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,1 which offer alternative points of connection for the for-

---

1 See the empirical studies on Jain laity in Carrithers & Humphrey 1991.
formation of variable group identities. In this model, scripture, 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. 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.

---

2 Used in a wider sense, including commentary, and ritual literature.

3 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”.

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-

---

4 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, Häretische, 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 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.6

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

---

5 “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 (uddhāraṇa) 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.

years after his death.\textsuperscript{7} It is commonly accepted that Luṅkā or Loṅkā\textsuperscript{8} 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, śīthilācāra, 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.\textsuperscript{9} 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,\textsuperscript{10} which was founded by Bhānā 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,\textsuperscript{11} nothing certain can be said at present

\textsuperscript{7} On the history of research of the aniconic Śvetāmbara traditions see Flügel 2000: 40-46; Jain & Kumār 2003: 109-115.

\textsuperscript{8} Hastīmal (1995: 765) criticises that he is variously called Lumpaka (from lutērā, thief) or lungā (from luuccā, scoundrel), etc., by his opponents, rather than by his real name. Weber (1882: 807f.) and Mālvaṅīya (1965: 185) interpret lumpaka as the Sanskrit translation of luṅkā (launkā), 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 Saṅvat 1600 (1543/4) by the Loṅkāgaccha yāti Keśavaṛsi.

\textsuperscript{9} Mūrtipūjaka scholars such as Devagupta Śāri (1016 CE) of the Upakesāgaccha 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 hīṃsā) (Williams 1983: 66). Digambaras additionally use the term udvīgī hīṃsā, violence that is connected with a purposeful (religious) action.

\textsuperscript{10} Originally: “Jinamata”.

\textsuperscript{11} Apart from Deśāī’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 yāits: 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 paṭṭuvalis, 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.12

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,13 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).14

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,15 was not entirely new in the aniconic tradition.16 In addition to Mahāvīra, Loṅkā is mentioned as a source of

---

12 The surviving biographical sources on the Loṅkāgaccha ascetics have not yet been studied.

13 The early Loṅkāgaccha tradition were opposed by local Mūrtipūjaka and Sthānakavāsī rivals, and to a lesser extent by Digambaras. 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.

14 See Assmann 1987 for the terms Sinnpflege and Textpflege.

15 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 Terāpanthās present themselves as direct disciples of Mahāvīra, like the Śramaṇasaṅgha. See Bhaṇḍārī 1937: 96; Flügel 2003a: 194ff.

16 See Balbir 2003a: 268ff.
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.\textsuperscript{17} 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.\textsuperscript{18} 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.\textsuperscript{19}

At the time, the sectarian struggle over the definition of the cultural memory of Loṅkā was particularly intense between the Sthānakavāsīs and the reformed “Ṣaṃvegī” Tapāgaccha Mürtipūjakas. For the Mürtipūjakas (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 Mürtipūjakas re-enacted the ideological struggle between Loṅkā (and the Loṅkāgaccha) and his Mürtipūjaka opponents in the 15th century. Yet, the agenda had signifi-

\textsuperscript{17} Cf. Hastimal 1968. The fact that the chronologies are relatively young may be seen as confirmation for the general view that the Sthānakavāsī muni Jetimal was the first to invoke Loṅkā as the dharmaguru of his tradition in 1808. See infra.

\textsuperscript{18} On the form and function of paṭṭāvalīs and gurvāvalīs see Flügel 2003a: 177-196.

\textsuperscript{19} 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 which are at the heart of the aniconic sects. 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. As such, it provides a crucial link between doctrine and practice, scripture and community, and is prone to processes of canonisation. A crucial point of contention between the Sthānakavāśī 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 Sthānakavāśī traditions. Currently, no records are

20 According to Dundas (1993: 248), one of the principal critics of the Loṅkā tradition, the Mūrtipūjaka monk Dharmasāgara, rejected in his Pravacanaparīkṣā 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.

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

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

23 On the problem of canonisation in the Jaina context see Bruhn 1987: 106.
known on disputes about Loṅkā’s teachings amongst Sthānakavāśīs and members of the Loṅkāgaccha.

The key question, to what extent the prescribed 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 Sarasvātī (1824-1883), and with Christian missionaries for support amongst the adherents of the traditional Jaina communities. Particularly virulent were the written exchanges between Sthānakavāśī mendicants and ex-Sthānakavāśī Mūrtipūjaka monks from the Pañjāb and Rājasthān, such as the polemicists Muni Buddhīvijay (Būṭerāy) (1807-1882), Ācārya Ātmārām (Vijayānand Sūri) (1837-1897) and his Gujarāt-

---

24 Observed behaviour of individual monks was generally not the key point of criticism.

25 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 Sthānakavāśī sādhvī Pārvatī (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 Sthānakavāśī example in his native Morvī state in Gujarāt.

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

27 He was born in the Ksatriya family of the soldier Ganeścandra Kapīr in the village Laharā in the Zirā Tahasīl near Phīrozpur in the Pañjāb. After coming in close contact with Osvāl Sthānakavāśī Jains, he was initiated on 5.12.1853 (1910 mrgasār śukla 5) by the Sthānakavāśī muni Jīvanrām (Jīvanmal), who probably belonged to the Jīvarāja Gaṅgarāma tradition. In 1874, he was re-initiated by the Mūrtipūjaka ācārya Buddhīvijay (the ex-Sthānakavāśī monk Būṭerāy) in Gujarāt, and was given the name “Vijayānandā” when he became a sūri on 1.12.1886 (1943 mrgasār śukla 5). See Ātmārām 1900a: 72ff.; Vallabhāvijay 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 Gujarat, which had to re-establish itself almost from scratch. 28 One of the fiercest critics of the aniconic tradition in the 20th century, the (ex-Sthānakavāśī) Mūrtipūjaka munī Jñānānanda (1936: 131ff.), born in 1880 in Rajasthan, 29 who attempted to revive the Upakēṣagaccha, has argued that contemporary Sthānakavāśī intellectuals such as Ācārya Amolakçū (1877-1936), 30 Vādilāl Motilāl Sāh (1878-1931), Muni Manilāl (1849-1932?), 31 and Muni Saubhāgyacandra “Santabāla” (died 1981), 32 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-

---

29 See the biographies by S. M. Jain (1929) and Guṇsundar (1938).
30 See his monumental work Jaina Tatva Prakāśa which was composed in 1903. The title of this not openly polemical text alludes to Ātmārāṃ’s Jaina Tatva Ādarsa. See also Grantha Kartā kā Sanksipt Jīvan Vṛttānta by Kalvānmal Corādigā in Amolakṣī 1908/1920: 3.
31 His dates 1849-1932, cited in sources of the Līmbī Nānī Paś, are probably wrong, since he was still a young man in a photo published by Amarvijay 1908: 77f. Manilāl’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 Jñānānanda 1936: 16, n.
32 Saubhāgyacandra “Santabāla” had publicised his views already in 1935 in the journal Jaina Prakāśa, the mouthpiece of the All India Sthānakavāśī Conference, and probably earlier in a book called Viśvasaṃdyā Prabhā Mahāvīr (Ed. Ghīrājīlī Ṭokārī Śāh), which is listed in Manilāl’s bibliography (1934).
dition.33 According to Jñānṣundar, who perceived a unified Sthānakavāṣṭa Śramaṇasangha 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 Sthānakavāṣṭa 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.34

The critique of the “lack of evidence” in the Sthānakavāṣṭa literature on Loṅkā is a modern topos of the Mūrtipūjaka praśnottara literature. It was already articulated by Ātmārāmi (1884/1903) and repeated again by Jñānṣundar (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.35 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.36 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

---

33 For details see Flügel 2000; 2003a.
34 Dayādharmā Caupāśa 11. The word upadeśa can also refer to Loṅkā’s famous conversion of Lakhamś 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.). Jñānṣundar (1936: 136) writes that there is also no evidence in Jethmal’s (1930) work Samakītsāṅ: un mem in bāōm kā īśārā tak bhi nahiṃ kīyā hai. However, on page 14f. of this text a praśnottara of fifty-two questions which are attributed to Loṅkā is published in Hindi, 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 Mālvaniyā (1963b: 80-82; 1964: 381).
36 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 reconstructions and reinterpretations of the past.³⁷ 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 “Sthānakavāsī” 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.³⁸

³⁷ Lokāsāh ke yug se lekar āj tak kisi bhī vidvān sthānakavāsī muni ne athvā grhaṣṭha ne viśuddha itihās ke drṣṭikṣṇ se kuch likhā ho, yah mere dekhne meṃ nahīṃ āyā... praśasti rathā guṇānuvāh hi adhik hai – itihās us meṃ nahīṃ hai (Mālvaniyā 1964: 365). The same is true for histories of Loṅkā by followers of other sectarian traditions.

³⁸ Flügel 2005; forthcoming (b).
ESSENCE OF RIGHT BELIEF

The Loṅkāgaccha tradition still exists today in small pockets in Gujarāt. 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, most of the modern texts on Loṅkā have been produced by Sthānakavāśi, Terāpanthī and Mūrtipūjaka mendicants and lay intellectuals. It appears that the first Sthānakavāśi text which explicitly sought support in Loṅkā’s teachings was Muni Jeṅhamal’s celebrated anti-Mūrtipūjaka polemic Samakītsāra, essence of right belief. The original Gujarāti text was prepared by several unnamed Sthānakavāśi lay followers, sometime after the religious debate (śāstrā) in which Jeṅhamal reportedly used the published arguments, and printed in 1882 in Rājkoṭ by Seth Nemicand Hirācand Koṭhārī from Goṇḍal in Saurāṣṭra. Two further Gujarāti editions were published in the following decades, and one revised Hindi edition of two parts in 1930 (with the translation of the original text forming part one). The way in which this work was created offers insights into the strategies through

39 Flügel, forthcoming (c). The term gaccha can mean school, monastic order or sect.
40 I have found only two histories of Loṅkā in the Loṅkāgaccha upāśrayas, Bagasarāvālā 1894, and P. T. Šāh 2001. Both texts are derivative and do not add anything new on Loṅkā. The second text relies largely on Vārī 1947.
41 Usī carcā kā sārāṃśi, anekōm jijnāṣu sadgrhaṁstha ke āgṛhaṁ se, pustakākār ke rūp mṛṁ dhāl diyā gayā (Pratham Bhāg kī Bhūmikā, in Jeṅhamal 1930: 4).
42 Ātmārām 1903: 289; Vallabhvijay 1909: 14; Bhūmikā in Jeṅhamal 1930: 10.
43 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.
44 V. M. Šāh (1909: 79) mentions a documentation of the counter-arguments of the Mūrtipūjakas, Dhundhakmat Khandan Rāś by Muni Uttamvilaj which was unavailable to me. Johannes Klatt’s Jaina Onomastikon, III, p. 1281, mentions another polemical text of this author: Dhundhiṁ no rāsado (Ahmadābād: Nāran Krṣṇarām, 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.45 First of all, Jeṭhmal was not the author of the published work. At the time, it was generally not considered appropriate for Sthānakavāsi 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 samvegī munis Vīrvijay and Yaśovijay on doctrinal differences which divided their religious traditions.46

The debate took place in Ahmedabad, either in 1808/9 (Śaṁvat 1865)47 or 1821/2 (Śaṁvat 1878).48 It was triggered by a communal dispute. According to Śāh (1909: 78f.), Sthānakavāsi mendicants were proselytising at the time in the town. In response, the locally dominant Mūrtipujaka laity threatened to excommunicate all Sthānakavāsis from their castes (jñātī). In order to help his beleaguered co-religionists in this situation, Ācārya Prāg from the Sthānakavāsi Dariyāpurī Sampradāya travelled from his abode in the village of Visalapura outside Ahmedabad to the Tabīa Pōḷ in the Sāraṅgapura district of the city centre. He stayed in Gulbācand Hīracand’s house

45 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.

46 Jñānsundar 1936: 15 suggests that Jethmal developed his arguments on the basis of a text called Vivāha Cāliyā Sūtra, which was unavailable to me.

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

48 V. M. Śāh 1909: 78f.
and also imparted religious instruction to the families of Girdhar Śāṅkar, Pānācand Jhavercand, Rāycand Jhavercand, Khīmcand Jhavercand, and others, who, in turn, helped him to spread his word. In order to end the ensuing quarrels between Sthānakavāsīs and Mūrtipūjākas, 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 Jeṣṭhmal, apparently a suṣṭisa of Muni Rūpcand of the Bhūḍhar Dharma-dāsa Sampradāya in Rājasthān, was present, together with twenty-seven other munis, and for the Mandirmārgīs Muni Viṃvijāy together with Yaśovijāy and several monks and scholars (śāstrī) came to the court. According to “someone’s” notes (yādī) of the court-proceedings, the judgement of 1878 paus śukla 13 (6.1. 1822) apparently favoured the arguments of Jeṣṭhmal’s side – described as cetanapūjākas, worshippers of living consciousness, in contrast to the mūrtipūjākas, worshippers of images – although in their respective literatures both sides claimed victory.

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

---


50 Reportedly, twenty-five monks from Rājasthān were present, plus two monks from Prāg’s group, and apparently Muni Mul (Mūl?) from the Sāyalā Sampradāya in Gujarāt who is said to have supported Muni Jeṣṭhmal from the Palanpur Sampradāya (Manilāl 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.


