

Journal of the Oriental Institute

VOLUME XIX
1969 - 1970

Edited by

B. J. Sandesara

DIRECTOR, ORIENTAL INSTITUTE



BARODA

Printed at the Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda Press (Sadhana Press), Near Palace Gate, Palace Road, Baroda and published on behalf of the M. S. University of Baroda by Prof. B. J. Sandesara, Director, Oriental Institute, Baroda, December 1970

intensive forms occur in interpolated passages ; the two noticed (both read by the Northern recension) are *dodhūyamāna* App. I.18.1.7 and *jājvalyamāna* App. I.19 1.18 (also Mbh. 1.92.26c, 3.98.18c, 186.98c, 4.21.42c, etc., cf *jājvalan* Rām. 1.59.31b). Intensive forms are also very rare in the text of the Sundara and Yuddha kāṇḍas. From the Yuddhakāṇḍa may be noted the irregular form *jājrbhamāna* at 48.50a.

The following are the instances of denominative bases which occur in the text of the Critical Edition of the Ayodhyā, Aranya and Kiṣkindhā kāṇḍas: *asūya* (*abhyasūyya* 2.8.1a and *abhyasūyitum* 4.15.19b), *pratikūlaya* (*apratikūlayan* 2.45.63b), *cirāya* (*cirāyasi* 2.58.5c), *dīrghaya* (*dīrghayasi* 2.94.14d) *namasya* (*namasyanti*, 2.2.32a, etc.), *niṣpatraya* (*niṣpatrayitum* 4.11.47d, which the Tilaka commentary glosses *patrahīnān kartum* ; Monier-Williams also notes the base for the Mahābhārata), *mahiya* (*mahiyamāna* 2.14.26c, etc.) and *śabdāya* (*śabdāpayet* 2.53.3d). There are, of course, other stems which are clearly denominative in origin though no longer classified as such, for example, *kīrt* (*kīrtaya* 2.52.9f and *aparikīrtita* 2.94.16b), *pāl* (*pālayiṣyuti* 2.8.8b, etc.) and *mantr* (2.4.1c et passim). But altogether the denominative is of such rare occurrence as to play no significant role in the verbal system of the Rāmāyaṇa.

PRAJÑĀPANĀ AND ŚAṬKHAṆḌĀGAMA

By

DALSUKHBHAI D. MALVANIA, Ahmedabad

The *Aṅga Sūtra Dṛṣṭivāda* is the common source of both *Prajñāpanāsūtra* and *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama*. That is, both these works have drawn upon the *Dṛṣṭivāda* for the material contained in them. Again, both these works are of the nature of compilation. But their style of presentation is different. One should note the points of this difference. *Prajñāpanāsūtra* contains 36 literary divisions called 'Padas'. It keeps living being in the forefront. *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, in the first Khaṇḍa called Jivasthāna, investigates, through various points viz gati etc., the 14th stage of spiritual evolution (guṇasthāna; here the term jivasamāsa is employed for guṇasthāna), resulted from the destruction of Karmas. Of the remaining part Khuddābandha, Bandhasvāmitva, Vedanā—these Khaṇḍas could be said to deal with living being keeping Karma in the forefront. In the Vargaṇākhaṇḍa too the main topic treated of is the vargaṇā (class) of karma. The vargaṇā of others is discussed in so far as it is conducive to the understanding of Karma-vargaṇā. The VIth Khaṇḍa is known by the name of Mahābandha. Hence there too the discussion about Karma is the main.

Out of the 36 'Padas' contained in *Prajñāpanāsūtra*, the names of six 'Padas' (23-27, 35) occurring in the *Prajñāpanāsūtra* itself are 'Karma' (23), Karmabandhaka (24), Karmavedaka (25), Vedabandhaka (26), Vedavedaka (27), Vedaṇā (35). It is interesting to compare these names with those of the concerned Khaṇḍas of the *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, suggested by the commentator. The concerned Khaṇḍas of the *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama* discuss the topics more in detail and more minutely than the Padas of *Prajñāpanāsūtra*. Thus in *Prajñāpanāsūtra*, the discussions centre round the Jīva while in *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama* they centre round the Karma.

