intensive forms occur in interpolated passages; the two noticed (both read by the Northern recension) are *dodhiyamāna* App. I.18.1.7 and *jāyvalyamāna* App. I.19.1.18 (also Mbh. 1.92.26c, 3.98.18c, 186.98c, 4.21.42c, etc., cf. *jāyvalan* 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 *jāyribhāmāna* 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 Kīśkindhā kāṇḍas: *asūya* (*abhayasūya* 2.8.1a and *abhayasūyitum* 4.15.19b), *pratikūlaya* (*apratikūlayan* 2.45.63b), *cirāya* (*citrayasi* 2.58.5c), *dirghaya* (*dirghayasi* 2.94.14d) *namasya* (*namasyanti* 2.2.32a, etc.), *nispatraya* (*nispatrayitum* 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 *śabdāyā* (*śabdāpayet* 2.53.3d). There are, of course, other stems which are clearly denominative in origin though no longer classified as such, for example, *kirta* (*kirtaya* 2.52.9f and *aparikirita* 2.94.16b), *pāl* (*pālsiyati* 2.8.8b, etc.) and *mantr* (*mantra* 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 ŚATKHANDĀGAMA**

By

DALSUHBHAH D. MALVANIA, Ahmedabad

The *Āṅga Sūtra Dṛṣṭivāda* is the common source of both *Prajñāpanāsūtra* and *Śatkhandāgama*. 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. *Śatkhandāgama*, in the first khaṇḍa called Jivāsthaṇa, investigates, through various points viz gati etc., the 14th stage of spiritual evolution (gūṇaṇaśāna; here the term jivasamāsa is employed for gūṇaṇaśāna), resulted from the destruction of Karmas. Of the remaining part Khuddābandha, Bandhasvāmitva, Vedān—these Khaṇḍas could be said to deal with living being keeping Karma in the forefront. In the Vargasākhaṇḍa 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 *Śatkhandāgama*, suggested by the commentator. The concerned Khaṇḍas of the *Śatkhandāgama* discuss the topics more in detail and more minutely than the Padas of *Prajñāpanāsūtra*. Thus in *Prajñāpanāsūtra*, the discussions centre round the Jiva while in *Śatkhandāgama* they centre round the Karma.

*Prajñāpanāsūtra* prominently employs question-answer style adopted in Āṅga Sūtras. And at many places it is clear that the questions and answers are of Gautama and Mahāvīra respectively. But *Śatkhandāgama* employs the scientific method the constituents of which are Uddēṣa, Nīrdeṣa 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 *Śatkhandāgama* is different. *Prajñāpanā* contains

¹ The topics like ‘Bandhasāmittavicaya,’ *Śatkhandāgama* Book VIII, occasionally employ question-answer style.
no Cūlika. But in Śatkañḍāgama Cūlika has been added. We know not as to who made these additions and when. But the term Cūlika 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 Śūtra while Śatkañḍāgama employs commentarial or expository style in addition to it. In the Śatkañḍāgama 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 ‘aniogadārāṇi’ the exposition is conducted through all those ‘entrances’ one by one. Moreover, the terms like Kitī, vedana, karma are explained through the method of Nikṣepas, viz. nāma, sthāpana, dravya and bhāva. In doing so it has clearly followed the style of exposition found in the Nīryukti of Jaina Āgamas. The employment of terms like ‘anugama’, ‘sahitaparūpaṇa’, ‘niddesa’, ‘vīhāsa’ (= vīhāsa) also points to its commentarial style. Everywhere in Śatkañḍāgama a discussion on those particular margañāvāras (topics of investigation) begins through the words ‘gadiyānuvādaṇa’, ‘indiyānuvādaṇa’, ‘kāyānuvādaṇa’ etc. This system is rarely found in the Prajñāpanāsūtra. Only two words ‘disānuvādaṇa’ and ‘khetānuvādaṇa’ occur in it. But the word ‘gatyanuvādaṇa’ 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 Śatkañḍāgama Book VI contains 9 Cūlikas. Book X I, Book XI, 2 and Book XII, 3. In the Sū. 381 (Book XIV) it is explicitly stated that—“etō uvarimagaritāho cūlī nāma.”
2 Śatkañḍāgama 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 Śatkañḍāgama 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.