52 Only the mūrtipūjāk ono parājay thayo – cetanapūjāk ono jay thayo; and jetho rīkh āvorye, kāgāl vāmc rari; pustak bahu āvorye, gaduṃ ek bhari (in V. M. Sāḥ 1909: 79). Jḥānsundar 1936: 15 simply states Jeṣṭhmal’s defeat (hār).
print in Ātmārām’s (1881/1954, II: 539f.) work *Jainatattvādarśa* which appeared in Bhāvnagar in Saṃvat 1937. After his separation from and excommunication by the St̹hānakvāṣī Ācārya Amarasinhā (1805-1881) of the Pañjāb Lavjiṣṭ Sampradāya and his re-initiation into the Tapāgaccha in Saṃvat 1932 (1875/6) in Ahmedabad, the ex-St̹hānakvāṣī *muni* Ātmārām (Vijayānanda Sūri) contributed much to the Mūrtipūjaka revival in Gujarāt and in the Pañjāb. To revive the “Sanātan Jaina Dharma” by attracting more followers, Ātmārām started a vigorous pro-image-worship campaign, which he had already instigated in his later years as a St̹hānakvāṣī monk, during which he criticised many of the contemporary practices of the St̹hānakvāṣīs. One of the points of contention before he left was that Ācārya Amarasinhā did not answer twenty-one “legitimate” questions which were put to him in Saṃvat 1925 (1868) by certain St̹hānakvāṣī śrūvakas from Dillī. Amarasinhā and his successor Ācārya Sohanlāl (1846-1936) of the Lavjiṣṭ tradition were the dominant St̹hānakvāṣī monks in his native Pañjāb at the time, and the main targets of his critique. After Ātmārām’s excommunication and the publication of his *Jaina-tattvādarśa*, Sohanlāl sent – on request of Amarasinhā – a prāśnotāra of one hundred questions 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. Shortly thereafter, it seems, in Saṃvat 1938 (1882)

53 *yah lok to sarva jainmat se viparīt calanevāle hai* (Ātmārām 1954, II: 540).
54 Ātmārām 1900a: 72.
55 *Vallabhvijay* 1891: 131f. The first question asked for the *paṭṭāvalī* of all ācāryas beginning with Mahāvīra, which apparently did not exist in this St̹hānakvāṣī tradition at the time: 1. *śrī mahāvīr svāmī se lekar āj tak pāṭānupāṭ kaun se ācārya hue unoon ke nām likhne* (p. 131).
56 In *Vallabhvijay* 1891: 72-82.
57 On the *sataka* format see Balbir 2003a; 2003b.
58 Published by *Vallabhvijay* 1891: 83-125.
59 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 mārtipūjā and a long list of questions to the Mandirmārgīs. Immediately after receiving a copy of this book from a Sthānakavāśī layman in Delhi, Ātmārām (1884/1903) composed an equally polemical point-for-point reply under the title Samyaktva Śalyodāra, removal of the thorns from right belief,60 and the work Ajīnāna Timira Bhāskara (1888/1906), radiant darkness of ignorance, in which both the Ārya Samāj and the Ḍūṇḍhiyās are systematically criticised.61 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 “Ḍūṇḍhiyās” was provoked by Jeṭhmāl’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 Sthānakavāśī manifestation),62 and “the path of violence” (ḥimśā mārga) of the Mūrtipūjaka samvegī mendicants, which were addressed as “yellow-clad pseudo-ascetics” (pīṭāmbar bheṣadhārī). As a synonym of dayā mārga, Jeṭhmāl used the term mokṣa mārga, and compared the path of salvation of the Sthānakavāśīs, which he derived directly from

60 Dhūṇḍhiyē hē hīṃśādharmē haim aur dayā kā yathārtha svarūp nahiṃ samajhte hain (Ātmārām 1903: 289). There are many texts in the Jaina bhandāras with titles such as Samakīt Sār Praśnottar Pacchāī Sājhāy (L.D. Institute Ms. No. 4734 etc.) which may contain information on earlier exchanges between exponents of the two traditions.

61 The title alluded to Dayānanda’s book Timir Bhāskar Jvālāprasad (cf. P. L. Jain 1913/1923: 41). The work addressed the view of the two main rivals of Ātmārām in the Paṇḍjab. 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, Īśāī Mat Samīkṣā, was published posthumously in the year 1900. See Kiranyaśāstri 1999, Parisīṣṭ I.

62 Jeṭhmāl 1930: 9f. does not use the word “Sthānakavāśī”, but refers directly to Loṅkā and his “true mendicant path”: loṅkā gaccha-sādhu mārga hī saccā hāī (p. 3)
Loṅkā, with the dual concern of the Mūrtipūjakas (and Digambara-s) with salvation and with material well-being (kuśālyā dasāna). The Mūrtipūjakas are spreading lies, he argued, because they convey to their followers the illusion that salvation can be reached through puṇja, while preventing them from reading the truth in the scriptures.

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) highlighted Jeṭhpāl’s “misspellings” and “misunderstandings” of the scriptures, and furnished descriptions of the lax conduct of contemporary Dāndhaka mendicants. In his view, the Sthānakavāsīs generally did not observe the canonical prescriptions, and thus truly formed a religion of violence: dhāndhiye hiṃsā dharmī haim.

In his critique of Jeṭhpāl’s account, Ātmārām (1903: 7f.) categorically stated that everything that “Jēṭhpāl” wrote about Loṅkā’s beliefs as the source of the Sthānakavāsi doctrines was a “self-imagined fabricated lie”. In accordance with the conventions of the praśnottara genre, he backed his claim with selected citations.
from the canon and from the writings of the Śthānakavāśī tradition itself. Information on the true historical origin (khārī utpattī) of the “Dhūṇḍhak Panth”, he argued, can be found in two other Śthānakavāśī texts which he summarised in a few pages: Hirakalāś-muni’s Kumati Vidhvamsana Caupaī, quatrains on the destruction of stupidity, and the Dhūṇḍhak Paṭṭīvalī of Amolakcand of the Pañjāb Amarasiṅha Sampradāya.

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

stressed diversities” 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).

68 Jeṭṭhalā men jo lumpakmat kī utpatti likhī hai bilkul jhūṭī aur svakapol kalpīt hai (Ātmārām 1903: 11).

69 Ātmārām 1954, II: 537 derives the term Dhūṇḍhīya or Dhūṇḍhaka, polemically from Dhūṇḍha, or ruin. The Śthānakavāśī themselves derive Dhūṇḍhīya from Dhūṇḍhīya or Dhūṇḍhaka, or seeker. See for instance Hastimal 1995: 769.


71 Jhānsundar 1936: 29 used the same method of critique backed with more evidence of this kind in his rejoinder to the later Śthānakavāśī itihāsa literature.

72 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 Devriśi’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 Jina-carīya 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 Nir-grantha 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 Sthānakavāśī orders, Lava and Dharmadāsa, against the followers of the Loṅkāgamca and the Ekal Pātriyāpanth, who indeed seem to have favoured the Jinarātra passage, to which Jetmal had re-

verted without fear of sanction, because the Loṅkāgamca was already in terminal decline, and no competition for the Sthānak-

vāśīs anymore.73 Since there is no independent criterion for judging which of the two versions is more authentic (even historical pre-

cedence would not solve the issue) any choice between them is a matter of personal preference and of sectarian interests. How-

ever, due to his correspondence with European scholars such as Hoernle74 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 influ-

enced the image of the Jaina community projected by the first

73 Flügel 2000: 72f
74 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 mahāsāti “Jainācārya”75 Pārvatī Devī (1854-1939) from the Amarasiṅha Sampradāya and Ātmārām’s disciple and future ācārya Muni Vallabhvijay (1870-1954). Pārvatī Devī was a remarkable Jaina nun76 who on the 28.12. 1872 (1929 mārgaśīrṣa krṣṇa 13) in Delhi changed from the Manoharadāsa Sampradāya of Ācārya Ratnacandra (died 1864)77 to the Pañjāb Lavjiṣṭha tradition of Ācārya Amarsiṅha (1805-1881).78 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.79 Her official biography by P. L. Jain (1913/1923: 30), however, informs us that she joined the Amarsiṅha Sampradāya because its mendicants followed the scriptures more closely. Pārvatī Devī’s pamphlet Jñāna Dīpiṇā (Lāhaur 1889), a critique of the Jainatattvādarṣa,80 and Muni Vallabhvijay’s (1891: 9-71) reply,

75 Book cover Pārvatī 1905b. “Ācārya” is here used as a honorific title.
76 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 Agra, took dīksā from her teachers Muni Kuṃvarṣena and Sādhvī Hirām of Ratnacandra’s Sthānakavāsī Manoharadāsa Sampradāya on the 6.4.1867 (1924 caitra śukla 2). Kuṃvarṣena 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 Ratnacand’s disciple Kuṃvarṣena (p. 5).
77 Vallabhvijay 1902: 46.
78 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 menṣ ākār bahut Jaina dharma ki nindā karāvēga.
79 Her texts are published in the prasīntottara format, and are probably based on protocols of oral conversations with her lay followers.
80 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, 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 Loñkā and the thirty-two Āgamas of the Sthānakāvāśīs was questioned by Vallabhvijay (1891: 130f.), who dismissed Pārvati’s book as a “work of sin” which calls for an atonement (prāyaścitta) since, in accordance with the rules of the scriptures, no sādhvi before her had ever written a book nor spoken in the assembly of men. Vallabhvijay was, in turn, repudiated by an anonymous [?] pamphlet called Gappa Dīpikā Samīr kā Gappa and Pañḍit Jiyālāl Jain’s (1893) Carcā Candrodāy Bhāg Tisrā. According to Vallabhvijay’s (1909: 14-18) chronology of the exchanges between 1881-1909, in response to Vallabhvijay, Ācārya Sohanlāl wrote Draupadi Jhanḍan (Āṃṛtsar), Muni Šrīrāj Satyārtha Sāgara (Pune), and an unnamed author Saṃvegīmat Sāguphā following which is not listed in the bibliography. Further books of Pārvati, which were inaccessible to me, are Jaina Dharma ke Dās Niyan (1889), Go Rakṣā kā Upadeś (1900), Kavyavān Nīśedh (1915), Muktī Nirṇay Prakāś (1916), Śrīmad Bhagavān Nemināth Rājīmati Jīvan Caritra (1918), Brahmacarya Vidhi (1919), and Vairāgya Prakāś (1930). Further criticisms of Ātmārām, whom she met personally for the first time in 1863 in Āgrā, 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 Jainatattvādarśa, and in particular the “misrepresentation” of the Sthānakāvāśī tradition in the last section of this book.

81 The title of Vallabhvijay’s Dhundhak-hita-śikṣā Apanām Gappa-dīpikā-samīr (1891) alludes also to V. M. Śāh’s Hita-śikṣā. Vallabhvijay quotes extensively from Ātmārām. His authorship of the work, as well as the attribution of the authorship of “Vijayrajendra Sūri’s” Caturtha Stuti Kayuktī Nirṇay Chedan Kuthā to Vallabhvijay’s disciple Dhanvijay, has been disputed by J. Jain (1893: 6f.), in response to the polemical attribution of Pārvati’s book to an anonymous Brāhmaṇ.

82 Vallabhvijay 1909: 1f.

83 With details supplemented from other sources.

(Ambalā); which was countered by an unnamed author’s text Jahālat Dhunḍhiyā (Ambalā). Three further Sthānakavāśī pamphlets, Kāgahans Nirnāy (Ambalā), Manta ki Bahsa Pujerām of Kanfiyālāl (Paṭayālā), and Samyaktva athava Dharma no Darvājo by V. M. Sāh (Ahmedabad), were countered by Muni Amarvijay’s Dharma nā Darvājā Jovā ni Dišā, which in turn was criticised by a text published in Ahmedabad, Kamalprabhā. The response to Mahāsaṭī Pārvatī’s Satyārtha-Candrodaya-Jain (Lāhaur: Lālā Mehracand, 1904) on the “stupid” worship of “lifeless objects” (jar pūjā) and on the nikṣepas was Muni Amarvijay’s (1908) Dhumḍhak-Hrday-Netrānjanaṁ athavā Satyārtha-Candrodaya-āṣṭakaṁ; and in response to the Sthānakavāśī pamphlet Isatāhār-Amarāvati, an unnamed Mūrtipījaka author wrote Dhumḍhakpol Amarāvati, which was countered by the texts Khulāsāpol Samvegīyām (Amṛtsar), Muni Ratnacand’s Samvegīmat Mordan (Amṛtsar), and Śāstrārtha Nābhā (Ambalā). The last Mūrtipījaka text on Vallabhvijay’s list is Dhumḍhakmat Parājāy (Ātmānand Jain Sabhā Paṇjab 1909) which gives information on the judgement of Mahārājā Hirāsinhā Bahādur of Paṭayālā in favour of Vallabhvijay in a debate with Sohanlāl on the scriptural foundations of their respective views in

85 Like most topics of the sectarian debate, the issue was already addressed by Loṅkā, and discussed for instance in Samayasundara’s Sāmācāri Sātaka 40 (Balbir 2003a: 260). However, like Ātmārām (Vijayānandsūri), Pārvatī (1905b) was also engaged in an ideological battle against the “Āryāṣ”, i.e. the Ārya Samāj.

86 See Jethmal’s (1930) critique of the interpretation of the nikṣepa doctrine by the hinsādharma, i.e. the image-worshippers. The Mūrtipījaka tradition treats the four principal analytical standpoints, or nikṣepa (nāma, dravya, sthāpana, bhāva), as equivalent, whereas the Sthānakavāśī or dāyādharma tradition gives priority to the bhāva nikṣepa: anuyogadvāra sātra men 4 nikṣepa kahe hāṁ yah to satya hai par cārōn hi nikṣepa vandanik nāhīṁ kahe. ek bhāv nikṣepa vandanik kahā hai (Jethmal 1930: 54). The principal reply was formulated by Muni Ātmārām (1884/1908), who in turn was criticised by Mahāsaṭī Pārvatī (1905a) in her work Satyārtha Candrodaya Jaina, which was rejected in Muni Amarvijay’s Dhumḍhak Hrday Netrānjanaṁ athavā Satyārtha Candrodaya-āṣṭakaṁ (1908). An early Digambara critique of this view can be found in the Suryaprabhā 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. It was followed by seven Sthānakavāsī responses, some of which are reprinted and criticised in the collection edited by Muni Amarvijay (1908): Pitāmbarī Parājaya (Amṛtsar), Muni Rāma-candra’s Amṛtsar Saṃgraha (Mumbai), the stavan of Muni Mādhav Taranगितīya Taran (Āgra 1908), Muni Saubhāgmal’s Vividh Ratna Prakāś (Pune), Muni Kundanmal’s Pragaṇ Jainā Pitāmbarī Mūrtipujaṇakoṃ kā Mithyātva (1908), and his Ātmārām Saṃvegī kī Karītīt, Ātmārām kī Ādāt kā Namūnā (n.d.), and finally V. M. Šāh’s (1909) Sādhumārgī Jainā Dharmānuṣayīoe Jāṃvā Jog Keṭālik Atīthāsik Nōṃdh, a key text for the modern Sthānakavāsī unification movement, which attracted much critical response from the Mūrtipujaṇakas, not least from Vallabhvijay (1909), Ujamcand (1909), and Jāṃnsundar (1936: 247ff.), because it again referred to Loṅkā as the common forefather of all Sthānakavāsīs and thereby started a new round of debates.