Prajñāpanāsūtra prominently employs question-answer style adopted in Aṅga Sūtras. And at many places it is clear that the questions and answers are of Gautama and Mahāvira respectively. But *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama* employs the scientific method the constituents of which are Uddeśa, Nirdeśa and Vibhāga. Only occasionally we come across the questions and answers.¹

Prajñāpanāsūtra which is of the nature of compilation is a work of one Ācārya. But the case with *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama* is different. *Prajñāpanā* contains

¹ The topics like 'Bandhasāmittavicaya,' *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama* Book VIII, occasionally employ question-answer style.

no Cūlikā. But in *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* Cūlikās have been added.¹ We know not as to who made this additions and when. But the term Cūlikā itself suggests that it is a later addition. The similar thing has happened even in case of Āgamas like *Daśavaikālika*.

Prajñāpanāsūtra is written in the style of original Sūtra while *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* employs commentarial or expository style in addition to it. In the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* many a time the discussion is conducted through 'entrances' to exposition; this suggests commentarial style. That is to say, after having suggested the entrances to exposition by the words 'aniogaddārāṇi' the exposition is conducted through all those 'entrances' one by one.² Moreover, the terms like Kṛti, vedanā, karma are explained through the method of Nikṣepas, viz. nāma, sthāpanā, dravya and bhāva. In doing so it has clearly followed the style of exposition found in the *Niryukti* of Jaina Āgamas.³ The employment of terms like 'anugama',⁴ 'saṃtaparūvaṇā',⁵ 'niddeśa',⁶ 'vihāsā'⁷ (= vibhāsā) also points to its commentarial style. Everywhere in *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* a discussion on those particular margaṇḍvāras (topics of investigation) begins through the words 'gadiyaṇuvādena', 'imḍiyaṇuvādena', 'kayānuvādena' etc.⁸ This system is rarely found in the *Prajñāpanāsūtra*. Only two words 'disānuvādena' and 'khetānuvādena'⁹ occur in it. But the word 'gatyānuvādena' has not been employed in the discussion on gati, etc.

Over and above the similarity of treatment we find, at various places, similarity of expression in both the works. This suggests that they had a common tradition as their basis. By similarity of treatment is meant the agreement on different points and it is easily noticed at many places in both the works. Hence it is not necessary for us to note all such places where the similarity of treatment is found. But we should note the places where the similarity of expression occurs.

Generally we can say that both the works are composed in prose but they contain gāthās also. Out of these gāthās some, it seems, should be traditional

1 *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* Book VI contains 9 Cūlikas, Book X, 1, Book XI, 2 and Book XII, 3. In the Sū. 581 (Book XIV) it is explicitly stated that—"etto uvarimagamtho cūlikā nāma."

2 *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* Book I Sū. 5; Book IX Sū. 45; Book X. Sū. 1; Book XI Sū. 1 & 165; Book XII Sū. 1; Book XIII Sū. 2 etc.

3 The employment of this method is noticed in *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* from Book IX Sū. 45 to Book XIV.

4 *Ibid*, Book I Sū. 7; Book III Sū. 1 etc.

5 *Ibid*, Book I Sū. 7; Book IX Sū. 71.

6 *Ibid*, Book I Sū. 8; Book III Sū. 1 etc.

7 *Ibid*, Book VI Sū. 2 (p. 4), Book VI Sū. 1 (p. 145); Book XIV Sū. 1.

8 *Ibid*, Book I Sū. 24, 33, 39, etc.

9 *Prajñāpanāsūtra* 213-224; 276-324; 326-329.

saṅgrahaṇi gāthās. Gāthās 99-101 of *Prajñāpanā* occur in *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*. The gāthās as found in *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* are as follows:—

Book XIV

Sū. 121 "tattha imaṃ sahāraṇalakkhaṇaṃ bhaṇidam —

Sū. 122 sähāraṇamähāro sähāraṇamāṇapāṇagahaṇaṃ ca /
sähāraṇajivāṇaṃ sähāraṇalakkhaṇaṃ bhaṇidam //

Su. 123 eyassa aṇuggahaṇaṃ bahūṇa sähāraṇanameyassa /
eyassa jam bahūṇaṃ samāsado taṃpi hodi eyassa //

Su. 124 samagaṃ vakkamāṇaṃ samagam tesim sariraṇippattī /
samagam ca aṇuggahaṇaṃ samagaṃ ussasaṇissāso //

