all printed

---

<sup>33</sup> For details see Flügel 2000; 2003a.

<sup>34</sup> *Dayādharma Caupāī* 11. The word *upadeśa* can also refer to Loṅkā's famous conversion of Lakhamsī which took place before the creation of the Loṅkā order. It is true that no details or references are offered by V. M. Śāh (1909: 49ff.) or Saubhāgyacandra (1939: 77ff.). Jñānsundar (1936: 136) writes that there is also no evidence in Jeṭhmal's (1930) work *Samakitsār: un meṃ in bātoṃ kā isārā tak bhī nahīṃ kiyā hai*. However, on page 14f. of this text a *praśnottara* of fifty-two questions which are attributed to Loṅkā is published in Hindī, though no references to the original Ms. are given. The questions correspond to a list of fifty-four questions in a 17th-century text (K) attributed to Loṅkā which was published by Mālvaṇiyā (1963a: 80-82; 1964: 381).

<sup>35</sup> See Cort 1995: 471, 491-494.

<sup>36</sup> See for instance the report of Śāh (1909: 79) on the use of the courts to settle doctrinal disputes in 1822.

vernacular texts on Loṅkā profess to be interested in history and often use scientific jargon. This does not mean that the texts are products of a scientific attitude, in the sense of Max Weber's *Wissenschaft als Beruf*, with at least a notional commitment towards objectivity. Most vernacular historiographies to date are partisan and often polemical works which explicitly aim at influencing the present through one-sided re-constructions and re-interpretations of the past.<sup>37</sup> To its credit, the new Jaina historiography has unearthed numerous important historical documents. Its authors also reflect on the method of writing history itself, but often only to discredit the work of opponents as “unreliable”.

As Jñānsundar (1936: 7) rightly observed, the interest of the Sthānakavāsīs in Loṅkā seems to be greatest during periods of expansion, crisis and change. Whenever “Sthānakavāsīs” feel the need to assert their common doctrinal heritage and the need for institutional integration, both Loṅkā and the common opposition against image-worship are brought into play. And whenever the “Mūrtipūjaka” tradition as a whole comes under attack, it usually retaliates in kind. In this way the antagonism generates a sense of self-identity in both traditions and contributes to their social integration. Underlying the antagonism between the previously socially insignificant denominational super-categories such as “Mūrtipūjaka” and “Sthānakavāsī”, incorporating several “sub-”sects, is the struggle over the definition of the “essence” of “true Jainism” (understood in the manner of the new book oriented *Religionswissenschaft*) under the banner of “Jain” unity. At stake was the ideological self-definition and thus political positioning of the entire “Jain community” at a time of the emergence of Jain religious nationalism.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> *Lokāsāh ke yug se lekar āj tak kisī bhī vidvān sthānakavāsī muni ne athvā gr̥hastha ne viśuddha itihās ke dr̥ṣṭikon se kuch likhā ho, vah mere dekhne meṃ nahīn āyā. ... praśasti tathā guṇānuvād hī adhik hai – itihās us meṃ nahīn hai* (Mālvaṇiyā 1964: 365). The same is true for histories of Loṅkā by followers of other sectarian traditions.

<sup>38</sup> Flügel 2005; forthcoming (b).

### ESSENCE OF RIGHT BELIEF

The Loṅkāgaccha tradition still exists today in small pockets in Gujarāt.<sup>39</sup> Yet, the contemporary followers of the Loṅkāgaccha remember nothing of Loṅkā or his teachings anymore, and have only the vaguest idea of the recent history of their tradition. Not even Loṅkā's name is mentioned in their few idiosyncratic rituals. With two negligible exceptions,<sup>40</sup> most of the modern texts on Loṅkā have been produced by Sthānakavāsī, Terāpanthī and Mūrtipūjaka mendicants and lay intellectuals. It appears that the first Sthānakavāsī text which explicitly sought support in Loṅkā's teachings was Muni Jeṭhmal's celebrated anti-Mūrtipūjaka polemic *Samakita-sāra*, essence of right belief. The original Gujarātī text was prepared by several unnamed Sthānakavāsī lay followers, sometime after the religious debate (*śāstrārtha*) in which Jeṭhmal reportedly used the published arguments,<sup>41</sup> and printed in 1882 in Rājkoṭ by Śeṭh Nemicand Hīrācand Koṭhārī from Goṇḍal in Saurāṣṭra.<sup>42</sup> Two further Gujarātī editions were published in the following decades, and one revised Hindī edition of two parts in 1930<sup>43</sup> (with the translation of the original text forming part one).<sup>44</sup> The way in which this work was created offers insights into the strategies through

---

<sup>39</sup> Flügel, forthcoming (c). The term *gaccha* can mean school, monastic order or sect.

<sup>40</sup> I have found only two histories of Loṅkā in the Loṅkāgaccha *upāśrayas*, Bagasarāvāḷā 1894, and P. T. Śāh 2001. Both texts are derivative and do not add anything new on Loṅkā. The second text relies largely on Vārīā 1976.

<sup>41</sup> *Usī carcā kā sārāṃś, anekoṃ jijñāsu sadgrhasṭha ke āgraha se, pustakākār ke rūp meṃ dhāl diyā gayā* (Pratham Bhāg kī Bhūmikā, in Jeṭhmal 1930: 4).

<sup>42</sup> Ātmārām 1903: 289; Vallabhvijay 1909: 14; *Bhūmikā* in Jeṭhmal 1930: 10.

<sup>43</sup> Without access to the first three editions it is impossible to clearly identify different layers of commentary which may have been added to the original text in the published version of 1930.

<sup>44</sup> V. M. Śāh (1909: 79) mentions a documentation of the counter-arguments of the Mūrtipūjakas, *Dhūṇḍhakmat Khaṇḍan Rās* by Muni Uttamvijay which was unavailable to me. Johannes Klatt's *Jaina Onomastikon*, III, p. 1281, mentions another polemical text of this author: *Dhūṇḍhiā no rāsado* (Ahmadābād: Nāran Kṛṣṇarām, 1869).

which the effective history of a tradition is created and re-created, and suggests that an investigation of parallels in the history of the transmission of knowledge in the Jaina tradition may yield materials for an understanding of processes of identity-formation through the work of canonisation outside the canon, which have not yet been investigated.<sup>45</sup> First of all, Jeṭhmal was not the author of the published work. At the time, it was generally not considered appropriate for Sthānakavāsī *munis* to publish books under their own name, because of the violence of the printing press and because of the implicit promotion of egotism. Instead, lay-followers published lecture notes of the *pravacanas* of their gurus. In its prefaces and introductions, the text is described as a synopsis of the arguments used by Jeṭhmal in a public debate with the Tapāgaccha *saṃvegī munis* Vīrvijay and Yaśovijay on doctrinal differences which divided their religious traditions.<sup>46</sup>

The debate took place in Ahmedabad, either in 1808/9 (Saṃvat 1865)<sup>47</sup> or 1821/2 (Saṃvat 1878).<sup>48</sup> It was triggered by a communal dispute. According to Śāh (1909: 78f.), Sthānakavāsī mendicants were proselytising at the time in the town. In response, the locally dominant Mūrtipūjaka laity threatened to excommunicate all Sthānakavāsīs from their castes (*jñātī*). In order to help his beleaguered co-religionists in this situation, Ācārya Prāg from the Sthānakavāsī Dariyāpūrī Saṃpradāya travelled from his abode in the village of Visalapura outside Ahmedabad to the Tabīā Poḷ in the Sāraṅapura district of the city centre. He stayed in Gulābcand Hīracand's house

<sup>45</sup> On strategies of canonisation in the Jaina context see Bruhn 1987: 107, etc. To my knowledge, the term “secondary canonisation” was first used by Glasenapp (1925). The term “work of canonisation” was introduced by Assmann (1987: 19). For further studies on processes of canonisation in South Asia see Dalmia, Malinar & Christof 2003.

<sup>46</sup> Jñānsundar 1936: 15 suggests that Jeṭhmal developed his arguments on the basis of a text called *Vivāha Cūliyā Sūtra*, which was unavailable to me.

<sup>47</sup> Jñānsundar (1936: 15, 293) argued that the debate itself took place in Saṃvat 1865, because Jeṭhmal was already dead in Saṃvat 1878 (he does not give any information as to which Jeṭhmal he identified).

<sup>48</sup> V. M. Śāh 1909: 78f.

and also imparted religious instruction to the families of Gīrdhar Śāṅkar, Pānācand Jhaverchand, Rāycand Jhaverchand, Khīmācand Jhaverchand, and others, who, in turn, helped him to spread his word. In order to end the ensuing quarrels between Sthānakavāsīs and Mūrtipūjakas, both parties went to court. To educate themselves about the Jaina religion, the judges invited *munis* from both sides as expert witnesses. For Prāg's side the learned Muni Jeṭhmal, apparently a *suśiṣya* of Muni Rūpcand of the Bhūdhar Dharmadāsa Sampradāya in Rājasthān,<sup>49</sup> was present, together with twenty-seven other *munis*;<sup>50</sup> and for the Mandirmārgīs Muni Vīrvijay together with Yaśovijay and several monks and scholars (*śāstrī*) came to the court. According to “someone's” notes (*yādī*) of the court-proceedings, the judgement of 1878 *pauṣ śukla* 13 (6.1. 1822)<sup>51</sup> apparently favoured the arguments of Jeṭhmal's side – described as *cetanapūjakas*, worshippers of living consciousness, in contrast to the *mūrtipūjakas*, worshippers of images – although in their respective literatures both sides claimed victory.<sup>52</sup>

Although there is no conclusive evidence, the timing of the belated publication was almost certainly related to the publication of what is probably the first polemic against the Sthānakavāsīs in

<sup>49</sup> Preface, in Jeṭhmal 1930: 4. Seth (1970: 1112, n. 1) writes that Jeṭhmal temporarily belonged to the orders of Ācārya Jaymal and of the Terāpanth *ācārya* Bhikṣu respectively. Other sources say that he worked under the directive of Ācārya Amarasīṅha (Flügel 2003a: 237).

<sup>50</sup> Reportedly, twenty-five monks from Rājasthān were present, plus two monks from Prāg's group, and apparently Muni Mul (Mū?) from the Sāyālā Sampradāya in Gujarāt who is said to have supported Muni Jeṭhmal from the Palanpur Sampradāya (Maṅilāl 1934: 227f.). This points to a concerted effort on the side of the Sthānakavāsīs, which may have required them to take recourse to Loṅkā to find a common platform.

<sup>51</sup> Some sources say: 1878 *phālgun śukla* 1 (22.2.1822). The case is mentioned in V. M. Śāh 1909: 78f.; Maṅilāl 1934: 192f., 198f., 228; Jñānsundar 1936: 7, 15, 293; Candanākumārī 1964: 150, 192; Hastīmal 1971: 138f. See Flügel 2000: 68, n. 54 and 79, n. 77; 2003a: 237.

<sup>52</sup> Only the *mūrtipūjak ono parājay thayo – cetanapūjak ono jay thayo*; and *jeṭho rīkh āvyore, kāgaḷ vāṁcī rarī; pustak bahu lāvyore, gādumī ek bhārī* (in V. M. Śāh 1909: 79). Jñānsundar 1936: 15 simply states Jeṭhmal's defeat (*hār*).

print<sup>53</sup> in Ātmārām's (1881/1954, II: 539f.) work *Jainatattvadarśa* which appeared in Bhāvnagar in Saṃvat 1937. After his separation from and excommunication by the Sthānakavāsī Ācārya Amarasīnha (1805-1881) of the Pañjāb Lavjīrṣi Sampradāya and his reinitiation into the Tapāgaccha in Saṃvat 1932 (1875/6) in Ahmedabad, the ex-Sthānakavāsī *muni* Ātmārām (Vijayānanda Sūri) contributed much to the Mūrtipūjaka revival in Gujarāt and in the Pañjāb. To revive the "Sanātan Jaina Dharma"<sup>54</sup> by attracting more followers, Ātmārām started a vigorous pro-image-worship campaign, which he had already instigated in his later years as a Sthānakavāsī monk, during which he criticised many of the contemporary practices of the Sthānakavāsīs. One of the points of contention before he left was that Ācārya Amarasīnha did not answer twenty-one "legitimate" questions which were put to him in Saṃvat 1925 (1868) by certain Sthānakavāsī *śrāvakas* from Dillī.<sup>55</sup> Amarasīnha and his successor Ācārya Sohanlāl (1846-1936) of the Lavjīrṣi tradition were the dominant Sthānakavāsī monks in his native Pañjāb at the time, and the main targets of his critique. After Ātmārām's excommunication and the publication of his *Jainatattvadarśa*, Sohanlāl sent – on request of Amarasīnha<sup>56</sup> – a *praśnottara* of one hundred questions<sup>57</sup> to Ātmārām in Saṃvat 1938 *caitra śukla* 5 (4.4.1881), to which Ātmārām instantly replied in Saṃvat 1938 *caitra śukla* 7 (6.4.1881), without receiving a response.<sup>58</sup> Shortly thereafter, it seems, in Saṃvat 1938 (1882)<sup>59</sup>

<sup>53</sup> *yah lok to sarva jainmat se viparīt calanevāle hai* (Ātmārām 1954, II: 540).

<sup>54</sup> Ātmārām 1900a: 72.

<sup>55</sup> Vallabhvijay 1891: 131f. The first question asked for the *paṭṭāvalī* of all *ācāryas* beginning with Mahāvīra, which apparently did not exist in this Sthānakavāsī tradition at the time: 1. *śrī mahāvīr svāmī se lekar āj tak pāṭānupāṭ kaun se ācārya hue unoṃ ke nām likhne* (p. 131).

<sup>56</sup> In Vallabhvijay 1891: 72-82.

<sup>57</sup> On the *śataka* format see Balbir 2003a; 2003b.

<sup>58</sup> Published by Vallabhvijay 1891: 83-125.

<sup>59</sup> Generally, the South Indian calendar applies in Gujarāt, therefore Saṃvat 1938 must be 1882, not 1881.



the polemical *Samakitsār* appeared in print with its sustained attack on *mūrtipūjā* and a long list of questions to the Mandirmārgīs. Immediately after receiving a copy of this book from a Sthānakavāsī layman in Delhi, Ātmārām (1884/1903) composed an equally polemical point-for-point reply under the title *Samyaktva Śalyod-dhāra*, removal of the thorns from right belief,<sup>60</sup> and the work *Ajñāna Timira Bhāskara* (1888/1906), radiant darkness of ignorance, in which both the Ārya Samāj and the Dhūṅḍhiyās are systematically criticised.<sup>61</sup> This triggered a long series of tit-for-tat exchanges between leading mendicants (and laity) of the two (three) traditions, which subsided somewhat only after Indian Independence in 1949, though the conflict is still smouldering and can re-erupt at any time.

Of particular interest for us is the role of “Loṅkā” in this debate. Ātmārām’s sharp criticism of the “heresy” (*nihnava*) of the “Dhūṅḍhiyās” was provoked by Jeṭhmal’s (1930: 1-9) construction of a contrast between “the path of compassion” (*dayā mārga*) and non-violence of the tradition of Loṅkā (in its Sthānakavāsī manifestation),<sup>62</sup> and “the path of violence” (*hiṃsā mārga*) of the Mūrtipūjaka *saṃvegī* mendicants, which were addressed as “yellow-clad pseudo-ascetics” (*pitāmbar bheṣadhārī*). As a synonym of *dayā mārga*, Jeṭhmal used the term *mokṣa mārga*, and compared the path of salvation of the Sthānakavāsīs, which he derived directly from

<sup>60</sup> *Dhūṅḍhiye hī hiṃsādharmī haiṃ aur dayā kā yathārtha svarūp nahīm samajhte haiṃ* (Ātmārām 1903: 289). There are many texts in the Jaina *bhaṅḍāras* with titles such as *Samakit Sār Praśnottar Pacchīsī Sajjhāy* (L.D. Institute Ms. No. 4734 etc.) which may contain information on earlier exchanges between exponents of the two traditions.

<sup>61</sup> The title alluded to Dayānand’s book *Timir Bhāskar Jvālāprasād* (cf. P. L. Jain 1913/1923: 41). The work addressed the view of the two main rivals of Ātmārām in the Pañjāb. It was composed in two parts between 1882-85 in Ambālā, and first published in Bhāvnagar in 1888. Ātmārām’s deliberation on the beliefs of the Christians, *Īsāi Mat Samikṣā*, was published posthumously in the year 1900. See Kiraṇyaśāstrī 1999, Parisiṣṭ I.

<sup>62</sup> Jeṭhmal 1930: 9f. does not use the word “Sthānakavāsī”, but refers directly to Loṅkā and his “true mendicant path”: *lokā gaccha-sādhu mārga hī saccā hai* (p. 3)

Loṅkā, with the dual concern of the Mūrtipūjakas (and Digambaras) with salvation and with material well-being (*kuśaliyā darśana*).<sup>63</sup> The Mūrtipūjakas are spreading lies, he argued, because they convey to their followers the illusion that salvation can be reached through *pūjā*, while preventing them from reading the truth in the scriptures.<sup>64</sup>

In his long list of rejoinders, of which only the *Samyaktva Śalyoddhāra* and the *Ajñāna Timira Bhāskara* seem to have been published during his lifetime, Ātmārām (1903; 1908)<sup>65</sup> highlighted Jeṭhmal's "misspellings" and "misunderstandings" of the scriptures, and furnished descriptions of the lax conduct of contemporary Dhūṇḍhaka mendicants. In his view, the Sthānakavāsīs generally did not observe the canonical prescriptions, and thus truly formed a religion of violence: *dhūṇḍhiye himsā dharmī haim*.<sup>66</sup> In his critique of Jeṭhmal's account, Ātmārām (1903: 7f.) categorically stated that everything that "Jūṭhmal" wrote about Loṅkā's beliefs as the source of the Sthānakavāsī doctrines was a "self-imagined fabricated lie". In accordance with the conventions of the *praśnottara* genre,<sup>67</sup> he backed his claim with selected citations

<sup>63</sup> Two realms of value in the Mūrtipūjaka tradition are also identified by Cort 2001.

<sup>64</sup> In contrast to other Mūrtipūjaka *ācāryas*, Ātmārām opposed the publication of the scriptures. He permitted both *sādhus* and laity to read the *sūtras* only in the presence of a guru who could explain the meaning of the text, and prevented access to certain texts to women. See for instance Malukcand 1908: 182f.

<sup>65</sup> See also his answers to Sohanlāl in Vallabhvijay 1891: 83-125.

<sup>66</sup> Ātmārām 1903: 289. It is not entirely clear whether Ātmārām attacks both observed behaviour and customary law in this section. Since he does not address any particular order, though he may have had the Lavjīrṣi Amarasinha Sampradāya in mind, his criticism is too vague to be considered in detail.

<sup>67</sup> In her discussion of the Kharataragaccha monk Samayasundara's (1553-1645) *Sāmācārī Śataka* of 1616, whose second section (and probably other points as well) is devoted entirely to the critique of "the Sthānakavāsīs" (probably the Loṅkāgaccha traditions, but since the canon of "thirty-two" is criticised in points 38 and 47 the Sthānakavāsī Jīvarāja may have been addressed), Balbir (2003a: 255, 257; 2003b: 56f.) argues that it was the conflict between Loṅkā and the Mūrtipūjakas which lead to the development of the *praśnottara* genre which reflects the formal features of oral debates. In her view it is the "tendency to

from the canon and from the writings of the Sthānakavāsī tradition itself.<sup>68</sup> Information on the true historical origin (*khari utpatti*) of the “Ḍhūṇḍhak Panth”,<sup>69</sup> he argued, can be found in two other Sthānakavāsī texts which he summarised in a few pages: Hīrakalaśmuni’s *Kumati Vidhvamsana Caupā*, quatrain on the destruction of stupidity, and the *Ḍhūṇḍhak Paṭṭāvalī* of Amolakcand of the Pañjāb Amarasinhā Sampradāya.

Although the furnished information on the lines of succession is rudimentary,<sup>70</sup> Ātmārām’s version of the “actual history” contrasts favourably with the account offered by Jeṭhmal<sup>71</sup> in the style of “localised” versions of Jaina “universal history”, i.e. the history of great beings or *mahāpuruṣas*, and doctrinal “cosmological history”.<sup>72</sup> In his first verse, Jeṭhmal (1930: 1) wrote, *śrī dayā dharma phailā aur bhasma graha utarā jiskā vistār*, effectively arguing –

---

stress divergencies” and the lack of “any global organising principle” which distinguishes the genre from the merely “literary” question-answer formats used in the canon, though the method of citing “authentic” written texts in the debates between the late medieval sectarian traditions (see Granoff 1993) seems to be the principal difference: “such works are meant to discuss specific points that gave birth to different opinions within different Jain circles by referring to scriptures, with the idea to settle them according to the view in force within the order to which the author belongs” (Balbir 2003a: 256).

<sup>68</sup> *Jeṭhmal meṃ jo luṃpakmat kī utpatti likhī hai bilkul jhūṭhī aur svakapol kalpit hai* (Ātmārām 1903: 11).

<sup>69</sup> Ātmārām 1954, II: 537 derives the term *Ḍhūṇḍhiya* or *Ḍhūṇḍhaka*, polemically from *Ḍhūṇḍha*, or ruin. The Sthānakavāsī themselves derive *Ḍhūṇḍhiya* from *Ḍhūṇṛhiya* or *Ḍhūṇṛhaka*, or seeker. See for instance Hastimal 1995: 769.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Flügel 2000; 2003a; Jain & Kumār 2003.

<sup>71</sup> Jñānsundar 1936: 29 used the same method of critique backed with more evidence of this kind in his rejoinder to the later Sthānakavāsī *itihāsa* literature.

<sup>72</sup> Bruhn 1983: 37 defines Jaina universal history in terms of “a definite mythological subject, the history of the sixty-three great men”. Cort 1995: 473 coined the loosely defined term “localised history” to describe similar narrative structures, focusing on great personalities, etc., within particular sectarian traditions. For the present purpose – the analysis of “historical narratives of great beings” – both definitions are too specific, and do not account for the cosmological themes in Jaina historical narratives. I would suggest to see “universal history”, as defined by Bruhn, as a term which mediates between “chronological” and “cosmological history”.

as Devr̥ṣi's commentary explains – that Loṅkā's revival of “true Jainism” in the year Saṃvat 1531, exactly two thousand years after Mahāvīra's death, was predicted already by the canonical *Jinacariya* 129-131, which says that after a two thousand year period during which

there will not be paid much respect and honour to the śramaṇas, the Nirgrantha monks and nuns (...) when the great [Bhasma] Graha, &c., leaves that natal asterism [of Mahāvīra], there will be paid much respect and honour to the śramaṇas, the Nirgrantha monks and nuns for an era of two-thousand years (KS 130f.).

This somewhat optimistic version of Jaina cosmological history, which allows for progressive intervals within the generally predicted decline, contrasts however with other passages in the scriptures. In his rejoinder, Ātmārām (1903: 4) cited the famous section Viy 20.8.4 in which Mahāvīra predicted that his teaching will survive for at least 21,000 years after his death. The same argument had previously been used by the 16th-century founders of two Sthānakavāsī orders, Lava and Dharmadāsa, against the followers of the Loṅkāgaccha and the Ekal Pātriyāpanth, who indeed seem to have favoured the *Jinacaritra* passage, to which Jeṭhmal had reverted without fear of sanction, because the Loṅkāgaccha was already in terminal decline, and no competition for the Sthānakavāsīs anymore.<sup>73</sup> Since there is no independent criterion for judging which of the two versions is more authentic (even historical precedence would not solve the issue) any choice between them is a matter of personal preference and of sectarian interests. However, due to his correspondence with European scholars such as Hoernle<sup>74</sup> and the presence of his representative V. R. Gāndhī at the first Parliament of World Religions in Chicago in 1893, Ātmārām's writings were widely read outside India, and significantly influenced the image of the Jaina community projected by the first

---

<sup>73</sup> Flügel 2000: 72f.

<sup>74</sup> Ātmārām 1916.

generations of modern Indologists. Jeṭhmal's text, by contrast, circulated only within the literary elite of the Sthānakavāsīs and Mūrtipūjakas. Thus, only the Mūrtipūjaka depiction entered European textbooks on Jainism.

The second round of the dispute was fought on behalf of Sohanlāl and Ātmārām between the Sthānakavāsī *mahāsatī* "Jainācārya"<sup>75</sup> Pārvatī Devī (1854-1939) from the Amarasinha Sampradāya and Ātmārām's disciple and future *ācārya* Muni Vallabhvijay (1870-1954). Pārvatī Devī was a remarkable Jaina nun<sup>76</sup> who on the 28.12.1872 (1929 *mārgaśīrṣa kṛṣṇa* 13) in Delhi changed from the Manoharadāsa Sampradāya of Ācārya Ratnacandra (died 1864)<sup>77</sup> to the Pañjāb Lavjīrī tradition of Ācārya Amarsinha (1805-1881).<sup>78</sup> According to Sarlā (1991: 299), she chose a less restrictive group in order to be able to preach in public, to publish books, and to wander alone.<sup>79</sup> Her official biography by P. L. Jain (1913/1923: 30), however, informs us that she joined the Amarsinha Sampradāya because its mendicants followed the scriptures more closely. Pārvatī Devī's pamphlet *Jñāna Dīpikā* (Lāhaur 1889), a critique of the *Jainatattvadarśa*,<sup>80</sup> and Muni Vallabhvijay's (1891: 9-71) reply,

<sup>75</sup> Book cover Pārvatī 1905b. "Ācārya" is here used as a honorific title.

<sup>76</sup> According to Vallabhvijay's often polemical remarks on her biography (1891: 6-11), she was born in an Agravāl *baniyā* family of the village Luhāra near Āgrā, took *dīkṣā* from her teachers Muni Kuṃṃvarsena and Sādhvī Hīrām of Ratnacandra's Sthānakavāsī Manoharadāsa Sampradāya on the 6.4.1867 (1924 *caitra śukla* 2). Kuṃṃvarsena did not follow Ratnacandra's command (*ājñā*) and separated himself later together with his disciples. Pārvatī's official biographer P. L. Jain (1913/1923) confirms her basic biodata. He relates the interesting detail that her father's brother followed the Digambara tradition, and her father the Sthānakavāsī tradition of Ratnacandra's disciple Kuṃṃvarsena (p. 5).

<sup>77</sup> Vallabhvijay 1902: 46.

<sup>78</sup> Vallabhvijay 1891: 8 notes that the disputes between Pārvatī and Ātmārām, who left the Sthānakavāsīs in 1874, caused great discordance between the Jaina traditions in the Pañjāb: *pañjāb meṃ ākar bahut Jaina dharma kī nindā karāvegā*.

<sup>79</sup> Her texts are published in the *praśnottara* format, and are probably based on protocols of oral conversations with her lay followers.

<sup>80</sup> The contents can be inferred from Vallabhvijay's response (1891: 9-71). I have not been able to locate a copy of this or any other text mentioned in the

*Gappa Dīpikā*,<sup>81</sup> re-ignited the debate in the Pañjāb which was again conducted in the form of *praśnottaras*, in which for instance the difference between the thirty-one Āgamas which were allegedly accepted by Loṅkā and the thirty-two Āgamas of the Sthānakavāsīs was questioned by Vallabhvijay (1891: 130f.), who dismissed Pārvatī's book as a "work of sin" which calls for an atonement (*prāyaścitta*) since, in accordance with the rules of the scriptures, no *sādhvī* before her had ever written a book nor spoken in the assembly of men.<sup>82</sup> Vallabhvijay was, in turn, repudiated by an anonymous [?] pamphlet called *Gappa Dīpikā Samīr kā Gappa* and Paṇḍit Jiyālāl Jain's (1893) *Carcā Candrodāy Bhāg Tisrā*. According to Vallabhvijay's (1909: 14-18) chronology of the exchanges between 1881-1909,<sup>83</sup> in response to Vallabhvijay, Ācārya Sohanlāl wrote *Draupadīpūjā Khaṇḍan* (Amṛtsar),<sup>84</sup> Muni Ṛṣirāj *Satyārtha Sāgara* (Pune), and an unnamed author *Samvegīmat Sāguphā*

---

following which is not listed in the bibliography. Further books of Pārvatī, which were inaccessible to me, are *Jaina Dharma ke Dās Niyam* (1889), *Go Rakṣā kā Upadeś* (1900), *Kuyasan Niṣedh* (1915), *Mukti Nirṇay Prakāś* (1916), *Śrīmad Bhagavān Nemīnāth Rājmatījī kā Jīvan Caritra* (1918), *Brahmacārya Vidhi* (1919), and *Vairāgya Prakāś* (1930). Further criticisms of Ātmārām, whom she met personally for the first time in 1863 in Agrā, are summarised in P. L. Jain 1913/1923: 32-37, 249f., 278-283, II: 47-50, 71f. They concern issues such as the initiation of five year old children, or the habit of Ātmārām's mendicants of taking baths, which are defended in the *Jainatattvadarśa*, and in particular the "misrepresentation" of the Sthānakavāsī tradition in the last section of this book.