HISTORICAL NOTES

V. M. Šāh (1878-1931) was the first layperson to make an important intellectual contribution to the study of Loṅkā’s legacy for the Sthānakavāsīs, 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. He was also a prime mover

---

87 Note that many pamphlets of the Mūrtipujaṇaka monks have been published under Ātmārām’s name even after his death. See footnote 81.
88 Kundanmal belonged to the Raghunātha Sampradāya.
89 He described it as a “work of deceit”. See V. M. Šāh’s reply (1925: 3f.).
90 Muni [Ācārya] Amolakiṣṭ’s Sāstrodhaṃ Mīmāṃṣā (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 Mūrtipujaṇakas and Digambaras. I only recently gained access to this book.
91 The Mūrtipujaṇaka layman Lālā Jayadayāl’s Dhiṅḍhak Mat Samīkṣā (n.d.) must have been published in the Paṇḍjab sometime before 1908.
92 Šāh 1909: 5 singles out the paṭṭāvalīs of the Dariyāpurī Sampradāya, the Paṇḍjab (Lavīrsī) Sampradāya and of the Mūrtipujaṇaka “Vijaya” and “Sāgara”
behind the creation of the *All India Sthānakavāṣī Jaina Conference* (AISJC) of the Sthānakavāṣī laity in February 1906 in Morvī, and publicised in his 1909 book for the first time the idea of creating a unified order of all Sthānakavāṣī mendicants. Although Loṅkā was a layman, it was he alone who could serve as a common ancestor, because the Sthānakavāṣī 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 Sthānakavāṣī 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 Sthānakavāṣī laity as well and obstructed aim of the AISJC leadership to assert the political influence of Sthānakavāṣī 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 Sthānakavāṣī mendicant traditions, which was finally held in 1933 in Ajmer.

Before the assembly congregated, a fourth edition of the *Sama-kitsār*, which was also the first Hindī edition, was published in 1930 under the auspices of *the Akhil Bhāratīya Sthānakavāṣī 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 Sthānakavāṣī monks at the time who was the first to publish a printed edition and

Śākhā (which treated the Śādhumārgī and Loṅkāgacchā as “*sammūrcchima*”) for their untrustworthiness, but exempts the Cha Koṭī Saṅgha (Limbṛi Nānī Pakṣa) *pattāvalī*.

93 On the significance of V. M. Śāh and the text *Aitihāsik Nomdh* see Flügel 2000; 2003a.
Hindi translation of the Śthānakavāśī Āgamas – as the leader of the Mālavā Ṛṣi Sampradāya. 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 Śthānakavāśī mendicants in opposition to the Mūrtipūjakas in particular. In this context, the author of the Samakī Śālyoddhāra became again a useful target. One of the three anonymous introductions to the Samakītsār94 accused the “stubborn mischief maker” Ātmārām in an ad hominem attack for not understanding the substance of samakīta (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 [Viyā- ha-]Pannati [and] who is studying the Diṭṭhivāya, makes a mistake in speaking, he should not mock him. (DVS 8.49).95

In other words, Ātmārām was chided for not seriously criticising the principles of the Śthānakavāśīs, 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 Sāḍārī as a fitting venue for the 1952 mahāsammelan, at which the Śramaṇaśaṅgha was formally founded, still stocks dozens of copies of this edition of the Samakītsār,96 which demonstrates the key role the text played during the constituent phase of the Śramaṇaśaṅgha, both as a symbol of the doctrinal unity of the Śthānakavāśīs and as a common reference source for arguments against the Mūrtipūjakas.

94 Written either by Devṛṣī or, more likely, by one of the editors of the book in Jethmal 1930: 11-19.
96 The Hindi edition of the Śrīlājī Mahārāj kā Sācīra Jīvancaritra which was composed by Durlabh T. Jhauhari (1922/23), one of the principal leaders of the Śthānakavāśī 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 Prabhū Vīr Paṭṭāvalī by Muni Manilāl (1934) of the Limbāṭī Nānī Pakṣa.97 The text contains a long chapter on the “great reformer” Loṅkā Śāh,98 in which Manilāl – 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. Manilāl unearthed much new material,99 particularly on the Gujarāṭī traditions, and produced the first comprehensive work on the aniconic traditions, as far as his (not clearly referenced) sources permitted.100 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 Sthānakā-

---

97 Reprinted photos of Manilāl and Pārvati Devī are mocked as “suitable evidence” for the “aniconic” credentials of the Sthānakavāsīs in Amarvijay 1908: 77f.
98 Manilāl 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.
99 For instance, the Tapāgaccha muni Kāntivijay’s Ath Loṅkāśāh numa Jīvan, which he published in its entirety at the beginning of the chapter on Loṅkā (Manilāl 1934: 161f.). For a critique of this text and its influence on Manilāl see Jhānsundar 1936: 9ff.
100 Deśā 1926-44, III: 2204 mentions that Manilāl edited the paṭṭāvalīs on which the published work is based in Saṃvat 1941. Seth 1962: 342 quotes an additional book of Manilāl, Prabhuvi Paṭṭāvalī nam Loṅkāśāh numa Jīvan-caritra. I was unable to trace these works; nor Jīvanlāl Kālidās Vorā’s (ed.) Jaindharmā Darpan of Saṃvat 1942 which, according to Deśā, also contains paṭṭāvalīs of the aniconic traditions.
vāśī traditions in North India.\textsuperscript{101} Jñānsundar (1936: 16), whose own publication \textit{Śrīmad Laṅkāśāh} responded critically to the renewed Śtānakavāśi 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 Śtānakavāśi 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 \textit{Dharmaprāṇ-Loṅkāśāh} (\textit{Krānti no Yugasṛṣṭā}), by the social reformer Muni Saubhāgyacandra “Santabāla” (1939) of the Līmbī Moṭī Paḵa. It was apparently written already in the 1920s and first published in the journal \textit{Śtānakavāśi Jain}, founded in Ahmedabad Paṅcabhāṅī Poḷ in 1932,\textsuperscript{102} and between 10.11.1935–13.1.1936 re-published in Gujarāṭī in the form of a series of articles in the journal \textit{Jaina Prakāśa}, the mouthpiece of the AISJC. The text contains few references, although Desāi’s work is mentioned. In the same year (1935), the Śtānakavāśi celebrated “Loṅkāśāh’s birthday”\textsuperscript{103} with a national poetry festival in the Rājasthān town Sojat Road. The festival was organised by “Marudhār Keśarī” Mantrī Muni Miśrimal (1891-1984) of the Raghunātha Sampradāya, a fervent advocate of reform (\textit{kṣetra viśuddhi}) and of the unification of all Śtānakavāśi traditions (Editors, in Miśrimal 1936: 1), whose speech at the regional sammelan of the Śtānakavāśi sādhus [sic!] on the 10.3.1932 in the town of Pālī, on the necessity to strengthen the influence of the Śtānakavāśis “in the world”, is now celebrated as one of the pivotal moments of the unification movement.\textsuperscript{104} 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, Miśrimal therefore

\textsuperscript{101} My earlier statement that Manilīl’s work was declared as the official history of the AISJC has to be corrected. See Flügel 2000: 41. The Līmbī Nānī Paḵa, to which Manilīl belonged, never joined the Śramaṇasāṅgha.

\textsuperscript{102} I have not been able to trace early editions of this journal.

\textsuperscript{103} The historical date is disputed, but the Śtānakavāśis declared \textit{kārtik śukla} 15 to be Loṅkā’s birthday.

\textsuperscript{104} Miśrimal, in Surānā 1976: 217f.
published in Hindi a book entitled *Dharmavīr Loṅkāśāh*. This work relies mostly on V. M. Śāh, Maṅilāl, and Saubhāgyacandra, but also uses two newly discovered sources: a “Prācin Paṭṭāvalī” which he found in the Jaintāraṇ Bhaṇḍār, and a “few leafs” from the Loṅkāgaccha Upāśray in Kuradāyā. It was followed in 1941 by a versified biography called *Krāntikārī Viṇ Loṅkāśāh* in 1941, and in 1946 by a short collection of *dohās* and *ghāls*, biographical poems, called *Viṇ Loṅkāśāh*. Saubhāgyacandra’s and Miśrīmal’s works spread the new Sthānakavāśī “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 Sthānakavāśī historiography, but even by the Sthānakavāśī muni Susīlkumār (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. It is one of four works which were published by Ratanlāl Doṣī of Sailānā (M.P.) in the 1930s and 1940s to defend key Sthānakavāśī doctrines and practices, such as the rejection of mūrtipūjā and the permanent use of the mukhavastrikā (which Loṅkā reportedly never wore). Doṣī was a leading lay intellectual of the orthodox Jñānagaccha and a personal devotee of its acārya Samarthamal (1898-1972), who was opposed to the unification of all Sthānakavāśī traditions. In the work *Loṅkāśāh Mat-Samarthan* he compiled textual evidence from the Śvetāmbara canon in support of the propo-

---

105 This may be the same text that was published in the collection of Hastīmal 1968.
106 Miśrīmal 1936: 64.
107 The published text has a complex history of translation from Hindi to Gujarāṭī (first edition) and back again.
sition that image worship is uncanonical, which he associated with
the name of Loṅkā in a general way. Kesarīcand Bhanḍārī’s (1938: 92)
widely circulated Sthānakaśāsī Jaina Itihās – one of the first
books with the 20th-century self-description “Sthānakaśāsī” in the
title – also refers to “Dośī’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 under-
mine the “unity” of the Jaina dharma were repeated several dec-
ades later in the works of the Mūrtipūjaka layman Nagīndās Gir-
dharlāl Śēṭh, Mūl Jaina Dharma ane Hāl nā Sampradāyo (1962),
Sthānakaśāsī Jaino num Dharma Kartavya (1963), and Loṅkaśāh
ane Dharmacarcā (1964). Whereas Dośī worked on the premise
that the Sthānakaśāsīs continue Loṅkā’s doctrinal tradition, Śēṭh
(1962: 342) reiterated Jñānsundar’s (1936: 171ff.) verdict that the
followers of the Loṅkāgaccha and the Sthānakaśāsīs are historical
enemies. To this purpose, he cites the depiction of Loṅkā in early
Mūrtipūjaka and Loṅkāgaccha sources, published by Jñānsundar
(1936: 234-240) and Deśāi (1926-44, II-III: 1931-1944), which had
been entirely ignored by the Sthānakaśāsī commentary literature
until the 1960s.

SIXTY-NINE STATEMENTS
Before the publication of two old manuscripts of the Loṅkāgaccha

108 In isolated form, the word “sthānakaśāsī” 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 sthānakaśāsī to prove that the
principal Sthānakaśāsīs are the mokṣa-seeking bhāva sthānakaśāsīs not the
dravya sthānakaśāsīs (sthānaka bhāvasamyoṣadīrūpe samyakcārītare vasati
tacchāla iti sthānakaśāsī), 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 polem-
cical Mūrtipūjaka text of the late 18th century.

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 Dayādharma Caupā Śīta, composed by the Loṅkāgaccha “yati” (monk or lay-ascetic) Bhāṇucandra in Śaṃvat 1587 (1521/2), and the Loṅkāšāha Siloka, written in Śaṃvat 1600 (1543/4) by the Loṅkāgaccha yati Keśavarṣi. 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-nirākaraṇaka Batrīśī of Muni Bīkā was written in Śaṃvat 1527 (1470/1), the Luṅkāmata Pratibodha Kulak was written by an anonymous author in Śaṃvat 1530 (1473/4), and the Siddhānta Caupāī of Muni Lāvaõyasamay in Śaṃvat 1543 (1486/7), and the short Siddhānta Sāroddhāra [Caupāī] of Upādyāya Kamalasaṃyam of the Kharataragaccha in Śaṃvat 1544 (1487/8). A text that has often been cited by Sthānakavāsiś is the Ath Loṅkāśāha nu Jīvan (ALJ), composed in Pātañ in Śaṃvat 1636 (1579/60) by the Tāpāgaccha muni Kāntivijay. Apart from a short passage in

110 Published by Jñāsundar (1936: 234-237) who located the Ms. in the Lābhāsundarājī Jhāna Bhaṇḍāra.


114 A manuscript of the Jānînghār in Pātañ was published by Desāī in Jaina Yuga 1.2 (Vaiśākh-Jeṭh 1986): 339-349 (reprint in Koṭhārī 2001: 499-500) and reprinted by Jñānsundar 1936: 228f.

115 Published in Manīlā 1934: 161f.; Hastimal 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 Acārya Hastimal 1995: 751.
Ācārya Ratnanandi’s Bhadrabāhu Caritra vv. 155-163 of Saṃvat 1625 (1568/9), the only presently known Digambara critiques of Loṅkā are the Loṅkāmata Nirākaraṇa Caupā of Sumatīkīrtī-sūri which was written almost a century after Loṅkā’s death, in Saṃvat 1627 (1570/1), and the Sata Prābhṛta Mokṣa Prābhṛta Tikā (pp. 305f.) of Bhaṭṭāraka Śrutasāgara. 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 Parāś of 1572 (Saṃvat 1629) and his Tapāgaccha Paṭṭavāli Śūtram of 1589/1590 (Saṃvat 1646).