It is noteworthy that *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* quotes these gāthās having employed the term 'bhaṇidam' suggestive of quotation, while *Prajñāpanāsūtra* does not use any such term. In *Prajñāpanāsūtra* they are given in a reverse order. Moreover, the gāthā occurring in the concerned sūtra 122 gives the reading 'lakkhaṇaṃ bhaṇidam', while *Prajñāpanā* gāthā 101 gives the reading 'lakkhaṇaṃ eyaṃ'. Though the gāthā occurring in the Sūtra 123 and *Prajñāpanā* gāthā no. 10) are identical, the reading of this gāthā given by *Prajñāpanā* is more correct than the one offered *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*. The reading as we find in *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* is in disorder and corrupt. Once again the gāthā occurring in Sūtra 124 and *Prajñāpanā* gāthā 99 are one and the same but both the works give different readings. In this case too *Prajñāpanā* gives correct reading.

At the occasion of discussing the topic of alpa-bahutva (numerical variation) of jīva (living beings), the beginning of 'Mahāḍaṇḍaya' in *Prajñāpanā* is as follows:—

"aha bhante savvajivappabahuṃ mahāḍaṇḍayaṃ vattaissami-savvatthovā gabbhavakkantiyā manussā.....". And the end is as follows: "sajogī visesahiyā 96, saṃsāratthā visesahiyā 97, savvajivā visesahiyā 98. Sūtra 334.

Even in *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* there occurs Mahāḍaṇḍaya. There its beginning is—"etto savvajivesu mahādaṇḍo kādavvo bhavadi savvatthovā manussapajjattā gabbhovakkantiā". And its end is—"nigodajivā visesahiyā" Book VII. Sūtra 1-79.

The difference that we find in the two expositions—one in *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* and another in *Prajñāpanāsūtra*—is that *Prajñāpanāsūtra* mentions 98 divisions of living beings while *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* mentions 78 divisions. The fact that some divisions are primary and some secondary should be considered to be the reason of this difference. But the important thing is that both the works give one name¹ 'Mahāḍaṇḍaka' to this discussion. This suggests the common tradition.

1 At other places also the word Mahāḍaṇḍaka is used in *Ṣaṭkha* See Book XIV. Sū 634 XI. Sū 30, VI Sū 1, p 140, 142.

The second Pada of *Prajñāpanāsūtra* is 'Sthānapada'. Therein it is described as to where in the Universe living beings of various types or grades—beginning with those possessed of one sense-organ and ending with those who are emancipated souls-dwell. In the chapter called 'Kṣetrānugama' of the second part (Khaṇḍa) of *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama* this very topic is discussed. The only difference that we find is that *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama* discusses this topic through points of investigation (margaṇāsthāna), viz. Gati etc.; while *Prajñāpanā* discusses this topic taking one by one various grades of living beings—from those possessed of one sense-organ to the liberated. In *Prajñāpanā*, the treatment of this topic is lengthy while in *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama* it is brief.

In *Prajñāpanā* alpa-bahutva (numerical variation) is discussed through various 'entrances' to exposition. Therein both the living and non-living substances are treated of. *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama* too, while treating of the 14 stages of spiritual evolution (guṇasthānas), discusses the alpa-bahutva of living beings through various points of investigation viz. Gati etc.¹ This discussion contained in *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama* is deeper than the one found in *Prajñāpanāsūtra*. Moreover, *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama* deals with this topic, purely through the points of investigation, gati etc.² According to *Prajñāpanāsūtra* the points of investigation are 26, while according to *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama* they are 14. These 14 points of investigation, viz. Gati etc. are common to both the works. This can be seen from the following lists.

<i>Prajñāpanāsūtra</i>	<i>Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama</i>
1 Diśā ³	—
2 Gati	1 Gati
3 Indriya	2 Indriya
4 Kāya	3 Kāya
5 Yoga	4 Yoga
6 Veda	5 Veda
7 Kaṣāya	6 Kaṣāya
8 Leśyā	10 Leśyā
9 Samyaktva	12 Samyaktva
10 Jñāna	7 Jñāna
11 Darśana	9 Darśana
12 Saṁnyama	8 Saṁnyama
13 Upayoga	—
14 Āhāra	14 Āhāraka

1 *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, Book V., P. 241 ff.