<sup>81</sup> The title of Vallabhvijay's *Dhūṇḍhak-hita-sikṣā Apanām Gappa-dīpikā-samīr* (1891) alludes also to V. M. Śāh's *Hita-sikṣā*. Vallabhvijay quotes extensively from Ātmārām. His authorship of the work, as well as the attribution of the authorship of "Vijayrājendra Sūri's" *Caturtha Stuti Kuyukti Nirṇay Chedan Kūthār* to Vallabhvijay's disciple Dhanvijay, has been disputed by J. Jain (1893: 6f.), in response to the polemical attribution of Pārvatī's book to an anonymous Brāhman.

<sup>82</sup> Vallabhvijay 1909: 1f.

<sup>83</sup> With details supplemented from other sources.

<sup>84</sup> The critique of image worship in the manner of Draupadī, who apparently only at her wedding under special circumstances venerated images, is a *topos* of the aniconic Jaina literature. See for instance L 7; Jeṭhmal 1930: 84-112. Compare: "The Story of Draupadī" in: Nagendra K. Singh (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Jainism*, Vol. 22, pp. 5931-5945. New Delhi: Anmol Publications, 2001.

(Ambālā); which was countered by an unnamed author's text *Jahālat Dhuṅḍhiyā* (Ambālā). Three further Sthānakavāsī pamphlets, *Kāgahans Nirṇay* (Ambālā), *Manta kī Bahsa Pūjerāṃ* of Kanīyālāl (Paṭayālā), and *Samyaktva athavā Dharma no Darvājo* by V. M. Śāh (Ahmedabad), were countered by Muni Amarvijay's *Dharma nā Darvājā Jovā nī Diśā*, which in turn was criticised by a text published in Ahmadabad, *Kamalprabhā*. The response to Mahāsati Pārvatī's *Satyārtha-Candrodaya-Jain* (Lāhaur: Lālā Meharand, 1904) on the "stupid" worship of "lifeless objects" (*jaṛ pūjā*)<sup>85</sup> and on the *nikṣepas*<sup>86</sup> was Muni Amarvijay's (1908) *Dhūṅḍhak-Hṛday-Netrāñjanaṃ athavā Satyārtha-Candrodayāṣṭakam*; and in response to the Sthānakavāsī pamphlet *Isatahār-Amarāvati*, an unnamed Mūrtipūjaka author wrote *Dhūṅḍhakpol Amarāvati*, which was countered by the texts *Khulāsāpol Saṃvegīyāṃ* (Amṛtsar), Muni Ratnacand's *Saṃvegīmat Mardan* (Amṛtsar), and *Śāstrārtha Nābhā* (Ambālā). The last Mūrtipūjaka text on Vallabhvijay's list is *Dhūṅḍhakmat Parājay* (Ātmānand Jain Sabhā Pañjāb 1909) which gives information on the judgement of Mahārāja Hīrāsīmha Bahādūr of Paṭayālā in favour of Vallabhvijay in a debate with Sohanlāl on the scriptural foundations of their respective views in

<sup>85</sup> Like most topics of the sectarian debate, the issue was already addressed by Loṅkā, and discussed for instance in Samayasundara's *Sāmācārī Śataka* 40 (Balbir 2003a: 260). However, like Ātmārām (Vijayānandsūri), Pārvatī (1905b) was also engaged in an ideological battle against the "Āryās", i.e. the Ārya Samāj.

<sup>86</sup> See Jeṭhmal's (1930) critique of the interpretation of the *nikṣepa* doctrine by the *hīṃsādharma*, i.e. the image-worshippers. The Mūrtipūjaka tradition treats the four principal analytical standpoints, or *nikṣepa* (*nāma*, *dravya*, *sthāpana*, *bhāva*), as equivalent, whereas the Sthānakavāsī or *dayādharma* tradition gives priority to the *bhāva nikṣepa*: *anuyogadvāra sūtra meṃ 4 nikṣepa kahe haiṃ yah to satya hai par cāroṃ hī nikṣepa vandanik nahīṃ kahe. ek bhāv nikṣepa vandanik kahā hai* (Jeṭhmal 1930: 54). The principal reply was formulated by Muni Ātmārām (1884/1908), who in turn was criticised by Mahāsati Pārvatī (1905a) in her work *Satyārtha Candrodaya Jaina*, which was rejected in Muni Amarvijay's *Dhūṅḍhak Hṛday Netrāñjanaṃ athavā Satyārtha Candrodayāṣṭakam* (1908). An early Digambara critique of this view can be found in the *Sūrya-prakāśa* of the year 1825. See Dundas 2001: 67, n. 44. For short summaries of Pārvatī's debates with Digambara laity see P. L. Jain 1913/1923.

5.2.1904.<sup>87</sup> It was followed by seven Sthānakavāsī responses, some of which are reprinted and criticised in the collection edited by Muni Amarvijay (1908): *Pītāmbarī Parājay* (Amṛtsar), Muni Rām-candra's *Amṛtsar Saṃgraha* (Mumbaī), the *stavan* of Muni Mādhav *Taraṅgiṇī Dvitiya Taraṅg* (Āgrā 1908), Muni Saubhāgmal's *Vividh Ratna Prakāś* (Pune), Muni Kundanmal's *Pragaṭ Jaina Pītāmbarī Mūrtipūjakoṃ kā Mithyātva* (1908),<sup>88</sup> and his *Ātmārām Saṃvegī kī Karttūt, Ātmārām kī Ādat kā Namūnā* (n.d.), and finally V. M. Śāh's (1909) *Sādhumārgī Jaina Dharmānuyāyīoe Jāṇvā Jog Ketāṭik Aitihāsik Noṃdh*, a key text for the modern Sthānakavāsī unification movement, which attracted much critical response from the Mūrtipūjakas, not least from Vallabhvijay (1909),<sup>89</sup> Ujamcand (1909), and Jñānsundar (1936: 247ff.), because it again referred to Loṅkā as the common forefather of all Sthānakavāsīs and thereby started a new round of debates.<sup>90</sup>

## HISTORICAL NOTES

V. M. Śāh (1878-1931) was the first layperson to make an important intellectual contribution to the study of Loṅkā's legacy for the Sthānakavāsīs,<sup>91</sup> and the first Sthānakavāsī to collect some of the available though "untrustworthy" *paṭṭāvalīs* in order to tentatively reconstruct, in the manner of Ātmārām, an accurate history of the entire Sthānakavāsī tradition.<sup>92</sup> He was also a prime mover

<sup>87</sup> Note that many pamphlets of the Mūrtipūjaka monks have been published under Ātmārām's name even after his death. See footnote 81.

<sup>88</sup> Kundanmal belonged to the Raghunātha Sampradāya.

<sup>89</sup> He described it as a "work of deceit". See V. M. Śāh's reply (1925: 3f.).

<sup>90</sup> Muni [Ācārya] Amolakṛṣi's *Śāstrodhār Mīmāṃsā* (1920), an addendum to his Āgama edition is also a key text for the Sthānakavāsī revival. It contains a few pages on Loṅkā (pp. 57-60) and sustained a criticism of the Mūrtipūjakas and Dīgambaras. I only recently gained access to this book.

<sup>91</sup> The Mūrtipūjaka layman Lālā Jayadayāl's *Dhūṇḍhak Mat Samikṣā* (n.d.) must have been published in the Pañjāb sometime before 1908.

<sup>92</sup> Śāh 1909: 5 singles out the *paṭṭāvalīs* of the Darīyāpurī Sampradāya, the Pañjāb (Lavjīṛṣi) Sampradāya and of the Mūrtipūjaka "Vijaya" and "Sāgara"



behind the creation of the *All India Sthānakavāsī Jaina Conference* (AISJC) of the Sthānakavāsī laity in February 1906 in Morvī,<sup>93</sup> and publicised in his 1909 book for the first time the idea of creating a unified order of all Sthānakavāsī mendicants. Although Loṅkā was a layman, it was he alone who could serve as a common ancestor, because the Sthānakavāsī tradition was founded not by one but by several different ex-Loṅkāgaccha mendicants, who initially shared little more than the rejection of image-worship and the criticism of “lax conduct” of the Loṅkāgaccha *yatis*. After their creation between c. 1628-1668, the original five Sthānakavāsī mendicant traditions quickly split into numerous sub-groups which developed different customs and began to struggle with one another, until the AISJC finally called for an end of all “internal” antagonism. Conflicts between mendicant orders were divisive for the Sthānakavāsī laity as well and obstructed aim of the AISJC leadership to assert the political influence of Sthānakavāsī representatives on a national platform. From 1906 onwards, the AISJC, like the competing Conferences of the Digambaras and Mūrtipūjakas which were established in 1893 and 1902 respectively, held regular meetings on an all-India basis to prepare the ground for the first *mahāsammelan*, or great assembly, of representatives of all Sthānakavāsī mendicant traditions, which was finally held in 1933 in Ajmer.

Before the assembly congregated, a fourth edition of the *Samakitsār*, which was also the first Hindī edition, was published in 1930 under the auspices of the *Akhil Bhāratīya Sthānakavāsī Jaina Conference* after years of careful preparation of the translation by Muni Devṛṣi (1872-1942), who in 1936 succeeded Ācārya Amolakṛṣi (1877-1936) – one of the most influential Sthānakavāsī monks at the time who was the first to publish a printed edition and

---

Śākhā (which treated the Sādhumārgī and Loṅkāgacchī as “*sammūrcchima*”) for their untrustworthiness, but exempts the Cha Koṭī Saṅgha (Limbḍī Nānī Pakṣa) *paṭṭāvalī*.

<sup>93</sup> On the significance of V. M. Śāh and the text *Aitihāsik Noṃdh* see Flügel 2000; 2003a.

Hindī translation of the Sthānakavāsī Āgamas – as the leader of the Mālva Ṛṣi Sampradāy. The plan was to make the ideas of Loṅkā available to everyone, in the national language of India, and to create a sense of unity amongst the Sthānakavāsī mendicants in opposition to the Mūrtipūjakas in particular. In this context, the author of the *Samakit Śalyoddhāra* became again a useful target. One of the three anonymous introductions to the *Samakitsār*<sup>94</sup> accused the “stubborn mischief maker” Ātmārām in an *ad hominem* attack for not understanding the substance of *samakita* (*samyak-tva*), right belief, nor practising it, as his violent use of language testified. As proof for Ātmārām’s wrongdoing, the following passage of the *Dasaveyāliya* is cited:

When he notices that [a monk] who has mastered the Āyāra and the [Viyāha-]Pannatti [and] who is studying the Ditthivāya, makes a mistake in speaking, he should not mock him. (DVS 8.49).<sup>95</sup>

In other words, Ātmārām was chided for not seriously criticising the principles of the Sthānakavāsīs, which are beyond reproach, but only the lax conduct of individual ascetics, and in so doing harmed himself due to the aggressive style of his attack. The impressive *Loṅkāśāh* [sic!] *Jaina Gurukul*, which was built by the AISJC in 1951 in Sāḍaḍī as a fitting venue for the 1952 *mahāsammelan*, at which the Śramaṇasaṅgha was formally founded, still stocks dozens of copies of this edition of the *Samakitsār*,<sup>96</sup> which demonstrates the key role the text played during the constituent phase of the Śramaṇasaṅgha, both as a symbol of the doctrinal unity of the Sthānakavāsīs and as a common reference source for arguments against the Mūrtipūjakas.

---

<sup>94</sup> Written either by Devṛṣi or, more likely, by one of the editors of the book in Jeṭhmal 1930: 11-19.

<sup>95</sup> Schubring’s translation. Original cited in Jeṭhmal 1930: 18.

<sup>96</sup> The Hindī edition of the *Śrīlālji Mahārāj kā Sacitra Jīvanacaritra* which was composed by Durlabh T. Jhauharī (1922/23), one of the principal leaders of the Sthānakavāsī laity at the time, is the only other text which is available in huge quantities.

The Ajmer *sammelan* identified the problem of harmonising the different *maryādās* of the Sthānakavāsī *sampradāyas* as one of the prime obstacles for the planned formation of a unified Śramaṇa-saṅgha. Another obstacle was the lack of a common origin and lineage. One year after this momentous meeting, the first important study of the history of the Sthānakavāsī tradition as a whole appeared in print: the *Śrī Jaina Dharm ano Prācīn Saṅkṣipt Itihās ane Prabhu Vīr Paṭṭāvalī* by Muni Maṇilāl (1934) of the Līmbḍī Nānī Pakṣa.<sup>97</sup> The text contains a long chapter on the “great reformer” Loṅkā Śāh,<sup>98</sup> in which Maṇilāl – with debatable success – attempted for the first time to resolve the contradictions between the transmitted biographies of Loṅkā in order to clearly establish the historical links between Loṅkā and the various Sthānakavāsī lineages, which are subsequently described in the book. Maṇilāl unearthed much new material,<sup>99</sup> particularly on the Gujarātī traditions, and produced the first comprehensive work on the aniconic traditions, as far as his (not clearly referenced) sources permitted.<sup>100</sup> His work was nevertheless criticised by the General Annual Meeting of the AISJC on the 10.5.1936 for its “incomplete” nature because it does not give a sufficient account of the Ajmer *sammelan*, and probably also because it does not provide much evidence on the Sthānaka-

<sup>97</sup> Reprinted photos of Maṇilāl and Pārvatī Devī are mocked as “suitable evidence” for the “aniconic” credentials of the Sthānakavāsīs in Amarvijay 1908: 77f.

<sup>98</sup> Maṇilāl 1934: 157-178. See also the chapter on the Loṅkāgaccha, pp. 179-186. There is no evidence in the oldest sources that Loṅkā’s family name was Śāh, though this is commonly assumed in modern literature.

<sup>99</sup> For instance, the Tapāgaccha *muni* Kāntivijay’s *Ath Loṅkāśāh nuṃ Jīvan*, which he published in its entirety at the beginning of the chapter on Loṅkā (Maṇilāl 1934: 161f.). For a critique of this text and its influence on Maṇilāl see Jñānsundar 1936: 9ff.

<sup>100</sup> Deśāi 1926-44, III: 2204 mentions that Maṇilāl edited the *paṭṭāvalīs* on which the published work is based in Saṃvat 1941. Śeṭh 1962: 342 quotes an additional book of Maṇilāl, *Prabhuvīr Paṭṭāvalī māṃ Loṅkāśāh nuṃ Jīvan-caritra*. I was unable to trace these works; nor Jīvaṅlāl Kālīdās Vorā’s (ed.) *Jaindharma Darpaṇ* of Saṃvat 1942 which, according to Deśāi, also contains *paṭṭāvalīs* of the aniconic traditions.

vāsī traditions in North India.<sup>101</sup> Jñānsundar (1936: 16), whose own publication *Śrīmad Lauṅkāśāh* responded critically to the renewed Sthānakavāsī interest in Loṅkā, did not fail to mention this.

After the Ajmer *sammelan*, the role of Loṅkā as a “founding father” was made more prominent within the Sthānakavāsī movement, and for the first time entire books were devoted to the depiction of his religious reforms. The most widely read account of Loṅkā at the time was the *Dharmaprāṇ-Loṅkāśāh (Krānti no Yugasṛṣṭā)*, by the social reformer Muni Saubhāgyacandra “Santabāḷa” (1939) of the Līmbḍī Moṭī Pakṣa. It was apparently written already in the 1920s and first published in the journal *Sthānakavāsī Jain*, founded in Ahmedabad Pañcabhāī nī Poḷ in 1932,<sup>102</sup> and between 10.11.1935–13.1.1936 re-published in Gujarātī in the form of a series of articles in the journal *Jaina Prakāśa*, the mouthpiece of the AISJC. The text contains few references, although Deśāī’s work is mentioned. In the same year (1935), the Sthānakavāsīs celebrated “Loṅkāśāh’s birthday”<sup>103</sup> with a national poetry festival in the Rājasthān town Sojat Road. The festival was organised by “Marudhar Keśarī” Mantrī Muni Miśrīmal (1891-1984) of the Raghunātha Sampradāya, a fervent advocate of reform (*kṣetra viśuddhi*) and of the unification of all Sthānakavāsī traditions (Editors, in Miśrīmal 1936: 1), whose speech at the regional *sammelan* of the Sthānakavāsī *sādhus* [sic!] on the 10.3.1932 in the town of Pālī, on the necessity to strengthen the influence of the Sthānakavāsīs “in the world”, is now celebrated as one of the pivotal moments of the unification movement.<sup>104</sup> At the time, no “reliable” biography of Loṅkā was available in Hindī, apart from the 1925 translation of V. M. Śāh’s (1909) pioneering work. In 1936, Miśrīmal therefore

<sup>101</sup> My earlier statement that Maṇilāl’s work was declared as the official history of the AISJC has to be corrected. See Flügel 2000: 41. The Līmbḍī Nānī Pakṣa, to which Maṇilāl belonged, never joined the Śramaṇasaṅgha.

<sup>102</sup> I have not been able to trace early editions of this journal.

<sup>103</sup> The historical date is disputed, but the Sthānakavāsīs declared *kārtik śukla* 15 to be Loṅkā’s birthday.

<sup>104</sup> Miśrīmal, in Surānā 1976: 217f.

published in Hindī a book entitled *Dharmavīr Loṅkāśāh*. This work relies mostly on V. M. Śāh, Maṇilāl, and Saubhāgyacandra, but also uses two newly discovered sources: a “Prācīn Paṭṭāvalī”<sup>105</sup> which he found in the Jaitāraṇ Bhaṇḍār, and a “few leafs” from the Loṅkāgaccha Upāśray in Kuraḍāyā.<sup>106</sup> It was followed in 1941 by a versified biography called *Krāntikārī Vīr Loṅkāśāh* in 1941, and in 1946 by a short collection of *dohās* and *dhāls*, biographical poems, called *Vīr Loṅkāśāh*. Saubhāgyacandra’s and Miśrīmal’s works spread the new Sthānakavāsī “standard portrait” of Loṅkā throughout the north Indian Jaina world. However, both books contain, if at all, only general references and no critical evaluation of the available sources. Their “scientific” value was therefore dismissed not only by Muni Jñānsundar (1936) in his evidence-based critique of the contemporary Sthānakavāsī historiography, but even by the Sthānakavāsī *muni* Suśīlkumār (1959: g), who further disagreed with Saubhāgyacandra’s “extreme” (*ativāda*) interest in social reform.

A doctrinal response to Mūrtipūjaka criticisms was formulated in the book *Loṅkāśāh Mat-Samarthan*, “Confirmation of Loṅkā’s belief”, whose revised version was published in 1939.<sup>107</sup> It is one of four works which were published by Ratanlāl Ḍośī of Sailānā (M.P.) in the 1930s and 1940s to defend key Sthānakavāsī doctrines and practices, such as the rejection of *mūrtipūjā* and the permanent use of the *mukhavastrikā* (which Loṅkā reportedly never wore). Ḍośī was a leading lay intellectual of the orthodox Jñānagaccha and a personal devotee of its *ācārya* Samarthamal (1898-1972), who was opposed to the unification of all Sthānakavāsī traditions. In the work *Loṅkāśāh Mat-Samarthan* he compiled textual evidence from the Śvetāmbara canon in support of the propo-

<sup>105</sup> This may be the same text that was published in the collection of Hastīmal 1968.

<sup>106</sup> Miśrīmal 1936: 64.

<sup>107</sup> The published text has a complex history of translation from Hindī to Gujarātī (first edition) and back again.

sition that image worship is uncanonical, which he associated with the name of Loṅkā in a general way. Kesarīcand Bhaṇḍārī's (1938: 92) widely circulated *Sthānakavāsī Jaina Itihās* – one of the first books with the 20th-century self-description “Sthānakavāsī” in the title<sup>108</sup> – also refers to “Ḍoṣī's (1939) text for authoritative doctrinal arguments. However, this work does not contain any references to Loṅkā's writings, for which no direct evidence existed at the time. The conventional counter-arguments of the Mūrtipūjakas against the “lying *sampradāyavādīs*” – the aniconic traditions – who undermine the “unity” of the Jaina *dharma* were repeated several decades later in the works of the Mūrtipūjaka layman Nagīndās Gir-dharlāl Śeṭh, *Mūl Jaina Dharma ane Hāl nā Sampradāyo* (1962), *Sthānakavāsī Jaino nuṃ Dharma Kartavya* (1963), and *Loṅkaśāh ane Dharmacarcā* (1964). Whereas Ḍoṣī worked on the premise that the Sthānakavāsīs continue Loṅkā's doctrinal tradition, Śeṭh (1962: 342) reiterated Jñānsundar's (1936: 171ff.) verdict that the followers of the Loṅkāgaccha and the Sthānakavāsīs are historical enemies. To this purpose, he cites the depiction of Loṅkā in early Mūrtipūjaka and Loṅkāgaccha sources,<sup>109</sup> published by Jñānsundar (1936: 234-240) and Deśāī (1926-44, II-III: 1931-1944), which had been entirely ignored by the Sthānakavāsī commentary literature until the 1960s.

## SIXTY-NINE STATEMENTS

Before the publication of two old manuscripts of the Loṅkāgaccha tradition in 1936 by Jñānsundar (1936: 234-240), “Loṅkā's” beliefs

---

<sup>108</sup> In isolated form, the word “*sthānakavāsī*” occurs reportedly much earlier (Suśīlkumār 1959: 427), but even Upādhyāya Ātmārām (1942: 12, cf. 16), who devoted an entire article on the history of the word *sthānakavāsī* to prove that the principal Sthānakavāsīs are the *mokṣa*-seeking *bhāva sthānakavāsīs* not the *dravya sthānakavāsīs* (*sthānake bhāvasaṃyamādirūpe samyaccāritre vasati tacchīla iti sthānakavāsī*), did not cite earlier examples of its modern use as a self-description. John E. Cort mentioned to me that the word is used in a polemical Mūrtipūjaka text of the late 18th century.

<sup>109</sup> Śeṭh 1962: 344-383.

were only indirectly known through the early polemics of his Mūrtipūjaka and Digambara opponents. The earliest known sources for the views of Loṅkā written by his own followers are the *Dayā-dharma Caupāi*, composed by the Loṅkāgaccha “yati” (monk or lay-ascetic) Bhānucandra in Saṃvat 1587 (1521/2),<sup>110</sup> and the *Loṅkāśāha Siloko*, written in Saṃvat 1600 (1543/4) by the Loṅkāgaccha yati Keśavaṛṣi.<sup>111</sup> However, they were not widely circulated and had no notable impact. The oldest dated texts on the Loṅkā-tradition were written by their Mūrtipūjaka opponents. The *Asūtra-nirākaraṇa Batrīśī* of Muni Bīkā was written in Saṃvat 1527 (1470/1),<sup>112</sup> the *Luṅkāmata Pratibodha Kulak* was written by an anonymous author in Saṃvat 1530 (1473/4),<sup>113</sup> the *Siddhānta Caupāi* of Muni Lāvaṇyasamay in Saṃvat 1543 (1486/7),<sup>114</sup> and the short *Siddhānta Sāroddhāra* [*Caupāi*] of Upādhyāya Kamal-saṃyam of the Kharataragaccha in Saṃvat 1544 (1487/8).<sup>115</sup> A text that has often been cited by Sthānakavāsīs is the *Ath Loṅkāśāh nuṃ Jīvan* (ALJ), composed in Pāṭaṇ in Saṃvat 1636 (1579/60) by the Tapāgaccha muni Kāntivijay.<sup>116</sup> Apart from a short passage in

<sup>110</sup> Published by Jñānsundar (1936: 234-237) who located the Ms. in the Lābhasundarajī Jñāna Bhaṇḍāra.

<sup>111</sup> Published in a Bombay paper on the 18.7.1936, and republished by Jñānsundar (1936: 238-240). For bibliographic references of early Loṅkāgaccha sources see Deśāi 1926-44; Flügel 2003a: 219-222.

<sup>112</sup> A manuscript of the Gokulbhāi Nānī Saṃgraha in Rājkoṭ was published by Deśāi in *Jaina Yuga* (Bhādrapad 1985 – Kārtak 1986): 99-100 (reprint in Koṭhārī 2001: 501-503) and reprinted by Jñānsundar 1936: 230-233. For further bibliographic information on the following texts see Flügel 2003a: 230-233.

<sup>113</sup> Ms. No. 5837, L.D. Institute, Ahmedabad, published with a Hindī translation in Hastīmal 1995: 642-646.

<sup>114</sup> A manuscript of the Jñānbhaṇḍār in Pāṭaṇ was published by Deśāi (reprint in Koṭhārī 2001: 486-499) and reprinted by Jñānsundar 1936: 209-227.

<sup>115</sup> A manuscript of the Jñānbhaṇḍār in Pāṭaṇ was published by Deśāi in *Jaina Yuga* 1.2 (Vaiśākh-Jeṭh 1986): 339-349 (reprint in Koṭhārī 2001: 499-500) and reprinted by Jñānsundar 1936: 228f.

<sup>116</sup> Published in Maṇilāl 1934: 161f.; Hastīmal 1995: 752-759, Hindī summary by Jñānsundar 1936: 9f. A copy of one original Ms., which was with Yati Sundar of the Kacch Nānī Pakṣa, has been given to Ācārya Hastīmal 1995: 751.

Ācārya Ratnanandī's *Bhadrabāhu Caritra* vv. 155-163 of Saṃvat 1625 (1568/9), the only presently known Digambara critiques of Loṅkā are the *Loṅkāmata Nirākaraṇa Caupāi* of Sumatikīrti-sūri which was written almost a century after Loṅkā's death, in Saṃvat 1627 (1570/1),<sup>117</sup> and the *Sata Prābhṛta Mokṣa Prābhṛta Ṭikā* (pp. 305f.) of Bhaṭṭāraka Śrutasāgara.<sup>118</sup> Most of these and similar texts are still difficult to access and have therefore not been properly studied. The only early sources on Loṅkā which were widely accessible in the 19th and early 20th centuries were short passages in Dharmasāgara's *Pravacana Parīkṣā* of 1572 (Saṃvat 1629) and his *Tapāgaccha Paṭṭāvalī Sūtraṃ* of 1589/1590 (Saṃvat 1646).<sup>119</sup>

The first published text which was directly attributed to Loṅkā himself was the *Loṅkejī kī Huṇḍī* (A), or *Ath Huṇḍī Lūṅkārī Likh-yate*, which contains sixty-nine doctrinal assertions (*bol*). The printed text is based on a manuscript that was reportedly found in the Sarūpacanda Rāmacanda Upāśrāya in Jaitāraṇ, a town in southern Rājasthān which was a centre of the Loṅkāgaccha Nānī Pakṣa until the beginning of the 20th century. It was first published by K. S. Caudharī (1936?: 338-430) in a book called *Jin Jñān Ratnā-kaṛ*, together with the original *sūtra* texts, which are summarised by "Loṅkā's bols", an interpretation of their meaning (*bhāvārtha*) in Hindī, and several versified Rājasthānī commentaries in the *ḍhāl*, *dohā* and *soraṭhā* meters which were composed in 1926 in Jaypur by Gulābcand (Luṇiyā?), a devotee of the Terāpanth *ācārya* Kālūgaṇi (1877-1936), who may have discovered the original

<sup>117</sup> Ms. Bīkāner Bṛhata Jñānabhaṇḍāra, Dānasāgara Saṃgraha No. 72. Padmanabh S. Jaini is currently publishing a book on the anonymous Digambara text *Cauryāmsī Bol* which contains extensive criticism of the "Loṅkā" tradition.

<sup>118</sup> The text is mentioned in Mahāprajña 2000: 7. The followers of Loṅkā are apparently accused by the author to be materialists and atheists, because they rejected the veneration of (protector) gods. It must be identical with the author's commentary to "Kundakunda's" Pāhuḍas in the *Ṣaṭprābhṛtādisaṃgraha*, which according to Schubring 1957: 559, describes the followers of Launka as "Pseudo-Svetāmbaras" (*śvetāmbārābhāsa*) and as "sinful wrong believers" (*pāpiṣṭhā mithyādrṣṭayah*) because they reject images.

<sup>119</sup> Published in Darśanavijaya 1933: 41-119.



manuscript.<sup>120</sup> The *bols* were published in a slightly different form and without any commentary by Āñcaliyā (1937: 120-128). Although Kālūgaṇi's oral explanations clearly informed Gulābcand's work,<sup>121</sup> no written commentary on Loṅkā's ideas has ever been created by any Terāpanth *ācārya*.<sup>122</sup> The present Terāpanth *ācārya* Mahāprajña (2000: 6) always cites the *Loṅkejī kī Huṇḍī* as an authoritative source on Loṅkā's teachings.