The first published text which was directly attributed to Loṅkā himself was the Loṅkejī kī Ḫuṇḍī (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 Jaitārāṇ, 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. Caudhāri (1936?: 338-430) in a book called Jin Jñān Ramā-kar, 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, doḥā and soraṛḥā meters which were composed in 1926 in Jaypur by Gūḷābcand (Lūṇiyā?), a devotee of the Terāpanth ācārya Kāḷūgaṛī (1877-1936), who may have discovered the original

---

117 Ms. Bīkāner Bhṛtā Jñānabhāṇḍāra, Dānasāgara Saṃgraha No. 72. Padmānabh S. Jaini is currently publishing a book on the anonymous Digambara text Cauryāmsi Bol which contains extensive criticism of the “Loṅkā” tradition.

118 The text is mentioned in Mahāprajñā 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” Paṭṭudas in the Saṭprabhṛtādisaṃgraha, which according to Schubring 1957: 559, describes the followers of Launka as “Pseudo-Svētāmbaras” (ṣvētāmbarabhāṣa) and as “sinful wrong believers” (paṇīṭha mithyādṛṣṭayoh) because they reject images.

119 Published in Darśanavijaya 1933: 41-119.
manuscript. 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, no written commentary on Loṅkā’s ideas has ever been created by any Terāpanth ācārya. The present Terāpanth ācārya Mahāprajāśa (2000: 6) always cites the *Loṅkejī kī Hūṇḍī* as an authoritative source on Loṅkā’s teachings.

Like the famous *tabos* (tābā) of the Sthānakavāśī ācārya Dharmasīnha (1599-1671) and of other, anonymous, authors – vernacular texts which offer rudimentary word-for-word translations of the Prakrit Jaināgamas without regard to their syntax – “Loṅkā’s *bols*” were, it seems, deliberately disseminated by the lay disciples of Ācārya Kālūgaṇi and his successor Ācārya Tulśī in order to establish an easy access to the “essential teachings” of the Āgamas in a language which everyone could understand. 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. Even

---

120 No further information is available on the original Ms.
121 *Hūṇḍī* jahe Loṅkā taṇṭ, acche purāṇan teha,
țiṇmem āgam sāksi thī, bol unhattar jeha. (1)
sakal sughan sīr sehrā, sīr kālū gaṇi rāy,
tāsu pasāye gulāb kahe, dohā rūp bānāya. (3)
(Gulābcand, in Caudhari 1936?: 338, cf. 428f.).
122 Information from Muni Navratnamala, 12.8.2004, who also stated that according to Terāpanth sources, Loṅkā’s original *Hūṇḍī* (or rather the Ms.?) was written in Saṃvat 1583.
124 A standard critique of Ācārya Bhiksu, even from the Sthānakavāśīs 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 Jānsundar 1936: 97, and Mālvanjīyā 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. An-
other 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
Lonkā, who was accepted as an authoritative reference point within
the Śthānakaśāśā movement.

It remains doubtful whether this text can really be attributed to
Lonkā. 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,125
together with the explanations (bol) of “Lonkā” in a quasi-stenog-
raphic Rājasthānī-Hindi mix (which indicates that these are not
Lonkā’s own words), and of Gulābcand in both Rājasthānī and
Hindi. The citations are so skilfully woven together that the re-
sulting text does not assume the form of a casuistic list of uncon-
nected points, but reads like a coherently constructed argument.126

which prevented them from understanding the Ardhamāgadhī canon itself and
the Sanskrit commentary; though Mālvanjī excluded Lonkā himself from this
verdict, in view of his extensive citations from the canon. Jhānsundar (1936: 63-
5, 109) and most Mūrtipūjakas credit Pārvacandra Sūri of the Pārvacandragaccha for the “translation” of the Āgās into Gujarātī, whereas the Śthānakaśāśā
tradition refers to Dharmasīha as the author of the first tabos. See Flügel 2000:

125 1. Śūy(agaḍa) 1.12.16, 2. Uvav(āya) 2.19, 3. Viy(āhapannatti) 7.2 (294b),
Śūy 1.1.2.4, 9. DVS 7.48, 10. Pannavanā 22, 11. DVS 5.1.92, 12. Āyāra
Uvav 2.20, 18. Āyāra 1.2.6.5, 19. Amogadārāṃ 7 [?], 20. Śūy 1.6.7, 21. Śūy
1.9.1, 22. Śūy 1.1.4.10, 23. Śūy 1.10.3, 24. Utt 4.8, 25. DVS 1.1, 26. Nis(īha)
11.11, 32. Nis 17.224, 33. Nis 8.12, 34. Nis 8.13, 35. Śūy 1.11.20, 36. Utt 20.44,
Śūy 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. Śūy 1.3.4.6-7, 48. Nis 12.1-2, 49. Āyāra 1.4.4.1f., 50. Utt 14.12,
10.15, 56. Utt 21.24, 57. Nis 13.42-45, 58. Nis 12.17, 59. Āyāra 2.3.6, 60. Āyāra
2.1.25, 61. Āyāra 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 (samav-
saraṇa adhikār men, 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. It focuses almost exclusively on the principles of proper monastic conduct, as taught by the kevalins, the condemnation of non-believers, heresies (nīhava), pseudo-monks, on the strict distinction between the standards for the Jaina householder and the mendicant, and on the prescribed atonements for transgressions. 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. Instead, the priority of knowledge over compassion is em-

---

126 In this respect, it contrasts with many maryādā lists. See Mette 1974: 4f.; Flügel 2003a: 17.
127 That is, before the reforms of Ācārya Tulsī (1914-1997) after 1949.
128 Nos. 5-6, 10, 15, 22-25, 55, 62, 64-66, 68.
130 Nos. 2, 8, 16, 41, 45, 50, 63.
133 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.
134 Nos. 6, 7, 36, 46-49, 55. An exception is No. 35: Je ya dānāṃ pasamsanti, vaham icchanti pāñināṃ; je ya nāṃ padisehanti, vitticcheyam 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” (Śūy 1.11.20, Jacobi’s translation). This passage has been associated with the Sthānakavāsī muni Jaymal’s defence against Bhīkaṇḍa’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 prānī jīvām ko badha baṅchaḥpāro kahyo (in Caudhari 1936?: 376). Gulab-cand’s dohā says:

do sāṃsārika dāna rī, kare praśansā koyā;
badhā baṅcha kāya nīṃ, sūyagadāṅge joya (128).
adhyayana igyārahvāṃ ne viśār, bīṃśī gāthā māṃhi;
niṣedhyāṃ vartitām mēṃ, vṛti cheda kahāhi (129)
(Caudhari 1936?: 376f.).
phasisised, and that giving “pure gifts” to a mendicant does not lead to accumulating good karma but to the destruction of karma.\footnote{Nos. 6-7, 8, 55.} 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.\footnote{Nos. 5, 22-25. See \textit{infra}.} 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 Sthānaka-vāsīs to be Loṅkā’s only legitimate successors.\footnote{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 \textit{Śāmīcārī} of the Sthānaka-vāśī Kacch Āṭh Koṭi Nānī Pakṣa (personal communication by Ācārya Rāghav).}

**OUR HISTORY**

The appropriation of Loṅkā by the Sthānaka-vāsīs was explicit and on quite a different scale. It culminated in the period after the creation of the unified Śramaṇasāṅgha under the rule of only one ācārya, which was accomplished after forty-six years of preparation at the mahāsammelan in 1952 at the Loṅkāsāh Jaina Gurukul in Sāḍaṛī. The Gujarāṭī Sthānaka-vāśī sampradāyas refused to join the new organisation, which was dominated by Hindi-speaking

\textit{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 sābda nahim pātha meny, samuccai dān kaheha re (p. 377). In order to explain the meaning, two types of gifts are distinguished: supātra dāna and kupātra dāna, and Viy 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).
mendicants. This may have been one of the reasons why, in the
decade after the constituent assembly of the Śramaṇaśaṅgha, two
official histories of the Sthānakaśī tradition in Hindi were com-
missoned by the Śramaṇaśaṅgha ācārya Ānandrṣi and the AISJC
respectively to put the significance of the new organisation into a
historical perspective. The resulting publications are Muni Suśī-
kumār’s (1959) Jainadharma kā Itihās (Pramukhatah Śrī Śvetām-
bara Sthānakaśī Jainadharma kā Itihās) and Sādhvī Candana-
kumārī’s (1964) Hamārā Itihās: Sthānakaśī Śramaṇ-Sāṃskṛtik
Paramparā kā Paricāyak. Both works built on earlier standard
histories of the Sthānakaśī tradition, but did not make use of the
published old sources on Loṅkā. Suśīlkumār (1959: g) mentions
that his work was initially based on an unpublished manuscript of
Saubhāgyacandra “Santabāla”, 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
Bīkāner, which were made available to him by Agarcand Nāhatā in
1957, two years after he started his work. Candanākumārī’s book
is to a large extent based on Suśīlkumār’s text and offers a crisp
summary of the historical literature of the Sthānakaśī at the time,
but without providing any references. Both texts contain exten-
sive sections on Loṅkā, on the Sthānakaśī-dominated “Loṅkā-
śāha Yuga” and on the “Saṅgha Yuga” which begins, according to
Suśīlkumār (1959: 2), with the foundation of the Śramaṇaśaṅgha in

139 See also Jain & Kumār’s (2003: 109) critique.
140 Suśīlkumār (1959: N) received advice from Ācārya Ānandrṣi, Upādhyāy
Hastīmal, Upādhyāy Amarmuni, Muni Pārbcand, and “Marudhar Keśāri” Mīśrān-
mal, i.e. from the Śramaṇaśaṅgha munīs who had the greatest interest and ex-
pertise in the study of history.
141 She received advice from Ācārya Ānandrṣi, Upādhyāy Hastīmal, Upā-
dhyāy Amarmuni, Pravartak Pannālāl, “Marudhar Keśāri” Mīśrānmal, Muni
Ambālāl, Muni Puṣkar(r)amuni, and Muni Padmacandra (Prakāṣatiya, in Candanā-
kumārī 1964: 9).
1952. 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 Śrāmanasāṅgha) the Sthānakavāsī traditions are the true followers of Loṅkā’s doctrine (siddhānta) – if not his direct lineal successors. 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 posadhāśāla; which, according to early Mūrtipūjaka sources, Loṅkā himself is said to have rejected. 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” Jaina tradition. 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. They begin their respective narratives with Rṣabha, not with Mahāvīra, whose ancestry is generally favoured: In the work of Bhaṅḍārī (1938: 85-87), who ignored the Loṅkāgaccha tradition entirely, though not Loṅkā himself.


143 See the sources published by Jñānsundar 1936.

144 Cf. Dundas 1996: 79.

145 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 Āmāraśā 1884/1908: 8-11; Vallabhvījaya 1891: 67-70; V. M. Sāh 1909: 96ff., 103f.; Jñānsundar 1936: 296-300.
The Unknown Loṅkā

self, it is asserted that “only the Sthānakavāśī sādhus are Mahāvīra’s true disciples”. The opening pages of Bhaṅḍārī’s book suggest that the only reason for including the tīrthāṅkaraś 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 Sthānakavāśī “culture” (saṃskṛti) is invoked – which figures in the title of Canadianākumārī’s book – with an emphasis on common scriptures and doctrinal principles. The Śrāmaṇasaṅgha has also a common code of conduct (sāmacārī); but no common rituals and liturgy, which remain different amongst the constituent sampradāyas. The “Varddhamāna” Śrāmaṇasaṅgha 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 paṭṭāvalīś of the respective sub-tradition of a particular monk or nun, but not of the united Śrāmaṇasaṅgha as a whole.

Accordingly, Suśīlkumār and Candanākumārī present the history of the Sthānakavāśī 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 Raśabha, 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 paṭṭāvalīś and gurvāvalīś on the one hand, and of the cosmologically informed Sthānakavāśī universal

---

147 phakat sthānakavāśī sādhuja mahāvīr nā sācā śīya che (Bhaṅḍārī 1938: 96).
149 Cf. Cort’s definition of gacchas = sampradāyas as “units, defining the boundaries within one can ritually interact” (Cort 1991: 662).
histories à la Jeṭhmal on the other.\textsuperscript{150} As such, the peculiar combinations of history (without source references) and legend reflect the particular problems of legitimation of the Śramaṇaśaṅgha.

An extreme example of a new Śthānakaśī universal history is Ācārya Ghāsilāl’s (1983)\textsuperscript{151} Sanskrit [sic!] poem Śrī Loṅkāśāha Caritam, which associates Loṅkā and the Śthānakaśīs, taken together, directly with Mahāvīrā and Gautama,\textsuperscript{152} 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.\textsuperscript{153} 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 “Śthānakaśī” 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.\textsuperscript{154} 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.\textsuperscript{155}

\textsuperscript{150} 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.

\textsuperscript{151} Ghāsilāl (1884-1973) originally belonged to the Śādhumārga tradition, which left the Śramaṇaśaṅgha in the 1950s. He was apparently made an ācārya by Ācārya Javāharlāl in 1933, but left when Gaṇeṣilāl became leader, and found his own splinter group, which does not exist today. See his disciple Kanhaiyālāl’s Bhūmikā, in Ghāsilāl 1983: 5f.; personal communication of Umeśmuni 13.10.2002.

\textsuperscript{152} Ghāsilāl 1983: 2f.

\textsuperscript{153} Kanhaiyālāl’s Bhūmikā, in Ghāsilāl 1983: 12.

\textsuperscript{154} See Bruhn 1987: 107, 111f., also for the term “canon of research”.

\textsuperscript{155} 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 LOÑKĀ’S SCRIPTURES

Thus far, our cursory review of the development of the pivotal role of Loñkā in the new Sthānakavāsī historiography has shown that received models of “chronological” and “cosmological” history both informed the modern portraits of Loñkā. 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.\(^{156}\)

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

\(^{156}\) 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.