2 *Ibid*, Book VII P. 520 ff.

3 In *Prajñāpanāsūtra Pada* 18 we find only 22 of this 26. Nos. 1, 24-26 are left out, see Sū 1259

<i>Prajñāpanāsūtra</i>	<i>Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama</i>
15 Bhāṣaka	—
16 Parritta	—
17 Paryāpta	—
18 Sūkṣma	—
19 Saṁjñi	13 Saṁjñi
20 Bhavassiddhika	11 Bhavya
21 Astikāya	—
22 Carima	—
23 Jīva	—
24 Kṣetra	—
25 Bandha	—
26 Pudgala	—

The point worthy of note is that at the end of this treatment occurs, in both the works, the 'Mahāḍaṇḍaka.' (*Śaṭkha*. Book VII, p. 575). As has been already said, *Prajñāpanā* mentions in Mahāḍaṇḍaka, 98 divisions of living beings, while *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama* mentions 78. From the list given above it becomes clear that the points of investigation that are employed in *Prajñāpanā* in this topic are more in number than those employed in *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama*. This leads us to conclude that the treatment of the concerned topic in *Prajñāpanā* suggests the fluid stage of investigation while the same in the *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama* suggests the crystalized stage. The crystalized stage that resulted from fluid stage is represented by 14 stages of spiritual evolution (guṇasthāna) 14 points of investigation (margaṇāsthāna) and 14 divisions of living beings-(Jivasthāna) which are accepted in the later works.

The real thing seems to be that in the first Khaṇḍa named 'Jivasthāna' the 14 points of investigation are employed in the investigation of each of the 14 stages of spiritual evolution. But in the second Khaṇḍa 'Khuddābandha' the system is changed. Therein the bandhaka (= living being) etc. are treated of through 14 points of investigation. There the discussion is not conducted from the point of view of guṇasthāna (keeping in view the 14 stages of spiritual evolution). This is the reason why the style of the treatment of this topic is similar in both the works.

The sthiti (life-span) of living beings is expounded in various ways in the *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama*. In the Kālānugama (Book VII, p. 114 ff.) the kālāsthiti (life-span) of living beings is expounded through 14 dvāras (points of investigation) beginning with gati. But in the *Prajñāpanā* it is discussed through 24 divisions and sub-divisions of living beings—known as 24 ḍaṇḍakas (*Prajñāpanā*, Sthitipada IV).

Again, similarity of treatment in regard to *avagāhanā* (occupation of space, *antara* (gap) etc. is found in both the works. We refrain from dealing with this point. It will suffice to suggest that the detailed and fine comparison of these two works is worth undertaking. That is to say, these two works are the solid means to know the stages of development of thought regarding living beings and Karma. We want to draw the attention of the scholars to this fact.

The fact that *Niryukti* gāthās occur in both the works suggests that *Niryukti* itself has borrowed them from some common source. Thus it is an interesting and even challenging problem to find out as to which gāthās of *Niryukti* are from the pen of Bhadrabāhu—Senior or Junior whoever he may be—and which are borrowed from an old tradition, see *Ṣaṭ*. Vol. XIII, Sū. 4-9, 12, 13, 15, 16 etc. *Āvani* -31 ff, *Viśiṣā* 604 ff.

Moreover, one striking point of similarity is to be noted. In the discussion on *gatyāgati* (transmigration) there occurs, in both the works, the discussion on the acquisition of the position of Tirthaṅkara, Cakravarti, Baladeva, Vāsudeva. The only difference is that *Prajñāpanā* adds two more positions viz. Māṅḍalika and Ratna. (*Prajñāpanā* Sū. 1466-68), *Ṣaṭkha*.VI, Sū. 216, 220.