Like the famous *ṭabos* (*ṭabbā*) of the Sthānakavāsī *ācārya* Dharmasīnha (1599-1671) and of other, anonymous, authors – vernacular texts which offer rudimentary word-for-word translations of the Prakrit Jaina Āgamas without regard to their syntax – “Loṅkā's *bols*” were, it seems, deliberately disseminated by the lay disciples of Ācārya Kālūgaṇi and his successor Ācārya Tulsī in order to establish an easy access to the “essential teachings” of the Āgamas in a language which everyone could understand.<sup>123</sup> This was important, since, with few exceptions, Sanskrit and Prakrit scholarship was all but lost in the Jaina mendicant traditions in the early 19th century, and did not exist at all within the aniconic traditions before the Jaina revival in the late 19th century.<sup>124</sup> Even

<sup>120</sup> No further information is available on the original Ms.

<sup>121</sup> *huṇḍī jahe Loṅkā taṇī, acche purātan teha,*  
*tiṇmeṃ āgam sākṣi thī, bol unhattar jeha. (1)*  
*sākal suguṇ śir sehrā, śrī kālū gaṇi rāy,*  
*tāsu pasāye gulāb kahe, dohā rūp banāya. (3)*  
(Gulābcand, in Caudharī 1936?: 338, cf. 428f.).

<sup>122</sup> Information from Muni Navratnamala, 12.8.2004, who also stated that according to Terāpanth sources, Loṅkā's original *Huṇḍī* (or rather the Ms.?) was written in Saṃvat 1583.

<sup>123</sup> See Dundas 1996: 74 on Jayācārya's Rājasthānī translation of Abhayadeva Sūri's 11th-century Sanskrit commentary on the *Viyāhapannatti*, and Budhmal 2001: 419 on the introduction of the study of the Sanskrit commentaries into the monastic curriculum of the Terāpanth by Kālūgaṇi.

<sup>124</sup> A standard critique of Ācārya Bhikṣu, even from the Sthānakavāsīs who were subject to the same criticism, was that he “had no knowledge of Sanskrit and Prakrit” (Muni Rajyash, in Nair 1970: iii). See already the complaints of Jñānsundar 1936: 97, and Mālvaṇiyā 1964: 378 cited in Dundas 2002: 247 and 250, on the lack of learning of the followers of the aniconic tradition in general,

in 1936, few Terāpanthī ascetics knew Sanskrit and Prakrit. Another reason for the publication of the text must have been the desire to legitimate the Terāpanth doctrine, which had been the target of critique from all other Jaina sects, with direct reference to Loṅkā, who was accepted as an authoritative reference point within the Sthānakavāsī movement.

It remains doubtful whether this text can really be attributed to Loṅkā. In contrast to other texts attributed to him (see *infra*), the cited passages from the primary literature contain not a single quote from the commentary literature, only citations from the Āgamas,<sup>125</sup> together with the explanations (*bol*) of “Loṅkā” in a quasi-stenographic Rājasthānī-Hindī mix (which indicates that these are not Loṅkā’s own words), and of Gulābcand in both Rājasthānī and Hindī. The citations are so skilfully woven together that the resulting text does not assume the form of a casuistic list of unconnected points, but reads like a coherently constructed argument.<sup>126</sup>

---

which prevented them from understanding the Ardhamāgadhī canon itself and the Sanskrit commentary; though Mālvaṇiyā excluded Loṅkā himself from this verdict, in view of his extensive citations from the canon. Jñānsundar (1936: 63-5, 109) and most Mūrtipūjakas credit Pārśvacandra Sūri of the Pārśvacandra-gaccha for the “translation” of the Aṅgas into Gujarātī, whereas the Sthānakavāsī tradition refers to Dharmasīṅha as the author of the first *ṭabos*. See Flügel 2000: 62; 2003a: 195.

<sup>125</sup> 1. Sūy(agaḍa) 1.12.16, 2. Uvav(āiya) 2.19, 3. Vīy(āhapannatti) 7.2 (294b), 4. DVS (Dasaveyāliya) 4.12, 5. Utt(arajjhāyā) 28.29, 6. DVS 4.10, 7. Vīy 8.6, 8. Sūy 1.1.2.4, 9. DVS 7.48, 10. Pannavaṇā 22, 11. DVS 5.1.92, 12. Āyāra 1.8.4.13, 13. Sūy 1.1.2.14, 14. Uvav 2.20, 15. Utt 28.31, 16. Utt 36.260, 17. Uvav 2.20, 18. Āyāra 1.2.6.5, 19. Aṇugaddārāiṃ 7 [?], 20. Sūy 1.6.7, 21. Sūy 1.9.1, 22. Sūy 1.1.4.10, 23. Sūy 1.10.3, 24. Utt 4.8, 25. DVS 1.1, 26. Nis(iha) 11.81, 27. Nis 11.91, 28. Nis 15.74f., 29. Nis 16.13f., 30. Nis 17.223, 31. Nis 11.11, 32. Nis 17.224, 33. Nis 8.12, 34. Nis 8.13, 35. Sūy 1.11.20, 36. Utt 20.44, 37. Pannavaṇā 11, 38. Dasāsuyakkhandha 9.9, 39. Sūy 1.10.15, 40. DVS 7.1, 41. Sūy 1.12.5, 42. Āyāra 1.6.4.1, 43. Āyāra 1.2.2, 44. Āyāra 1.5.6.1, 45. Uvav 2.19, 46. Utt 31.3, 47. Sūy 1.3.4.6-7, 48. Nis 12.1-2, 49. Āyāra 1.4.4.1f., 50. Utt 14.12, 51. Uvav 2.21, 52. DVS 6.19 [not: “6.21”], 53. DVS 4.[10], 54. Nis 4.22, 55. Utt 10.15, 56. Utt 21.24, 57. Nis 13.42-45, 58. Nis 12.17, 59. Ṭhāṇa 2.3.6, 60. Ṭhāṇa 2.1.25, 61. Ṭhāṇa 2.1.25, 62. Utt 28.36, 63. Utt 23.63, 64. Āyāra 1.4.2.1, 65. DVS 9.4.4, 66. Āyāra 1.1.7 [not: “1.2.4”], 67. Uvav 2.34, 68. Uvav (*samavasaraṇa adhikār meṃ*, four types of meditation), 69. DVS 7.47.

Moreover, the content of the text corresponds entirely with the views of the Terāpanthīs at the time.<sup>127</sup> It focuses almost exclusively on the principles of proper monastic conduct,<sup>128</sup> as taught by the *kevalins*,<sup>129</sup> the condemnation of non-believers, heresies (*niṅhava*),<sup>130</sup> pseudo-monks,<sup>131</sup> on the strict distinction between the standards for the Jaina householder and the mendicant,<sup>132</sup> and on the prescribed atonements for transgressions.<sup>133</sup> It seems that indirectly the credentials of the Sthānakavāsī *dayā-dāna* theory are also deliberately undermined through the condemnation of the accumulation of good karma through gift-giving and acts of compassion, etc.<sup>134</sup> Instead, the priority of knowledge over compassion is em-

<sup>126</sup> In this respect, it contrasts with many *maryādā* lists. See Mette 1974: 4f.; Flügel 2003a: 17.

<sup>127</sup> That is, before the reforms of Ācārya Tulsī (1914-1997) after 1949.

<sup>128</sup> Nos. 5-6, 10, 15, 22-25, 55, 62, 64-66, 68.

<sup>129</sup> Nos. 1, 11-14, 17-18, 20-21.

<sup>130</sup> Nos. 2, 8, 16, 41, 45, 50, 63.

<sup>131</sup> Nos. 3, 9-13.

<sup>132</sup> Nos. 39, 58-61, 67.

<sup>133</sup> Thirteen points are concerned with *prāyaścittas* as outlined in the *Nisīha*, whereas not one of the *bols* of L, LH, and LTC deal with atonements. This, and the absence of any discussion of image-worship, indicates that the sixty-nine *bols* are probably the creation of a (Terāpanth) monk rather than a layman such as Loṅkā.

<sup>134</sup> Nos. 6, 7, 36, 46-49, 55. An exception is No. 35: *je ya dānaṃ pasamsanti, vahaṃ icchanti pāṇiṇaṃ; je ya ṇaṃ paḍisehanti, vitticcheyāṃ karanti te* – “Those who praise the gift, are accessory to the killing of beings; those who forbid it, deprive (others) of the means of subsistence” (Sūy 1.11.20, Jacobi’s translation). This passage has been associated with the Sthānakavāsī *muni* Jaymal’s defence against Bhīkhaṇ’s famous critique of the value of gift giving for the purpose of accumulating *punya* (Seth 1970: 1004). It does not come as a surprise, then, that different interpretations of the Prakrit original are offered: “Loṅkā’s *bol*” explains the verse as follows: *sāvadya dāna kī praśansā kare tīna ne prāṇī jīvāṃ ko badha bañchaṇhāro kahyo* (in Caudharī 1936?: 376). Gulāb-cand’s *dohā* says:

*do sāmsārika dāna rī, kare praśansā koya;*  
*badha bañche kāya nūṃ, sūyagaḍāṅge joya (128).*  
*adhyayana igyārahvāṃ ne viṣai, bīsmī gāthā māṃhi;*  
*niṣedhiyāṃ varttamān meṃ, vṛtti cheda kahāhi (129)*  
(Caudharī 1936?: 376f.).

phasised, and that giving “pure gifts” to a mendicant does not lead to accumulating good karma but to the destruction of karma.<sup>135</sup> In contrast to the available indirect evidence on Loṅkā’s teachings, there is no discussion of image-worship at all. It therefore remains doubtful whether the text, which has apparently not been commented upon by any author, is the product of Loṅkā; despite the fact that it also contains some of the most well known of “Loṅkā’s” quotations from the canon.<sup>136</sup> Thus, by publishing a hitherto unknown text confirming their own views, together with a Terāpanth commentary, the Terāpanthīs could implicitly claim Loṅkā as their own predecessor while challenging the assertion of the Sthānakavāsīs to be Loṅkā’s only legitimate successors.<sup>137</sup>

### OUR HISTORY

The appropriation of Loṅkā by the Sthānakavāsīs was explicit and on quite a different scale. It culminated in the period after the creation of the unified Śramaṇasaṅgha under the rule of only one *ācārya*, which was accomplished after forty-six years of preparation at the *mahāsammelan* in 1952 at the *Loṅkāśāh Jaina Gurukul* in Sāḍarī. The Gujarātī Sthānakavāsī *sampradāyas* refused to join the new organisation, which was dominated by Hindī-speaking

---

The *sorthā* finally objects to “Loṅkā’s” insertion of the word *sāvadya*, blameful, in front of the word *dāna*, because it is not in the original text: *sāvadya śabda nahīṃ pāṭha meṃ, samuccai dān kaheha re* (p. 377). In order to explain the meaning, two types of gifts are distinguished: *supātra dāna* and *kupātra dāna*, and Vy 8.6.1 (No. 7. in the list of *bols*) is invoked which states that a gift of pure food to a worthy recipient (a pure monk) is a pure gift (*śuddha dāna*) “which brings about the annihilation of *karman*”, rather than the influx of *puṇya* (which is *pāpa* from the “absolute” point of view that is favoured by the Terāpanth).

<sup>135</sup> Nos. 6-7, 8, 55.

<sup>136</sup> Nos. 5, 22-25. See *infra*.

<sup>137</sup> The method of legitimising a particular sectarian interpretation of the canon by constructing a selective list of “authoritative” citations is not unusual (Balbir 2003a: 272). Today, it can be found for instance in the unpublished *Sāmācārī* of the Sthānakavāsī Kacch Aṭh Koṭī Nānī Pakṣa (personal communication by Ācārya Rāghav).

mendicants. This may have been one of the reasons why, in the decade after the constituent assembly of the Śramaṇasaṅgha, two official histories of the Sthānakavāsī tradition in Hindī were commissioned by the Śramaṇasaṅgha *ācārya* Ānandṛṣi and the AISJC respectively to put the significance of the new organisation into a historical perspective.<sup>138</sup> The resulting publications are Muni Suśīlkumār's (1959) *Jainadharmā kā Itihās (Pramukhataḥ Śrī Śvetāmbara Sthānakavāsī Jainadharmā kā Itihās)* and Sādhvī Candanākumārī's (1964) *Hamārā Itihās: Sthānakavāsī Śramaṇ-Sāṃskṛtik Paramparā kā Paricāyik*. Both works built on earlier standard histories of the Sthānakavāsī tradition, but did not make use of the published old sources on Loṅkā.<sup>139</sup> Suśīlkumār (1959: g) mentions that his work was initially based on an unpublished manuscript of Saubhāgyacandra "Santabāḷa", which was handed to him by the AISJC. Since he saw no historical value in the manuscript, he wrote an entirely new text on the basis of information from leading mendicant scholars and of unspecified historical sources from Bikāner, which were made available to him by Agarcand Nāhaṭā in 1957, two years after he started his work.<sup>140</sup> Candanākumārī's book is to a large extent based on Suśīlkumār's text and offers a crisp summary of the historical literature of the Sthānakavāsīs at the time, but without providing any references.<sup>141</sup> Both texts contain extensive sections on Loṅkā, on the Sthānakavāsī-dominated "Loṅkā-śāha Yuga" and on the "Saṅgha Yuga" which begins, according to Suśīlkumār (1959: 2), with the foundation of the Śramaṇasaṅgha in

<sup>138</sup> See Flügel 2000; 2003a.

<sup>139</sup> See also Jain & Kumār's (2003: 109) critique.

<sup>140</sup> Suśīlkumār (1959: N) received advice from Ācārya Ānandṛṣi, Upādhyāy Hastīmal, Upādhyāy Amarmuni, Muni Pyārcand, and "Marudhar Keśarī" Mīśrīmal, i.e. from the Śramaṇasaṅgha *munis* who had the greatest interest and expertise in the study of history.

<sup>141</sup> She received advice from Ācārya Ānandṛṣi, Upādhyāy Hastīmal, Upādhyāy Amarmuni, Pravartak Pannālāl, "Marudhar Keśarī" Mīśrīmal, Muni Ambālāl, Muni Puṣkarmuni, and Muni Padmacandra (Prakāśakīya, in Candanākumārī 1964: 9).

1952.<sup>142</sup> And both emphasise the differences between the Loṅkāgaccha “*yatis*”, whose tradition is characterised as negligible “after the 15th century”, and the Sthānakavāsī “*sādhus*”. Candanākumārī (1964: 105) contends that (in the view of the leading mendicants of the Śramaṇasaṅgha) the Sthānakavāsī traditions are the true followers of Loṅkā’s doctrine (*siddhānta*) – if not his direct lineal successors.<sup>143</sup> In support of this view, she points to the common lay practice of *dharmadhyāna* in the *sthānakas*, which she interprets as a replication of the ancient institution of the *poṣadhasālā*; which, according to early Mūrtipūjaka sources, Loṅkā himself is said to have rejected.<sup>144</sup> Both authors employ various strategies to bypass the conventional Mūrtipūjaka emphasis on the importance of a continuous teacher lineage for the transmission of the “authentic” Jain tradition.<sup>145</sup> Rather than attempting to construct lists of succession in the form of a single *paṭṭāvalī*, which is generally not acceptable within the Sthānakavāsī movement due to the continuing existence of competing lineages or sub-groups with independent histories, the texts present chronological lists of important historical personalities in the Sthānakavāsī tradition.<sup>146</sup> They begin their respective narratives with Ṛṣabha, not with Mahāvīra, whose ancestry is generally favoured: In the work of Bhaṇḍārī (1938: 85-87), who ignored the Loṅkāgaccha tradition entirely, though not Loṅkā him-

<sup>142</sup> Suśīlkumār 1959: 2 distinguishes five eras: 1. Ādi Yuga (pre 500 before V.S.), 2. Mahāvīra Yuga (500 before V.S. – 2nd century before V.S.), 3. Bhadrabāhu Yuga (2nd century before V.S. – 16th century V.S.), 4. Loṅkāśāha Yuga (16th century V.S. – 2007 V.S.), 5. Saṅgha Yuga (2007 V.S. – today). See Flügel 2000: 43, n. 11 for other emic periodisations of the Jain history.

<sup>143</sup> *varṭamān meṃ pracalit śvetāmbar sthānakavāsī jain-samāj Loṅkāgacch kī varṭamānkālīn kaṛī hai. isī samāj meṃ hamēṃ āj sahī rūp meṃ śrī Loṅkāśāh-siddhānta ke darśan hote haiṃ* (Candanākumārī 1964: 105).

<sup>144</sup> See the sources published by Jñānsundar 1936.

<sup>145</sup> Cf. Dundas 1996: 79.

<sup>146</sup> The idea for this procedure evidently stems from Ācārya Javāharlāl (1875-1943) whose arguments were rejected at the Ajmer *sammelan* in 1933. See Flügel 2003a: 195. On the incompatibility of many Sthānakavāsī *paṭṭāvalīs* see Ātmārām 1884/1908: 8-11; Vallabhvijay 1891: 67-70; V. M. Śāh 1909: 96ff., 103f.; Jñānsundar 1936: 296-300.

self, it is asserted that “only the Sthānakavāsī *sādhus* are Mahāvīra’s true disciples”.<sup>147</sup> The opening pages of Bhaṇḍārī’s book suggest that the only reason for including the *tīrthaṅkaras* of the “Ādi Yuga” (Suśīlkumār) in a “historical” account is to prove the *ancienneté* of the Jaina tradition *vis à vis* the competing Hindu and Buddhist traditions.

Instead of lists of succession, the concept of a common Sthānakavāsī “culture” (*saṃskṛti*) is invoked – which figures in the title of Candanākumārī’s book – with an emphasis on common scriptures and doctrinal principles. The Śramaṇasaṅgha has also a common code of conduct (*sāmācārī*),<sup>148</sup> but no common rituals and liturgy, which remain different amongst the constituent *sampradāyas*.<sup>149</sup> The “Varddhamāna” Śramaṇasaṅgha has not been able to construct a single official *paṭṭāvalī*, because no consensus could be established amongst the leading monks as to which names should be selected. Instead, it produces *abhinandana granthas* for eminent mendicants within the tradition. These texts comprise *paṭṭāvalīs* of the respective sub-tradition of a particular monk or nun, but not of the united Śramaṇasaṅgha as a whole.

Accordingly, Suśīlkumār and Candanākumārī present the history of the Sthānakavāsī tradition as a chronology of great individuals and their disciples, not as the history of a single lineage of succession going back to Mahāvīra, Pārśva or even Rṣabha, as preferred by the constituent sub-groups. Although their contents cannot be described as “mythological”, the narrative form of the texts – the chronology of the deeds of selected great beings – represents a spectrum of compromises between the chronological history of modern historiography and the *paṭṭāvalīs* and *gurvāvalīs* on the one hand, and of the cosmologically informed Sthānakavāsī universal

<sup>147</sup> *phakat sthānakavāsī sādhuja mahāvīr nā sēcā śiṣya che* (Bhaṇḍārī 1938: 96).

<sup>148</sup> AISJC 1987: 71ff. See Flügel 2003a: 195f.; forthcoming (a).

<sup>149</sup> Cf. Cort’s definition of *gacchas* = *sampradāyas* as “units, defining the boundaries within one can ritually interact” (Cort 1991: 662).

histories *à la* Jethmal on the other.<sup>150</sup> As such, the peculiar combinations of history (without source references) and legend reflect the particular problems of legitimation of the Śramaṇasaṅgha.

An extreme example of a new Sthānakavāsī universal history is Ācārya Ghāsīlāl's (1983)<sup>151</sup> Sanskrit [sic!] poem *Śrī Loṅkāśāha Caritam*, which associates Loṅkā and the Sthānakavāsīs, taken together, directly with Mahāvīrā and Gautama,<sup>152</sup> without mentioning any structures of mediation. His *mahākāvya*, he concedes, is based on hearsay or oral (*jabānī*) history for which, as the editor Muni Kanhaiyālāl notes in his introduction, no trustworthy evidence exists.<sup>153</sup> Kanhaiyālāl's remarks show that a century of debate on "factual history" has generated a critical awareness within the Jaina tradition that even the questionable attempts of attributing all common doctrinal features of the "Sthānakavāsī" tradition, such as the rejection of image-worship, the "ur-canon" of thirty-two texts, and the permanent wearing of a *mukhavastrikā*, to the legendary founding father Loṅkā, utilise the toolkits of legend, historiography and canonisation.<sup>154</sup> The age-old method of excluding and including, compiling and re-compiling, of picking-and-choosing – and inventing – authoritative references from the amorphous sediments of the preserved tradition to legitimise contemporary preferences, has, to a certain extent, become self-reflective.<sup>155</sup>

<sup>150</sup> The texts are not stifled by formalism, whose significance for other genres of the Jaina literature was highlighted by Bruhn 1981: 36. Only the information on the "great beings" after Loṅkā can claim some historical credibility.

<sup>151</sup> Ghāsīlāl (1884-1973) originally belonged to the Sādhumārgī tradition, which left the Śramaṇasaṅgha in the 1950s. He was apparently made an *ācārya* by Ācārya Javāharlāl in 1933, but left when Gaṇeśīlāl became leader, and founded his own splinter group, which does not exist today. See his disciple Kanhaiyālāl's *Bhūmikā*, in Ghāsīlāl 1983: 5f.; personal communication of Umeśmuni 13.10.2002.

<sup>152</sup> Ghāsīlāl 1983: 2f.

<sup>153</sup> Kanhaiyālāl's *Bhūmikā*, in Ghāsīlāl 1983: 12.

<sup>154</sup> See Bruhn 1987: 107, 111f., also for the term "canon of research".

<sup>155</sup> Although history writing as such was not always an issue, the "delicate balance between objectivity and in-depth analysis ... and aggressivity" is nothing



### THE DISCOVERY OF LOṅKĀ'S SCRIPTURES

Thus far, our cursory review of the development of the pivotal role of Loṅkā in the new Sthānakavāsī historiography has shown that received models of “chronological” and “cosmological” history both informed the modern portraits of Loṅkā. Features of the two models were creatively mixed during the modern period of revival of the Jaina tradition, which consciously distinguished itself from earlier epochs through an increasing concern with verifiable “facts” as a principal source of legitimation. In the context of renewed sectarian rivalry, the analysis of vernacular Jain sources – which Schubring (1944: vi) saw as the next important step in the history of Jaina research – has started in India earlier than elsewhere. Methodical research was nevertheless largely confined to the post-independence period, probably benefiting from a slight easing of the overt sectarian tensions within the Jaina tradition.<sup>156</sup>

After more than one hundred years of inquiry, historical sources on Loṅkā and the Loṅkāgaccha from within the aniconic tradition are still extremely rare.<sup>157</sup> The same can be said of critical scholarship of the tradition. The first manuscripts composed by early Loṅkāgaccha *yatis* were discovered and described by Deśāi (1931) in Part II of his ground-breaking study *Gūrjar Kavio*. Two further

---

new in Jaina religious discourse as Balbir 2003a: 259, 268 has shown with regard to the 16th-century Kharataragaccha monk Samayasundara. Both “canonisation” and “creeping change” and the “reconstruction of history from the point of view of the present” are founded in one-sided interests, strategies of exclusion and inclusion, and in polemics. The contrast between “canonical interest” and “historical interest” proposed by Assmann (1987: 15) is therefore not as sharp in practice as the conceptual distinction suggests.

<sup>156</sup> Several factors are responsible for this. Some explicit agreements were made between leading *ācāryas* to discourage the production and distribution of violently polemical pamphlets which can harm the public image of Jainism as a whole. Overt attacks and *ad hominem* denunciations are therefore nowadays largely confined to intra-sectarian politics. Another factor was the accomplishment of the unification of most Sthānakavāsī traditions, and the end of the main period of institutional reform.

<sup>157</sup> There are also hardly any sources concerning the founders of the Sthānakavāsī traditions.

texts (see *infra*) were published by Jñānsundar (1936: 234-240), who was the first monk to emphatically emphasise that only the study of historical sources itself can provide a more reliable picture of Loṅkā's life and work. Detailed information on Loṅkāgaccha (and Sthānakavāsī) *paṭṭāvalīs* – in addition to the unreferenced materials provided by Ātmārām (1884/1903) and Vallabhvijay (1891), Śāh (1909) and Maṇilāl (1934), and others – was published in Part III of Deśāī's (1944: 2205-2222) work. Further historical materials on the Loṅkā tradition, such as *gurvāvalīs*, *paṭṭāvalīs*, historical poems and lists of *boḷs*,<sup>158</sup> were unearthed by the next generation of Jaina scholars in the 1950s and 1960s, in particular by Bhanvarlāl Nāhaṭā (1957), Agarcand Nāhaṭā (1958; 1964; 1966, etc.), Dalsukhbhāī Mālvaṇiyā (1963a; 1963b; 1964; 1965), and Ācārya Hastīmal (1968), who revolutionised the historiography of the aniconic Jaina tradition (see *infra*). Most of these authors contributed to the *Muni Śrī Hajārīmal Smṛti Granth*, edited by Śobhācandra Bhārill (1965), which contains further important articles on the literature of the Loṅkāgaccha tradition by Muni Kāntisāgar (1965) and Ālamśāh Khān (1965).<sup>159</sup> Particularly significant for future research was Ācārya Hastīmal's (1968) compilation *Paṭṭāvalī Prabandh Saṅgrah*, which made the oldest surviving *paṭṭāvalīs* of the Loṅkāgaccha traditions and the North Indian Sthānakavāsī traditions available for the first time. This fertile period of historical research, during which almost every Sthānakavāsī tradition investigated its own history in order to construct its own *paṭṭāvalī*, culminated in Hastīmal's (1987/1995) synopsis of most of the available material on Loṅkā in the fourth volume of his monumental work *Jaina Dharma kā Maulik Itihās*, after which only the book by Duggar (1989) furnished new information on the extinct lineages of the Loṅkāgaccha in the Pañjāb.

While the outlines of the structure of differentiation of the mendicant lineages of the aniconic tradition became clearly visible by

<sup>158</sup> See Nahar 1918: 38, etc. for short inscriptions of the Loṅkāgaccha.

<sup>159</sup> Another widely read article on Loṅkā was written by K. L. Nāhaṭā (1968).

the end of the 1960s, the teachings of Loṅkā, and the doctrinal and organisational differences between Loṅkā and the Loṅkāgaccha traditions, and the Sthānakavāsī traditions remained almost unknown – and to a large extent still are. The answers to these questions hinge on the credibility of the sources on Loṅkā’s teachings, in particular Loṅkā’s own writings – which probably neither Jñānsundar (1936: 97) nor his adversaries had known – since no traces of the rules and regulations of the various Loṅkāgaccha traditions, whose practices differed from Loṅkā’s own, had ever been discovered.

In a series of path-breaking articles, D. D. Mālvaṇiyā (1963a, 1963b, 1964, 1965) identified for the first time two manuscripts in the Puṇyavijay collection at the L.D. Institute in Ahmedabad which, in his view, can clearly be attributed to Loṅkā himself. The publication of this discovery changed the entire discourse on Loṅkā. The authenticity of the texts is now accepted within the aniconic tradition itself. They are the only documents which were published by the followers of the Loṅkāgaccha itself (Vārīā’s 1976 modern Gujarātī translation, in P. T. Śāh 2001), together with summaries of Hastīmal’s (1968) collection of Loṅkāgaccha *paṭṭāvalīs*. But Mālvaṇiyā’s claim has not remained unchallenged, especially by Mūrtipūjaka authors.

The manuscripts can be attributed to Loṅkā in terms of their contents,<sup>160</sup> which clearly relate to the beliefs of Loṅkā or the Loṅkā tradition, and because both of the two key texts mention “Luṅkā” or the “Luṅkāmatī” at the end;<sup>161</sup> though Loṅkā’s name has been deliberately cut out at two places at the beginning and at the end of the Ms. *Luṅkā nā Saddahiyā ane Kariyā Aṭhāvan Bol*, as Mālva-

<sup>160</sup> *ukt donom partiyom kā sīdhā sambandh lokāsāh se avaśya hai. kyomki lokāsāh ke mat ko, unkī vicārdhārā ko usmeṃ spaṣṭ rūp meṃ prastut kiyā gayā hai* (Mālvaṇiyā 1964: 366).

<sup>161</sup> *e sarva Luṅkāmatī nī yukti chai (Luṅkā nī Huṇḍī 34 Bol)* (L.D. Institute Ms. No. 4121). The early sources always use the term *mata*, doctrine or sect, and never *gaccha*, order, sect or school, as a designation of the Loṅkā tradition.

niyā (1964: 381) has pointed out.<sup>162</sup> Mālvaṇiyā (1964: 366, 1965: 188) believed that Loṅkā was either the author of these texts, or that the texts have been written under his instruction, since his opponents would have used the Sanskrit term Luṃpaka for Luṅkā, although no final proof has been furnished yet. Śeṭh (1964: 54) disputed Mālvaṇiyā's argument and attributed both texts to the Sthānakavāsī *ācārya* Dharmasinha. His views were comprehensively rejected by Hastīmal (1995: 759-789)<sup>163</sup> because of the "lack of proof", and with reference to Pārśvacandra Sūri's<sup>164</sup> text *Lūṅkāe Pechela 13 Praśna ane Tenā Uttarī*, which cites Loṅkā's questions concerning image-worship: why should *vandana* be performed to non-living entities, why are *sādhus* not allowed to perform *dravya pūjā*, etc.<sup>165</sup> This 16th-century text is now routinely referred to as a significant source for Loṅkā's views, which indirectly confirms the authenticity of the disputed texts.<sup>166</sup>

---

<sup>162</sup> *iti ... Luṅkā nā saddahiyā anaī Luṅkā nā kariyā aṭhāvana bola anaī tehanuṃ vicāra likhaṃ chai. śubhaṃ bhavatu sramaṇasaṅghāya, śrī* (L.D. Institute Ms. No. 2989). Mālvaṇiyā's view is still vigorously opposed by orthodox followers of the Mūrtipūjaka tradition, who point out that the manuscript had been tampered with. Even today, many Mūrtipūjaka libraries, such as the Kailāsa-sāgarasūri Jñān Mandir of the Śrī Mahāvīr Jaina Arādhana Kendra in Kobā, restrict access to texts of the aniconic tradition which criticise Mūrtipūjaka practices.