\(^{157}\) 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 Śthinakavāśī) 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 Deśāi’s (1944: 2205-2222) work. Further historical materials on the Loṅkā tradition, such as gurvāvalīs, paṭṭāvalīs, historical poems and lists of bols,158 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.), Dalsukhbhai Mālvanjā (1963a; 1963b; 1964; 1965), and Ācārya Hastimal (1968), who revolutionised the historiography of the aniconic Jaina tradition (see infra). Most of these authors contributed to the Muni Śrī Hajārimal Smṛti Granth, edited by Śobhācandra Bhārill (1965), which contains further important articles on the literature of the Loṅkāgaccha tradition by Muni Kāntisāgar (1965) and Ālamsāh Khān (1965).159 Particularly significant for future research was Ācārya Hastimal’s (1968) compilation Paṭṭāvalī Prabandh Saṅgrah, which made the oldest surviving paṭṭāvalīs of the Loṅkāgaccha traditions and the North Indian Śthinakavāśī traditions available for the first time. This fertile period of historical research, during which almost every Śthinakavāśī tradition investigated its own history in order to construct its own paṭṭāvalī, culminated in Hastimal’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

158 See Nahar 1918: 38, etc. for short inscriptions of the Loṅkāgaccha.
159 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 Sthānakavāśī 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 Jñān-sundar (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. Mālvanīyā (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 (Vārīś’s 1976 modern Gujarāṭī translation, in P. T. Śāh 2001), together with summaries of Hastīmal’s (1968) collection of Loṅkāgaccha paṭṭāvalīs. But Mālvanīyā’s claim has not remained unchallenged, especially by Mūrtipūjakā authors.

The manuscripts can be attributed to Loṅkā in terms of their contents,160 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;161 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 Athāvan Bol, as Mālva-
niyā (1964: 381) has pointed out. Mālvaṅiyā (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 Lūmpaka for Loṅkā, although no final proof has been furnished yet. Seth (1964: 54) disputed Mālvaṅiyā’s argument and attributed both texts to the Śthānakavāśī ācārya Dharmasiṅha. His views were comprehensively rejected by Hastimal (1995: 759-789) because of the “lack of proof”, and with reference to Pārvacandra Sūri’s text Lūṅkāe Pechela 13 Praśna ane Tenā Uttarā, 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. 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.

162 iti ... Loṅkā nā saddahiyā anaī Loṅkā nā kariyā aṭhāvana bola anaī teha-nūrūm vicāra likhaum chai. subhaṃ bhavatu srāmaṇasaṅghaṅhāya, śrī (L.D. Institute Ms. No. 2989). Mālvaṅiyā’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 Kailāśa-sāgaraṣūri Jhān Mandir of the Śrī Mahāvīr Jaina Arādhana Kendra in Kobā, restrict access to texts of the aniconic tradition which criticise Mūrtipūjaka practices.

163 Hastimal (1995: 759ff.) disproved Seth’s (1964: 43) “sectarian” view that Loṅkā had only a few followers with citations from the Tapāgaccha pattāvalī, and that his views were adharmik (Seth 1964: 46) and that he had no knowledge of Ardhamāgadhī (p. 25) with Āgama citations from Loṅkā’s Atthāvan Bol.

164 The founder of the Pārvacandragaccha.

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

166 Jain & Kumār 2003: 115-117. Hastimal 1995: 762 also refers to Pārvacandraṣūri’s Śhāpanā Paṅcāśikā, which was not accessible to me.
LOŃKĀ’S FIFTY-EIGHT PROCLAMATIONS

The first manuscript attributed to “Lońkā”, No. 2989, has been dated by Mālvañiyā (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, Luńkā nā Saddahiyyā ane Luńkā nā Kariyā Athāvana Bolo (L), “Lońkā’s beliefs and fifty-eight assertions created by Lońkā”,167 has Lońkā’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 ni 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 “Lońkā” which contains not just questions to opponents, but also positive doctrinal statements.168 The main text (L) consists largely of selected quotations (uddhāraṇa) 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

167 The original text was published for the first time by Mālvañiyā (1963a), then together with a modern Gujarātī translation by Vārū (1976), and again by Hastīmal (1995: 655-693). A Gujarātī summary of this text has been published by P. T. Śāh (2001), and an 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).

168 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 Sthānakaśāśi 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), 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 ahimsā vrata, which uses the term dayām 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 (Śuyagaḍa 17), by contrasting it to violence, which produces only suffering (Śuyagaḍa 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

---

169 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. 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” (śūtra viruddha). Bol 8 states that liberation can only be accomplished by observing the five mahāvrata, 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; the inauthenticity of the commentary literature; and the problems associated with mūrtipūjā, such as image-making and installation, prasāda, the sthāpanā nikṣepa, and the term caitya (Pkt. ceiya). Other categories could be created, for instance concerning the prominent issues of tīrtha yātṛa, 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 Añcalagaccha (and Kaḷuṅgaccha) that only the laity can perform pratiṣṭhās and other Mūrtipūjaka sects which regard the performance of this ceremony

---

170 Most prāśnottara 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.
171 L 1-9, 17, 20-21, 40-52, 54-55, 58.
173 L 57.
174 L 53 points to the inner journey advocated by Viy 18.10.4 for instance.
as a prerogative of the mendicants. Only one statement (No. 27) explicitly refers to the Digambaras, asking where in the scriptures the issue of the naked representation of tīrthankaras is discussed, which is controversial between Digambaras and Svetambaras.

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. Mālvāiyā (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. He suggested that the various canons of the aniconic traditions were products of the early Loṅkāgaccha and Sthānākavāśī traditions. These are open questions. The commentary literature – which the author of L evidently knew – is expli-

175 Balbir 2003b: 57 refers to “some inscriptions” as evidence for the view that Añcalgaccha mendicants “take help from ācāryas belonging to other groups” for pratiṣṭhā.

176 Mālvāiyā 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 scriptures: ‘niryukti, bhāṣya, cārtā, vṛtti aur tīkāṁ mēṁ jo sūtra viruddha bāteṁ haim, unhen pramāṁ kaise mānā jā sakā hai?’ lekin jīnā siddhānta sūtraṁ ke sāth mēṁ mēl baṁt jāāi hai, unhen pramāṁ mānne mēṁ kā hāṁ hai? He suggests that, judging on the basis of the two Mss., Loṅkā himself must have been of this view (Mālvāiyā 1964: 378).

177 According to Dharmasāgara’s Pravacaṇ aparīkṣā, in Mālvāiyā 1964: 378, some of Loṅkā’s followers accepted twenty-seven scriptures, and others twenty-nine. Earlier Loṅkāgaccha sources, such as Bhānucandra’s Davāḍharma Caupaṭā, already mention the Loṅkāgaccha canon of thirty-two scriptures, though the canon of thirty-two may have originated with the Sthānākavāśī 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 Vavāhāra was added by the Sthānākavāśīs, whereas Jānsundar (1936: 106) argued that it was the “Avaśyaka Sūtra”. Suśīlkumār (1959: 395, 431f.) tells us that the Sthānākavāśī ācārya Jīvarāja (died ca. 1641) created the present canon of thirty-two scriptures. Mālvāiyā (1964: 378f.) also believes that it was created after the emergence of the Sthānākavāśīs, 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 opens the door to laxity. However, the claim that Loṅkā rejected the entire Śvetāmbara commentary literature in the name of a “fundamentalist scriptural literalism”, 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.\textsuperscript{180}

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 āvāṣyaka rituals (śāmāyika, caturvimśatistava etc.), and to support the ascetics with offerings of food, upāśrayas, etc., if they wish to reap the fruit of salvation (moksā nāṃ phal).\textsuperscript{181} He rejected, however, all rituals which are predicated on violence (against flowers and fruits, water, fire, etc.). The claim by his early Mūrtipūjakas opponents, which Jñānsundar (1936: 98ff.) and Śeth (1964) cited in support of their

\textsuperscript{178} For instance, in the Āvassaya Nījuttī or the Brhatkalpabhāṣya.
\textsuperscript{179} Dharmasāgara, in Dundas 1996: 74; 2002: 62. See also Mālvanij’s (1964: 376) critique of the “hard” (dyṛh) dogmatism of the Sthānakavāsīs, who in his view do not tolerate differences of opinion.
\textsuperscript{180} The terms are from Assmann 1987: 13f.
\textsuperscript{181} tathā śrāvakā nāṃ bārā vrata pālayā nāṃ phal śrī uuvavā upāṅga tathā śāmāyika cauvaṣatthao ītyādi āvāṣyaka nāṃ phal ānuyogadvāra madhye, tathā śrāvakā nāṃ ju sādhau cāritīrā vandānīka chaṁ tu sādh unai vāṃdāya nāṃ phal, tathā sādhu nī paryupāṣṭi kidhā nāṃ phal tathā ānā pāṇī didhā nāṃ phal tathā upāśraya didhā nāṃ phal, tathā vastra pātra didhā nāṃ phal ītyādi (L 8).
\textsuperscript{182} See the Asūtranirākaraṇa Bṛtiṣi of Muni Bīkā of 1470/1, the Siddhānta Cauṇā of Muni Lāvanyasamay of 1486/7, and the Siddhānta Sāroddhāra of Upādhyāya Kamalsāmyam of the Kharataragaccha in 1487/8. The Lonkāśāha Sīloko 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, is neither confirmed by the two published manuscripts of “Loṅkā”, nor by his “thirteen questions”. The Dayādharma Caupāśī vv. 15-19 of 1521/2 of the Loṅkāgaccha yati Bhānucandra explicitly mentions the practice of two sāmāyikas (in the morning and evening), one-day poṣadha, pratikramaṇa (not without taking a vow), pratyāhārā, dāna to restrained individuals, bhāva pījā (but not dravya pījā), and the belief in thirty-two Āgamas (v. 19) within his own group. Jāṇuṣandar (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 Bhānaṇa introduced them, because the śrāvaka pratikramaṇa is not part of the Āvāṣya-ka Śūtra (Nyāyuktī) amongst the thirty-two accepted Āgamas, and because it is known that both Loṅkā and Kaḍūa were householders who rejected the sāmāyika (Jāṇuṣandar 1936: 105-107). Yet, the statement that Kaḍūa was “also” against the sāmāyika is obviously fabricated, since several points of Kaḍūa’s Niyamāvalī demand its performance. Without taking note of Jāṇuṣandar’s writings,

---

184 kintu Loṅkāsāh ke 58 bolom evam 13 praśnoṁ ādi meṁ kahūṁ koṁ ek bhī aśā śabda nahin. ... Loṅkāsāh ke virodha meṁ likhane vāle viśvānom ke dvārā kiye gaye ulekhon meṁ sthān-sthān par is prakār ke tathyaṁ kī anekhī āraṣṭiyocar hoī hāi (Hasṭimal 1995: 751, cf. 759-789).
185 sāmāyika tālāṁ be bāra, parva pare posaha pariḥār, pāḍikramaṇaṁ bina vrata na karaṁ, paccakkhāṇaṁ kima āgāra dharaṁ (17).
    tālāi asamyaṁtī naim dāna, bhāva pījā thi rādu jānā, dravya pījā navi kahi jina rāja, dharme nāṁnāṁ hiṁsāī akāja (18).
    sūtra baṁsa sācā sadāhāryā, samatā bhāve sādhā kahyā,
    sīra Loṅkā no sācco dharme, bhrame pāriyā na lahai marma (19)
    (Bhānucandra, in Jāṇuṣandar 1936: 236).
186 This is evidently the first reference to the thirty-two Āgamas in the Jaina literature, which points to a pre-Sthānakhavāṣā origin of this classification.
187 Dundas 1999: 22. Jāṇuṣandar 1936: 327 also cites Kaḍūa’s list, but comments on the relevant point 4 (point 6 in Dundas’ list) that Kaḍūa may have included it in the list to distinguish himself on paper from Loṅkā: sāyad lauṅkā-
Mālvanīyā (1964: 367f.) merely mentions that the difference of opinion between Loṅkā and the Mūrtipūjakas over these issues developed only when in Saṅvat 1544 Loṅkā met Lakhamsī, who became his first associate. But Hastimal (1995: 786-788) points out that nowhere in Loṅkā’s own writings is sāmāyika, poṣadha, prati-kramaṇa, pratyaṅkhyaṇa 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, prati-kramaṇa, poṣadha, etc. in the report on the meeting between Bhānā and Kaļu in Saṅvat 1539 in the Kaļuvāmat Paṭṭāvali (Paṭṭāvali Parāga Samgraha, p. 483), which would have recorded a debate between the two if Bhānā had indeed not practiced these rituals which Kaļu himself observed. 188

Another controversial issue is whether Loṅkāgaccha mendi-cants observed the mahāvrataḥ, or whether they were yatis in the modern sense of half-ascetics from the outset; as apparently the Kaļuagaccha 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.), Jhānsundar (1936: 97ff.), and Mālvanīyā (1964: 367-369), who stressed the difference between Loṅkāgaccha “yatis” and Sthānakavāśi “sādhus”, expressed the opinion (backed by the reports of the Mūrtipūjakas Dharmasāgarā and Kamalsāmyam) that the first leader of the Loṅkāgaccha, Bhānā, was known for not observing the mahāvrataḥ and for not wearing the dress of a sādhu. 189 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 asvīkār kiyā thā, iṣṭi lie kaļuśāh ko yah niyam banānā karā ho (p. 327, n. 4).

188 Hastimal 1995: 750 also points to the absence of any polemic along these lines in critique of Loṅkā in the Digambara muni Ratnāndi’s Bhadrabāhu Caritra 158-163 of Saṅvat 1625.

189 A different picture is painted in the much younger Vinaycandrajī-krīt Paṭṭāvalī, published by Hastimal (1968: 141).
nakavāśī 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), even now and in future by everyone, as stated in the Sūyagaṛda:

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”) focus was the doctrine of dayā dharma, or the law of compassion. 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 Sthānaka-vāśī 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

---

190 jīvadayāṁ karī mokṣa puhatā (L 58).
191 L 46. See Mālvanijā’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: dharma ki jo sādhana 13ven guṇasthāna se 14ven guṇasthāna men jāne ke lie hoti hai, vahi sādhāṇā prahām guṇasthāna vāle ke lie bhi āvāyak hai – is prakār kā āghra karne se sāmānyā vyakti ko dharma ke mārga par kaise lāyā jā sakā hai? sādhāṇā ke mārga par is prakār ekānta āghra se kām nahiṁ calā. kyōnki sabhi sādhanām kī yogyatā samān nahiṁ ho sakā. This critique echoes the standard criticisms of the views of the Terāpanth ācārya Bhikṣu. The additional criticism, directed at the Sthānaka-vāśīs, that their emphasis on dayā unduly neglects the importance of knowledge is, partly, polemical: sthānaka-vāśī paramparā jānāṁ-sūnya baṁ gaṁ (Mālvanijā 1964: 376).
192 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 punya and pāpa, from the niścaya point of view, is not discussed in the text. Notably, the text does not reject religious property per se, but declares the gift of upāśrayas (= sthānakaś) to the mendicants (sādhu) as a religious act.