Upāṅga *Prajñāpanā* *sūtra* is the work of Ārya Śyāmācārya. But this does not mean that all the material contained in it is thought out by himself. It is so because his objective was to compile and arrange in a certain way, the material came down to him from the tradition of *śruta*. This is the reason why he has not followed the same classification of Living beings occurring in the first Pada while discussing the points of investigation sthiti etc. The exposition of the dvāras—*sthāna* etc., which had been variously developed by the former Ācāryas, was before him. So, his task was to collect and compile all the ideas and thoughts in proper dvāras. Though the exposition performed in the dvāras beginning with 'sthāna' has bearing on all the living beings, there is no unanimity regarding the point as to which dvāras are to be treated of (employed) in which type of divisions of living beings. Keeping in view the point as to how the treatment of a particular subject can be easy, subdivisions of living beings to be described at the occasion of dealing with a particular dvāra—are determined. If one and the same individual were to describe it after considering all the points, then it is quite possible that he might describe it altogether differently. But this is not the case with *Prajñāpanā*. Ārya Śyāma has acquired, through tradition, the legacy of whatever the earlier Ācāryas had thought. And in *Prajñāpanā* Ārya Śyāma collected the thoughts and ideas arose in the tradition from time to time. If we look at *Prajñāpanā* from this view-point it is nothing but a systematic collection of ideas and thoughts accumulated in tradition upto that period. This is the reason why

the readers were asked to refer to *Prajñāpanā* for complete discussion when the Āgamas were put down in writing.

Living being and Karma (moral causation)—these are the two main subjects dealt with in the Jaina Āgamas. One trend of thinking keeps living being in the centre while discussing various topics viz. as to how many divisions of living beings there are, as to how long a living being of a particular type can live, as to where it dwells, in which class it can take birth after death, as to how many sense-organs it can possess, as to which sex it can have, as to how many knowledges it can possess, as to which karmas it can bind, etc. Another trend of thinking keeps Karma in the centre and discusses in the amid, different types of Karma and their role in the spiritual evolution or degradation of a living being. Hence this trend, keeping in view the spiritual evolution of a living being, determines the 14 points of investigation (*margaṅsthāna*) for the examination of and search for the 14 stages of spiritual evolution of a living being (*guṇasthāna*) which are known as Jīvasamāsa. These 14 points of investigation are the different divisions of living beings due to their gati etc.

Prajñāpanā represents the first trend while old works on Karma like *Karmaprakṛti*, *Ṣaṭkhaṅḍāgama*, etc. represent the second trend. The state of affairs being what it is, it becomes very difficult for us to determine the chronological order of these works. In the 15th Cent. and even after when the Sthānakavāsī tradition tried to present in the form of thokada works, written in Gujarātī the ideas and thoughts of Āgamas, it presented the *margaṅsthānas* etc. in such a way as could be easily grasped by an ordinary reader. And in the Aṅga work named Sthānāṅga too a particular item is presented keeping in view the number of its constituents. But let us remember that even in the days of Sthānāṅga the ideas relating to living beings and Karma were presented in a complicated manner. So, style of treatment—i.e. its simplicity or otherwise—cannot be a determining factor in fixing up the chronological order of these works. This is so because the nature of the style was dependent on the objective of the author and not on the nature of the subject-matter—simple or subtle. Hence we would be making a great blunder in fixing up the chronological order of *Prajñāpanā* and *Ṣaṭkhaṅḍāgama* if we were guided only by the fact that the treatment of the subject-matter in the *Ṣaṭkhaṅḍāgama* is more detailed and subtle than that found in *Prajñāpanā*. Therefore we should tackle differently the problem of their chronological order. We should first study such works independently and only afterwards we should try to fix their chronological order. According to both these works, literature of both these types is rooted in Dīṣṭivāda. This means that innumerable Ācāryas have variously presented the subject-matter of Dīṣṭivāda itself to achieve different objectives. This presents one more difficulty in fixing up the chronological order of the works on the basis of the nature of the treatment of the subject-matter simple or subtle. If one were

not to take into consideration all these facts he can easily—but wrongly—conclude that as the discussions in *Prajñāpanā* are more simple and brief than those in *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* the former is prior to the latter. But on account of the difficulty as already pointed out it is not proper to fix *Prajñāpanā* prior to *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*. So, we have given up this manner of fixing up the chronological order of the works on the basis of the nature of their treatment. Now, it becomes necessary for us to employ the different method for fixing up their chronological order. Only after we have done so, we can utilise the argument based on the nature of treatment.

The Author of Prajñāpanā and His Date:—In the original text of *Prajñāpanā* there occurs no reference to its author. But in the beginning, after benedictory verses, there are two gāthās which have some connection with this problem. Āc. Haribhadra and Āc. Malayagiri have commented on them. But they consider them to be of the nature of interpolation. These two gāthās mention Ārya Śyāma as the author of *Prajñāpanāsūtra*. This means that even before the time of Āc. Haribhadra, *Prajñāpanā* was known as a work of Ārya Śyāma.