<sup>163</sup> Hastīmal (1995: 759ff.) disproved Śeṭh's (1964: 43) "sectarian" view that Loṅkā had only a few followers with citations from the Tapāgaccha *paṭṭāvalīs*, and that his views were *adharmik* (Śeṭh 1964: 46) and that he had no knowledge of Ardhamaṅgadhī (p. 25) with Āgama citations from Loṅkā's *Aṭṭhāvan Bol*.

<sup>164</sup> The founder of the Pārśvacandraḡaccha.

<sup>165</sup> The thirteen questions, a selection of the longer text (L.D. Institute Mss. No. 24466, 30565), were published by Hastīmal (1995: 694f.) and re-published by Jain and Kumār (2003: 539-541), who also rendered the text into Hindī (Jain & Kumār 2003: 115-117).

<sup>166</sup> Jain & Kumār 2003: 115-117. Hastīmal 1995: 762 also refers to Pārśvacandrasūri's *Sthāpanā Pañcāsikā*, which was not accessible to me.

### LOṅKĀ'S FIFTY-EIGHT PROCLAMATIONS

The first manuscript attributed to “Loṅkā”, No. 2989, has been dated by Mālvaṇiyā (1964: 381) to the 17th century CE. It contains three texts which, judging on the evidence of the handwriting and the format of the texts, must have been written by three different individuals. The main text, *Luṅkā nā Saddahiyā ane Luṅkā nā Kariyā Athāvana Bolo* (L), “Loṅkā’s beliefs and fifty-eight assertions created by Loṅkā”,<sup>167</sup> has Loṅkā’s name in its title. It is clearly the oldest text of the three. The text is framed by an untitled index of the fifty-eight topics at the beginning of the Ms., and at the end by a list of fifty-four questions to unnamed opponents, which is generally referred to as *Keha nī Paramparā Chai* (K), “Whose tradition is this?”, in the secondary literature. Both of these supplementary texts, the index and the *praśnottara* text, must have been added sometime after the completion of the core text, which is the only document of “Loṅkā” which contains not just questions to opponents, but also positive doctrinal statements.<sup>168</sup> The main text (L) consists largely of selected quotations (*uddharāṇa*) from the Śvetāmbara scriptures, on both ethical and abstract doctrinal issues concerning Jaina mendicants as well as laity, and renditions of their meaning in Old Gujarātī. At the beginning of the text the citations form a logical sequence on *samyaktva* which can be read as an entirely new text on the “essence” of the Jaina scriptures, although many subsequent statements take the form of questions and can be attributed to the *praśnottara* genre. The method of weaving selected citations together to form a new text is not fundamentally

<sup>167</sup> The original text was published for the first time by Mālvaṇiyā (1963a), then together with a modern Gujarātī translation by Vārīā (1976), and again by Hastīmal (1995: 655-693). A Gujarātī summary of this text has been published by P. T. Śāh (2001), and a Hindī rendition by Jain and Kumār (2003: 124-139), who also re-published the version by Hastīmal and a copy of an unspecified hand-written manuscript of the text in an appendix (Jain & Kumār 2003: 503-537).

<sup>168</sup> Only a future comparison of different manuscripts can establish whether K is always presented in conjunction with L.

different from the method of compilation of the Āgamas themselves. Loṅkā's work can therefore be interpreted as a case of secondary canonisation, since many of his tenets are still reflected in the Sthānakavāsī literature, although their original handwritten sources are either lost or hidden away. There are, as Bruhn (1987: 106) has indicated, many examples of canonisation outside the canon in the Jain tradition; and generally the post-canonical literatures achieve a higher degree of closure than the canon itself; which Schubring (1910: 63) pointedly described as a "chaos of atoms". Considering its form, content and function, it would be misleading to classify Loṅkā's *siddhānta* as an instance of a mere literature of use (*Gebrauchsliteratur*),<sup>169</sup> that is as an *ad hoc* composition, since, *de facto*, Loṅkā's teachings established an entirely new doctrinal school within the Jaina tradition.

The text starts with *Āyāra* 1.4.1, the precursor of the later *ahiṃsā vrata*, which uses the term *dayāiṃ dharma*, or law of compassion, to describe the law of non-violence. *Āyāra* 1.4.2.3-6 is then cited in the second statement which comprises the rejection of the negation of this proposition: many Brāhmaṇas and Śramaṇas say that there is nothing wrong in injuring living beings, but this is not true because all living beings fear pain. The third *bol* cites *Āyāra* 1.4.2.1-2 which describes the necessity to discriminate between actions which cause the influx (*āsrava*) of karma and actions which destroy karma (*nirjarā*). The fourth and fifth *bols* establish the importance of the law of compassion (non-violence) as the sole path to liberation (*Sūyagada* 17), by contrasting it to violence, which produces only suffering (*Sūyagada* 18). *Bol* 6 and 7 use for the first time more than one citation within a sustained argument, and leave the monastic sphere behind in order to apply the basic

---

<sup>169</sup> Cf. Bruhn 1981: 18. In her *4th Annual Lecture on Jainism* at the London School of Oriental and African Studies on the 17.3.2004, "Thoughts on the meaning and the role of the Śvetāmbara canon in the history of Jainism", Nalini Balbir introduced the term "canon of use" which can be usefully applied in this case; though the difference between a primary and secondary canon is merely a matter of degree.

principles of *bol* 1-5 “with discrimination” to the case of image-worship.<sup>170</sup> Point 6 establishes that unavoidable violence committed in the course of the prescribed duties of a monk, such as crossing a river, must be counteracted through atonements (*prāyaścitta*), and asks why the same rule is not applied to the image worship of the laity. *Bol* 7 argues that “according to the scriptures (*siddhānta*)” the path of liberation (*mokṣamārga*) cannot be entered through image worship, since it only produces worldly gratification (*phal*). Any other interpretation is “opposed to the scriptures” (*sūtra viruddha*). *Bol* 8 states that liberation can only be accomplished by observing the five *mahāvratas*, the *guptis* and *samitis* on the level of the mendicants, and the *bārah vrata*, and the *ṣaḍāvaśyaka* rituals, etc., on the level of the laity, but not through image-worship, which most of the remaining *bols* address.

Mālvaṇiyā (1964: 382) classified the contents of L into three broad categories: *samyaktva* and *mithyātva*;<sup>171</sup> the inauthenticity of the commentary literature; and the problems associated with *mūrti-pūjā*,<sup>172</sup> such as image-making and installation, *prasāda*, the *sthāpanā nikṣepa*, and the term *caitya* (Pkt. *ceiya*).<sup>173</sup> Other categories could be created, for instance concerning the prominent issues of *tīrtha yātrā*,<sup>174</sup> lay or mendicant practices (generally all points concerning image-worship imply lay conduct), or assertions addressing particular opponents, such as in L 30 (Āgamikagaccha’s rejection of *pūjā* with flowers) or L 26, which questions the scriptural basis for the dispute between the view of the A(ñ)calagaccha (and Kaḍuāgaccha) that only the laity can perform *pratiṣṭhās* and other Mūrtipūjaka sects which regard the performance of this ceremony

<sup>170</sup> Most *praśnottara* texts address issues in the religious life “of the mendicant as well as of the layman” (Balbir 2003a: 259), which reflects the prevalence of “fourfold”, etc., sectarian forms of organisation.

<sup>171</sup> L 1-9, 17, 20-21, 40-52, 54-55, 58.

<sup>172</sup> L 7-16, 18-19, 22-32, 34-39, 42, 53, 56.

<sup>173</sup> L 57.

<sup>174</sup> L 53 points to the inner journey advocated by *Viy* 18.10.4 for instance.

as a prerogative of the mendicants.<sup>175</sup> Only one statement (No. 27) explicitly refers to the Digambaras, asking where in the scriptures the issue of the naked representation of *tīrthanīkaras* is discussed, which is controversial between Digambaras and Śvetāmbaras.

The analysis of the contents and exegetical procedures employed by the author of this text requires a separate study. A cursory view shows that all selected texts belong to the canonical literature (of thirty-two scriptures), though no new classification of the Āgamas is offered. Mālvaṇiyā (1964: 378) argued that Loṅkā only rejected those passages in the commentaries which are not in agreement with the scriptures, which made the creation of a new canon unnecessary.<sup>176</sup> He suggested that the various canons of the aniconic traditions were products of the early Loṅkāgaccha and Sthānakavāsī traditions.<sup>177</sup> These are open questions. The commentary literature – which the author of L evidently knew – is expli-

<sup>175</sup> Balbir 2003b: 57 refers to “some inscriptions” as evidence for the view that A(ṅ)calgaccha mendicants “take help from *ācāryas* belonging to other groups” for *pratiṣṭhā*.

<sup>176</sup> Mālvaṇiyā 1964: 377 cites the key passage of Loṅkā’s texts, and asks what harm there is to accept the commentaries which are in agreement with the *sūtras*: ‘*niryukti, bhāṣya, cūrṇī, vṛtti aur tīkāoṃ meṃ jo sūtra viruddha bāteṃ haiṃ, unheṃ pramāṇ kaise mānā jā saktā hai?*’ *lekin jinkā siddhānta sūtroṃ ke sāth meṃ mel baiṭh jātā hai, unheṃ pramāṇ mānne meṃ kyā hāni hai?* He suggests that, judging on the basis of the two Mss., Loṅkā himself must have been of this view (Mālvaṇiyā 1964: 378).

<sup>177</sup> According to Dharmasāgara’s *Pravacanaparīkṣā*, in Mālvaṇiyā 1964: 378, some of Loṅkā’s followers accepted twenty-seven scriptures, and others twenty-nine. Earlier Loṅkāgaccha sources, such as Bhānucandra’s *Dayādharma Caupāṭ*, already mention the Loṅkāgaccha canon of thirty-two scriptures, though the canon of thirty-two may have originated with the Sthānakavāsī *ācārya* Jīvarāja. The modern association of a canon of thirty-one with Loṅkā seems to go back to Ātmārām 1881/1954, II: 519; 1888/1906: 204; in Vallabhvijay 1891: 131. Ātmārām wrote that the *Vavahāra* was added by the Sthānakavāsīs, whereas Jñānsundar (1936: 106) argued that it was the “*Āvaśyaka Sūtra*”. Suśīlkumār (1959: 395, 431f.) tells us that the Sthānakavāsī *ācārya* Jīvarāja (died ca. 1641) created the present canon of thirty-two scriptures. Mālvaṇiyā (1964: 378f.) also believes that it was created after the emergence of the Sthānakavāsīs, because in all cases only thirty-two are mentioned in the later literature. See Flügel 2000: 49, n. 18 and 59, n. 38.



citly rejected in L 41, with reference to additional insertions concerning image worship which cannot be found in the original text, and in L 57, which argues that the elaboration of exceptions (*apavāda*) of the prescriptions of the Āgamas in the commentary literature<sup>178</sup> opens the door to laxity. However, the claim that Loṅkā rejected the entire Śvetāmbara commentary literature in the name of a “fundamentalist scriptural literalism”,<sup>179</sup> seems too broad, since all aniconic traditions accept the “philological commentary”, while rejecting the “canonical commentary”, which while explaining the meaning of the scriptures also mediates creatively between the closed canon and the openness of the world.<sup>180</sup>

If L was really composed by Loṅkā, and there are more arguments in favour than against this assumption, then there can be no doubt that he propagated the necessity for the mendicants to observe the five *mahāvratas*, and for the laity to observe the twelve lay vows (which include the *poṣadha vrata*), the *āvaśyaka* rituals (*sāmāyika*, *caturviṃśatistava* etc.), and to support the ascetics with offerings of food, *upāśrayas*, etc., if they wish to reap the fruit of salvation (*mokṣa nāṃ phal*).<sup>181</sup> He rejected, however, all rituals which are predicated on violence (against flowers and fruits, water, fire, etc.). The claim by his early Mūrtipūjaka opponents,<sup>182</sup> which Jñānsundar (1936: 98ff.) and Śeṭh (1964) cited in support of their

<sup>178</sup> For instance, in the *Āvassaya Nijjutti* or the *Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya*.

<sup>179</sup> Dharmasāgara, in Dundas 1996: 74; 2002: 62. See also Mālvaṇiyā’s (1964: 376) critique of the “hard” (*dṛṛh*) dogmatism of the Sthānakavāsīs, who in his view do not tolerate differences of opinion.

<sup>180</sup> The terms are from Assmann 1987: 13f.

<sup>181</sup> ... *tathā śrāvaka naiṃ bāra vrata pālyā nāṃ phal śrī uvavāi upāṅga tathā sāmāyika cauvīsathao ityādi āvaśyaka nāṃ phal ānuyogadvāra madhye, tathā śrāvaka naiṃ ju sādhu cāritrīā vandanīka chaiṃ tu sādhu unai vāmdyā nāṃ phal, tathā sādhu nī paryupāsti kīdhā nāṃ phal tathā annā pāṇī dīdhā nāṃ phal tathā upāśraya dīdhā nāṃ phal, tathā vastra pātra dīdhā nāṃ phal ityādi* (L 8).

<sup>182</sup> See the *Asūtranirākaraṇa Batrīśī* of Muni Bīkā of 1470/1, the *Siddhānta Cauṣā* of Muni Lāvaṇyasamay of 1486/7, and the *Siddhānta Sāroddhāra* of Upādhyāya Kamalsamyam of the Kharataragaccha in 1487/8. The *Loṅkāśāha Siloko* vv. 13-15 of 1543/4 by the Loṅkāgaccha *yati* Keśavṛṣi also contains similar statements, which is difficult to explain.

own views, that Loṅkā had rejected the standard Jaina *sāmāyika*, *pratikramaṇa*, *poṣadha*, *dāna* etc. rituals entirely,<sup>183</sup> is neither confirmed by the two published manuscripts of “Loṅkā”, nor by his “thirteen questions”.<sup>184</sup> The *Dayādharma Caupāi* vv. 15-19 of 1521/2 of the Loṅkāgaccha *yati* Bhānucandra<sup>185</sup> explicitly mentions the practice of two *sāmāyikas* (in the morning and evening), one-day *poṣadha*, *pratikramaṇa* (not without taking a vow), *pratyā-khyāna*, *dāna* to restrained individuals, *bhāva pūjā* (but not *dravya pūjā*), and the belief in thirty-two Āgamas (v. 19) within his own group.<sup>186</sup> Jñānsundar (1936: 237, n. 1) explains this away as the result of a post-Loṅkā reform, and further argued that no such lay rites could have been practised before probably Bhāṇā introduced them, because the *śrāvaka pratikramaṇa* is not part of the *Āvaśyaka Sūtra* (*Niryukti*) amongst the thirty-two accepted Āgamas, and because it is known that both Loṅkā and Kaḍuā were householders who rejected the *sāmāyika* (Jñānsundar 1936: 105-107). Yet, the statement that Kaḍuā was “also” against the *sāmāyika* is obviously fabricated, since several points of Kaḍuā’s *Niyamāvalī* demand its performance.<sup>187</sup> Without taking note of Jñānsundar’s writings,

<sup>183</sup> Jñānsundar 1936: 29, 97, App. 3; Mālvaṇiyā 1964: 367f.; Dundas 2002: 248.

<sup>184</sup> *kintu Loṅkāśāh ke 58 bolom evaṃ 13 praśnoṃ ādī meṃ kahīṃ koī ek bhī aisā śabda nahīṃ. ... Loṅkāśāh ke virodha meṃ likhane vāle vidvānoṃ ke dvārā kiye gaye ullekhoṃ meṃ sthān-sthān par is prakār ke tathyoṃ kī andekhī dṛṣṭigocar hotī hai* (Hastūmal 1995: 751, cf. 759-789).

<sup>185</sup> *sāmāika ṭālaiṃ be bāra, parva pare posaha parihār,  
paḍikkamaṇuṃ bina vrata na karaiṃ, paccakhānai kima āgāra  
dharaiṃ (17).  
ṭālai asaṃyati naiṃ dāna, bhāva pūjā thī rūḍau jñāna,  
dravya pūjā navi kahī jinarāja, dharma nāmaiṃ hiṃsāi akāja (18).  
sūtra batīsa sācā saddahyā, samatā bhāve sādhu kahyā,  
siri Luṅkā no sācco dharma, bhrame paṛiyā na lahai marma (19)*  
(Bhānucandra, in Jñānsundar 1936: 236).

<sup>186</sup> This is evidently the first reference to the thirty-two Āgamas in the Jaina literature, which points to a pre-Sthānakavāsī origin of this classification.

<sup>187</sup> Dundas 1999: 22. Jñānsundar 1936: 327 also cites Kaḍuā’s list, but comments on the relevant point 4 (point 6 in Dundas’ list) that Kaḍuā may have included it in the list to distinguish himself on paper from Loṅkā: *śāyad laumkā-*

Mālvaṇiyā (1964: 367f.) merely mentions that the difference of opinion between Loṅkā and the Mūrtipūjakas over these issues developed only when in Saṃvat 1544 Loṅkā met Lakhamsī, who became his first associate. But Hastīmal (1995: 786-788) points out that nowhere in Loṅkā's own writings is *sāmāyika*, *poṣadha*, *pratikramaṇa*, *pratyākhyāna* or *dāna* rejected in principle. What is rejected is the manner in which these rituals are performed or not performed, for instance the ostentatious giving of gold and money in the context of *pratiṣṭhā*, etc., rituals. He also notices that there is no mentioning of any opposition to *sāmāyika*, *pratikramaṇa*, *poṣadha*, etc. in the report on the meeting between Bhāṇā and Kaḍuā in Saṃvat 1539 in the *Kaḍuvāmat Paṭṭāvalī* (*Paṭṭāvalī Parāga Saṃgraha*, p. 483), which would have recorded a debate between the two if Bhāṇā had indeed not practiced these rituals which Kaḍuā himself observed.<sup>188</sup>

Another controversial issue is whether Loṅkāgaccha mendicants observed the *mahāvratas*, or whether they were *yatis* in the modern sense of half-ascetics from the outset; as apparently the Kaḍuāgaccha ascetics were, though this remains doubtful (Klatt 1888: 58f.; Dundas 1999: 21, cf. 30, n. 11). Modern commentators such as V. M. Śāh (1909: 49f.), Jñānsundar (1936: 97ff.), and Mālvaṇiyā (1964: 367-369), who stressed the difference between Loṅkāgaccha “*yatis*” and Sthānakavāsī “*sādhus*”, expressed the opinion (backed by the reports of the Mūrtipūjakas Dharmasāgara and Kamalsamyam) that the first leader of the Loṅkāgaccha, Bhāṇā, was known for not observing the *mahāvratas* and for not wearing the dress of a *sādhu*.<sup>189</sup> He therefore must have been a *yati*, i.e. neither a householder nor a monk; which would turn the Sthā-

---

*śāh ne sāmāyik ko bhī asvikār kiya thā, isī lie kaḍuāsāh ko yah niyam banānā karā ho* (p. 327, n. 4).

<sup>188</sup> Hastīmal 1995: 750 also points to the absence of any polemic along these lines in critique of Loṅkā in the Digambara *muni* Ratnanandī's *Bhadrabāhu Caritra* 158-163 of Saṃvat 1625.

<sup>189</sup> A different picture is painted in the much younger *Vinaycandrajī-kṛt Paṭṭāvalī*, published by Hastīmal (1968: 141).

nakavāsī mendicants into the first truly *pañca-mahāvratī* ascetics of the aniconic tradition. If this is indeed true, then already the practices of the earliest Loṅkāgaccha ascetics would not have corresponded with the principles of Loṅkā, as articulated in L.

L ends with the statement that *mokṣa* can only be reached through the practice of protecting life (*jīvadayā*),<sup>190</sup> even now [sic!] and in future by everyone, as stated in the *Sūyagada*:

O ye monks, the virtuous (Jinas) that have been and will be, the followers of the law of Kaśyapa, they all have commended these virtues. Do not kill living beings in the threefold way, being intent on your spiritual welfare and abstaining from sins. In this way numberless men have reached perfection [*siddhā*], and others, who live now, and who are to come, (will reach it) (Sūy 1.2.3.20-21, translated by Jacobi).

Loṅkā's main (“*ekānta*”)<sup>191</sup> focus was the doctrine of *dayā dharma*, or the law of compassion.<sup>192</sup> His interpretation of *jīvadayā* is, however, restricted to practising abstinence from violence in general, and does not explicitly recommend an active intervention into the world for the saving of life, as advocated today by most Sthānakavāsī traditions. Since L presents such practices as an aspect of worldly conduct, but not of the *mokṣamārga*, this text could be cited in favour of Ācārya Bhikṣu's interpretation of the dividing

<sup>190</sup> *jīvadayāim karī mokṣa puhatā* (L 58).

<sup>191</sup> L 46. See Mālvaṇīyā's (1964: 373-375) critique of the “one-sidedness” of Loṅkā's *niścaya-naya* approach, which does not take into account practical considerations of religious instruction for beginners: *dharmā kī jo sādhanā 13veṃ guṇasthāna se 14veṃ guṇasthāna meṃ jāne ke lie hotī hai, vahī sādhanā pratham guṇasthāna vāle ke lie bhī āvaśyak hai – is prakār kā āgrah karne se sāmānya vyaktī ko dharmā ke mārga par kaise lāyā jā saktī hai? sādhanā ke mārga par is prakār ekānta āgrah se kām nahīṃ caltā. kyomki sabhī sādhanā kī योग्यता समान नहीं हो सकती*. This critique echoes the standard criticisms of the views of the Terāpanth *ācārya* Bhikṣu. The additional criticism, directed at the Sthānakavāsīs, that their emphasis on *dayā* unduly neglects the importance of knowledge is, partly, polemical: *sthānakavāsī paramparā jñān-sūnya ban gāī* (Mālvaṇīyā 1964: 376).

<sup>192</sup> See L 17 for a lengthy list of citations from the Āgamas using the term *dayā* in defence of his choice of catchphrase.

line between *laukika* and *lokottara dharma*, though his controversial equation of *puṇya* and *pāpa*, from the *nīścaya* point of view, is not discussed in the text.<sup>193</sup> Notably, the text does not reject religious property per se, but declares the gift of *upāśrayas* (= *sthānakas*) to the mendicants (*sādhu*) as a religious act.

### LOṅKĀ'S THIRTY-FOUR PROCLAMATIONS

The second manuscript, No. 4121, contains only one text, *Luṅkā nī Huṇḍī 34 Bol* (=LH), Loṅkā's list of thirty-four assertions,<sup>194</sup> which gives thirty-three examples from the commentaries for significant deviations from the scriptures under the label of *apavāda*, or exception. The statements No. 1-25 criticise various points of the *Niśītha Cūrṇī*, which cannot be found in the *Niśītha*, No. 26 does the same for the *Uttarādhyayana Vṛtti*, No. 27 for the *Vyavahāra Vṛtti*, Nos. 28-33 for the *Āvaśyaka Niryukti*, and the last section for the *Prajñāpanā Vṛtti*. The underlying ordering principle of the diverse list of topics is the reference to the five *mahāvratas*. More than one example is given for excuses for the exceptional use of violence in self-defence (Nos. 1, 22, 26); for the violation of the vow on non-possession (Nos. 3, 4); for the violation of the vow of not taking what is not given (Nos. 2, 18, 28, 29); for the violation of the vow of celibacy (Nos. 14, 15, 23);<sup>195</sup> and for using living objects such as water, fire, earth, food, plants, etc., in various contexts. Because the text focuses only on explicit discrepancies between canonical and

<sup>193</sup> Cf. Mālvaṇiyā 1964: 373f., and Jain and Kumār's (2003: 140) summary of the text, which would also support this interpretation.

<sup>194</sup> Mālvaṇiyā 1964: 382 cites the text as *Luṅkā nī Huṇḍī 33 Bol*. It was however published with an explanation in Hindī under the title *Caumṭīs Bol* (34 assertions) by Hastīmal (1995: 648-655), and re-published under the same title by Jain and Kumār (2003: 499-503), who also give a summary in Hindī (Jain & Kumār 2003: 120-124). The numerical difference can be explained by the fact that Mālvaṇiyā did not count *bol* No. 34, because it contains only the general statement that only on the basis of the scriptures progress can be achieved.

<sup>195</sup> See U. P. Shah 1955b for an inscription documenting historical cases.

post-canonical monastic law, and on the use of *prāyaścittas* for normalising transgressions (No. 23), image-worship is not mentioned at all, and neither are issues of contemporary practice. Interestingly, both the *Vavahāra* and the *Āvassaya Sutta* are implicitly referred to, which are often cited in the modern secondary literature as the two texts whose canonical status may have been disputed between the early Loṅkāgaccha and the Sthānakavāsī traditions.<sup>196</sup>

### LOṅKĀ'S FIFTY-FOUR QUESTIONS TO THE IMAGE-WORSHIPPERS

The fifty-four rhetorical questions *Whose tradition is that? (Te Keha nī Paramparā Chai?)*,<sup>197</sup> which are appended to the *Athāvan Bol* in the L.D. Institute Ms. 2989, effectively ask (like some of the *Athāvan Bols*) whether any of the listed practices (not beliefs), which must have been prevalent amongst the image-worshipping Jaina traditions of the time, are backed up by the “root” scriptures.<sup>198</sup> Since the answer is assumed to be “no” in all cases, the main function of the questions is to provide summary criticism of the key shortcomings of the addressees of these questions, which in accordance with the etiquette of the *praśnottara* genre are not explicitly mentioned. Fifty-two almost identical questions which were attributed to Loṅkā were published in Hindī in the fourth edition of Muni Jeṭhmal's (1930: 14f.) polemical work *Samakita-sāra*.<sup>199</sup> The content of this slightly shorter list overlaps to a large

<sup>196</sup> See Flügel 2000: 18.

<sup>197</sup> The text was first published by Mālvaṇiyā (1963a: 80-82), and reprinted in Hastīmal 1995: 691-693, and from Hastīmal's publication (without an indication of the original source) in Jain & Kumār 2003: 537-539. A Hindī summary can also be found in Jain & Kumār 2003: 118-120.

<sup>198</sup> See Samayasundara's question “What are the textual references for such and such a rite, usage, etc.?” in his *Sāmācārī Śataka* cited by Balbir 2003a: 267.

<sup>199</sup> Fourth edition with Hindī translation by Muni Devṛṣi (1872-1929), who became the *ācārya* of the Sthānakavāsī Mālvā Rṣi Sampradāya after Amolakṛṣi's death, and was the predecessor of Ānandṛṣi (1901-1963), the second *ācārya* of

extent with K, but comprises some extra questions, which points to the existence of other recensions which are yet to be unearthed, or to later interpolations.<sup>200</sup> The original text (K) can be translated as follows:

The tradition is written. Someone says, Śrī Vīra's tradition says this. Where is that?<sup>201</sup>

1. To cause images to be made and to be installed (*maṇḍāvai*) in the house, whose tradition is that?<sup>202</sup> To buy male and female disciples (*celā-celī*), whose tradition is that?<sup>203</sup>
2. To give initiation to small children, whose tradition is that?<sup>204</sup>
3. To change the name (to give a different name at the time of initiation), whose tradition is that?
4. To cause the ear to be extended (*vadhārai*), whose tradition is that?<sup>205</sup>
5. To venerate (*viharai*) the forgiving *guru* (in the presence of symbols), whose tradition is that?<sup>206</sup>

---

the Śramaṇasaṅgha in which the Mālvā Ṛṣi Sampradāya was incorporated in 1952. See Flügel 2000: 70, n. 62.