LOṆKĀ’S THIRTY-FOUR PROCLAMATIONS

The second manuscript, No. 4121, contains only one text, Luṅkā nī Hunḍī 34 Bol (=LH), Loṅkā’s list of thirty-four assertions, 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 Cūṇī, which cannot be found in the Niśīha, No. 26 does the same for the Uttarādhyayana Vṛtti, No. 27 for the Vyavahāra Vṛtti, Nos. 28-33 for the Āvaśyaka Nīryukti, and the last section for the Prajñāpana Vṛtti. The underlying ordering principle of the diverse list of topics is the reference to the five mahāvrataṣ. 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); 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

193 Cf. Mālvanīyā 1964: 373f., and Jain and Kumār’s (2003: 140) summary of the text, which would also support this interpretation.

194 Mālvanīyā 1964: 382 cites the text as Luṅkā nī Hunḍī 33 Bol. It was however published with an explanation in Hindī under the title Caṃtīti 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 Mālvanīyā 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.

195 See U. P. Shah 1955b for an inscription documenting historical cases.
post-canonical monastic law, and on the use of \textit{prāyaścittas} for normalising transgressions (No. 23), image-worship is not mentioned at all, and neither are issues of contemporary practice. Interestingly, both the \textit{Vavahāra} and the \textit{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 Sthānakavāśī traditions.\footnote{196 See Flügel 2000: 18.}

\textbf{LOṅKĀ’S FIFTY-FOUR QUESTIONS TO THE IMAGE-WORSHIPPERS}

The fifty-four rhetorical questions \textit{Whose tradition is that? (Te Keha nī Paramparā Chaī?)},\footnote{197 The text was first published by Mālwāõiyā (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.} which are appended to the \textit{Āthāvan Bol} in the L.D. Institute Ms. 2989, effectively ask (like some of the \textit{Āthāvan 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 \textit{“root”} scriptures.\footnote{198 See Samayasundara’s question “What are the textual references for such and such a rite, usage, etc.?“ in his \textit{Sāmācārī Sātaka} cited by Balbir 2003a: 267.} 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 \textit{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 \textit{Samakītasāra}.\footnote{199 Fourth edition with Hindī translation by Muni Devṛsi (1872-1929), who became the \textit{ācārya} of the Sthānakavāśī Mālvā Ṛṣi Sampradāya after Amolakṛṣṭi’s death, and was the predecessor of Ānandṛśi (1901-1963), the second \textit{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. The original text (K) can be translated as follows:

The tradition is written. Someone says, Śrī Viśva’s tradition says this. Where is that?

1. To cause images to be made and to be installed (maññāvai) in the house, whose tradition is that?
2. To buy male and female disciples (celā-celi), whose tradition is that?
3. To give initiation to small children, whose tradition is that?
4. To cause the ear to be extended (vadhāraī), whose tradition is that?
5. To venerate (viharāri) the forgiving guru (in the presence of symbols), whose tradition is that?

the Śrāmanasaṅgha in which the Mālavī Rṣi Sampradāya was incorporated in 1952. See Flügel 2000: 70, n. 62.

200 Jeñhmal 1930: 14 has as question No. 6: ghorō, rath, bail, dolī men baithte ho. – To sit on a horse, chariot, bullock (-cart) or litter carried by porters; No. 8: ghar jākar kalpa sūtra parśte ho. – To read the Kalpa Sūtra after going to a house; No. 12: rassī dore dete ho. – To give strings of rope (as blessings); No. 13: mantra, yantra, jhār phāk karte ho. – To perform mantra, yantra, exorcism; 14. pustak, pātare bēcte ho. – To sell leafs of a book (to sell knowledge); 15. māl urāte ho. – To indulge in property; 25. tip likhā rupaye lete ho. – To take money for writing documents; 29. tapasyā karakar paise lete ho. – To accept money after performing a fast; 45. mor pīch ke dāndāsan rakhte ho. – To keep a peacock feather staff (Digambara style); 46. sitr kā saṅghatā karte ho. – To keep the company of women; 49. kapre dhulāte ho. – To cause clothes to be washed. These are standard complaints against “domesticated” Jain mendicants.


202 Jain and Kumār (2003: 118) have ghar men pratimā banavāne yā citrit karavāne. This sentence appears in Jeñhmal 1930: 14 as No. 24: māññāvai karāte ho.

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

204 On bāλ dīkṣā see Balbir 2001.

205 Or “split”. On ascetics piercing their ears see Wujastyk 1984.
6. To amuse oneself (viharai) • 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?
8. To ask (someone) to take a bath, whose tradition is that?
9. To make use (prajunja) of the secret of astrology, whose tradition is that?
10. To tell the future, whose tradition is that?
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 saïg¹jā, whose tradition is that?

---

206 The word kham̄samāsamāna refers to the vandanā ritual to the kṣamāśrama-na, which begins with the words icchāmi khamā-samāno vandion – I desire to venerate you forgiving monk, which Mūrtipujaka 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: “kham̄sañā guru ko diyā jātā hain, dev ko nahīn”. The issue is also addressed in Samayasundara’s Sāmacārī Śataka 1 etc. (Balbir 2003a: 261).

207 Also: to spend time.

208 A common mistake, known in the scriptures as nitya-pīṇḍa or nittyā-pīṇḍa.

209 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 Cūṇi 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 pūjā and purity in asceticism”.

210 In Rājasthāni (R.) kalavañā, 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 kalavañā karke dete hain.

211 There are two uses of the term: (1) The prime recipients of the saṅghāpijā, which Williams 1983: 166 described as a “later development”, are the mendicants, who during an annual ceremony (at the end of paryuṣana) receive at once “blankets, cloth, needles, thread, staves, almsbowls, rajoharaṇas, and other objects useful to an ascetic”. Jethmal 1930: 14 (question No. 18) uses the expression “to extract” (nikalnā) the saṅghāpijā. (2) The “worship of the congrega-
15. To perform installation ceremonies (of idols), whose tradition is that? \(^{212}\)
16. To give books during paryusana, whose tradition is that? \(^{213}\)
17. And to sell pilgrimages, whose tradition is that? \(^{214}\)
18. And to give a certain amount, whose tradition is that? \(^{215}\)
19. And to bind garlands made of vegetation to arched gateways, whose tradition is that?
20. To keep specially prepared food (ādhākarma) for the ascetics in the posadhasālā, \(^{216}\) whose tradition is that? \(^{217}\)

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). Sanghapūjā 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. Seeth).

\(^{212}\) This question reflects L 26. The A(ñ)calagaccha did/does not allow this for its own mendicants. See Balbir 2003b: 57.
\(^{213}\) Jeethmal 1930: 14 understands this as: paryusān men pothī de rātra jāgara karāte. – To cause night watches to be done to books given out during paryusāṇ. 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 paryusāṇa. 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.

\(^{214}\) For allocating the honour of leading specific rituals, auctions (boī) 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 paripūṭi is addressed. Williams 1983: 234 indirectly confirms Loṅkā’s suspicion. He writes: “The tīrtha-yātrā seems to be a later development”.

\(^{215}\) 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: mātra (prasravaṇa) dene, prasravaṇa meaning flow, outflow.

\(^{216}\) posālā; see R. posāla, S. pāthāsālā. The posadhasālā is a special room that is used for the collective performance of a one-day fast, or posadha, 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 posadhasālā from home (Yaśovijay, in Williams 1983: 145). Since posadha does not involve performing an almsround, only specially prepared food can be eaten. Therefore, Loṅkā must have disagreed with eating food at all during posadha, apparently in agreement
21. To create the impression of the importance of the scriptures but not reading them, whose tradition is that?  
22. To cause decorative pavilions (for images) to be constructed, whose tradition is that?  
23. To cause the fast in the name of “Gautama” to be performed, whose tradition is that?  
24. To cause the “Sāṃsāratāraṇa” vow to be taken, whose tradition is that?  
25. To cause the “Candanābālā” fast to be performed, whose tradition is that?  
26. To cause the “ladder of gold and silver” to be created, whose tradition is that?  

with the Añcalagaccha and the Kāçāṅgaccha, but in contrast with the Tapāgaccha and Kharataragaccha (Samayasundara) at the time (cf. Balbir 2003b: 60).  

217 Ādhākarma is discussed in L. 21 as well.  
218 Ālokapānā advocated open access to the scriptures.  
219 The word māṇḍavī (H. manḍapa) can also signify a temple, or the entrance hall of a temple.  
220 Literally, the sound or echo (paragho, G. padaghi). Jethmal 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. Vārā 1976: 129 explains the question as: gautam padagha num tap karāve che. Jain and Kumār (2003: 119) read the word paragho as pratipadā (parvā) – the first day of the lunar fortnight. Though Jethmal 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 Dīpāvallī (cf. Cort 2001: 168-70).  
221 Sāṃsāra-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 Jinendravijaygani’s Taparatna Mahodadhi (Lākhāvālā-Sāntipuri: Harṣapuspāmāra Jaina Granthamāla 101, 1982) which is based on the Kharataragaccha ācārya Vardhamāna’s 15th-century Ācāradinakara. Jethmal 1930: 14 speaks of the Sāṃsārā-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 tapasvin/ni (to eat only one unsalted cereal). Both the privilege of the first feeding of the tapasvin/ni on day four, and of the first feeding at the time of the breaking of the fast on day five are auctioned (Kelting 2001: 46). For the story of Candanā see Sāntī 1997: 122-128.

222 This fast takes four days: three one-day fasts (upavāsa), followed by one day eating only one meal (ekāsana) with or without practising āyambilā (to eat only one unsalted cereal). Both the privilege of the first feeding of the tapasvin/ni on day four, and of the first feeding at the time of the breaking of the fast on day five are auctioned (Kelting 2001: 46). For the story of Candanā see Sāntī 1997: 122-128.
27. To cause the “Lākhā Paḍāvī” to be performed, whose tradition is that?224
28. To cause gifts to be given (dhourāvai) to celebrate the end of a fast (ūnjamanā), whose tradition is that?225
29. To cause the pājā to be recited,226 whose tradition is that?
30. To cause the “Āsoka-tree” (āso vrksa) to be supported (bharavāi),227 whose tradition is that?228
31. To cause the eightfold bath (aṭṭhattarī snātra) to be performed, whose tradition is that?229

223 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. Śeth).
224 John Cort suggested to me, this may refer to the lakṣa pratipada fast (G. lākhī paḍavo), which is listed in modern Gujaṛātī Jaina compilations of fasts.
225 G. unjamanum, R. njamanam, njavanam, a celebration at the end of a fast, involving donations of money to the fasting person(s). Jain and Kumār (2003: 119) translate ūnjamanā as “udyāpana”, which signifies the concluding ceremony or the dedication of a temple on completion. The meaning of the word dhourāvai (?) S. dhauk, P. dhoyna, to offer, to give gifts) is not entirely clear. It may generally refer to celebrations. Jeṭhmal 1930: 15 has “dhourāna”.
226 Or to be sung (pādhāi).
227 The Hindī verb bharvāy or bharvāna, to have something filled, makes less sense here than the Rājasthāṇī verb bharvāi, to carry, nurture, maintain, or pay for.
228 Mahāvīra renounced the world under an Āsoka-tree; which is also one of the twelve symbols of the arīhantas. 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: 23, 7f., 24, Plate XIIb). The asoka vrksa is also listed as a fast in Jinendravijayani’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. Kanubhā Śeth (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.
229 This question refers back to L 35, which questions the canonical basis of the “upper eight” (Skt. aṣṭottarī, Pkt. aṭṭhottarī) 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?\textsuperscript{230}

33. To put sandalwood powder\textsuperscript{231} on the head of laymen and laywomen, whose tradition is that?

34. To be involved\textsuperscript{232} in the search for possessions, whose tradition is that?\textsuperscript{233}

35. To cause the laity to offer a head tax (pāīṃ māṇḍaka) before ascending a hill (pilgrimage site), whose tradition is that?\textsuperscript{234}

36. To place garlands (on persons or idols), whose tradition is that?\textsuperscript{235}

37. To permit laymen and laywomen to walk together (during pilgrimages) by foot, whose tradition is that?\textsuperscript{236}

38. To cause the “Nāndi”\textsuperscript{237} to be erected, whose tradition is that?

39. To cause foot prints (shrines) (padika cāṃka) to be built, whose tradition is that?

40. To put powder (bhāko) into the water, whose tradition is that?\textsuperscript{238}

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

\textsuperscript{230} 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.

\textsuperscript{231} S. vāsākṣepa, colloquial vāskṣep or vāskep, to sprinkle with scented powder. Mūrtipūjakas charge sandalwood powder with mantras and sprinkle it on the heads of their devotees to transfer their blessings-cum-spiritual energy to them.

\textsuperscript{232} bāṃdhai, H. bamdhnā.

\textsuperscript{233} 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 upadhī āḍi potaliyom men bāṃdhe haiṃ – to tie up/bring together property etc. in small parcels.

\textsuperscript{234} The religious legitimacy of the pilgrimage sites of Śāatrūjaya, Girnār, Ābū, etc., and tīrhas other than the catuviridhasaṅgha is questioned for instance in L 36, L 38, L 39, L 41, L 44.

\textsuperscript{235} The privilege of giving garlands, for instance for the successful performers of the upadhīna tapa, is also auctioned off amongst Mūrtipūjakas.

\textsuperscript{236} Samayasundara, in Balbir 2003a: 260, similarly questioned the co-wandering of monks and nuns, which is still practised within the Tapāgaccha.