saṅgrahaṅī gāthās. Gāthās 99-101 of Prajñāpanāsūtra occur in Śatkañḍāgama. The gāthās as found in Śatkañḍāgama are as follows:

Book XIV

Sū. 121 “tatthā imañi sahārāpalakkhaṇaṁ bhaṇādām —
Sū. 122 sāhārācāmāhiro sahārāpalamāṇapāyagahaṇaṁ ca /
 sāhārācāvijayaṁ sāhārāpalakkaṇhaṁ bhaṇadām //
Su. 123 eyassa aṇugghaṅhaṇaṁ bhabuṇa sāhārāgāneeyasya /
eyaṣa jam bhabuṇa samāsado tahpi hody eyassa //
Su. 124 samagāṁ vaktaraṇāṇi samagāṁ teśinī sarira-piippatti /
samagāṁ ca aṇugghaṅhaṇī samagāṁ uśasānivissā //

It is noteworthy that Śatkañḍāgama quotes these gāthās having employed the term ‘bhaṇādām’ 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 ‘lakkaṅhaṇaṁ bhaṇadām’, while Prajñāpanāsūtra gāthā 101 gives the reading ‘lakkaṅhaṇaṁ eyaṁ’. Though the gāthā occurring in the Sūtra 123 and Prajñāpanāsūtra gāthā no. 10 are identical, the reading of this gāthā given by Prajñāpanāsūtra is more correct than the one offered Śatkañḍāgama. The reading as we find in Śatkañḍāgama is in disorder and corrupt. Once again the gāthā occurring in Sūtra 124 and Prajñāpanāsūtra gāthā 99 are one and the same but both the works give different readings. In this case too Prajñāpanāsūtra gives correct reading.

At the occasion of discussing the topic of alpa-bahutva (numerical variation) of jīva (living beings), the beginning of ‘Mahāāḍaṅḍaya’ in Prajñāpanāsūtra is as follows:

“aha bhante savajivappabahuṁ mahāāḍaṅḍayaṁ vattaissami-savattho vā gabbhavakkarṇīya manussā ————. And the end is as follows: “sajogi vīsesāhyā 96, saṃhāratthā vīsesāhyā 97, savajjavīsesāhyā 98. Sūtra 334.

Even in Śatkañḍāgama there occurs Mahāāḍaṅḍaya. There its beginning is—“etō savajjvesu mahāāḍaṅḍaō kādaṇavo bhavadi savattho manussapajjātaī gabbhavakkarṇītā”. And its end is—“nigodajjā vīsesāhyā”. Book VII. Sūtra 1-79.

The difference that we find in the two expositions—one in Śatkañḍāgama and another in Prajñāpanāsūtra—is that Prajñāpanāsūtra mentions 98 divisions of living beings while Śatkañḍāgama 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 name ‘Mahāāḍaṅḍaya’ to this discussion. This suggests the common tradition,

1 At other places also the word Mahāāḍaṅḍaya is used in Śatk 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 Śatkhāndagāma this very topic is discussed. The only difference that we find is that Śatkhāndagāma discusses this topic through points of investigation (margāṇāsthāna), viz. Gati etc.; while Prajñāpanā śatkhāndagāma 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 Śatkhāndagāma 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. Śatkhāndagāma too, while treating of the 14 stages of spiritual evolution (gupasthānas), discusses the alpa-bahutva of living beings through various points of investigation viz. Gati etc.1 This discussion contained in Śatkhāndagāma is deeper than the one found in Prajñāpanāsūtra. Moreover, Śatkhāndagāma 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 Śatkhāndagāma 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.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Prajñāpanāsūtra} & & \text{Śatkhāndagāma} \\
1 & \text{Diśa}^3 & - \\
2 & \text{Gati} & 1 \text{Gati} \\
3 & \text{Indriya} & 2 \text{Indriya} \\
4 & \text{Kāya} & 3 \text{Kāya} \\
5 & \text{Yoga} & 4 \text{Yoga} \\
6 & \text{Veda} & 5 \text{Veda} \\
7 & \text{Kaśāya} & 6 \text{Kaśāya} \\
8 & \text{Leśyā} & 10 \text{Leśyā} \\
9 & \text{Samyaktva} & 12 \text{Samyaktva} \\
10 & \text{Jāna} & 7 \text{Jāna} \\
11 & \text{Darśana} & 9 \text{Darśana} \\
12 & \text{Sānyāsā} & 8 \text{Sānyāsā} \\
13 & \text{Upayoga} & - \\
14 & \text{Āhāra} & 14 \text{Āhāra} \\
\end{align*}
\]