<sup>200</sup> Jeṭhmal 1930: 14 has as question No. 6: *ghoṛā, rath, bail, ḍolī meṃ baiṭhte ho.* – To sit on a horse, chariot, bullock (-cart) or litter carried by porters; No. 8: *ghar jākar kalpa sūtra paṛhte ho.* – To read the *Kalpa Sūtra* after going to a house; No. 12: *rassī ḍore dete ho.* – To give strings of rope (as blessings); No. 13: *mantra, jantra, jhār phūk karte ho.* – To perform *mantra, yantra*, exorcism; 14. *pustak, pātare becte ho.* – To sell leafs of a book (to sell knowledge); 15. *māl urāte ho.* – To indulge in property; 25. *ṭīp likhā rupaye lete ho.* – To take money for writing documents; 29. *tapasyā karākar paise lete ho.* – To accept money after performing a fast; 45. *mor piñch ke ḍaṇḍāsaṅ rakhte ho.* – To keep a peacock feather staff (Digambara style); 46. *strī kā saṅghaṭṭā karte ho.* – To keep the company of women; 49. *kapṛe dhulāte ho.* – To cause clothes to be washed. These are standard complaints against “domesticated” Jain mendicants.

<sup>201</sup> On the uses of written texts in earlier medieval Jaina debates see Granoff 1993, and also Dundas 1996. On the role of written texts for the “protestant” Jaina reform movements see Flügel 2000: 38, 46.

<sup>202</sup> Jain and Kumār (2003: 118) have *ghar meṃ pratimā banavāne yā citrit karavāne.* This sentence appears in Jeṭhmal 1930: 14 as No. 24: *māṇḍvī karāte ho.*

<sup>203</sup> This sentence has only been published in Hindī in Jeṭhmal 1930: 14. It is not related to the first sentence of point 1, and should have been listed separately. The laxities of (some) medieval Mūrtipūjaka mendicants are well documented in an inscription published by U. P. Shah 1955b.

<sup>204</sup> On *bāl dīkṣā* see Balbir 2001.

<sup>205</sup> Or “split”. On ascetics piercing their ears see Wujastyk 1984.

6. To amuse oneself (*viharai*)<sup>207</sup> sitting in the householder's house, whose tradition is that?
7. To go every day to the same house (for food), whose tradition is that?<sup>208</sup>
8. To ask (someone) to take a bath, whose tradition is that?<sup>209</sup>
9. To make use (*prajumjai*) of the secret of astrology, whose tradition is that?
10. To tell the future, whose tradition is that?<sup>210</sup>
11. To cause a reception to be held at the time of entering into a town, whose tradition is that?
12. To consecrate sweets, whose tradition is that?
13. To cause the worship of religious books, whose tradition is that?
14. To cause the performance of *saṅghapūjā*, whose tradition is that?<sup>211</sup>

<sup>206</sup> The word *khamāsamaṣaṇu* refers to the *vandanā* ritual to the *ḥṣamāśramaṇa*, which begins with the words *icchāmi khamā-samaṇo vandituṃ* – I desire to venerate you forgiving monk, which Mūrtipūjaka ascetics (and laity) also perform in front of symbolic objects representing the *guru*, such as the *sthāpanā-cārya*, and in front of statues (*caitya vandanā*). See Leumann 1934: 7-10; Williams 1983: 199-203; Cort 2001: 65. The sentence is interpreted by Jain and Kumār (2003: 118) as: “*khamāsaṇā guru ko diyā jātā haīm, dev ko nahīm*”. The issue is also addressed in Samayasundara's *Sāmācārī Sataka* 1 etc. (Balbir 2003a: 261).

<sup>207</sup> Also: to spend time.

<sup>208</sup> A common mistake, known in the scriptures as *nitya-piṇḍa* or *nitiya-piṇḍa*.

<sup>209</sup> Jain and Kumār (2003: 118) have: *snān karne kā kahanā aur snān karnā*. – To ask (someone) to take a bath and to take a bath. LH 19 criticises that the *Niśītha Cūrṇī* permits taking a bath under certain circumstances, although the scriptures prohibit it unequivocally for mendicants. The question may also address the obligatory practice of image-worshipping lay Jainas to take a bath before entering the temple in order to “purify” themselves outwardly. See Williams 1983: 221, and Laidlaw 1995: 273 on the “incongruence between purity in *pūja* and purity in asceticism”.

<sup>210</sup> In Rājasthānī (R.) *kalavāṃṇī*, means “dirty water” (Lālas 1986-87: 208). The question may thus alternatively refer to *sacitta* water that is left over from the ablutions of the ascetics and/or images, and distributed as a sacred object, or to “raw” water used at certain ritual consecrations. Cf. Williams 1983: 224. Jain and Kumār (2003: 118) have *kalavānī karke dete haīm*.

<sup>211</sup> There are two uses of the term: (1) The prime recipients of the *saṅghapūjā*, which Williams 1983: 166 described as a “later development”, are the mendicants, who during an annual ceremony (at the end of *pariyuṣaṇa*) receive at once “blankets, cloth, needles, thread, staves, almsbowls, *rajoharaṇas*, and other objects useful to an ascetic”. Jeṭhmal 1930: 14 (question No. 18) uses the expression “to extract” (*nikalnā*) the *saṅghapūjā*. (2) The “worship of the congrega-



15. To perform installation ceremonies (of idols), whose tradition is that?<sup>212</sup>
16. To give books during *paryuṣaṇa*, whose tradition is that?<sup>213</sup>
17. And to sell pilgrimages, whose tradition is that?<sup>214</sup>
18. And to give a certain amount,<sup>215</sup> whose tradition is that?
19. And to bind garlands made of vegetation to arched gateways, whose tradition is that?
20. To keep specially prepared food (*ādḥākarma*) for the ascetics in the *poṣadhasālā*,<sup>216</sup> whose tradition is that?<sup>217</sup>

tion” may also involve “giving every participant at some public religious function a small amount of money (usually a one-rupee coin) and a red forehead mark as a token of respect” (Cort 2001: 150). *Saṅghapūjā* is, for instance, performed in connection with the visit of prominent ascetics to the residence of a householder. The host invites his family and friends to participate in this event and prepares *kunkum* for auspicious *tilakas* on the fronts of their heads and distributes money to each visitor after the monk or nun has left – a kind of *prasāda* (personal communication K. Śeth).

<sup>212</sup> This question reflects L 26. The A(ñ)calagaccha did/does not allow this for its own mendicants. See Balbir 2003b: 57.

<sup>213</sup> Jeṭhmal 1930: 14 understands this as: *paryuṣaṇ meṃ pothī, de rātra jāgaraṇ karāte*. – To cause night watches to be done to books given out during *paryuṣaṇ*. Loṅkā thus may have rejected the veneration of books as objects. Often, manuscripts are copied or books printed in honour of deceased parents, whose names are mentioned in the introductory sections of a text, and then offered to the mendicants during *paryuṣaṇa*. The objection may also have been directed against the payments for something that has been produced especially for the mendicants, or, more likely, against motivating the laity to auction the privilege of taking the *Kalpa Sūtra* home for one night.

<sup>214</sup> For allocating the honour of leading specific rituals, auctions (*bolī*) are routinely held in many Jaina traditions. In the question, the practice of bidding for the privilege of leading the *saṅgha yātrā* as a *caitya paripātī* is addressed. Williams 1983: 234 indirectly confirms Loṅkā’s suspicion. He writes: “The *tīrtha-yātrā* seems to be a later development”.

<sup>215</sup> The contextual meaning of *mātra* is unclear here. It could mean measure, a certain amount of money, etc. Jain and Kumār (2003: 118) interpret the half-sentence as: *mātrā (prasavaṇ) dene, prasavaṇa* meaning flow, outflow.

<sup>216</sup> *posālim*; see R. *posāla*, S. *pāṭhasālā*. The *poṣadhasālā* is a special room that is used for the collective performance of a one-day fast, or *poṣadha*, during which the practising laity imitates the lifestyle of the ascetics. A variety of fasts can be performed. Because not all of them require the complete renunciation of all nourishment, food and drink may be brought to the *poṣadhasālā* from home (Yaśovijay, in Williams 1983: 145). Since *poṣadha* does not involve performing an almsround, only specially prepared food can be eaten. Therefore, Loṅkā must have disagreed with eating food at all during *poṣadha*, apparently in agreement

21. To create the impression of the importance of the scriptures but not reading them, whose tradition is that?<sup>218</sup>
22. To cause decorative pavilions (for images) to be constructed, whose tradition is that?<sup>219</sup>
23. To cause the fast in the name of<sup>220</sup> “Gautama” to be performed, whose tradition is that?
24. To cause the “Saṃsāratāraṇa” (vow to be taken), whose tradition is that?<sup>221</sup>
25. To cause the “Candanabālā” fast to be performed, whose tradition is that?<sup>222</sup>
26. To cause the “ladder of gold and silver” (*sonā rūpā nī nīsarāṇī*) to be created, whose tradition is that?<sup>223</sup>

---

with the A(ñ)calagaccha and the Kāḍuāgaccha, but in contrast with the Tapāgaccha and Kharataragaccha (Samayasundara) at the time (cf. Balbir 2003b: 60).

<sup>217</sup> *Ādhākarma* is discussed in L 21 as well.

<sup>218</sup> Loṅkā advocated open access to the scriptures.

<sup>219</sup> The word *māṇḍavī* (H. *maṇḍapa*) can also signify a temple, or the entrance hall of a temple.

<sup>220</sup> Literally, the sound or echo (*paraḡho*, G. *paḍaḡhī*). Jeṭhmal 1930: 46-52 lists fifteen practices opposed to the scriptures (*sūtra*) which the *hiṃsā dharmī*, i.e. the image-worshippers, associate with the name of Gautama. Vārīā 1976: 129 explains the question as: *gautam paḍaḡhā nuṃ tap karāve che*. Jain and Kumār (2003: 119) read the word *paraḡho* as *pratipadā* (*parvā*) – the first day of the lunar fortnight. Though Jeṭhmal does not mention this, the question may also refer to the *sūrimantra* (cf. Dundas 1998) which is addressed explicitly in questions 45 and 46, or, more likely, to Gautama’s invocation during the annual *pūjā* of the account books at Dīpāvalī (cf. Cort 2001: 168-70).

<sup>221</sup> *Saṃsāra-tāraṇa* means literally “to cross the ocean of existence”. John Cort informed me that this practice is listed as a fast in the Tapāgaccha monk Jinendravijaygaṇī’s *Taporatna Mahodadhi* (Lākhāvāḷa-Śāntipuri: Harṣapūṣpāmṛta Jaina Granthamālā 101, 1982) which is based on the Kharataragaccha *ācārya* Vardhamāna’s 15th-century *Ācāradinakara*. Jeṭhmal 1930: 14 speaks of the *Saṃsāra-tāraṇa* “*telā*”, i.e. a continuous three-day fast. Most, if not all, of the practices mentioned in questions Nos. 24-27 are likely to be special fasts, which involve auctions of the meritorious act of giving the first drink and food to a *tapasvī(nī)* to conclude, or “break”, the fast (*pāraṇa*).

<sup>222</sup> This fast takes four days: three one-day fasts (*upavāsa*), followed by one day eating only one meal (*ekāsana*) with or without practising *āyambīla* (to eat only one unsalted cereal). Both the privilege of the first feeding of the *tapasvī(nī)* on day four, and of the first feeding at the time of the breaking of the fast on day five are auctioned (Keltling 2001: 46). For the story of Candanā see Shāntā 1997: 122-128.

27. To cause the “Lākhā Paḍavi” to be performed, whose tradition is that?<sup>224</sup>  
 28. To cause gifts to be given (*dhovarāvai*) to celebrate the end of a fast (*ūṃjamaṇā*), whose tradition is that?<sup>225</sup>  
 29. To cause the *pūjā* to be recited,<sup>226</sup> whose tradition is that?  
 30. To cause the “Aśoka-tree” (*āso vṛkṣa*) to be supported (*bharavāi*),<sup>227</sup> whose tradition is that?<sup>228</sup>  
 31. To cause the eightfold bath (*aṭṭhattarī snātra*) to be performed, whose tradition is that?<sup>229</sup>

<sup>223</sup> This is probably another fast involving public auctions. Alternatively, the question may or may not refer to one of the following practices: (a) a ladder of gold is often given by grandsons to grandfathers; (b) ladders are often used to reach a large statue for *pūjā* (personal communication K. Śeṭh).

<sup>224</sup> John Cort suggested to me, this may refer to the *lakṣa pratipada* fast (G. *lākhi paḍavo*), which is listed in modern Gujarātī Jaina compilations of fasts.

<sup>225</sup> G. *ujamaṇum*, R. *ujamaṇau*, *ujavanau*, a celebration at the end of a fast, involving donations of money to the fasting person(s). Jain and Kumār (2003: 119) translate *ūṃjamaṇā* as “*udyāpana*”, which signifies the concluding ceremony or the dedication of a temple on completion. The meaning of the word *dhovarāvai* (? S. *dhauk*, P. *dhovaṇa*, to offer, to give gifts) is not entirely clear. It may generally refer to celebrations. Jeṭhmal 1930: 15 has “*dhurāna*”.

<sup>226</sup> Or to be sung (*pāḍhāi*).

<sup>227</sup> The Hindī verb *bharvāi* or *bharvāna*, to have something filled, makes less sense here than the Rājasthānī verb *bharvāi*, to carry, nurture, maintain, or pay for.

<sup>228</sup> Mahāvīra renounced the world under an Aśoka-tree; which is also one of the twelve symbols of the *arihantas*. The tree is associated with the worship of portable Jina images, and is believed to have wish-fulfilling powers. Models of it are often installed on the roofs of temples (Jain & Fischer 1978, II: 3, 7E., 24, Plate XIIb). The *aśoka vṛkṣa* is also listed as a fast in Jinendravijaygaṇi’s *Taporatna Mahodadhi*, the breaking of which was possibly auctioned off in various ritual contexts (personal communication of John Cort). The word *bharavāi* could refer to an auction as well. Kanubhāi Śeṭh (personal communication 7.7.2003) informs me that the expression may also point to a decorative curtain with a tree motif (though it seems unlikely). These curtains are made with gold and silver inlays to adorn the wall behind the seat of a monk. Today, they are called *choda*, a small tree or shrub. They contain the name of the donor, his family members, and the name of the inspiring monk or nun. After being used as an adornment, they are later venerated in the house of the donor. Sometimes sixteen or eighteen curtains of this type are requested to be made, to be presented to women who have performed a long fast.

<sup>229</sup> This question refers back to L 35, which questions the canonical basis of the “upper eight” (Skt. *aṣṭottarī*, Pkt. *aṭṭhattarī*) ritual of installation of images,

32. To cause fresh rice and fresh fruit to be offered in front of an image, whose tradition is that?<sup>230</sup>
33. To put sandalwood powder<sup>231</sup> on the head of laymen and laywomen, whose tradition is that?
34. To be involved<sup>232</sup> in the search for possessions, whose tradition is that?<sup>233</sup>
35. To cause the laity to offer a head tax (*pāṁ mūṇḍaka*) before ascending a hill (pilgrimage site), whose tradition is that?<sup>234</sup>
36. To place garlands (on persons or idols), whose tradition is that?<sup>235</sup>
37. To permit laymen and laywomen to walk together (during pilgrimages) by foot, whose tradition is that?<sup>236</sup>
38. To cause the “Nāndi”<sup>237</sup> to be erected, whose tradition is that?
39. To cause foot prints (shrines) (*padīka cāṁka*) to be built, whose tradition is that?
40. To put powder (*bhūko*) into the water, whose tradition is that?<sup>238</sup>

---

which includes the use of fire in *āratī*, the rite of throwing “living” salt into the fire, etc.

<sup>230</sup> This was also rejected by the A(ñ)calagaccha. See Balbir 2003b: 60. Since image-worship is rejected *per se*, this point is redundant, and may have been imported simply to add more venom to the attack.

<sup>231</sup> S. *vāsakṣepa*, colloquial *vāskṣep* or *vāskep*, to sprinkle with scented powder. Mūrtipūjaka ascetics charge sandalwood powder with *mantras* and sprinkle it on the heads of their devotees to transfer their blessings-*cum*-spiritual energy to them.

<sup>232</sup> *bāṁdhai*, H. *baṁdhnā*.

<sup>233</sup> An alternative reading would be: “To set a limit (for individual laymen) in their search for possessions”. Jain and Kumār (2003: 119) interpret the meaning of the passage as *upadhi ādi potaliyoṁ meṁ bāṁdhte haiṁ* – to tie up/bring together property etc. in small parcels.

<sup>234</sup> The religious legitimacy of the pilgrimage sites of Śatruñjaya, Gīrnār, Ābū, etc., and *tīrthas* other than the *caturvidhasaṅgha* is questioned for instance in L 36, L 38, L 39, L 41, L 44.

<sup>235</sup> The privilege of giving garlands, for instance for the successful performers of the *upadhāna tapa*, is also auctioned off amongst Mūrtipūjakas.

<sup>236</sup> Samayasundara, in Balbir 2003a: 260, similarly questioned the co-wandering of monks and nuns, which is still practised within the Tapāgaccha.

<sup>237</sup> The questioned issue is not clear. Maybe the word *nāndi* refers to the *nandīśvara-paṭa* which is venerated in the context of the *nandīśvara* fast (U. P. Shah 1955a: 121; Williams 1983: 232; Jain & Fischer 1978, II: 19). It could also (though unlikely) refer to the bull *Nandin*, who is associated with Śiva, or to an inauguration involving praise of the gods (*nāndī*).

41. To cause worship (*vāndaṇā*) to be offered, whose tradition is that?<sup>239</sup>  
 42. To move the broom (*oghā*) (in front of the idols), whose tradition is that?<sup>240</sup>  
 43. To keep the *deva dravya*, whose tradition is that?<sup>241</sup>  
 44. To wear a long covering garment (*paccheṛī*) down to the feet, whose tradition is that?<sup>242</sup>  
 45. To accept the *sūrimantra*, whose tradition is that?<sup>243</sup>

<sup>238</sup> G. *bhūko* or *bhūkā*, powder, is related to R. *bhūkau* (Lālas 1986-87: 296). The question addresses a common form of water sterilisation amongst the Jains through “killing” *sacitta* water by adding a different living substance such as lime powder (*cūnā*). Hastīmal 1995: 693 transcribes the original *bhūko* as *bhūmkā*. Jain and Kumār (2003: 119) interpret *bhūmkā* as G. *thūmka* or H. *thūka*, saliva, spittle. The issue of *cūrṇa*, or powder, is also addressed in Samayasundara’s *Sāmācārī Śataka* 37 etc. (Balbir 2003a: 261).

<sup>239</sup> The sentence apparently means: “to cause veneration to be given (to an ascetic or image)”, since R. *vāndaṇau* (*bāndaṇau*) is equivalent to S. *vandana*, to worship. Jain and Kumār (2003: 119) translate *vāndaṇā dīrāvai* as *bāmdhanā dilānā* – to cause someone to give an oath (to bind him/herself). They derive *vāndaṇā* from S. *bandhana*, to bind, R. *bāmdhanau*. Cf. Lālas 1986-87: 194f.

<sup>240</sup> Jain and Kumār (2003: 119) render the words *oghā phervai chai* as *āśīrvād svarūp kiśī par oghā phernā*. Loṅkā apparently did not use an *oghā* at all (Mālvaṇiyā 1964: 369).

<sup>241</sup> The donations given “to the gods” should only be used for the maintenance of the temples, etc. Jeṭhmal 1930: 15 has as question No. 44: *gāmṭh meṃ paisā rakhte ho*. – To keep money in the pocket.

<sup>242</sup> To wear a long *pacchevaṛī* (P. *pacchāga*) is considered wasteful. It seems, Loṅkā himself used one almsbowl (*pātra*), one loincloth (*colapaṭṭāka*) and one short *pacchevaṛī* (*cādar*) (L. D. Institute Ms. No. 2328, in Mālvaṇiyā 1964: 369). He rejected the *oghā*, *muhapattī*, *kambala*, and *daṇḍa*. See Mālvaṇiyā 1964: 369; he cites Ghelārṣi, a contemporary of Loṅkā, who reportedly (L.D. Institute Ms. No. 7588, question 86) asked him in which *sūtra* it is written to wear a *colapaṭṭa*, or loincloth: *āp jaisā colapaṭṭak pahante haiṃ, vaisā kis sūtra meṃ likhā hai?* From this, it can be deduced that the ascetics at the time did not wear a *colapaṭṭa*; though *colapaṭṭas* are mentioned in the canon (Vy 8.6.2 (374), etc.). Jñānsundar (1936: 173f.) writes that in the 20th century (?) Loṅkāgaccha ascetics wore *colapaṭṭakas* and *caddars* (*cādar*), but in a slightly different form than the Sthānakavāsīs. In contrast to the Sthānakavāsīs, they did not wear a *muhapattī* permanently, but carried an *oghā*, *kambal*, and *daṇḍa*, etc. I have never seen any evidence of a Loṅkāgaccha *yati* carrying a *daṇḍa* though of *oghā* and *kambal*.

<sup>243</sup> For the tantric cult of the *sūrimantra* in the Mūrtipūjaka tradition see Dundas 1998: 36-46. He points out that it is not used by the Sthānakavāsīs because they claim “during the fifth century C.E. there occurred a major inter-

46. To recite the *sūrimantra* every day, whose tradition is that?<sup>244</sup>  
 47. To shine in starched<sup>245</sup> (white clothes), whose bright tradition is that?  
 48. To cause the “Bairakanhai” fast to be performed during *paryuṣaṇa*, whose tradition is that?<sup>246</sup>  
 49. To cause a waterpot (*ghaḍūlā*) to be made, whose tradition is that?<sup>247</sup>  
 50. To cause the *āyambīla olī* fast to be performed together with the *siddhacakra* (*pūjā*), whose tradition is that?<sup>248</sup>  
 51. To hold a ceremony of mourning (*ūṭhamaṇum*)<sup>249</sup> after the death of an ascetic, whose tradition is that?  
 52. To cause the swinging of the images (of the fourteen dreams of Mahāvīra’s mother) to be performed, whose tradition is that?<sup>250</sup>

---

ruption of the teacher lineage through which the formula was transmitted” (Dundas 1998: 36).

<sup>244</sup> The *mantra* was recited to acquire mystical powers, and in order to strengthen the commitment to the particular lineage.

<sup>245</sup> Jain and Kumār (2003: 119) translate the expression *kalapaṛā* with the Hindi word *kalaf*, starch.

<sup>246</sup> Jain and Kumār (2003: 120) identify this fast as the *vajra-kṛṣṇa* (*vairakannai*), or black thunderbolt-fast. No further information is given.

<sup>247</sup> G. *ghaḍūlo*, small pitcher, water pot. Pots and bowls should be produced by the ascetics themselves. K. Śeṭh informs me that the question may point to welcoming celebrations for ascetics (*nāgara praveśa*) performed by women with auspicious water pots on their heads, for which see the photo on the dustjacket of Cort 2001. The Hindi rendition of Jain & Kumār 2003: 120 reads: *jhaḍūle karvānā* (*bāl utarvānā*), i.e. to cause the hair to be shaved (R. *jhaḍūlau* signifies the hair of a newly born child). Jaina ascetics should pluck their hair or have it plucked by another ascetic.

<sup>248</sup> For a description of this ritual, which comprises the use of flowers and fruit and the veneration of images and gods, see Jain & Fischer 1978, II: 2-4; Cort 2001: 162f. Jain and Kumār (2003: 120) have: *siddhacakra ke āyambīl kī bolī karvānā*, to cause the auction of the *siddhacakra āyambīla* fast to be done, which must have been one of the main objections implied by the question.

<sup>249</sup> In Rājasthānī, *ūṭhāvanau* denotes collective mourning. In the case of ascetics, this is the *guṇānuvāda sabhā*, the auspicious praise of the deceased ascetic. A special carpet is used in this context.

<sup>250</sup> This ritual is performed by the Mūrtipūjaka Jaina laity on the fifth day of *paryuṣaṇa*, which is called Mahāvīra Jayanti, though the actual birthday of Mahāvīra falls on an earlier date in the year. For details of this ritual, which is performed for well-being and involves extensive bidding for ritual acts, see Cort 2001: 154-7, who also cites earlier literature.

53. To create a decorated table (*ṭhavaṇī*) in front of the feet (of an ascetic or an image),<sup>251</sup> whose tradition is that?

54. To perform the *pratīkramaṇa* on the fourth day (of the second lunar fortnight) of *paryuṣaṇa*, whose tradition is that?<sup>252</sup>

Notably, the questions are addressed to a Jaina mendicant, not to the laity, and imply a mendicant perspective. The basic question, whether any of the fifty-four listed beliefs and practices corresponds to the teachings of the root scriptures seems, at first sight, to reflect an attitude of a-temporal lay-inspired scriptural literalism which deliberately ignores the commentary traditions of the teachers of the mendicant lineages.<sup>253</sup> However, a closer view reveals that Loṅkā may not have rejected commentaries per se, especially not those (such as the later vernacular *ṭabos*) which merely explain the meaning of the *sūtras* themselves, but only commentaries or parts of commentaries whose contents do not correspond at all to the teachings of the root scriptures. Mālvaṇiyā 1964: 377f. argued that this interpretation is supported by the fact that the two Mss. which have been attributed to Loṅkā make use of all available Jaina scriptures and commentaries. Further evidence for a positive attitude toward the commentaries in the aniconic Jaina tradition can be found in the published *Sthānakavāsī* and *Terāpanth Āgama* editions which make explicit use of all commentaries in order to establish the literal meaning of the *sūtras* themselves, though some modern monks, such as Upādhyāya Amarmuni, argue that because of their condensed nature the *sūtras* are intrinsically polyvalent and can therefore only be interpreted symbolically.<sup>254</sup> In contrast to

<sup>251</sup> Jain and Kumār (2003: 120) use the word *gavalī* (*uṃbaṇī*) for *ṭhavaṇī*.

<sup>252</sup> This refers to the practices of the Tapāgaccha and the Kharataragaccha to perform the final *saṃvatsarī pratīkramaṇa* not, like most Jaina traditions, on *bhādrapad śukla* 5 but already on *bhādrapad śukla* 4, apparently following the advice of Kālakācārya (cf. Jacobi 1880). In contrast to Loṅkā, Kaḍuā seems to have accepted “the general practice established by Kālakācārya” (in Dundas 1999: 22), but not the A(ñ)calagaccha (Balbir 2003b: 59).

<sup>253</sup> Dundas 1996: 74, 89f.

Mālvaṇīya's view that the canon of thirty-two was codified after the emergence of the Sthānakavāsī orders, there is evidence that Loṅkā himself advocated for a restricted canon of thirty-two scriptures in Bhānucandra's *Dayādharma Caupāi* v. 19 of 1521/2, though, if Mālvaṇīya's source Dharmasāgara's *Pravacanaparīkṣā* of 1572/3 can be believed, it had not been canonised one hundred years later. According to Kāpaḍiā (1941/2000: 38, 53), even the current Mūrtipūjaka classification of forty-five scriptures emerged sometime after the 14th century. The construction of alternative Āgama classifications in the late medieval period thus appears to be generally a product of sectarian politics, predicated on the emergence of a new style of text-oriented critique in "reformed" *gacchas* and *gaṇas*.

The fifty-four questions are *de facto* commentaries themselves, whose contents have in parts been canonised in the aniconic tradition. Their rhetoric may be literalist and fundamentalist, but they function as means of innovation and of canonisation, since they censure certain customary practices which back them up, while favouring others which are not explicitly mentioned. The fluidity of the usage of textual allusions is illustrated by Loṅkā's objection to child initiation (K2) which contradicts the canonical *Vavahāra* 10.16f.,<sup>255</sup> and by the fact that the equally rejected custom of changing names at the point of initiation (K3) is nowadays practiced by several Sthānakavāsī traditions,<sup>256</sup> and by the Terāpanthīs. Since much of the meaning of the fifty-four questions is contextual and implicit, their interpretation must remain tentative. However, the collection and analysis of similar lists from the same period, as studied by Dundas (1999) and Balbir (2003a; 2003b), may in future

---

<sup>254</sup> See Flügel 2003a: 162, n. 49; 195, n. 140; 196, n. 145. Dundas (1996: 80, 83, 86) has discussed similar remarks of Abhayadeva, Prabhācandra and Dharmasāgara.

<sup>255</sup> Schubring 1935/2000: 250; Balbir 2001: 154. Amongst the Śvetāmbara sects, only the Śramaṇasaṅgha rejects child initiation.

<sup>256</sup> Amongst the Sādhumārgīs only women change their names. The empirical situation is complex.



produce a clearer view of the sectarian faultlines in the 15th and 16th centuries.

### LOṆKĀ'S TEACHINGS ACCORDING TO MODERN STHĀNAKAVĀSĪ SOURCES<sup>257</sup>

With the publications of Mālvaṇiyā and Hastīmal, in particular, fruitful comparisons between the early beliefs and customs of different aniconic traditions are rendered possible for the first time. Of special interest is the reconstruction of the early development of the Loṅkāgaccha for which still hardly any evidence exists. For the present investigation of the effective history of Loṅkā the comparison between “Loṅkā's” writings and versions of his teachings transmitted within the Sthānakavāsī tradition is important, as are preliminary observations on the differences between the customary law (*maryādā*) of the early Sthānakavāsī traditions and “Loṅkā's” proclamations.