\textsuperscript{237} The questioned issue is not clear. Maybe the word nāndi refers to the nandēśvara-patha which is venerated in the context of the nandēśvara fast (U. P. Shah 1955a: 121; Williams 1983: 232; Jain & Fischer 1978, II: 19). It could also (though unlikely) refer to the bull Nāndin, who is associated with Śiva, or to an inauguration involving praise of the gods (nāndī).
41. To cause worship (vāṇḍaṇā) to be offered, whose tradition is that?239
42. To move the broom (oghā) (in front of the idols), whose tradition is that?240
43. To keep the deva dravya, whose tradition is that?241
44. To wear a long covering garment (pacherī) down to the feet, whose tradition is that?242
45. To accept the sūrimantra, whose tradition is that?243

238 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 Jaina through “killing” sacitta water by adding a different living substance such as lime powder (cānā). Hastimal 1995: 693 transcribes the original bhūko as bhūmkā. Jain and Kumār (2003: 119) interpret bhūmkā as G. thūmka or H. thůka, saliva, spittle. The issue of cūrṇa, or powder, is also addressed in Sama-yasundara’s Sāmācārī Sataka 37 etc. (Balbir 2003a: 261).
239 The sentence apparently means: “to cause veneration to be given (to an ascetic or image)”, since R. vāṇḍaṇau (bāṇḍaṇau) is equivalent to S. vandana; to worship. Jain and Kumār (2003: 119) translate vāṇḍaṇā drāvai as bāṇḍhanā dīlānā – to cause someone to give an oath (to bind him/herself). They derive vāṇḍaṇā from S. bandhana, to bind, R. bāṇḍhanau. Cf. Lālas 1986-87: 194f.
240 Jain and Kumār (2003: 119) render the words oghā phervai chai as āśīrvād svārūp kisi par oghā phernā. Lōṅkā apparently did not use an oghā at all (Mālvāniyā 1964: 369).
241 The donations given “to the gods” should only be used for the maintenance of the temples, etc. Jethmal 1930: 15 has as question No. 44: gāṃṭh meṃ paisā rakhte ho. – To keep money in the pocket.
242 To wear a long paccheva (P. pacchāga) is considered wasteful. It seems, Lōṅkā himself used one almsbowl (pāra), one loincloth (colapāṭṭaka) and one short paccheva (cādar) (L. D. Institute Ms. No. 2328, in Mālvāniyā 1964: 369). He rejected the oghā, muha-pattī, kambala, and dāṇḍa. See Mālvāniyā 1964: 369; he cites Ghelārī, a contemporary of Lōṅkā, 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 colapāṭṭak phante hain, vaisā kis sūtra meṃ likhā ha? From this, it can be deduced that the ascetics at the time did not wear a colapāṭṭa, though colapāṭṭas are mentioned in the canon (Viy 8.6.2 (374), etc.). Jānnsundar (1936: 173f.) writes that in the 20th century (?) Lōṅkāgaccha ascetics wore colapāṭṭakas and caddars (cādar), but in a slightly different form than the Sthānakavāsīs. In contrast to the Sthānakavāsīs, they did not wear a muha-pattī permanently, but carried an oghā, kambal, and dāṇḍa, etc. I have never seen any evidence of a Lōṅkāgaccha yāti carrying a dāṇḍa though of oghā and kambal.
243 For the tantric cult of the sūrimantra in the Mūrtiptjāka 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?  
47. To shine in starched (white clothes), whose bright tradition is that?  
48. To cause the “Bairakanhai” fast to be performed during paryuṣanā, whose tradition is that?  
49. To cause a waterpot (ghadūlā) to be made, whose tradition is that?  
50. To cause the āyambilā olī fast to be performed together with the siddhacakra (pūjā), whose tradition is that?  
51. To hold a ceremony of mourning (ūḍhānau) 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?

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

244 The mantra was recited to acquire mystical powers, and in order to strengthen the commitment to the particular lineage.

245 Jain and Kumār (2003: 119) translate the expression kalaparā with the Hindī word kalaf, starch.

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

247 G. ghadūlō, small pitcher, water pot. Pots and bowls should be produced by the ascetics themselves. K. Ėśēt 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 Hindī rendition of Jain & Kumār 2003: 120 reads: jhādūle karvānā (bāl utarvānā), i.e. to cause the hair to be shaved (R. jhādulau signifies the hair of a newly born child). Jaina ascetics should pluck their hair or have it plucked by another ascetic.

248 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 āyambilā kī bolī karvānā, to cause the auction of the siddhacakra āyambilā fast to be done, which must have been one of the main objections implied by the question.

249 In Rājasthānī, uthāvanau denotes collective mourning. In the case of ascetics, this is the guṇānvāda sabhā, the auspicious praise of the deceased ascetic. A special carpet is used in this context.

250 This ritual is performed by the Mārtīptūjaka Jaina laity on the fifth day of paryuṣanā, which is called Mahāvīra Jayantī, 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 (thavani) in front of the feet (of an ascetic or an image).\textsuperscript{251} whose tradition is that?

54. To perform the pratikrama\textsubscript{a} on the fourth day (of the second lunar fortnight) of paryu\textsubscript{a}na, whose tradition is that?\textsuperscript{252}

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.\textsuperscript{253} However, a closer view reveals that Lo\textsuperscript{a}nk\textsuperscript{a} may not have rejected commentaries per se, especially not those (such as the later vernacular tabos) which merely explain the meaning of the s\textit{ū}tras themselves, but only commentaries or parts of commentaries whose contents do not correspond at all to the teachings of the root scriptures. M\textsuperscript{ā}lviy\textsuperscript{ā} 1964: 377f. argued that this interpretation is supported by the fact that the two Mss. which have been attributed to Lo\textsuperscript{a}nk\textsuperscript{a} 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 Sth\textit{ā}nak\textit{ā}v\textit{ā}s\textsuperscript{ī} and Ter\textit{ā}panth \textit{Ā}gama editions which make explicit use of all commentaries in order to establish the literal meaning of the s\textit{ū}tras themselves, though some modern monks, such as Up\texti{ā}dhy\textit{ā}ya Amarmuni, argue that because of their condensed nature the s\textit{ū}tras are intrinsically polyvalent and can therefore only be interpreted symbolically.\textsuperscript{254} In contrast to

\textsuperscript{251} Jain and Kum\textsuperscript{ā}r (2003: 120) use the word gavali (um\textit{b}ani) for thavani.

\textsuperscript{252} This refers to the practices of the Tap\textsuperscript{ā}gaccha and the Kharataragaccha to perform the final samvatsari pratikrama\textsubscript{a} not, like most Jaina traditions, on bh\textit{ā}drapad \textit{ś}ukla 5 but already on bh\textit{ā}drapad \textit{ś}ukla 4, apparently following the advice of K\textsuperscript{ā}lak\textsuperscript{ā}c\textit{ā}rya (cf. Jacobi 1880). In contrast to Lo\textsuperscript{a}nk\textsuperscript{a}, Kad\textit{u}\textsuperscript{ā} seems to have accepted “the general practice established by K\textsuperscript{ā}lak\textsuperscript{ā}c\textit{ā}rya” (in Dundas 1999: 22), but not the A(ñ)calagaccha (Balbir 2003b: 59).

\textsuperscript{253} Dundas 1996: 74, 89f.
Mālvanīya’s view that the canon of thirty-two was codified after the emergence of the Sthānakavāṣī orders, there is evidence that Loṅkā himself advocated for a restricted canon of thirty-two scriptures in Bhaṇucandra’s Dayādharmā Caupāī v. 19 of 1521/2, though, if Mālvanīya’s source Dharmaśāgara’s Pravacanaparikṣā of 1572/3 can be believed, it had not been canonised one hundred years later. According to Kāpaḍā (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 ganas.

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.,255 and by the fact that the equally rejected custom of changing names at the point of initiation (K3) is nowadays practised by several Sthānakavāṣī traditions,256 and by the Terāpanthās. 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

256 Amongst the Śaḍhumārgīs only women change their names. The empirical situation is complex.
produce a clearer view of the sectarian faultlines in the 15th and 16th centuries.

LOṆṆĀ’S TEACHINGS ACCORDING TO MODERN STHĀNAKAVĀŚĪ SOURCES\textsuperscript{257}

With the publications of Mālvaniyā and Hastimal, 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 Sthānakavāśī tradition is important, as are preliminary observations on the differences between the customary law (\textit{maryādā}) of the early Sthānakavāśī 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 Sthānakavāśī secondary literature. One was published by Śādhvī Candaṅkumārī (1964: 102)\textsuperscript{258} and the other by Gulabacanda Nānacanda Seṭṭ (1970: 703f.).\textsuperscript{259} 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 Sthānakavāśī traditions have not been pre-


\textsuperscript{258} It is possible that Candaṅkumārī extracted the rules from the book by Susīlkumār (1959), which was one 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 Susīlkumār’s text.

\textsuperscript{259} 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. 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 ki Sāmācārī (LS). Without acknowledgement of the source, her list was re-published in Gujarāṭī by Muni Prakāścandra (1998: 31) of the Limbāḍi Moṭi Pakṣa.

The code of conduct of the Loṅkāgaccha

1. Only the Sanskrit commentaries (ṭīkā) 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].
6. During the vows of upavāsa, etc., absolutely all types of lifeless (prāṣuka) water can be accepted.

---

260 Flügel 2000; 2003a; forthcoming (c).
261 prācin śāstra-bhandārom mem in niyamom ke anek patri prāpta hote haim. un sabhī niyamom kā likhnā yahām āvaśyak nahīm hai. un mem se kuch upayogī niyam jāṅkāri ke lie yahām diye jā rahe haim (Candanākumārī 1964: 102).
262 Translated by the author.
263 The Añcalagaccha allowed its use only for mendicants, not for the laity as most Mūrtipūjaka traditions. See Balbir 2003b: 59f.
264 The word upavāsa signifies either fasting in general, or a specific thirty-six-hour fast (Pkt. cauṭtha 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 posadha 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-tīthi).265
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 (danda).266

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 Ḫunḍi 34 Bol, and the locus classicus of Loṅkā’s critique of image worship is the text Loṅkā nī Athāvan Bol. Candanākumārī’s method of extraction and her utilitarian criterion of “contemporary relevance” offers a glimpse into the rational 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 Sthānakavāśī 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

265 This rule is identical with one of the stipulations of Kaduā (KS 7); though Jñānsundar 1936: 327, n. 5 expressed the opposite view. The point was rejected by the A(h)iṣakagaccha and the Kharitāragaccha (Samayasundara), but accepted by the Tapāgaccha (Balbir 2003b: 59). Dundas 1999: 22 understands the meaning of rule KS 7 slightly differently — that “the poyadhā fast can be celebrated when it does not fall on an observance day (parvan)”.

266 The prototype must be LH 22, which criticises the Niśītha Čāndī’s permission for using an acitta staff for purposes of self-defence, which contradicts the Niśītha 5 itself.
reforms of Ācārya Ānandṛṣṭi, and founded the independent Dharma-
dāsa Jayamala Sampradāya. 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 Śramaṇaśaṅgha to re-establish the Ratnavanmśa as an independent order. Hastīmal (1968) had already published a collection of paṭṭāvalīs of the Loṅkāgaccha tradition and of the Sthānakavāśīs, and systematically researched the history of the aniconic Jaina tradition during the following two decades. The following twenty points (LN) which Seṭh attributes to Loṅkā have been summarised by him in Hindi without any reference to the original source. The introductory sentence only mentions that Loṅkā prepared this sāmaṇcāri in Saṅvat 1531 (1474/5 CE) in order to prevent the rise of śītihilācāra, or laxity, amongst the sādhus of Bhānḥ’s newly created Loṅkāgaccha:

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

---

269 Translation by the author.
270 The upadhāna tapa is a special, extended (usually thirty-five or forty-seven day long) collective posadha, a collective fast-cum-study exercise which, according to Cort 2001: 137, has been first described in the 7th-century Mahā-
ниśīha 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, Kaḍuṇā, that “One should not perform garlanding (māḷārāpana) 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 (ṭīkā), 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 (pāṭa) [during the rest of the year].

7. One should not keep a staff.

8. One can possess books.

9. Paying attention to genuineness and purity, one can collect alms from every family.

10. A layperson (śrāvaka) can also perform the almsround (gocāri).

11. A layperson (śrāvaka) cannot accept a religious gift (dāna).

12. During fasting (upavāsa) one can take lifeless whey (āch) of buttermilk.

13. Poṣadha can even be performed without practising a one-day fast.

---

271 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 pāñaka, which may be a corruption of S. pāṭaka, part of a village, which would make even less sense.

272 The issue of the possession of books is touched upon in a different context in K 16 on the distribution of books during paryuṣana. It was also a point of contention between the “bookish” Dharmasinha and Lava, who rejected the possession of books. See Pracīna Paṭīvārī in Hastimal 1968: 186-192.

273 Cf. Dharmadāsa’s critique of Dharmasinha, who apparently upheld Loṅkā’s rule, in Seth 1970: 369, n.: upavāsa men chāch kī āch pīnī nahim. – One should not drink the whey of buttermilk during a fast. The Sthānākāvāśī traditions of Raghunāth (Dharmadāsa Sampradāya), Amarsinha, Dīpcand, Malākand (Jīva-rāja Sampradāya), Khetṣi and Khemṣi (Hara Sampradāya) also touched on this issue in a common decree of 1753 whose wording is, however, not entirely intelligible: 2. tapasyā men telā uparānt dhovan taḥā āch aur chāch kī āch pīnī nahim. pī lī jāye to ādhē tap kā prāyaṣcit (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.).