1 Śatkhāndagāma, 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

The point worthy of note is that at the end of this treatment occurs, in both the works, the ‘Mahādaṇḍika.’ (Śatkhā. Book VII, p. 575). As has been already said, Prajñāpanā mentions in Mahādaṇḍika, 98 divisions of living beings, while Śatkhāndagāma 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 Śatkhāndagāma. 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 Śatkhāndagāma suggests the crystalized stage. The crystalized stage that resulted from fluid stage is represented by 14 stages of spiritual evolution (gupasthāna) 14 points of investigation (margāṇāsthāna) 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 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 gupasthāna (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 Śatkhāndagāma. In the Kālānugama (Book VII, p. 114 ff.) the kālāsthitī (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 daṇḍakās (Prajñāpanā, Sthitipada IV).
Aagain, 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 Niruykti gāthās occur in both the works suggests that Niruykti 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 Niruykti are from the pen of Bhadrabāhu—Senior or Junior whoever he may be—and which are borrowed from an old tradition, see Sañ. Vol. XIII,Śū. 4-9, 12, 13, 15, 16 etc. Āvani -31 ff, Viśiṣṭa 604 ff.

Moreover, one striking point of similarity is to be noted. In the discussion on gatyogati (transmigration) there occurs, in both the works, the discussion on the acquisition of the position of Tirthāṅkaara, Cakravarti, Baladeva, Vāsudeva. The only difference is that Prajñāpanā adds two more positions viz. Māṇḍalika and Caitra. (Prajñāpanā Śū. 1466-68), Sañkha,VI, Śū. 216, 220.

Upāśa Prajñāpanā sūtra is the work of Ārya Śyāmacārya. 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 súttini 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 ‘sthaṇa’ 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 (margaṇāsthāna) for the examination of and search for the 14 stages of spiritual evolution of a living being (guṇāsthāna) which are known as Jivasamāsa. 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 Karmprakṛti, Sañkhandāgama, 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 Śtāṇa-kavāś tradition tried to present in the form of thokada works, written in Gujarati the ideas and thoughts of Āgamas, it presented the margaṇāsthānas etc. in such a way as could be easily grasped by an ordinary reader. And in the Śāgā work named Śtāṇānāa too a particular item is presented keeping in view the number of its constituents. But let us remember that even in the days of Śtāṇānaa 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 Sañkhandāgama if we were guided only by the fact that the treatment of the subject-matter in the Sañkhandāgama is more detailed and subtle than that found in Prajñāpanasūtra. 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 Dṛṣṭīvāda. This means that innumerable Ācāryas have variously presented the subject-matter of Dṛṣṭīvāda 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 Prajñāpāna are more simple and brief than those in Śatkhandāgama the former is prior to the latter. But on account of the difficulty as already pointed out it is not proper to fix Prajñāpāna prior to Śat-khandāgama. 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 Prajñāpāna and His Date.—In the original text of Prajñāpāna 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 Prajñāpāna-sūtra. This means that even before the time of Āc. Haribhadra, Prajñāpāna 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 itham eva sūtram racayati” (Comm. p. 72).