Āc. Malayagiri uses an epithet 'Bhagavān for Ārya Śyāma. The passages in point are as follows :

“bhagvān Ārya Śyāmo'pi ittham eva sūtram racayati” (Comm. p. 72).

“bhagavān Ārya-Śyāmāh paṭhati” (Ibid, p. 47). “sarveśām api prāvacaṇika-sūriṇām matāni bhagavān Ārya Śyāma upadiṣṭavān” (Ibid, p. 385). “bhagavad-Ārya Śyāma pratipattau” (Ibid, p. 385).¹ This points out his greatness. From these two gāthās it becomes clear that Ārya Śyāma belonged to Vācaka lineage (vaṁśa), and was well versed in Pūrvaśruta. In the composition of *Prajñāpanā-sūtra* he had displayed his talent to such an extent that even Aṅga and Upāṅga works recommend the readers to refer to *Prajñāpanā* for detailed discussions on various subjects.

The *Nandisūtra Paṭṭāvali* enumerates the names beginning from Sudharma. There the eleventh name is of Ārya Śyāma. The actual words of the Paṭṭāvali are : “vaṁdimo hāriyaṁ sāmajjaṁ.” Thus according to this Paṭṭāvali he belonged to Hāritagotra. But the above mentioned two interpolated gāthās regard him as 23rd in the line of Vācakavaṁśa. Following these two gāthās Āc. Malayagiri too considers him to be 23rd in the line. But it is to be borne in mind that therein we are told this much that he is 23rd in the line ; there we find no enumeration of the names from Sudharma to Ārya Śyāma

From the Paṭṭāvalis we know the fact that there were three persons bearing the same name Kālakācārya. The first Kālaka is that whose death (according

1 All these references have been noted by Pt. Becharadasaji in his note in Bhagavati-sūtra, Pt. II, p. 135.

to *Dharmasāgariyā Paṭṭāvali*; birth according to *Kharataragacchiya Paṭṭāvali*)¹ occurred in 376 V.N. (i.e. 376 years after the death of Lord Mahāvira). The second Kālaka is that who destroyed the King Gardabhilla and who flourished in V.N. 453 (= 17 years before the commencement of Vikrama Era). The third Kālaka is that who flourished in V.N. 993 = 523 V.S.) and who changed the day of Saṁvatsarī from the 5th day of Bhādrapada to the 4th.

According to the tradition represented by the Paṭṭāvalis the first Kālaka and Śyāmācārya, the author of *Prajñāpanā*, are identical. But in the Paṭṭāvalis Śyāmācārya is not regarded as 23rd in the line while in the two gāthās, under consideration, he is so regarded. Hence it becomes necessary for us to regard the references to his number in the line as secondary, while tackling the problem of his date.

The third Kālaka who flourished in 993 V.N. (= 523 V.S.) could in no way be the author of *Prajñāpanā* because Nandī which was written before 993 V.N. (= 523 V.S.) mentions *Prajñāpanā* in the list of Āgamas.

Now what remains for us to decide is as to who out of the first two Kālakas is identical with Śyāmācārya. Dr. U. P. Shah opines that, Śyāmācārya mentioned 11th in the line and Kālakācārya, destroyer of King Gardabhilla, become identical, if the first two Kālakas were regarded as one identical person. In the Paṭṭāvalis where these two Kālakas are considered to be two different persons, the date of one is 376 V.N. and that of another is 453. Though it is written there that 376 V.N. is the year of birth, elsewhere it is considered to be the year of death. Similarly, 453 V.N. too seems most probably the year of death (of the second Kālaka). Thus there is no long gap between the dates of the two Kālakas. If we take 376 V.N. to be the year of birth (of the first Kālaka) even then there will be a gap of only 77 years between the dates of two Kālakas. These two Kālakas may or may not be identical but it is certain that *Prajñāpanā* is a work of that Kālaka who flourished before the commencement of Vikrama Era.