To my knowledge, in addition to the paraphrases in Jeṭhmal (1930), only two texts are currently available on Loṅkā's rules in the Sthānakavāsī secondary literature. One was published by Sādhvī Candanākumārī (1964: 102)<sup>258</sup> and the other by Gulābācanda Nānacanda Seṭh (1970: 703f.).<sup>259</sup> This is somewhat surprising, given the importance of Loṅkā as the founder of the aniconic Jaina traditions. However, a recent survey by the present writer has shown that most of the ancient sources of the comparatively sparse literary output of the aniconic traditions before the 20th century has either been lost or not been catalogued or used. Even the writings of the founders of the Sthānakavāsī traditions have not been pre-

---

<sup>257</sup> Original source not cited in Candanākumārī 1964: 102; Prakāścandra 1998: 31.

<sup>258</sup> It is possible that Candanākumārī extracted the rules from the book by Suśīlkumār (1959), which was one of the main sources for her work. I cannot disconfirm this, since several pages of the chapter on Loṅkā are missing in my own xerox-copy of Suśīlkumār's text.

<sup>259</sup> The texts were also published in Flügel 2000: 52; 2003a: 233.

served in their original form. It is therefore not surprising that no literary traces of the debates between the followers of the Loṅkā traditions and the Sthānakavāsī (and Terāpanth) traditions have been discovered to date.<sup>260</sup> Candanākumārī (1964: 102) writes that several manuscripts of the regulations (*niyama*) which Loṅkā himself composed for the Loṅkāgaccha mendicants (*sādhu-sansthā*) can be readily found in old Jaina libraries. She therefore decided to publish only a selection of eleven particularly “useful” rules in summary form in Hindī under the title *Loṅkāgaccha kī Sāmācārī* (LS).<sup>261</sup> Without acknowledgement of the source, her list was re-published in Gujarātī by Muni Prakāścandra (1998: 31) of the Līmbdī Moṭī Pakṣa.

The code of conduct of the Loṅkāgaccha<sup>262</sup>

1. Only the Sanskrit commentaries (*tīkā*) which agree with the scriptures are acceptable as authoritative.
2. One should live a steadfast disciplined life in agreement with the scriptures.
3. From the point of view of religion “image-worship” is not in agreement with the scriptures.
4. Genuine, pure vegetarian food can be accepted from every family [caste].
5. It is not necessary for anyone to set up the symbols of the monastic order (*sthāpanācārya*) [for worship].<sup>263</sup>
6. During the vows of *upavāsa*,<sup>264</sup> etc., absolutely all types of lifeless (*prāsuka*) water can be accepted.

<sup>260</sup> Flügel 2000; 2003a; forthcoming (c).

<sup>261</sup> *prācīn śāstra-bhaṅdāroṃ meṃ in niyamoṃ ke anek patra prāpta hote haiṃ. un sabhī niyamoṃ kā likhnā yahāṃ āvaśyak nahīṃ hai. un meṃ se kuch upayogī niyam jānkārī ke lie yahāṃ diye jā rahe haiṃ* (Candanākumārī 1964: 102).

<sup>262</sup> Translated by the author.

<sup>263</sup> The A(ṅ)calagaccha allowed its use only for mendicants, not for the laity as most Mūrtipūjaka traditions. See Balbir 2003b: 59f.

<sup>264</sup> The word *upavāsa* signifies either fasting in general, or a specific thirty-six-hour fast (Pkt. *cauttha bhatta*, Skt. *caturtha-bhakta*) without any food, but with or without drink. I have preferred the more specific meaning in all translations, since the *upavāsa* performed in the context of *pośadha* is addressed, though often fasting in general may have been the intended meaning in a particular case.

7. The one-day fast (*upavāsa*) can even be performed on days other than the lunar holy days (*parva-tithi*).<sup>265</sup>
8. There is no need for monks to practise the skills of *mantra-tantra* and *yantra*, etc.
9. Laymen can beg, but cannot receive religious gifts (*dāna*).
10. To give gifts (*dāna*) to the poor due to the feeling of compassion is not a sin (*pāpa*), but rather the cause of merit (*punya*).
11. There is no need to keep a staff (*daṇḍa*).<sup>266</sup>

If this list was indeed composed on the basis of primary literature, then the information must have been selected from all the texts that have been attributed to Loṅkā to date. The critique of the validity of the Jaina commentary literature in point one, for instance, is mainly discussed in the *Loṅkā nī Huṇḍī 34 Bol*, and the *locus classicus* of Loṅkā's critique of image worship is the text *Loṅkā nī Aṭhāvan Bol*. Candanākumārī's method of extraction and her utilitarian criterion of "contemporary relevance" offers a glimpse into the rationale of the strategies of selection, exegesis and transmission of chosen elements of the doctrinal tradition and of the customary law within the aniconic Jaina mendicant traditions.

A second Sthānakavāsī source for the rules and regulations of Loṅkā was published by Gulābcand Nāncand Seth (1970: 703f.), a poet who was hired to write down the results of the extensive historical research of Muni Cauthmal (died 1951) on the life of Ācārya Jaymal, which was completed by the *munis* Cāndmal (1908-1968), Jītmal and Lālcand, who in 1964 split from the Śramaṇasaṅgha in protest against the controversial institutional

---

<sup>265</sup> This rule is identical with one of the stipulations of Kaḍuā (KS 7); though Jñānsundar 1936: 327, n. 5 expressed the opposite view. The point was rejected by the A(ñ)calagaccha and the Kharataragaccha (Samayasundara), but accepted by the Tapāgaccha (Balbir 2003b: 59). Dundas 1999: 22 understands the meaning of rule KS 7 slightly differently – that "the *pośadha* fast can be celebrated when it does not fall on an observance day (*parvan*)".

<sup>266</sup> The prototype must be LH 22, which criticises the *Niśītha Cūrṇi*'s permission for using an *acitta* staff for purposes of self-defence, which contradicts the *Niśītha* 5 itself.

reforms of Ācārya Ānandṛṣi, and founded the independent Dharma-dāsa Jayamala Sampradāya.<sup>267</sup> The bulky text, entitled *Jaydhvaj*, was published with the aim of strengthening the sectarian identity of the newly established tradition. The publication was supported by the influential Ācārya Hastīmal, who in 1968 also separated himself from the Śramaṇasaṅgha to re-establish the Ratnavamśa as an independent order. Hastīmal (1968) had already published a collection of *paṭṭāvalīs* of the Loṅkāgaccha tradition and of the Sthānakavāsīs, and systematically researched the history of the aniconic Jaina tradition during the following two decades.<sup>268</sup> The following twenty points (LN) which Seth attributes to Loṅkā have been summarised by him in Hindī without any reference to the original source. The introductory sentence only mentions that Loṅkā prepared this *sāmācārī* in Saṃvat 1531 (1474/5 CE) in order to prevent the rise of *śīthilācāra*, or laxity, amongst the *sādhus* of Bhāṇā's newly created Loṅkāgaccha.<sup>269</sup>

1. Even without having completed the *upadhāna* fast one can study the scripture.<sup>270</sup>
2. From the point of view of religion, worshipping the Jina image is not in the forty-five scriptures.

---

<sup>267</sup> Varddhamāna Sthānakavāsī Jaina Śrāvaka Saṅgha Jaypur 1964; Flügel 2003a: 164-168; forthcoming (a).

<sup>268</sup> See Hastīmal 1968; 1971; 1987/1995, and his collection of Mss. in the Lāl Bhavan Sthānak in Jaypur.

<sup>269</sup> Translation by the author.

<sup>270</sup> The *upadhāna tapa* is a special, extended (usually thirty-five or forty-seven day long) collective *poṣadha*, a collective fast-cum-study exercise which, according to Cort 2001: 137, has been first described in the 7th-century *Mahā-nisītha* 3.3.15-3.36.1. At the end of the programme, which demands image-worship three times a day, “each lay faster takes a garland of flowers used in temple worship and puts it over the head of the mendicant leader”. Dundas 1999: 22 cites the stipulation of Loṅkā's younger contemporary, Kaḍuā, that “One should not perform garlanding (*mālāropana*) at the end of *Upadhāna Tapas*”, which he interprets as the ceremony of the “lay votary being garlanded by the presiding monk” (Dundas 1999: 30, n. 21). The objection expressed in the text that is attributed to Loṅkā addresses another aspect of *upadhāna*, i.e. that one is not allowed to study without a prior fast.

3. Apart from the root aphorism (*sūtra*), the scripture (*āgama*) and the root teaching (*śāstra*), joined together with the Sanskrit commentaries (*tīkā*), other scripture and Sanskrit commentary is not to be believed in any respect.
4. It is forbidden to practice magical skills (*vidyā*).
5. The fast day (*poṣadha*) [and the] ritual of repentance (*pratikramaṇa*) is performed according to individual custom.
6. Apart from *cāturmāsa*, one can also use a seat (*pāta*) [during the rest of the year].<sup>271</sup>
7. One should not keep a staff.
8. One can possess books.<sup>272</sup>
9. Paying attention to genuineness and purity, one can collect alms from every family.
10. A layperson (*śrāvaka*) can also perform the almsround (*gocarī*).
11. A layperson (*śrāvaka*) cannot accept a religious gift (*dāna*).
12. During fasting (*upavāsa pratyākhyāna*) one can take lifeless whey (*āch*) of buttermilk.<sup>273</sup>
13. *Poṣadha* can even be performed without practising a one-day fast.<sup>274</sup>

<sup>271</sup> The meaning of this statement is not entirely clear, though there is a certain resonance with point 6 in Dharmadāsa's critique of Lava (in Seth 1970: 368, n.) on the use of seats, which are unnecessary luxuries, even outside of *cāturmāsa*. The printed text has the word *pātakā*, which may be a corruption of S. *pāṭaka*, part of a village, which would make even less sense.

<sup>272</sup> The issue of the possession of books is touched upon in a different context in K 16 on the distribution of books during *paryuṣaṇa*. It was also a point of contention between the "bookish" Dharmasīṅha and Lava, who rejected the possession of books. See *Pracīn Pattāvālī* in Hastimal 1968: 186-192.

<sup>273</sup> Cf. Dharmadāsa's critique of Dharmasīṅha, who apparently upheld Loṅkā's rule, in Seth 1970: 369, n.: *upavās meṃ chāch kī āch pīnī nahīm*. – One should not drink the whey of buttermilk during a fast. The Sthānakavāsī traditions of Raghunāth (Dharmadāsa Sampradāya), Amarsīṅha, Dīpcand, Malūkcand (Jīvarāja Sampradāya), Khetsī and Khemsī (Hara Sampradāya) also touched on this issue in a common decree of 1753 whose wording is, however, not entirely intelligible: *2. tapasyā meṃ telā uparānt dhovaṅ tathā āch aur chāch kī āch pīnī nahīm. pī lī jāye to ādhe tap kā prāyaścīt* (Seth 1970: 919f.; cf. Flügel 2003a: 237f.). The Terāpanth mendicants, which emerged from the Dharmadāsa traditions as well, however, use *āch* during fasts: "When they undertake long fasts they take, if available, the greenish water floating on boiled whey, after the thicker portion of the boiled whey has settled down, otherwise they take boiled water only" (Chopra 1945: 27, n.).

<sup>274</sup> Even in the *Śrāvakācāras* of the image worshippers, *poṣadha* is not identical with *poṣadhopavāsa*. See Williams 1983: 142f. on the four spheres of appli-

14. A one-day fast (*upavāsa*) can even be performed on days other than the lunar holy days (*tithi parva*).
15. One can take the vow of a one-day fast together (in a group).
16. One should not enumerate the auspicious days (*kalyāṇaka*) amongst the lunar days (*tithi*).<sup>275</sup>
17. The day on which one takes a milk product, on that day one should not use hard (*dvidala* grains).<sup>276</sup>
18. It is not necessary to set up a *sthāpanācārya*.
19. Within forty-eight minutes (*do ghaṛī*) life is generated in waste water (*dhovana*).<sup>277</sup>
20. From a religious understanding, to give a gift (*dāna*) to an unworthy one (*apātra*) must be violence (to give to a poor person out of compassion is not the cause of the fault of one-sidedness (*ekānta pāpa*)).<sup>278</sup>

cation of the *poṣadha* vow. The issue is also addressed in Samayasundara's *Sāmācārī Śataka* 25, 29 which accepts this practice (Balbir 2003a: 260), as did the Tapāgaccha, but not the A(ñ)calagaccha (Balbir 2003b: 60).

<sup>275</sup> Cf. L 22. For another debate concerning the *kalyāṇakas*, in Samayasundara, see Balbir 2003a: 263ff.

<sup>276</sup> Soft food made of milk, such as yoghurt, and hard food made of grains that are (under their skin) split into two parts (S. *dvidala*) should not be eaten on the same day. The rule is identical with one of the stipulations of Kaṣṭhā (KS 8 citing the *Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya*); though Jñānsundar (1936: 327, n. 6) expressed the view that Loṅkā permitted the use of *dvidala*. It is also mentioned in the lists of forbidden food (*abhakṣya*) in the medieval *Śrāvākācāra* texts under the name *ghola-vaṭāka*, buttermilk in tiny lumps (Williams 1983: 110f.). Here, *dvidala* are described as “pulses which when ground yield no oil”. They should not be consumed because they contain many micro-organisms; in particular not in combination with milk products “for in this latter instance it is the combination of sour food and milk-product which curdles the milk product and thus results in the generation of innumerable organisms” (Cort 1989: 271). The issue is also addressed in Samayasundara's *Sāmācārī Śataka* 7 (Balbir 2003a: 261).

<sup>277</sup> It is believed that new micro-organisms develop in lifeless water after forty-eight minutes. *Dhovana* (P. *dhovaṇa*) water has been used by Jaina ascetics from the outset (see AS 2.1.7.7-9, DVS 5.1.75-79, 5.1.47-55), although some Jaina traditions insist nowadays that only boiled water is acceptable (see Sūy 1.2.2.18, 1.2.2.20, DVS 5.2.22). Often *dhovana* water is filtered and thus kept much longer than forty-eight minutes.

<sup>278</sup> This rule is oriented towards a layperson. It resonates with the debate on the nature of the pure gift (*dāna*) between the Sthānakavāsīs Raghunāth and Jaymal on the one hand and the founder of the Terāpanth, Bhikhan (Bhikṣu), on the other. The Terāpanthīs argued that for the seeker of salvation, the imperative to get rid of all *karma* is authoritative. Giving for reasons of compassion is counter-

The list overlaps to a great extent with Candanākumārī's, and may indeed have served as the immediate source for Candanākumārī's selection of useful points. In many cases the wording is almost identical. Another indication is that Seth's list is much more detailed, and must have been available to Candanākumārī, because it was apparently composed by Muni Cauthmal, who died in 1951, although it was published much later.<sup>279</sup> It is an intriguing but currently unanswerable question whether all of these rules go back to Loṅkā, or Bhāṇā, or whether at least some of these rules have been created by subsequent Loṅkāgaccha or Sthānakavāsī writers. Rule 2 states wrongly that worshipping images is not mentioned in the "forty-five" scriptures.

### LOṅKĀ AND KAḌUĀ

As indicated in the footnotes, most, but not all, points of the two largely overlapping lists concur with topics of "Loṅkā's" texts L, LH and K, and can be said to be historically akin to Loṅkā's teachings. However, certain points, particularly on gift giving and *jīva-dayā* (see *infra*), seem to be later additions,<sup>280</sup> while many of the more intricate points in Loṅkā's texts have been left out altogether.

---

productive, and thus a form of violence against the self, because it contributes to the accumulation of more *karma*, i.e. *puṇya*. The Sthānakavāsīs argued that compassionate giving, even to a non-ascetic or to a bad ascetic, is nevertheless a religious act, since both the relative point of view (*vyavahāra naya*) of conventional morality and the absolute point of view (*nīścaya naya*) of the *karma* theory are part of religion. See Flügel 1995-95: 123f.; 2000: 96, n. 107. The statement in the "Loṅkā's" *sāmācārī* supports both Bhikṣu's view, which is based exclusively on the *nīścaya naya*, and Raghunāth's belief that the more fundamental Jaina principle of non-onesidedness (*anekāntavāda*) supports the ethics of compassionate help, because it is predicated on the irreducible complementarity of the absolute and the conventional point of view.

<sup>279</sup> I asked Candanākumārī personally which sources she used for this list, but she said she could not remember anymore.

<sup>280</sup> LN 6 (using a seat) and LN 8 (possession of books) touch on issues which were controversial between Dharmasīṅha, Lava and Dharmadāsa. See Flügel 2000; forthcoming (b).

Although the wording sometimes differs, the contents of Candanā-kumārī's list (LS) are entirely covered by Seth's list,<sup>281</sup> which confirms its derivative nature. The two lists have only few issues in common with the reported *maryādās* of three of the founders of the Sthānakavāsī tradition, Dharmasīṅha, Lava, and Dharmadāsa.<sup>282</sup> But many points mirror Kaḍuā's rules, which were, as Jñānsundar (1936: 327, n. 4, etc.) suspected, probably formulated in contradistinction to Loṅkā's rules or vice versa. Though they differ in certain details, many of the transmitted rules of Loṅkā and Kaḍuā address similar issues. The main common topics are "ascetic"<sup>283</sup> rituals for the laity, such as the *pratikramaṇa*, *sāmāyika*, *upadhāna*, and *poṣadha*, which is often discussed in connection with the *upavāsa* fast. However, because both authors discuss many areas of monastic conduct as well, which do not overlap, it cannot be inferred from this that the followers of either Loṅkā and/or Kaḍuā were advanced householders, or *yatis*, and not mendicants. If the two Sthānakavāsī lists are considered together ("Loṅkā's" writings), the following picture emerges with regard to the lay rituals:

Both Loṅkā and Kaḍuā advocated the performance of the *pratikramaṇa* ritual, according to individual (LN 5) and group custom, not scripture (there are no *pratikramaṇa* texts in the Āgamas). However, Loṅkā (K 58) determined that, in accordance with the scriptures, the *saṃvatsarī pratikramaṇa* should be performed on the 5th *bhadrapāda*, not on the 4th *bhadrapāda* as Kaḍuā (following the Tapāgaccha custom) prescribed (KS 4). Contrary to the scriptures, Kaḍuā also fixed the *pākṣika pratikramaṇa* for the 14th of every lunar fortnight, not for the 15th (KS 3), and additionally adopted the *tristuti* formula (KS 11), which has been introduced by the Āgamikagaccha into the *pratikramaṇa*.<sup>284</sup>

<sup>281</sup> LS 8 (*mantra-tantra*) and LN 4 (*vidyā*) cover similar ground, as does future telling and astrology which "Loṅkā" criticised for instance in K 9, K 10.

<sup>282</sup> Seth 1970: 368, n. & 369, n. See Flügel, forthcoming (b).

<sup>283</sup> "Ascetic" rather than "symbolic" or reflective rituals such as *pūjā*.

<sup>284</sup> See Dundas 1999: 30, n. 23.



Loṅkā (K 8) and Kaḍuā (KS 6) also agreed that the *sāmāyika* should be performed repeatedly. But only Kaḍuā asserted that the laity should use a *muhapattī* during the ritual (KS 5), and should recite the *īryāpathika ā locanā* after the first *sāmāyika* (KS 15).

The *poṣadha* is the topic of many points. It is usually discussed together with the topic of the one-day-fast (*upavāsa*).<sup>285</sup> Both Loṅkā (LS 7) and Kaḍuā (KS 7) determined that *poṣadha* can be performed repeatedly according to individual preference (LN 5), even outside the *parvan* days, on which it is obligatory.<sup>286</sup> However, Kaḍuā (KS 13) prohibited the consumption of all food or water during the fast (*upavāsa*), whereas Loṅkā permitted the use of all types of lifeless water, and of the whey (*āch*) of buttermilk, the use of which was/is prohibited in many Sthānakavāsī traditions.<sup>287</sup> Kaḍuā stressed particularly that women can also perform *poṣadha* (KS 11). Loṅkā emphasised that one *upavāsa* can be performed together in a group (LN 15).

The statements KS 11 and LN 15 may refer to the collective *upadhāna* fast as well. The *upadhāna* is an extended *poṣadha* (*cum* study) exercise, that was propagated by Loṅkā and Kaḍuā, who both however rejected the ceremonial garlanding of the *tapasvīns* with flowers at the end of the fast (K 36, KS 9), as performed by the Mūrtipūjakas. At the time, the *upadhāna* must have been performed either with or without studying, otherwise Loṅkā would not have highlighted that one can study the scripture “even without having completed the *upadhāna* fast” (LN 1); although his rule

---

<sup>285</sup> In the *Śrāvakācāra* literature of the image-worshipping traditions, which Williams (1983: 142) studied, *poṣadha* usually means “the fast on the *parvan* day”. The term *poṣadhupavāsa* therefore appears to be “etymologically tautological”, though other interpretations of *poṣadha* can be found as well, such as “that which strengthens or fattens the religious life” (YŚ 3.85) or “the supreme mendicant” (Cāritrasundar).

<sup>286</sup> Jñānsundar 1936: 327, n. 5 deliberately misunderstands the respective rules.

<sup>287</sup> See footnote 273.

may also reflect customary prohibitions for studying certain texts without prior fasting.

The principal difference between Kaḍuā and Loṅkā, according to the lists published by Seth and Candanākumārī, was that Kaḍuā, who assumed an intermediary position between Loṅkā and the Mūrtipūjakas (especially the dominant Tapāgaccha), also propagated image-worship (KS 1, KS 20),<sup>288</sup> though rejecting the installation (*pratiṣṭhā*) of images by monks rather than laity (KS 2). Kaḍuā also advocated the veneration of the *sthāpanācārya* (KS 10), which Loṅkā rejected as a “worship of dead objects” (LS 5, LN 18). These differences can be explained in terms of fundamentally different attitudes to the scriptures, because Kaḍuā accepted the authority of the post-canonical calendar,<sup>289</sup> and maybe (though there is no evidence) defined the auspicious days (*kalyāṇaka*) as moon days (*tithi*) which Loṅkā explicitly criticised (since this would artificially reduce the number of fast days) (LN 16), and commentaries such as the *Āvaśyaka Cūrṇī* (KS 13, KS 15) or the *Bṛhatkalpa-bhāṣya* (KS 8) which Loṅkā had rejected (L 57, LS 1),<sup>290</sup> though both referred to the “seniors” of the canon as the main source for monastic conduct (KS 18).<sup>291</sup>

### CONCLUSION: REMARKS ON COMPASSIONATE GIVING

One of the most controversial issues in the aniconic Jaina tradition is the question of the origins of the so-called *dāna-dayā* theory, the doctrine of the religious value of the protection of life through charity and active compassionate help, not only to Jainas but to all living beings. Under Ācārya Bhikṣu, the Terāpanth tradition split from the Sthānakavāsī Dharmadāsa Raghunātha Sampradāya because it believed that such actions contributed only to the accumu-

<sup>288</sup> Image-worship is also a traditional ingredient of the *upadhāna*.

<sup>289</sup> See Jñānsundar 1936: 328, n. 2; Dundas 1999: 31, n. 31.

<sup>290</sup> Dundas 1999: 31, n. 31.

<sup>291</sup> Dundas 1999: 31, n. 30.

lation of *punya*, but nothing to the reduction of the overall karmic load. From the absolute point of view (*niścaya naya*), therefore, compassionate help is an impediment to ultimate salvation, and in this sense a sin (*pāpa*). The Terāpanthīs tend to claim that Loṅkā already rejected the *dāna-dayā* theories of the Mūrtipūjakas and Sthānakavāsīs, and that they are presently the only aniconic tradition which still pursues Loṅkā's neo-orthodox point of view. It seems that the text *Loṅkejī kī Huṇḍī* was published deliberately by the Terāpanth tradition in the mid-1930s, when the sectarian disputes within the Jaina community peaked, to prove this point. By contrast, many contemporary Sthānakavāsīs believe that Loṅkā was the originator of their own interpretation of the *dāna-dayā* theory, which promotes merit-making through *dāna* for financing *gośālās* rather than temples, although Jñānsundar (1936: 210, n. 1) and other critics of the aniconic tradition argued, with reference to early Mūrtipūjaka polemics against Loṅkā, that it must have been one of the early leaders of the Loṅkāgaccha who introduced this doctrine, since Loṅkā rejected the religious merit of gift giving altogether (for purposes other than sustaining the subsistence of worthy mendicants), though L commends the sponsorship of *upāśrayas*.<sup>292</sup> At the same time, most modern commentators underline that Loṅkā himself was not an initiated monk, and that even the early Loṅkāgaccha ascetics may have been *yatis*, half-ascetics in the modern sense, rather than *sādhus* and *sādhvīs*, and thus must have stood with one foot in the world.<sup>293</sup> This remains an open question, although Loṅkā's own writings suggest that Loṅkā himself was vigorously opposed to a semi-ascetic lifestyle (L8 and LH whose structure is informed by the *mahāvratas*). The example of contemporary Digambara *bhaṭṭārakas*<sup>294</sup> indicates that even *yatis*

<sup>292</sup> See L 23 and DC 18 for the distinction between worthy (*yogya*) and unworthy mendicants.

<sup>293</sup> See for instance V. M. Śāh 1909: 54, 65; Jñānsundar 1936: 105; Suśīl-kumār 1959: 426; Mālvaṇiyā 1964: 368.

<sup>294</sup> Joharāpurkar in Shāntā 1985: 186, n. 99; Flügel 2006: 382, n. 190.

tend to be *pañca-mahāvratīs*, they simply do not observe the rules strictly, or interpret them slightly differently, not unlike the *aṇu-vratas* for the laity.

Of particular interest in this context are the three statements concerning compassionate gift giving (*dāna-dayā*) in the two Sthānakavāsī summaries of “Loṅkā’s” teachings, LS and LN. For these statements, no equivalent assertions can be found in “Loṅkā’s” texts L, LH, and K, which use *dayā dharma* and *jīva dayā* merely as synonyms of *ahiṃsā dharma*.<sup>295</sup> The rules LS 4 = LN 9 describe in a straightforward way that a renouncer can collect food from all families, without regard to caste and class, if the food and the manner of giving correspond to the canonical rules.<sup>296</sup> This contrasts both with the rule No. 75 of *101 Bol* of the Kaṣṭhāgaccha which prohibits the renouncers to visit houses of followers of the Loṅkāgaccha,<sup>297</sup> and with the Mūrtipūjaka preference for *vaṇik* (*vāṇiyā*) households as expressed in rule No. 2 of the *Paṭṭīs Bol* (PB) of 1526/7 of the Mūrtipūjaka reformer Ācārya Ānandvīmaḷsūri (1490-1539).<sup>298</sup> The texts ascribed to Loṅkā himself remain silent on this point.

Rules LS 9 = LN 10+LN 11 are more puzzling. They state that “a layperson” can perform *gocarī* in the manner of an ascetic, but cannot receive *dāna* in the manner of an ascetic. How can this be understood? The use of the term *gocarī* rules out non-religious contexts of begging which are addressed in LS 10. The most likely explanation points to the definition of the intermediary stages between householder and mendicant, since the religious status of Loṅkā and the Loṅkāgaccha ascetics was disputed from the beginning in the literature. In the eleventh *pratimā*, or stage of spiritual

<sup>295</sup> See for instance L 17, which lists several passages from the canon where the word *dayā* occurs.

<sup>296</sup> The same conviction is expressed by the contemporary Loṅkāgaccha laity, though no universally recognised *yatis* exist anymore.

<sup>297</sup> In Jñānsundar 1936: 333.

<sup>298</sup> *keval vaṇik jāti ke viraktoṃ ko hī śramaṇ-śramaṇī dharma meṃ dīkṣā karnā, anya jāti ke logoṃ ko nahīṃ* (PB 2, in Hastīmaḷ 1995: 582).

progress for the laity, a lay person should renounce all business of the world, has the head shaven, is clad in a mendicant's garment, carries a broom (*rajoharaṇa*), and a begging bowl (*pātra*), and performs the begging round, though technically not in the same manner as a monk (Williams 1983: 178-180). This means that although a layperson who took the vow of the eleventh *pratimā* performs the almsround in exactly the same way as a mendicant, technically s/he does not qualify for being a worthy receiver (*supātra*) for a religious gift (*dāna*) which generates a destruction of karma (and the accumulation of *puṇya karma*) on the part of the giver.

The rules concerning giving must have been created or selected from an unmentioned source by the Sthānakavāsīs to clearly demarcate the status of a properly initiated mendicant from an advanced householder or (Loṅkāgaccha) *yati*.<sup>299</sup> A material gift can, after all, also become a means of material enrichment. This explanation corresponds well to LN 20, which is addressed not to the receiver but to the giver. The first part states: "From a religious understanding, to give a gift (*dāna*) to an unworthy one (*apātra*) must be violence". This statement coincides with the conventional view presented in the Āgamas and in the Śrāvakācāra literature.<sup>300</sup> However, rather than representing the summary of a statement of "Loṅkā", the second part of the assertion (in brackets) seems to introduce a new argument, which lends support to the dominant Sthānakavāsī position in the debate with the Terāpanthīs on the nature of the pure gift (*śuddha dāna*), seen from the transcendent (*niścaya*) and conventional (*vyavahāra*) perspectives: "to give to a

<sup>299</sup> As in the case of Digambara *bhaṭṭārakas*, only few *yatis* existed in the Loṅkāgaccha traditions between the 17th and 21th centuries, often only single individuals without disciples who were in charge of the property and religious ceremonies of a particular *gaccha*.