274 Even in the Śrāvakācāras of the image worshippers, poṣadha is not identical with poṣadhapavāsa. 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 (kalyānaka) amongst the lunar days (tithi).\[275\]
17. The day on which one takes a milk product, on that day one should not use hard (dividala) grains.\[276\]
18. It is not necessary to set up a sthāpanācārya.
19. Within forty-eight minutes (do gharī) life is generated in waste water (dhovana).\[277\]
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)).\[278\]

---

\[275\] Cf. L 22. For another debate concerning the kalyānakas, in Samayasundara, see Balbir 2003a: 263ff.

\[276\] Soft food made of milk, such as yoghurt, and hard food made of grains that are (under their skin) split into two parts (S. dividala) should not be eaten on the same day. The rule is identical with one of the stipulations of Kaduā (KS 8 citing the Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya); though Jānsundar (1936: 327, n. 6) expressed the view that Lōkā permitted the use of dividala. It is also mentioned in the lists of forbidden food (abhakṣya) in the medieval Śrāvakācāra texts under the name ghola-vatāka, buttermilk in tiny lumps (Williams 1983: 110f.). Here, dividala 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 Sāmācāri śatakā 7 (Balbir 2003a: 261).

\[277\] It is believed that new micro-organisms develop in lifeless water after forty-eight minutes. Dhovana (P. dhovana) 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.

\[278\] This rule is oriented towards a layperson. It resonates with the debate on the nature of the pure gift (dāna) between the Śhānakavāsī Raghunāth and Jaymal on the one hand and the founder of the Terāpanth, Bhikhān (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. It is an intriguing but currently unanswerable question whether all of these rules go back to Loṅkā, or Bhānā, or whether at least some of these rules have been created by subsequent Loṅkāgaccha or Sthānakavāśī 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-adāyā (see infra), seem to be later additions, 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. punya. The Sthānakavāśīs 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 (niścaya 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 niścaya 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.

I asked Candanākumārī personally which sources she used for this list, but she said she could not remember anymore.

LN 6 (using a seat) and LN 8 (possession of books) touch on issues which were controversial between Dharmisīha, Lava and Dharmadāśa. 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, 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 Sthānakavāśī tradition, Dharmasīhā, Lava, and Dharmādāsa. But many points mirror Kaṭuā’s rules, which were, as Jhānsundar (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 Kaṭuā address similar issues. The main common topics are “ascetic” 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 Kaṭuā were advanced householders, or yātis, and not mendicants. If the two Sthānakavāśī lists are considered together (“Loṅkā’s” writings), the following picture emerges with regard to the lay rituals:

Both Loṅkā and Kaṭuā 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 Kaṭuā (following the Tapāgaccha custom) prescribed (KS 4). Contrary to the scriptures, Kaṭuā also fixed the pākṣika pratikramaṇa for the 14th of every lunar fortnight, not for the 15th (KS 3), and additionally adopted the tristūti formula (KS 11), which has been introduced by the Āgamikagaccha into the pratikramaṇa.

281 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.


283 “Ascetic” rather than “symbolic” or reflective rituals such as pūjā.

284 See Dundas 1999: 30, n. 23.
Loṅkā (K 8) and Kaḍuṇā (KS 6) also agreed that the sāmāyika should be performed repeatedly. But only Kaḍuṇā asserted that the laity should use a muhapattī during the ritual (KS 5), and should recite the ṛṛyāpathika ālocanā after the first sāmāyika (KS 15).

The posadha is the topic of many points. It is usually discussed together with the topic of the one-day-fast (upavāsa).285 Both Loṅkā (LS 7) and Kaḍuṇā (KS 7) determined that posadha can be performed repeatedly according to individual preference (LN 5), even outside the parvan days, on which it is obligatory.286 However, Kaḍuṇā (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 Sthānakavāṣī traditions.287 Kaḍuṇā stressed particularly that women can also perform posadha (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 posadha (cum study) exercise, that was propagated by Loṅkā and Kaḍuṇā, who both however rejected the ceremonial garlanding of the tapasvins 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

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

286 Jhāmsundar 1936: 327, n. 5 deliberately misunderstands the respective rules.

287 See footnote 273.
may also reflect customary prohibitions for studying certain texts without prior fasting.

The principal difference between Kađu and Loṅkā, according to the lists published by Seṭh and Candanākumāri, was that Kađu, who assumed an intermediary position between Loṅkā and the Mūrtipūjakas (especially the dominant Tapāgaccha), also propagated image-worship (KS 1, KS 20), though rejecting the installation (pratiṣṭhā) of images by monks rather than laity (KS 2). Kađu 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 Kađu accepted the authority of the post-canonical calendar, 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 Brhatkalpa-bhāṣya (KS 8) which Loṅkā had rejected (L 57, LS 1), though both referred to the “seniors” of the canon as the main source for monastic conduct (KS 18).

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 Sthānakavāṣī Dharmaḍāsa Raghunātha Sampradāya because it believed that such actions contributed only to the accumu-
lation of puṇya, 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 ki Ṣuṇḍī 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 gośālas rather than temples, although Jhānsundar (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. 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. 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 indicates that even yatis

292 See L 23 and DC 18 for the distinction between worthy (yogya) and unworthy mendicants.
tend to be pāñca-mahāvratis, they simply do not observe the rules strictly, or interpret them slightly differently, not unlike the anuvrataś for the laity.

Of particular interest in this context are the three statements concerning compassionate gift giving (dāna-dayā) in the two Sthānakavāśī 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 aḥimsā dharma.295 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.296 This contrasts both with the rule No. 75 of 101 Bol of the Kaḍuṅgaccha which prohibits the renouncers to visit houses of followers of the Loṅkāgaccha,297 and with the Mūrtipūjaka preference for vaṇik (vānīyā) households as expressed in rule No. 2 of the Paṅtis Bol (PB) of 1526/7 of the Mūrtipūjaka reformer Ācārya Ānandvimal-sūri (1490-1539).298 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

295 See for instance L 17, which lists several passages from the canon where the word dayā occurs.
296 The same conviction is expressed by the contemporary Loṅkāgaccha laity, though no universally recognised yatis exist anymore.
297 In Jhānsundar 1936: 333.
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 (rajo harana), 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 (Lonkāgaccha) yati. 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. However, rather than representing the summary of a statement of “Lonkā”, 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

---

299 As in the case of Digambara bhaṭṭārakas, only few yatīs existed in the Lonkāgaccha 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.

300 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 Viy 8.6.
poor person out of compassion is not the cause of the fault of one-sidedness” (ekānta pāpa). 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 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, 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 Thāna 10.475 and Viyāhapanatti 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.

301 The reasons for interpreting anukampādāna to a kupātra or apātra as an acceptable and even meritorious act are discussed by Puskarmuni (1977: 504).
302 Thāna 10.97 distinguishes between ten forms of dāna only one of which is called dharmadāna.
303 See Flügel, forthcoming (b).
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APPENDIX I:

Keha nī Paramparā Chai – Text in Old Gujarāti

paramparā likhiṁ chain, ketalā eka ima kahai chai śrī vīra nī paramparā ima kahai chai, te kihāṁ chai. 305
2. nāṁhā chokarā nai 308 dikṣā dii chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
3. nāma 309 pheravai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
4. kāṁna vadhārai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
5. khamāsamāśaṇu 310 viharai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
6. ghraṁta (nī) gharaṁ baiṣi 311 viharai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
7. dihāḍi dihāḍi 312 2 teṇai 313 ghariṁ viharai, te keha nī paramparā chai?

304 Text based on L.D. Institute Ms. 2989, pp. 14b-15a.
305 The meaning (vivaraṇa) of this sentence has been given by Vārīā (1976: 127) as follows: have paramparā lakkhe che, ketalak ema kehe che ke vīra prabhue a rite paramparā kahī che.śrī lonkāśāha praśna kare che ke a paramparā kaṭamāṃ sāstro mām kahī che te batāvo. The text was reproduced verbatim by Hastīmal (1995) (and Jain & Kumār 2003), which shows that the subsequent-ly published versions are all based on Vārīā’s transcription.
306 Vārīā’s (1976: 127) reproduction of the text uses the past tense here and in the following question: “te keha nī paramparā thai”. 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.
307 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.
309 Hastīmal 1995: 691 added in brackets: (dikṣā kāle).
313 Hastīmal 1995: 692 added in brackets: (usī ek).
8. anghola\textsuperscript{314} kahai\textsuperscript{315} kare,\textsuperscript{316} te keha nī paramparā chai?
9. jyotiṣa nai marma prajūṃjai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
10. kalavāṇi karī āpai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
11. nagara māhiṇḍ paisatā paim sāru sāhamun karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
12. lāḍū pratiṣṭā\textsuperscript{317} chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
13. pothī pūjāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
14. saṅghapijā karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
15. pratiṣṭā karai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
16. pajūsaṇaṁ 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 ghāṭaḍi donu toraṇa\textsuperscript{318} bāṅghai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
20. ādhaṅkarma posāliṁ rahai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
21. siddhānta prabhāvaṇā pākhai na vāṃcai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
22. māṇḍavī karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
23. gautama paḍagho\textsuperscript{319} karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
24. saṃsāra-tāraṇa karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
25. candanabāḷā nu tapa karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
26. sonā rūpā nī niṣaraṇī karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
27. lākhāpaḍavi karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?

\textsuperscript{314} Hastīmal 1995: 692 added in brackets: (snān).
\textsuperscript{315} Hastīmal 1995: 692 added in brackets: (koi).
\textsuperscript{316} Hastīmal 1995: 692: karai.
\textsuperscript{317} Hastīmal 1995: 692: pratiṣṭhāi.
\textsuperscript{318} Hastīmal 1995: 692: ghāṭaṛī and added in brackets: (vanaspati ke toraṇ).
\textsuperscript{319} Hastīmal 1995: 692: paragho.
28. ājamanāḥ
dhovarāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
29. pūjā pādāhāṁ chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
30. āsovvṛkṣa bharāvī
d chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
31. aṭṭhotarī 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 dhūndha māṁ bāndhai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
35. śrāvaka pāṭṭaṁ māndakum apāvī dūṅgara caḍhāvī
d chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
36. māḷāropāṇa karai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
37. padika śrāvaka śrāvikā suṁ bhelī jāiṁ chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
38. nāndi maṇḍāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
39. padika cāṅka bāṇḍhai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
40. pāṇi māhīṁ bhūko
d muṅkai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
41. vāṇḍanā divarāvai
d chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
42. ogā pheṇvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
43. devadravya rākhai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
44. pagai lāgai nīcī pacheṭṭi odhai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
45. sūrimantra leṭiṁ ṭiṁ chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
46. dīhāḍi sūrimantra gaṇṭhai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?
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47. kalapaḍā ṭhaṭai326 chaिण, te keha nī paramparā chai újalā?

48. pajūsaṇa māhiṁ bairakanhai tap karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?

49. ghadūla karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?

50. āṃbila nī olī siddhacakra nī karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?

51. mahātamā nāla327 karā pachī te ṛhamaṇuṣ karai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?

52. pratimā jhūlanum328 karāvai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?

53. padika āgali ṭhavai329 māṇḍai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?

54. pajūsaṇa parva nai cauthai330 paḍikamai chai, te keha nī paramparā chai?

---

326 Vārīā 1995: 693 thaṭai.
APPENDIX II:
Loṅkā’s assertions according to Candanākumārī 1964 in Hindī

1. āgamtā sammat tīkāom ko hī prāmāṇik mānā jāy.
2. āgamtā ke anusār dṛṣṭhatāpūrvak samyamoṃ jīvan vyaṭī kiyā jāy.
3. dharmadrṣṭi se ‘pratimā-pūjan’ sāstra-sammat naḥīṃ hai.
4. sūdhā sāttvik śākāhārī pratyek kul kā āhār liyā jā saktā hai.
5. sthāpanācārya kī sthāpanā kī koī āvaśyaktā naḥīṃ hai.
6. upavās ādi vratoṃ meṃ sabhī prakār kā prāṣuk jāliyā jā saktā hai.
7. parv-tithi ke bīna bhī upavās kiyā jā saktā hai.
8. sādhuom ko mantra-tantra tathā yantra ādi vidyāom kā prayog naḥīṃ karnā cāhie.
9. śrāvak bhikṣā kar saktā hai, par dān naḥīṃ le saktā.
10. dayā bhāv se garibonn kā dān dēnā pāp naḥīṃ hai, apitu punya kā kāraṇ hai.
11. daṇḍ naḥīṃ rakhā jānā cāhie.
APPENDIX III:
Loṅkā’s Sāmācārī according to Seth 1970 in Hindi

1. upadham tap kiye bin bah śāstra-abhyās karāyā já saktā hai.
2. jin pratimā k dharma-dryṣṭi se pūjā karnā 45 āgamoṃ maṃ
    nahim hain.
3. mūl śūtra, āgam aur mūl śāstra, samasta śikāṃ ke sivāvī anya
    āgam evam jīkā sarvathā anānya hain.
4. vidyā kā prayog niśiddha hai.
5. pausadh pratikramaṇ svatantra riti se karnā.
6. cāturmaṃ ke sivāvī bhī pāṭ kā vyavahār já saktā hai.
7. daṇḍ nahim rakhā jānā cāhiye.
8. pustakeṃ rakhī já sakī hain.
9. sātviktā aur śuddhi kā dhīyān rakhte hue pratyek kul maṃ gocarī
    kī já sakī hain.
10. śrāvak bhī gocarī kar saktā hai.
11. śrāvak dān nahim le saktā.
12. upavās prátyākhyān maṃ chāch-pānī kī āch prāṣuk le sakte
    hain.
13. binā upavās ke bhī pausadh kiyā já saktā hai.
14. tīthi-parv ke binā bhī upavās kiyā já saktā hai.
15. ek sāṭh upavās paccakkhe já sakte hain.
16. kalyāṇakoṃ ko tīthi maṃ nahim ginnā cāhiye.
17. jis din goras liyā jáy us din kāthor (dvidal dhānya) kā prayog
    nahim honā cāhiye.
18. sthāpanācārya kī sthāpanā anāvaśyak hai.
19. dhovan pānī maṃ do gharī ke anantar jīvotpatti sambhav hai.
20. apātra ko dharma buddhi se dān dene se hīṃsā hoī hai
    (anukampā se garīb ko denā ekānta pāp kā kāraṇ nahim hain).
PICTURE:
Lōṅkā ṇā Āṭhāvāṇa Bolo, Ms. No. 2989,
L.D. Institute, Ahmedabad, p. 14b