In *Prajñāpanāsūtra* the exposition of the divisions of living beings is found in verses instead of in prose.² And these verses occur even in the *Uttarādhyayana-sūtra* and *Niryukti*. From this it is proved that these verses are not added in the *Prajñāpanāsūtra* after its compilation but they are included by the compiler himself while compiling the work. So, we can definitely say that *Prajñāpanā* is later than *Uttarādhyayanasūtra*. It is interesting to note that *Niryukti gāthās* occur in *Mūlācāra* and *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*. Hence it is very difficult to decide as to who—Junior or Senior Bhadrabāhu—composed them. But many of them

1 “adyaḥ prajñāpanakṛta indrasya agre nigodavīcaravakta Śyāmācāryaparanāma/ sa tu virat 376 varṣair jātaḥ.

2 These verses occur, with minor changes, in the XXXVI Chapter of Uttarādhyayana

seem to be *saṅgrahaṇī gāthās*, current in the tradition, which afterwards, were included in the *Niryukti* by the author himself. Thus the problem of the date of the *Niryuktis* has its own difficulty. And according to scholars, *Uttarādhyayanāsūtra* has gradually assumed its present form. The narrative story-part, the didactic-part and the philosophical part—these three parts are noticeable in the *Uttarādhyayanāsūtra*. Scholars are of the opinion that these three parts are composed at different periods of time. But it is generally held that it, assumed its present form in 3rd-4th Century B.C. And *Prajñāpanā*, being composed after *Uttarādhyayana*, should be of a later date, than that of *Uttarādhyayana*. Moreover, this much we can definitely hold that the *gāthās* contained in the *Ācā āṅga-Niryukti* (Refer to *Prajñāpanā Sū.* p. 14, Note 1) are preserved in their original form. It is so because therein the mention is made of the 36 names of Pṛthivi (earth) and the number of these names is really 36. These very *gāthās* occur in the *Uttarādhyayanāsūtra*. There too 36 names are hinted at in the phrase “bheyā chattisamāhiyā”. In spite of this hint or reference it enumerates 40 names (or types) of Pṛthivi. Hence the question arises as to when these four types were conceived and added to the 36. The four types were included in the *gāthā* but the original reference to 36 remained there side by side. Āc. Śilāṅka has explained only the 36 divisions mentioned in the *Ācārāṅga-Niryukti*. But the *Ācārāṅgacūrṇi* enumerates 40 divisions. This clearly proves that the additional four divisions came to be included in the 36 after the composition of the *Niryukti*. The structure of the concerned *gāthā* shows that it is a *saṅgrahaṇī gāthā*. In spite of this, some may raise a question as to whether this *saṅgrahaṇī gāthā* is from the pen of the author of *Niryukti* or it is a traditionally current *gāthā* which he included in the *Niryukti*. The possible answer to this question is that he included the traditionally current *gāthā* in his work, the reason being that it is found in the *Uttarādhyayana* too.

To sum up, if *Prajñāpanā* were composed after *Uttarādhyayana*, then we can conclude that it is a work belonging to the period of time later than 3rd-4th Century. B.C.; that is, in that case we cannot assign it to an earlier date.

Tradition believes, on the basis of the identical meaning of the two names that Kālaka who explained Nigoda and Āc. Śyāma are not two different persons. According to tradition he secured the status of Yugapradhāna in 335 V.N. and lived upto the year 376 V.N. Now, if *Prajñāpanā* were the work of this Kālaka, then it might have been composed in the period 335-376 V.N. (i.e. 135-194 years, before the commencement of Vikrama Era; 78-137 B.C.). If we were to consider the *Niryukti* to be the work of Senior Bhadrabāhu and also to think that there is a reason to believe that the *Niryukti* follows the *Uttarādhyayana* in mentioning 36 divisions then *Prajñāpanā* is proved later than the *Niryukti*; and the date of *Prajñāpanā* is not in conflict with that of Senior Bhadrabāhu because he is believed to be earlier than *Prajñāpanā*.

Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama, in its present form, is a work of two Ācāryas Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali who are posterior to Dharasena who, in turn flourished sometime after 683 V.N. From this we can safely conclude that *Prajñāpanā* is prior to *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*. Maturity of thought, Systematic treatment and employment of commentarial style—all these that are found in *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* are due to its being lately composed. *Prajñāpanā* is mentioned in the list of Āgamas, given in the *Nandisūtra* which belongs to the period of time prior to 523 V.S. Thus even the date of *Nandisūtra* is not in conflict with our proposed date of *Prajñāpanāsūtra*.