<sup>300</sup> See Williams 1983: 152 for the difference between a *kupātra*, a poor person of a more or less righteous lifestyle but wrong belief, and an *apātra*, a person devoid of all good qualities. Both are normally not considered worthy recipients of religious gifts in the Śrāvakācāra literature, nor are adherents of non-Jain traditions. See Vy 8.6.

poor person out of compassion is not the cause of the fault of one-sidedness” (*ekānta pāpa*).<sup>301</sup> In contrast to the first part of LN 20, the equivalent formulation LS 10 in the list of Candanākumārī is not entirely consistent with the previous rules on giving, by eliminating the brackets and by using the unqualified term *dāna*<sup>302</sup> for the compassionate giving to the “poor” (*garīb*), while avoiding the doctrinal term *kupātra*: “To give gifts (*dāna*) to the poor due to the feeling of compassion is not a sin (*pāpa*), but rather the cause of merit (*puṇya*)”. This interpretation contrasts both with the Terāpanth distinction between *lokottara dāna* and *laukika dāna* and with the conventional Sthānakavāsī interpretation of religious charity, which also stresses the suboptimal, if sometimes acceptable, character of giving to a *kupātra* or *apātra*. Given the subsequent life-course of the author Candanākumārī, the founder of the reformist Vīrāyatan group of nuns who engage in social work in the manner of Christian nuns,<sup>303</sup> it must be assumed that the word *dāna* was used intentionally in an unqualified form. It should be interesting to trace the origins of this belief in *anukampādāna*, a concept which is mentioned already in the canonical texts *Ṭhāṇa* 10.475 and *Viyāhapannatti* 304b but re-projected and attributed to Loṅkā within the Sthānakavāsī traditions which now regard it as their own distinctive teaching. The contemporary Loṅkāgaccha tradition itself has lost all written sources and retains no cultural memory anymore on the doctrinal views of Loṅkā or the earlier Loṅkāgaccha *ācāryas*.

---

<sup>301</sup> The reasons for interpreting *anukampādāna* to a *kupātra* or *apātra* as an acceptable and even meritorious act are discussed by Puṣkarmuni (1977: 504).

<sup>302</sup> *Ṭhāṇa* 10.97 distinguishes between ten forms of *dāna* only one of which is called *dharmadāna*.

<sup>303</sup> See Flügel, forthcoming (b).

## REFERENCES

## Primary Sources

- A = *Loṅkejī kī Hunḍī*, of Loṅkā [?]. (Reportedly based on a Rājasthānī Ms. of Saṃvat 1830 in the Rūpacanda Rāmacanda Upāśraya, Jaitāraṇa.) With a *dohā*-style commentary of Gulābcand (Luṇiyā?), written in Jaypur in 1926. Published in Caudharī 1936?: 338-430. A corrupted version of the Rājasthānī root text has been published under the title *Ath Hunḍī Lūṅkārī Likhyaṭe* in Āṅcaliyā 1937: 120-128.
- AB = *Asūtranirākaraṇ Batrīśī*, of the Mūrtipūjaka Muni Bīkā. Ca. Saṃvat 1527 (1470/1). Published in Jñānsundar 1936, Appendix 1, pp. 230-233; Koṭhārī 2001: 500-503.
- ALJ = *Ath Loṅkāśāh nuṃ Jīvan*, of the Tapāgaccha Muni Kāntivijaya. Written in Pāṭaṇ in Saṃvat 1636 (1579/60). Published in Maṇilāl 1934: 161f.; Hastīmal 1995: 752-759.
- DC = *Dayādharma Caupāī*, of the Lauṃkāgacchīya Yati Bhānucandra. Saṃvat 1587 (1521/22). Published in Jñānsundar 1936, Appendix 2, pp. 234-237.
- DVS = *Dasaveyāliya (Daśavaikālika Sūtra)*, of Ārya Sayyambhava. Edited by Ernst Leumann. And translated, with introduction and notes, by Walther Schubring. Ahmedabad: The Managers of the Sheth Anandji Kalianji, 1932. (Reprinted in: *Kleine Schriften* (ed. Klaus Bruhn): 109-248. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1977.) – *Arya Sayyanbhava's Daśavaikālika Sūtra*. Translation and Notes by Kastur Chand Lalwani. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1973.
- J = *Jinacariya*. Translated by Hermann Jacobi as *Lives of the Jinas*. In: *Sacred Books of the East*, 22 (1884): 217-285.
- K = *Keha nī Paramparā Chai?*, of Loṅkā [?]. Ms. No. 2989, L.D. Institute, Ahmedabad. A Hindī variation is published in Jeṭhmal 1930: 14f. The original is published in: Mālvaṇiyā 1963a: 80-82; Vārīā 1976: 127-130 with a Gujarātī translation; Hastīmal 1995: 691-693; reprinted in Jain & Kumār 2003: 537-539, with a Hindī translation pp. 118-120.
- KS = “*Kaḍuā-Mat kī Sāmācārī*”, on the basis of Śāh Kalyāṇavijaya's Kaṭukamat Paṭṭāvalī. Saṃvat 1684 (1628/9). Translated by Dundas 1999: 21f. A slightly different extract was published by Muni Jñānsundar (1936: 326-336) under the title *Kaḍuā-Mat Paṭṭāvalī kā Sār*.
- L = *Luṅkā nā Athāvana Bolo*, of Loṅkā [?]. Ms. No. 2989, L.D. Institute, Ahmedabad. See also Mss. No. 19224 and 19225, Oriental Institute, Baroda; Ms. Rājagranthāsāra, Prācyā Vidyāpīṭha, Śāhajāpura (photographic reproduction in: Jain & Kumār 2003, Parisīṣṭa). Ms. No.

- 2989, L.D. Institute, published by Mālvaniyā 1963a: 52-82; Vārīā 1976: 1-127, with a Gujarātī translation; Hastīmal 1995: 655-691; reprinted in Jain & Kumār 2003: 403-537 with a Hindī summary pp. 124-139.
- LH = *Luṅkā nī Huṅḍī Caumṭīs Bol*, of Loṅkā [?]. Ms. No. 4121, L.D. Institute, Ahmedabad. Extract (*Loṅkāśāh ke Caumṭīs Bol*) in Hastīmal, 1995: 648-655; reprinted in Jain & Kumār 2003: 499-503, with a Hindī summary pp. 120-123.
- LN = “*Loṅkā’s Niyamāvalī*”. In Gulābcand Nāncand Seṭh 1970: 703f.
- LP = *Loṅkāgacchīya Paṭṭāvalī* (Bābu Puraṅcandjī Nahār no Bhaṅḍār). In Koṭhārī 2001: 405-407. (First published in the Jain Śvetāmbara Conference Herald, April-June 1918, 169-171).
- LS = *Loṅkāgaccha kī Sāmācārī*. In Candanākumārī 1964: 102.
- LTC = *Luṅkā nū 13 nī Carcā*, of Pārśvacandrasūri of the Pārśvacandra-gaccha. Ca. 16th century CE. Mss. No. 24466, 30565, L.D. Institute, Ahmedabad. Extract (*Luṅkāe Pūchela 13 Praśna ane tenā Uttaro*) in Hastīmal 1995: 694f.; reprinted in: Jain & Kumār 2003: 439-441, with a Hindī translation pp. 115-117.
- PB = *Paṁtīs Bol*, of the Mūrtipūjaka Ācārya Ānandvīmalsūri. Saṁvat 1583 (1526/7). Published in Hastīmal 1995: 582-584.
- PP = *Pravacanaparīkṣā*, of Upādhyāya Dharmasāgara, 1572/3. Surat: Ṛṣabhadeva Keśaramalajī Śvetāmbara Saṁstha, 1937.
- SC = *Siddhānta Caupāī*, of the Mūrtipūjaka Muni Lāvaṅyasamaya. Saṁvat 1543 Kārtik śukla aṣṭamī (5.11.1486/7). Published in Jñānsundar 1936, Appendix 1, pp. 209-227; Koṭhārī 2001: 486-499.
- SS = *Siddhānta Sāroddhāra [Caupāī]*, of the Kharataragaccha Upādhyāy Śrī Kamalsamyam. Saṁvat 1544 [1487]. Published in Jñānsundar 1936, Appendix 1, pp. 228f; Koṭhārī 2001: 499-500.
- Sūy = *Sūyagaḍa (Sūtrakṛtāṅga Sūtra)*. Translated by Hermann Jacobi. In: Sacred Books of the East, 45 (1895): 233-435.
- TPS = *Tapāgaccha Paṭṭāvalī Sūtram*, of Dharmasāgara. Saṁvat 1646 [1589/90]. Published in Darśanavijaya 1933: 41-119.
- Viy = *Viyāhapannatti (Bhaḡavaī)*. *The Fifth Anga of the Jaina Canon*. Introduction, Critical Analysis, Commentary & Indexes. Brugge: Rijks-universiteit de Gent, 1970.
- Ṭhāṇa = *Ṭhāṇa (Sthānāṅga)*. Mūla Pāṭha, Saṁskṛta Chāyā, Hindī Anuvāda tathā Ṭippaṇa. Vācana Pramukha: Ācārya Tulsī. Sampādak-Vivecaka: Muni Nathmal. Lāḍnūn: Jaina Viśva Bhāratī, 1976.
- Yś = *Yogaśāstra of Hemacandra. A Twelfth Century Handbook on Śvetāmbara Jainism*. Translated by Olle Qvarnström. (Harvard Oriental Series, 61.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002.



### Secondary Sources

- AISJC = Akhil Bhāratiya Sthānakavāsī Jaina Kānfrens (ed.), *Akhil Bhārat-varṣīya Vardhamān Sthānakavāsī Jaina Śramaṇ Saṅghīya Samācārī*. Compiled by Saubhāgyamuni “Kumud”. Dillī: Akhil Bhāratiya Varddhamaṇ Sthānakavāsī Jaina Kānfrens, 1987.
- AMARVIJAY, Muni (ed.) 1908. “*Ḍhūṇḍhak Hṛday Netrāñjanaṃ*” athavā “*Satyārtha Candrodāyāṣṭakam*”. Amadāvād: Śrī Satyavijay Pṛiṅṅing Pres māṃ, Śā. Sāñkulcand Harīlāle Chāṣyūṃ.
- AMOLAKRṢI, Muni [Ācārya] 1908/1920. *Jaina Tattva Prakāś*. Duliya: Amola Jñānālaya. (Fourth edition, Ahmednagar 1920.)
- 1920. *Śāstroddhara Mīmāṃsā*. Sākandarābād: Jaina Śāstroddhara Mudrālaya.
- ĀÑCALIYĀ, Dhansukhdās Hīrālāl (ed.) 1937. *Śīśu Hit Śikṣa*. Gaṅgāśahar: Dhansukhdās Hīrālāl Āñcaliyā.
- ASSMANN, Jan 1987. Kanon und Zensur als kultursoziologische Kategorien. In: Aleida & Jan Assman (eds.), *Kanon und Zensur. Beiträge zur Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation*, II: 100-112. München: Wilhelm Fink.
- 2000. *Religion und kulturelles Gedächtnis*. München: C. H. Beck. (English version: *Cultural Memory. Ten Studies*. Transl. by R. Livingstone. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006.)
- Ātmānand Jain Sabhā Pañjāb 1909. “*Ḍhūṇḍhakmat Parājay arthāt Phaislā Śāstrārthanāmā*” tathā “*Phaislā Samānā Ilākā Mahārājā Paṭiyālā*”. Lahaur: Ātmānand Jain Sabhā Pañjāb kī Ājñā se Ātmānand Pustak Pracār Maṇḍal ke Janral Sakreṭarī Ajmer ke Seṭh Hīrācandjī Secetī ne Chapdhāyā. (Tṛṭiyā Vṛtti. Lahaur: Jasvantrāy Jaini, 1906.)
- ĀTMĀRĀM, Ācārya (Vijayānanda Sūri) 1881/1954. *Jainatattvadarśa*. Bhāg 1 & 2. Ed. Banārsīdās Jain. Pañcam Saṃskaraṇ. Bambaī: Śrī Ātmānand Jaina Sabhā.
- 1884/1903. *Śrī Samyaktva Śalyoddhāra*. Third edition. Hindustānī translation of the Gujarātī original. Lahore: Śrī Ātmānand Jaina Sabhā Pañjāb.
- 1884/1908. *Śrī Samyaktva Śalyoddhāra Dohā Ḍhūṇḍhak Mat ke Śālya ko Dūrakare Niradhāra Satya Nāmāim Grantha kā Samākita Śalyoddhāra*. Dillī: Ātmānand Jain Pustak Pracār Maṇḍal.
- 1888/1906. *Ajñāna-timira-bhāskara*. Bhāvnagar: Jaina Dharma Hitteccu Sabhā. (With the exception of the Prastāvanā to the 1st edition, cited after the 2nd edition of the Jaina Ātmānand Sabhā in Bhāvnagar, 1906).

- ĀTMĀRĀM, Ācārya [1888-90] 1916. *Praśnottara-saṃgraha (Śrīmad-Vijayānanda-Sūriśvarāj (Ātmārāmji) Mahārājaji Kalkattā Esīāṭik Sosāīṭi nā Sekretarī Daṃkṭar Hornla nā Praśno nā āpelā Uttaro)*. Bhāvnagar: Jaina Ātmānand Sabhā Taraph thī Bhāvsār Gāṇḍālāl Māncand.
- 1893/1900a. *Jainamata Vrkṣa*. Second revised edition. Ed. Muni Vallabhvijay. Amadāvād: Śrī Ātmārām Jaina Sabhā Pañjāb.
- 1895/1902. *Tattvanirṇayaprāsāda: 36 Stambha*. Samśodhankarttā: Muni Vallabh Vijay. Prasiddhakarttā: Amarcand P. Parmār. Mumbaī: Induprakāś Jāītaṣṭāṃk Kaṃ. Lī. meṃ chāpkar prasiddha kiyā.
- 1900b. *Īsāī Mat Samikṣā*. Bambaī: Jaina Jñāna Prasārak Maṇḍal.
- ĀTMĀRĀM, Upādhyāy 1914. *Śrīmad Jainācārya Śrī 1008 Amarasīṅha kā Jīvan Caritra*. Lāhaur: Pañjāb Ekāntomīkal Yantrālay.
- 1942. *Sthānakavāsī*. Ludhiyānā: Lālā Valāyatī Rām Kastūrī Lāl Jain.
- BAGASARĀVĀLĀ, Rāma Deva Maḍīā 1894. *Loṅkāgacchoṭpatti ane Mahārāja Śrīpūjya Bhaṭṭāraka Kalyāṇa Candrajī Surīśvarjī nuṃ Jīvana Caritra*. Mumbaī Ghī Royal Prīṇṭīng Pres Bāhārakoṭa Bhājīpālā Len. (Reprinted with additions as *Loṅkāgacchoṭpatti ane Upāśraya nā Pranetā Pūjya Ācārya Śrī Kalyāṇacandrajī Sūriśvarjī nuṃ Jīvana Caritra*. Mumbaī: Śrī Mumbaī Loṅkāgaccha Jaina Saṅgha. Upāśraya nā Śatābdī Mahotsava Prasaṅge Sabhāsado ne Bheṭa, 11.3.2001.)
- BALBIR, Nalini 1993. *Āvaśyaka-Studien, I: Introduction générale et traductions*. (Alt- und Neuindische Studien, 45.1.) Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- 2001. La question de l'ordination des enfants en milieu jaina. In: Christine Chojnacki (ed.), *Les âges de la vie dans le monde Indien*: 153-182. Paris: Diffusion de Boccard.
- 2002/2003a. Samayasundara's Sāmācārī-Śataka. In: Piotr Balcerowicz (ed.), *Caturaranayacakram. Essays in Jaina Philosophy and Religion*: 253-277. (First Indian edition: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.)
- 2003b. The A(ñ)calagaccha viewed from inside and from outside. In: Olle Qvarnström (ed.), *Jainism and Early Buddhism. Essays in Honor of Padmanabh S. Jaini*: 47-77. Fremont: Asian Humanities Press.
- BHAṆḌĀRĪ, Kesarīcand 1938. *Sthānakavāsī Jaina Itihās*. Amadāvād: Śrī Sthānakavāsī Jaina Kāryālay.
- BHĀRILL, Śobhācandra (ed.) 1965. *Muni Śrī Hajārīmal Smṛti Granth*. Byāvar: Muni Śrī Hajārīmal Smṛti Granth Prakāśan Samiti.
- BLOCH, Maurice. 1977/1989. The past and the present in the present. In: *Ritual, History and Power. Selected Papers in Anthropology*: 1-18. London: The Athlone Press.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre 1980/1992. *The Logic of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. London: Polity Press.

- BRUHN, Klaus 1981. Āvaśyaka-Studies I. In: Klaus Bruhn & Albrecht Wezler (eds.), *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus* (Gedenkschrift für Ludwig Alsdorf): 11-49. Universität Hamburg: Steiner Verlag.
- 1983. Repetition in Jain narrative literature. *Indologica Taurinensia* 11: 27-75.
- 1987. Das Kanonproblem bei den Jainas. In: Aleida & Jan Assmann (eds.), *Kanon und Zensur. Beiträge zur Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation*, II: 100-112. München: Wilhelm Fink.
- BUDHMAL, Muni. *Terāpanth kā Itihās. Dvitiya Khaṇḍ*. Sampādak: Muni Sumaramal ‘Sudarśan’ & Muni Mohanlal ‘Śārdūl’. Calcutta: Jain Śvetāmbar Terāpanth Mahāsabhā Prakāśan, 2001.
- BŪṬERĀY, Muni 1878. *Muḥapatti Viṣe Cārcā*. Racnār Śuddha Mārg nā Rāgī Śrī Būṭerājī Mahārāj Temnā Caritra Sāthe. Amadāvād: Māṅekcok āgal Kāgadiol nā sāme Śā. Hirābhāi Puñjāsānā Makān māṃ Amadāvād Ṭāims Pres māṃ Kālīdās Sāṅkalcand chāpī prasiddha karī.
- CANDANĀKUMĀRĪ, Mahāsati 1964. *Hamārā Itihās. Sthānakavāsī Śramaṇ-Sāṃskṛtik Paramparā kā Paricāyik*. Sampādak: Ācārya Śrī Amṛtumār. Ahmadnagar: Śrī Tilok Ratna Sthānakavāsī Jaina Dhārmik Parīkṣā Borḍ.
- CARRITHERS, Michael 1990. Jainism and Buddhism as enduring historical streams. *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford* 21.2: 141-163.
- 2000. On polytrophy: Or the natural condition of spiritual cosmopolitanism in India: The Digambar Jain case. *Modern Asian Studies* 34.4: 831-861.
- CARRITHERS, Michael & Caroline HUMPHREY (eds.) 1991. *The Assembly of Listeners. Jains in Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CAUDHARĪ, Kastūrcand Sūrajmal (ed.) 1936? *Jinñān Ratnākar*. Kalkattā: Mahāland Bayed “Osvāl Pres”.
- CHOPRA, Chogmal 1937/1945. *A Short History of the Terapanthi Sect of the Svetambar Jains and its Tenets*. 4th Edition. Calcutta: Sri Jain Svetamber Terapanthi Sabha.
- CORT, John E. 1989. *Liberation and Wellbeing. A Study of the Mūrtipūjak Jains of North Gujarat*. Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.
- 1990. Models of and for the study of the Jains. *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion* 2.1: 42-71.
- 1991. The Śvetāmbar Mūrtipūjak Jain mendicant. *Man (N.S.)* 26: 651-671.
- 1995. Genres of Jain history. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 23: 469-506.

- CORT, John E. 2001. *Jains in the World. Religious Values and Ideology in India*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- DALMIA, Vasudha, Angelika MALINAR & Martin CHRISTOF (eds.) 2001/2003. *Charisma & Canon. Essays on the Religious History of the Indian Subcontinent*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- DARŚANA VIJAYA, Muni (col.) 1933. *Paṭṭāvalī Samuccayaḥ*. Prathamo Bhāgaḥ. Vīramgām: Cāritra Smāraḥ Granthamālā. (Reprinted by the Jinaśāsana Ārādhanā Ṭṛṣṭ in Mumbaī in 1996.)
- DAYANAND Sarasvatī, Svami 1882/1908. *Satyārtha Prakash*. Translated into English by Durga Prasad. Lahore: Virjanand Press.
- DEŚĀĪ, Mohanlāl Dalicand 1926-44. *Jaina Gūrjar Kavīo*. Mumbaī: Jaina Śvetāmbara Conference Office (Second edition: Sampādak: Jayant Kothārī. Bhāg 1-5. Mumbaī: Śrī Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyalaya, 1988.)
- ḌOŚĪ, Ratanlāl 1939. *Loṅkāśāh Mat-Samarthan*. Hindī Anuvād. Jodhpur: Jaina Ratna Pustakālay. (Hindī translation of Jivanlāl Bhāī's Gujarātī translation of lost Hindī original revised by the author.) (Reprint Byāvar: Akhil Bhāratīya Sudharma Jaina Saṃskṛti Rakṣak Saṅgh, Jodhpur, 2002.)
- DUGGAR, Hīrālāl 1989. *Madhya Eśīyā aur Pañjāb meṃ Jainadharmā*. Dillī: Jaina Prācīn Sāhitya Prakāśan Mandir.
- DUNDAS, Paul 1993. The marginal monk and the true tīrtha. In: Rudy Smet & Kenji Watanabe (eds.), *Jain Studies in Honour of Jozef Deleu*: 237-259. Tokyo: Hon-no-Tomosha.
- 1996. Somnolent sūtras: Scriptural commentary in Śvetāmbara Jainism. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 24: 73-101.
- 1998. Becoming Gautama: Mantra and history in Śvetāmbara Jainism. In: John E. Cort (ed.), *Open Boundaries. Jain Communities and Culture in Indian History*: 31-52. Albany: SUNY.
- 1999. Jainism without monks? The case of Kaḍuā Śāh. In: N. K. Wagle & O. Qvarnström (eds.), *Approaches to Jain Studies. Philosophy, Logic, Rituals and Symbols*: 19-35. Toronto: University of Toronto, Center for South Asian Studies.
- 2001. History in future mode: A nineteenth century Digambara Jain prophetic text. In: Jayendra Soni (ed.), *Vasantagauravam. Essays in Jainism*: 51-72. Mumbai: Vakils, Feffer & Simons.
- 2002. *The Jains*. Second revised edition. London: Routledge.
- FARQUHAR, J. N. 1915. *Modern Religious Movements in India*. New York: Macmillan.
- FLÜGEL, Peter 1995-96. The ritual circle of the Terāpanth Śvetāmbara Jains. *Bulletin d'Études Indiennes* 13: 117-176.

- FLÜGEL, Peter 2000. Protestantische und Post-Protestantische Jaina-Reformbewegungen: Zur Geschichte und Organisation der Sthānakavāsī I. *Berliner Indologische Studien* 13/14: 37-103.
- 2003a. Protestantische und Post-Protestantische Jaina-Reformbewegungen: Zur Geschichte und Organisation der Sthānakavāsī II. *Berliner Indologische Studien* 15/16/17: 149-240. (Also published on line: <http://eprints.soas.ac.uk/view/subjects/1500.html>).
- 2003b. The codes of conduct of the Terāpanth Samaṇ order. *South Asia Research* 23.1: 7-53.
- 2005. The invention of Jainism: A short history of Jaina studies. *Journal of Jaina Studies* (Kyoto) 11: 1-19. (Also: *International Journal of Jain Studies* 1, <http://www.soas.ac.uk/ijjs>).
- , forthcoming (a). Protestantische und Post-Protestantische Jaina-Reformbewegungen: Zur Geschichte und Organisation der Sthānakavāsī III. *Berliner Indologische Studien* 18.
- , forthcoming (b). Protestantische und Post-Protestantische Jaina-Reformbewegungen: Zur Geschichte und Organisation der Sthānakavāsī IV.
- , forthcoming (c). The Loṅkāgaccha revisited. Paper presented at the 12th World Sanskrit Conference in Helsinki, July 2003, and at the 6th Jaina Studies Workshop at SOAS, March 2004.
- GADAMER, Hans-Georg 1960/1990. *Wahrheit und Methode. Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- GHĀSĪLĀL, Ācārya 1983. *Śrī Loṃkāśāha Caritam*. Niyojaka: Muni Kanhaiyālāl. Ahmadāvād: Akhila Bhāratīya Śvetāmbara Sthānakavāsī Jaina Śāstradvāra Samiti Pramukha Baladevabhāi Ḍosābhāi Paṭel.
- GLASENAPP, H. von. 1925. *Der Jainismus – Eine Indische Erlösungsreligion*. (Kultur und Weltanschauung, 1.) Berlin: A. Hager.
- GOMBRICH, Richard 1988. *Theravāda Buddhism. A Social History from Ancient Benares to Modern Colombo*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- GOONASEKERE, Ratna Sunilsantha Abhayawardana 1986. *Renunciation and Monasticism among the Jains of India*. Ph.D. dissertation. San Diego: University of California.
- GRANOFF, Phyllis 1991. The politics of religious biography: The biography of Balibhadra the Usurper. *Bulletin d'Études Indiennes* 9: 75-91.
- 1993. Going by the Book: The role of written texts in medieval Jain sectarian conflicts. In: R. Smet & K. Watanabe (eds.), *Jain Studies in Honour of Jozef Deleu*: 315-338. Tokyo: Hon-no-Tomosha.
- GUṆSUNDAR, Muni 1938. *Ādarś Jñān. Śrīmān Jñānsundarjī Mahārāj Sāhib kā Ādarś-Jīvan*. Bhāg 1-2. Jodhpur (?).

- HASTĪMAL, Ācārya 1968. *Paṭṭāvalī Prabandh Saṅgrah*. Ed. Narendra Bhana-wat. Jaypur: Jaina Itihāsa Nirmāṇ Samiti.
- 1971. *Jaina Ācārya Caritāvalī (Jaina Ācārya Paramparā kā Kāvya-baddha Rūpa)*. Ed. Gajasiṅha Rāthor. Jaypur: Jaina Itihās Samiti.
- 1987/1995. *Jaina Dharma kā Maulik Itihās*, IV. Jaypur: Jaina Itihās Samiti.
- JACOBI, Hermann 1880. Das Kālakācārya-Kathānakam. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 34: 247-298.
- JAIN, Jiyālāl 1893. *Carcā Candrodāy Bhāg Tisrā*. Ahmadāvād: Yuniyan Priṅṅ.
- JAIN, Jyotindra & Eberhard FISCHER 1978. *Jaina Iconography*, I-II. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- JAIN, Kamleś Kumār 2003. *Jaina Uddharāṇa Kośa*. Bhāg I. Dillī: Bhogīlāl Leharcand Bhāratīya Saṃskṛti Saṃsthān.
- JAIN, Mohanlāl 1892. *Durvād Mukh-Capeṭikā*. Lāhaur: Eṅglo Saṃskṛt Yantrā-lay.
- JAIN, Pannālāl L. 1913/1923. *Jainācārya Śrī 1008 Śrīmatī Pārvatījī ke Jīvan Caritra*. Pratham Bhāg & Dvītīya Bhāg. Hindī Anuvād: Dayācandra Jain. Lāhaur: Candra Lakhanpāl. (1st Edition in Urdū.)
- JAIN, Sāgarmal & Vijay KUMĀR 2003. *Sthānakavāsī Jaina Paramparā kā Iti-hās*. Vārāṇasī: Pārśvanāth Vidyāpīṭh.
- JAIN, Śrīnāth Modī 1929. *Muni Śrī Jñānsundarjī*. Jodhpur: Rājasthān Sundar Sāhitya Sadan.
- JAYDAYĀL, Lālā, n.d. *Dhuṅḍhak Mat Samīkṣā*. (Photocopy without bibliogra-  
phic references.)
- JETHMAL, Muni 1882/1930. *Samakit-Sār I-II*. Prabodhak: Tapasvīrāj Śrī Dev-jīrṣi. Prakāśak: Śrīmān Sardārmal Pugaliā, Nāgpur, Śrīmān Ratanlāl Pīrcand Pārasevanī evam Barār Jaina Śrīmān. Caturtha Saṃskaraṇ.  
Hindī Anuvād: Rastabcand. Ratlām: Jainoday Pustak Prakāśak Samiti.
- JHAUHARĪ, Durlabh Trībhuvan. 1922/1923. *Śrīlālī Mahārāj kā Sacitra Jīvan-caritra*. Morvī-Jaipur: Durlabh Trībhuvan Jhauharī.
- JÑĀNSUNDAR, Muni 1936. *Śrīmad Lauṅkāśāh*. Phalodī: Śrī Jñān Puṣpamālā.
- KĀNTISĀGAR, Muni 1965. Śrī Loṅkāśāh kī Paramparā aur uskā Ajñāt Sāhitya.  
In: Śobhācandra Bhārill (ed.), *Muni Śrī Hajārīmal Smṛti Granth*: 214-253. Byāvar: Muni Śrī Hajārīmal Smṛti Granth Prakāśan Samiti.
- KĀPAḌĪĀ, Hīrālāl Rasikdās. *A History of the Canonical Literature of the Jinas*. Surat: Hiralāl Rasikdas Kapadia, 1941. (Reprint: Ahmedabad: Shree Shwetambar Murtipujak Jaina Boarding, 2000.)

- KELTING, Mary Whitney 2001. *Singing to the Jinas. Jain Laywomen, Maṅḍal Singing, and the Negotiations of Jain Devotion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- KHĀN, Ālamśāh 1965. Loṅkāgaccha kī Sāhitya-Sevā. In: Śobhācandra Bhārill (ed.), *Muni Śrī Hajārimal Smṛti Granth*: 203-213. Byāvar: Muni Śrī Hajārimal Smṛti Granth Prakāśan Samiti.
- KIRAṆYAŚĀSTRĪ, Mahārāj 1999. *Śrī Vijayānandjī ke Vāḍam kā Vihāṅgāvalokaṇa*. Baṛaudā: Mahilā Jaina Upāśray.
- KLATT, Johannes 1888. Eine apokryphe Paṭṭāvalī der Jainas. In: *Festgruss an Otto von Böhlingk zum Doktor-Jubiläum 3. Februar 1888 von seinen Freunden*: 54-59. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
- *Onomasticon*. Bound copy. 8 vols. Hamburg: Institut für Indologie und Tibetologie.
- KOṬHĀRĪ, Jayant 2001. *Prācīn Madhyakālīn Sāhitya Samgraha* (Mohanlāl Dalicand Desāi Sampādit Laghukṛti Saṃgraha). Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology. [See AB, LP, SC and SS under Primary sources.]
- KUNDANMAL, Muni 1908. *Pragaṭ Jain Pīṅambarī Mūrtipūjakoṃ kā Mithyātva. Amarāvati. Mūlcand Jugrāj*. (The short *stavan* is reprinted in *Amarvijay* 1908: 34-36.)
- , n.d. *Ātmārām Saṃvegī kī Karttūt, Ātmārām kī Ādāt kā Namūnā*. Ambālā: Paṇḍit Bhīmasena.
- LAIDLAW, James 1985. Profit, salvation and profitable saints. *Cambridge Anthropology* 9.3: 50-70.
- 1995. *Riches and Renunciation. Religion, Economy, and Society among the Jains*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- LĀLAS, Padmaśrī Sītārām (ed.) 1986-87. *Rājasthānī-Hindī Saṅkṣipt Śabda Koś*, I-II. Rājasthān Purātan Granthamālā. Prabandh Sampādak: Padmadhar Pāthak. Jodhpur: Rājasthān Prācyavidyā Pratiṣṭhān.
- LESLIE, Julia 2003. *Authority and Meaning in Indian Religions. Hinduism and the Case of Vālmiki*. Hants: Ashgate.
- LEUMANN, Ernst 1934. *Übersicht über die Āvaśyaka Literatur*. Aus dem Nachlass herausgegeben von Walther Schubring. (Alt- und Neuindische Studien, 4.) Hamburg: De Gruyter.
- MĀDHAV, Muni 1908. *Taraṅgiṇī Dvītyā Taraṅg*. Āgrā. (Reprinted in *Amarvijay* 1908: 31-34.)
- MAHĀPRAJÑA, Ācārya 2000. *Jainism and Its Philosophical Foundations*. New Delhi: Anmol Publications.
- MALUKCAND, Anūpcand 1908. “*Praśnottara-ratna-cintāmaṇī*” aur “*Aṣṭhārah Dūṣaṇa-nivāraka*”. Ahmadābād: Rāy Bahādur Bābu Buddhasiṅghī.

- MĀLVAṆIYĀ, Dalsukhbhārī 1963a. Śrī Loṅkāśāh nī ek Kṛti. *Svādhyāya* 2.1: 50-82.
- 1963b. Śrī Lokāśāh ane temnā Mat. *Svādhyāya* 2.2: 143-155.
- 1964. Lokāśāh aur unkī Vicār-Dhārā. In: Vijay Muni Śāstri & Harīśankar Śarmā (eds.), *Gurudev Śrī Ratna Muni Smṛti-Granth*: 365-383. Āgrā: Gurudev Smṛti Granth Prakāśak Samiti.
- 1965. Loṅkāśāh Mat kī Do Pothiyāṃ. In: Śobhācandra Bhārill (ed.), *Muni Śrī Hajārīmal Smṛti Granth*: 184-188. Byāvar: Muni Śrī Hajārīmal Smṛti Granth Prakāśan Samiti.
- MAṆILĀL, Muni 1934. *Śrī Jaina Dharma no Prācīn Saṅkṣipt Itihās ane Prabhu Vīr Paṭṭāvalī*. Amadāvād: Jīvaṅlāl Chaganlāl Saṅghvī.
- METTE, Adelheid 1974. *Piṇḍ'esaṅā. Das Kapitel der Oha-Nijutti über den Bettelgang übersetzt und kommentiert*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- MIŚRĪMAL, Mantrī Muni “Marudhar Kesarī” 1936. *Dharmavīr Loṅkāśāh*. Ṭāṅṭoṭī/Ajmer: Jaina Śvetāmbara Sthānakavāsī Sakal Śrī Saṅgh Ṭāṅṭoṭī.
- 1941. *Krāntikārī Vīr Loṅkāśāh*. Jodhpur Śṭeṭ: Jaina Buddhavīr Smārak Maṅḍal.
- 1946. *Vīr Loṅkāśāh*. Prakāśak: Śāh Mukancand Nemīcand Bahorā Jain. Jodhpur: Jaina Buddhavīr Smārak Maṅḍal.
- NAHAR, Puran Chand. 1918/1983. *Jaina Inscriptions*. Delhi: Indian Book Gallery.
- NĀHAṬĀ, Agarcand 1958. Kaḍuā Mat kī Mānyatāoṃ par Prakāś. *Jaina Bhārātī* 6.2: 19f.
- 1964. Uttarārdha Gaccha. *Jaina Bhārātī* 12.9.
- 1966. Nāgorī Loṅkāgaccha ke Sthāpak Hīrāsāh aur Rūpcand. *Jinavāṇī* 15: 2-4.
- 1968. Bhūmikā. In: Ācārya Hastīmal, *Paṭṭāvalī Prabandh Saṅgrah* (Ed. Narendra Bhanawat): 33-39. Jaypur: Jaina Itihāsa Nirmāṇ Samiti.
- NĀHAṬĀ, Bhanvarlāl 1957. Luṅkāśāh aur unke Anuyāyī. In: Agarcand Nāhaṭā et al. (eds.), *Śrīmad Rājendrasūri Smārak Granth*: 470-477. Āhora tathā Bāgarā (Mārvār): Śrī Saudharmabṛhattapāgacchīya Jaina Śvetāmbara Śrī Saṅgh.
- NĀHAṬĀ, Kuṃvar Lālcandra “Tarūṅ”. 1968. Lauṃkāśāh: Vyaktitva aur Vicār. In: Śobhācandra Bhārill (ed.), *Marudhar Kesarī Muni Miśrīmaljī Mahārāj Abhinandan Granth*: 159-168. Jodhpur: Marudhar Kesarī Abhinandan Granth Prakāśan Samiti.
- NAIR, V. G. 1970. *Jainism and Terehpanthism*. Bangalore: Shri Adinath Jain Svetambar Temple, 1970.



- PĀRVATĪ, Mahāsati 1905a. “*Satyārtha-Candroday Jaina*” arthāt “*Mithyātva Timir-Nāśak*”. *Jis ko Sanātan Satya Jaina Dharmopadeśikā Bāl Brahmācāriṇī Jaināryyājī Śrī Mahāsati Pārvatījī ne banāyā*. Lāhaur: Lālā Meharandra Lakṣmīdās Śrāvak.
- 1905b. “*Samyaktva Sūryoday Jaina*” arthāt “*Mithyātva Timir Nāśak*”. *Jis ko Jainācāryya Pañjābī Śrī 1008 Śrī Parampūjya Amara-siṅhajī kī Sampradāya meṃ Sanātan Satya Jaina Dharmopadeśikā Bāl Brahmācāriṇī Jainācāryyājī Śrīmat Śrī 1008 Satījī Śrī Pārvatījī ne banāyā*. Hośīārpur: Lālā Kṛpārām Koṭūmal Śrāvak. (Second edition: Rohtak: Jyotrām Seth kī Dharmapatnī Lā. Śerasiṅha.)
- PRAKĀŚCANDRA, Muni 1998. *Ā Che Aṇagār Amārā*. Mumbaī: Śrī Naval Sāhitya Prakāśan Maṇḍal.
- PUṢKARMUNI, Upādhyāy 1977. *Jain Dharma meṃ Dān. Ek Samikṣātmak Adhyayan*. Sampādak: Devendramuni & Śrīcand Surānā ‘Sarat’. Agra: Śrī Tārakguru Jaina Granthālay.
- QVARNSTRÖM, Olle 1998. Stability and adaptability: A Jain strategy for survival and growth. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 41: 33-55.
- ŚĀH, Praviṇḍand Tulsīdās 2001. *Dharma Priya Krāntivīr Lokāśāh nuṃ Jīvan Caritra (Saṅkṣep)*. Mumbaī: Śrī Mumbaī Loṅkāgaccha Jaina Saṅgha.
- ŚĀH, Vāḍīlāl Motīlāl 1909. *Śrī Sādhumārgī Jaina Dharmānuyāyīoe Jāṇvā Jog Keṭalīk Aitihāsik Noṃdh*. Amadāvād: “Jaina Samācār”.
- 1925. *Aitihāsik Noṃdh*. Hindī Anuvād, Mulatānmal Hīrācand Dhārīvāl. Ratan Rāyppur C. P.: Jaina Pāṭhśālā ke Sahāya Tīrth.
- SARLĀ, Sādhvī 1991. Sthānakavāsī Pañjāb Sampradāy kī Pramukha Sādhvīyāṃ. [Extract of: Sādhanā Path kī Amar Sāhikā.] In: Hīrābāī Boradiyā, *Jainadharmā kī Pramukh Sādhvīyāṃ evaṃ Mahilāeṃ*: 298-304. Sampādak: Sāgarmal Jain. Vārāṇasī: Pārśvanāth Vidyāśram Śodha Saṃsthān.
- ŚĀSTRĪ, Hansrāj 1915. *Svāmī Dayānand aur Jainadharmā*. Gopipura/Surat: Paṇḍit Hansrāj Śāstrī.
- SAUBHĀGYACANDRA, Muni “Santabāḷa” 1939. *Dharmaprāṇ-Loṅkāśāh (Krānti no Yugasṛṣṭā)*. Amadāvād: Sthānakavāsī Jaina Kāryālay. (First published in *Jaina Prakāś* 1935.)
- SCHUBRING, Walther 1935/2000. *Die Lehre der Jainas. Nach der alten Quellen dargestellt*. (Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, 3.7.) Berlin: Walter De Gruyter & Co. [Cited after the English translation: *The Doctrine of the Jainas. Described after the Old Sources*. Transl. Wolfgang Beurlen. 3rd English edition. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.]
- 1944. *Die Jaina-Handschriften der Preussischen Staatsbibliothek*. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.

- SCHUBRING, Walther 1957. Kundakunda echt und unecht. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 107: 537-574.
- SETH, Gulābcand Nāncand 1970. *Jaydhvaj. Pūjya Ācārya Jaymaljī Mahārāj kā Jīvan Caritra*. Madrās: Jaydhvaj Prakāśan Samiti.
- ŚEṬH, Nagīndās Girdharlāl 1962. *Mūl Jaina Dharma ane Hāl nā Sampradāyo*. Mumbai: Jaina Siddhānta Sabhā.
- (ed.) 1963. *Sthānakavāsī Jaino nuṃ Dharma Kartavya*. Satya Dharma Samāj vā Icchanāra ne Māṭe Ja. Jaina Siddhānta Granthamālā Aṅko 49 Mo. Mumbai: Jaina Siddhānta Sabhā (Rajīṣṭarḍ) nī Vatī Śeṭh Nagīndās Girdharlāl. [Includes chapters 7-13 and 22-26 of Śeṭh's Mūl Jaina Dharma ane Hāl nā Sampradāyo: E Pustak māṃ nā Ahim Umerelā Mūrti ne Lagtā Prakaraṇo.]
- 1964. *Loṅkāśāh ane Dharmacarcā*.
- SHAH, Umakant Premanand 1955a. *Studies in Jaina Art*. Varanasi: Pārśvanātha Vidyāpīṭha.
- 1955b. A forgotten chapter in the history of the Svetāmbara Jaina church, or, a documentary epigraph from Mount Satrunjaya. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay* 30: 100-113.
- SHĀNTĀ, N. 1985/1997. *La voie Jaina. histoire, spiritualité, vie des ascètes pèlerines de l'Inde*. Paris: O.E.I.L. (English version: *The Unknown Pilgrims. The Voice of the Sādhvīs: The History, Spirituality and Life of the Jaina Women Ascetics*. Transl. by M. Rogers. (Sri Garib Dass Oriental Series, 219.) Delhi: Shri Satguru Publications, 1997.)
- SMITH, Wilfred Cantwell. 1962/1991. *The Meaning and End of Religion*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- SURĀNĀ, Śrīcand "Saras" 1976. *Mahāprajña Pravartak Śrī Pannālālī Mahārāj. Jīvan, Vyaktitva aur Kṛtīva*. Vijaynagar/Rājasthān: Śrī Prajña Jaina Smārak Samiti.
- SUŚĪLKUMĀR, Ācārya 1959. *Jainadharmā kā Itihās (Pramukhtaṅ Śrī Śvetāmbara Sthānakavāsī Jainadharmā kā Itihās)*. Kalkattā: Samyag Jñān-Mandir.
- UJAMCAND, Rikhabcand (Mumbai) 1909. *Sthānakavāsī Sādhumārgī Satyatā Ūpar Kuhāḍo. Urphe. Bhī. Vāḍilāl-kṛt Aitihāsik Khoṭī Noṃdh Upar Ṭikā*. Bhāg 1. Amadāvād: Englo Varnākyular Priṅṭiṅg.
- VALLABHVIJAY, Muni (ed.) 1891. *Dhūṇḍrak-hita-śikṣā Apanām Gappa-dīpikā-samīr*. Amadāvād: Śrī Jainadharmā Prasārak Sanā. Nāvnagar.
- 1902. Tapāgaccha Ācārya Śrīmad Vijayānandasūrisvarjī Prasiddha nām Ātmārāmjī Mahārājī Jainī Sādhu kā Janmacaritra. In: Ācārya Ātmārām (Vijayānanda Sūri), *Tattvanirṇayaprasāda: 36 Stambha*: 33-83. Samsōdhankarttā: Muni Vallabh Vijay. Prasiddhakarttā: Amar-

- cand P. Parmār. Mumbaī: Induprakāś Jāṭastāṃk Kaṃ. Lī. meṃ Chāp-  
kar Prasiddha kiyā.
- 1909. *Javābdāvā. Jain Samācār Dhūṅḍhak Patrādhipati kī Pūkār kā Javāb*. Written in Pālaṅpur, Gujārāt. Lāhaur: Jasvantrāy Jainī.
- 1996. *Navyug Nirmātā (Nyāyāmbhoniḍhi Ācārya Śrīmad Vijayānand Sūri (Ātmārāmji) Mahārāj kī Jīvan Gāthā)*. Dvītīya Saṃskaraṅ. Pāvā-  
gaḍh Tīrtha: Vijayānand Sūri Sāhitya Prakāśan Phāuṅḍeśan.
- Varddhamāna Sthānakavāsī Jaina Śrāvaka Saṅgha, Jaypur (ed.) 1964. *Ajmer Śikhar Sammelan meṃ Saṃśodhit evaṃ Pārit – Varddhamān Sthāna-  
kavāsī Jaina Śramaṅ Saṅgh ke Prastāv, Vidhān evaṃ Sāmācārī*.  
Jaypur: Mantrī, Varddhamāna Sthānakavāsī Jaina Śrāvaka Saṅgha.
- VĀRĪĀ, Ratanśī 1976. *Dharma Prāṅ Śrī Loṅkāśāh nā Aṭṭhāvan Bol*. Jāmnagar:  
Lālbāg (Ratanśī Vārīā).
- WEBER, Albrecht 1882. Über den Kupakshakauçikāditya des Dharmasāgara.  
Streitschrift eines orthodoxen Jaina, vom Jahre 1573. In: *Sitzungs-  
berichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu  
Berlin* 37: 793-814.
- WILLIAMS, Ronald. 1963/1983: *Jaina Yoga. A Survey of the Medieval Śrāvakā-  
cāras*. London: Oxford University Press.
- WUJASTYK, Dominik 1984. The spikes in the ears of an ascetic: an illustrated  
tale in Brahmanism and Jainism. *Oriental Art (N.S.)* 30: 189-194.

**APPENDIX I:****Keha nī Paramparā Chai – Text in Old Gujarātī<sup>304</sup>**

*paramparā likhīṃ chaiṃ, ketalā eka ima kahai chai śrī vīra nī  
paramparā ima kahai chai, te kihāṃ chai.*<sup>305</sup>

1. *ghariṃ pratimā ghaḍāvī maṇḍāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā  
chai?*<sup>306</sup> – *celā celī vecānā leī teha keha nī paramparā chai?*<sup>307</sup>
2. *nānhā chokarā nai*<sup>308</sup> *dīkṣā dīi chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
3. *nāma*<sup>309</sup> *pheravai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
4. *kāṃna vadhārai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
5. *khamāsamaṣaṇa*<sup>310</sup> *viharai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
6. *grhastha (nī) gharaiṃ baisī*<sup>311</sup> *viharai, te keha nī paramparā  
chai?*
7. *dīhāḍī dīhāḍī*<sup>312</sup> *2 teṇai*<sup>313</sup> *ghariṃ viharai, te keha nī paramparā  
chai?*

<sup>304</sup> Text based on L.D. Institute Ms. 2989, pp. 14b-15a.

<sup>305</sup> The meaning (*vīvaraṇa*) of this sentence has been given by Vārīā (1976: 127) as follows: *have paramparā lakhīe chīe. keṭalāk ema kahe che ke vīra prabhue ā rīte paramparā kahī che. śrī loṅkāśāha praśna kare che ke ā paramparā kayāṃ sāstro māṃ kahī che te batāvo*. The text was reproduced *verbatim* by Hastīmal (1995) (and Jain & Kumār 2003), which shows that the subsequently published versions are all based on Vārīā's transcription.

<sup>306</sup> Vārīā's (1976: 127) reproduction of the text uses the past tense here and in the following question: “*te keha nī paramparā thāī?*”. Since the L.D. Institute Ms. No. 2989 uses the present tense, I have amended the printing mistakes in the published version in these two cases.

<sup>307</sup> This sentence has been left out in all published versions of L.D. Institute Ms. No. 2989, probably because it is regarded as too controversial.

<sup>308</sup> Hastīmal 1995: 691: *chokaranaiṃ*.

<sup>309</sup> Hastīmal 1995: 691 added in brackets: (*dīkṣa kāle*).

<sup>310</sup> Hastīmal 1995: 691: *khamāsamaṣaṇu*.

<sup>311</sup> Hastīmal 1995: 692: *baisi*.

<sup>312</sup> Hastīmal 1995: 692: *dīhāḍī* and added in brackets: (*pratidin*).

<sup>313</sup> Hastīmal 1995: 692 added in brackets: (*usī ek*).

8. *aṅghola*<sup>314</sup>*kahai*<sup>315</sup> *kare*,<sup>316</sup> *te keha nī paramparā chai?*
9. *vyotiṣa nai marma prajumjai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
10. *kalavāṇī karī āpai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
11. *nagara māhiṃ paisatā paiṃ sāru sāhamuṃ karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
12. *lādūā pratiṣṭai*<sup>317</sup> *chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
13. *pothī pūjāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
14. *saṅghapūjā karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
15. *pratiṣṭā karai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
16. *pajūsaṇaiṃ pothī āpai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
17. *tathā yātrā vecai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
18. *tathā mātra āpai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
19. *tathā ghāṭaḍī donuṃ toraṇa*<sup>318</sup> *bāṅghai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
20. *ādḥākarma posāliṃ rahai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
21. *siddhānta prabhāvanā pākhai na vāṃcai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
22. *māṇḍavī karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
23. *gautama paḍagho*<sup>319</sup> *karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
24. *saṃsāra-tāraṇa karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
25. *candanabālā nu tapa karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
26. *sonā rūpā nī nīsarāṇī karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
27. *lākhāpaḍavi karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*

<sup>314</sup> Hastīmal 1995: 692 added in brackets: (*snān*).

<sup>315</sup> Hastīmal 1995: 692 added in brackets: (*koī*).

<sup>316</sup> Hastīmal 1995: 692: *karai*.

<sup>317</sup> Hastīmal 1995: 692: *pratiṣṭhāī*.

<sup>318</sup> Hastīmal 1995: 692: *ghāṭaṭī* and added in brackets: (*vanaspati ke toraṇ*).

<sup>319</sup> Hastīmal 1995: 692: *paṛagho*.

28. *ūjamaṇā*<sup>320</sup> *dhovarāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
29. *pūja pūdhāiṃ chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
30. *āsovṛkṣa bharāvi*<sup>321</sup> *chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
31. *aṭṭhottarī sanātra karāvi chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
32. *navā ghāna navā phala pratimā āgali dhoi chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
33. *śrāvaka-śrāvikā nai māthai vāsa ghālai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
34. *parigraha dhūṇḍha māṃ bāṃdhai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
35. *śrāvaka pāiṃ mūṇḍakuṃ apāvī ḍuṅgara caḍhāvī*<sup>322</sup> *chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
36. *mālāropaṇa karai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
37. *padika śrāvaka śrāvikā suṃ bheli jāiṃ chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
38. *nāndi maṇḍāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
39. *padika cāṅka bāṃdhai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
40. *pāṇi māhiṃ bhūko*<sup>323</sup> *muṃkai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
41. *vāndaṇā divarāvai*<sup>324</sup> *chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
42. *oghā pheravai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
43. *devadravya rākhai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
44. *pagai lāgai nīcī pacheḍī oḍhai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
45. *sūrimantra leiṃ iṃ chai,*<sup>325</sup> *te keha nī paramparā chai?*
46. *dīhāḍī sūrimantra gaṇai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*

---

<sup>320</sup> Hastīmal 1995: 692: *ūṇjamaṇā*.

<sup>321</sup> Vāriā 1976: 129: *bharāvā*.

<sup>322</sup> Hastīmal 1995: 693: *dūṅgara caḍhāvā*.

<sup>323</sup> Vāriā 1976: 129: *bhūṅko muṃkai*; Hastīmal 1995: 693: *bhūṅko mukai*.

<sup>324</sup> Hastīmal 1995: 693: *dirāvai*.

<sup>325</sup> Vāriā 1976: 130: *sūrimantra leiṃ chai*.

47. *kalapaḍā ṭhatai<sup>326</sup> chaiṃ, te keha nī paramparā chai ūjalā?*
48. *pajūsana māhiṃ bairakanhai tap karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
49. *ghaḍūlā karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
50. *āṃbila nī olī siddhacakra nī karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
51. *mahātama nāla<sup>327</sup> karā pachī te ūṭhamaṇuṃ karai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
52. *pratimā jhūlaṇuṃ<sup>328</sup> karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
53. *paḍika āgali ṭhavaṇi<sup>329</sup> māṇḍai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*
54. *pajūsana parva nai cauthaiṃ<sup>330</sup> paḍikamai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?*

---

<sup>326</sup> Vāriā 1995: 693 *ṭhatai*.

<sup>327</sup> Vāriā 1976: 130: *kāla*.

<sup>328</sup> Vāriā 1976: 130: *jhūlaṇaṃ*.

<sup>329</sup> Vāriā 1976: 130: *Uambaṇi*.

<sup>330</sup> Hastīmal 1995: 693: *cauthanaiṃ paḍikamai chaiṃ*.

**APPENDIX II:****Loṅkā's assertions according to Candanākumārī 1964 in Hindī**

1. *āgam-sammat ṭīkāoṃ ko hī prāmāṇik mānā jāy.*
2. *āgam ke anusār dṛṣṭhatāpūrvak samyamōṃ jīvan vyatīt kiyā jāy.*
3. *dharmdṛṣṭi se 'pratimā-pūjan' śāstra-sammat nahīṃ hai.*
4. *śuddha sāttvik śākāhārī pratyek kul kā āhār liyā jā saktā hai.*
5. *sthāpanācārya kī sthāpanā kī koī āvaśyaktā nahīṃ hai.*
6. *upavās ādi vratōṃ meṃ sabhī prakār kā prāsuk jal liyā jā saktā hai.*
7. *parv-tithi ke binā bhī upavās kiyā jā saktā hai.*
8. *sādhuōṃ ko mantra-tantra tathā yantra ādi vidyāōṃ kā prayog nahīṃ karnā cāhie.*
9. *śrāvak bhikṣā kar saktā hai, par dān nahīṃ le saktā.*
10. *dayā bhāv se garīboṃ ko dān denā pāp nahīṃ hai, apitu puṇya kā kāraṇ hai.*
11. *daṇḍ nahīṃ rakhā jānā cāhie.*



**APPENDIX III:****Loṅkā's Sāmācārī according to Seṭh 1970 in Hindī**

1. *upadhān tap kiye binā bhī śāstra-abhyās karāyā jā saktā hai.*
2. *jin pratimā kī dharma-dr̥ṣṭi se pūjā karnā 45 āgamom̃ meṃ nahīṃ hai.*
3. *mūl sūtra, āgam aur mūl śāstra, samasta ṭīkāom̃ ke sivāy anyā āgam evaṃ ṭīkā sarvathā amānya hai.*
4. *vidyā kā prayog niṣiddha hai.*
5. *paṣadh pratikramaṃ svatantra rīti se karnā.*
6. *cāturmas̃ ke sivāy bhī pāṭ kā vyavahār jā saktā hai.*
7. *daṇḍ nahīṃ rakhā jānā cāhiye.*
8. *pustakeṃ rakhī jā saktī haiṃ.*
9. *sātviktā aur śuddhi kā dhyān rakhte hue pratyeḱ kul meṃ gocarī kī jā saktī hai.*
10. *śrāvaka bhī gocarī kar saktā hai.*
11. *śrāvaka dān nahīṃ le saktā.*
12. *upavās pratyākhyān meṃ chāch-pānī kī āch prāsuk le sakte haiṃ.*
13. *binā upavās ke bhī paṣadh kiyā jā saktā hai.*
14. *tīthi-parv ke binā bhī upavās kiyā jā saktā hai.*
15. *ek sāth upavās paccakkhe jā sakte haiṃ.*
16. *kalyāṇakoṃ ko tīthi meṃ nahīṃ ginnā cāhiye.*
17. *jis din goras liyā jāy us din kaṭhor (dvidal dhānya) kā prayog nahīṃ honā cāhiye.*
18. *sthāpanācārya kī sthāpanā anāvaśyak hai.*
19. *dhovan pānī meṃ do ghaṛī ke anantar jīvotpatti sambhav hai.*
20. *apātra ko dharma buddhi se dān dene se hiṃsā hotī hai (anukampā se garīb ko denā ekānta pāp kā kāraṇ nahīṃ hai).*

## PICTURE:

*Loṅkā nā Athāvana Bolo, Ms. No. 2989,*

*L.D. Institute, Ahmedabad, p. 14b*

पञ्चमीसंसेपरिनाणं पुत्रं पुत्रं परित्रं जावपञ्चमं  
 त्रिभूत्सि किममताइ ॥ उक्कुकुइतविचारी जोड्ये  
 हता। वत्तमानकालइं जमो रूपुहवड इं बइं। अत्र  
 मलिरवीइ बइं। अत विंसु विसिरकावा। आएस्सा  
 एणमाहणे। आयहि ए अनिया एसं बुडा। एवं  
 जीजाउ इराउ तहनइ विषइ ॥ जीवइयाइ करी।  
 लुंकानासइ हिआ अतइ लुंकाना कर्

॥ परंपरा लिरवीं बइं केतला एकइमकइइबः  
 १ घरिप्रतिमाघडावीमं डावइइबइचेलाचेलीवेचा  
 २ नाहाजेकरानइदीसादिइबइतेकेहनीय  
 ३ नामकेरवइइबइतेकेहनीपरंपराबइ ॥  
 ४ कांनवधरइइबइतेहकेहनीपरंपराबइ ॥