“bhagvān Ārya-Śyāmāḥ paṭhaṭi” (Ibid. p. 47). “sarveśām api prāvacanika-sūrīnām maṇi bhagvāvan Ārya Śyāma upadīṣṭvan” (Ibid. p. 385). “bhagvad-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 (vaṇśa), and was well versed in Pūrvaśruta. In the composition of Prajñāpāna-sūtra he had displayed his talent to such an extent that even Aṅga and Upāṅga works recommend the readers to refer to Prajñāpāna for detailed discussions on various subjects.

The Nandisūtra Pratīṣṭāvali enumerates the names beginning from Sudharma. There the eleventh name is of Ārya Śyāma. The actual words of the Paṭṭāvali are: “vaṇḍimo hāriyaṁ sāmaṇjaṁ.” Thus according to this Paṭṭāvali he belonged to Hārītagotra. But the above mentioned two interpolated gāthās regard him as 23rd in the line of Vācakavanśa. 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 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. Bechardasa in his note in Bhagavati-sūtra, Pt. II, p. 135.

to Dharmasāgariyā Paṭṭāvali; birth according to Kharataragacchaya Paṭṭāvali) occurred in 376 V.N. (i.e. 376 years after the death of Lord Mahāvīra). 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 Saṅhavatsari 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 Prajñāpāna, 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 Prajñāpāna because Nandi which was written before 993 V.N. (= 523 V.S.) mentions Prajñāpāna 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 Prajñāpāna is a work of that Kālaka who flourished before the commencement of Vikrama Era.

In praṭīṣṭāśūtra the exposition of the divisions of living beings is found in verses instead of in prose.² And these verses occur even in the Uttarādhyayanaśūtra and Nīryukti. From this it is proved that these verses are not added in the Prajñāpānaśūtra after its compilation but they are included by the compiler himself while compiling the work. So, we can definitely say that Prajñāpāna is later than Uttarādhyayanaśūtra. It is interesting to note that Nīryukti gāthās occur in Mūlaśāra and Śatkhandāgama. Hence it is very difficult to decide as to who—Junior or Senior Bhadradhāvu—composed them. But many of them

¹ “adyāḥ praṭīṣṭāpanakṛta indraśyā agre nigodavicaravaṇa Śyāmācārīyaparanāmaḥ sa tu viratī 376 varṣair jātah.

² These verses occur, with minor changes, in the XXXVI Chapter of Uttarādhyayana
seem to be saṅghrahaḥ gathās, current in the tradition, which afterwards, were included in the Niryukti by the author himself. Thus the problem of the date of the Niryukti has its own difficulty. And according to scholars, Uttarādhyāyanasūtra has gradually assumed its present form. The narrative story-part, the didactic-part and the philosophical part—these three parts are noticeable in the Uttarādhyāyanasūtra. 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 Uttarādhyāyanasūtra, should be of a later date, than that of Uttarādhyāyanasūtra. Moreover, this much we can definitely hold that the gathās contained in the Ācārānga-Niryukti (Refer to Prajñāpanā Śū, p. 14, Note 1) are preserved in their original form. It is so because therein the mention is made of the 36 names of Pṛthivī (earth) and the number of these names is really 36. These very gathās occur in the Uttarādhyāyanasūtra. There too 36 names are hinted at in the phrase “bheyaḥ chaitismāhīyaḥ”. Inspite of this hint or reference it enumerates 40 names (or types) of Pṛthivī. Hence the question arises as to when these four types were conceived and added to the 36. The four types were included in the gathā 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 Ācārāṅgaśāstra 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 gathā shows that it is a saṅghrahaḥ gathā. In spite of this, some may raise a question as to whether this saṅghrahaḥ gathā is from the pen of the author of Niryukti or it is a traditionally current gathā which he included in the Niryukti. The possible answer to this question is that he included the traditionally current gathā in his work, the reason being that it is found in the Uttarādhyāyanasūtra too.

To sum up, if Prajñāpanā were composed after Uttarādhyāyanasūtra, 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. Śyama are not two different persons. According to tradition he secured the status of Yugapradhāna in 335 V.N., and lived up to 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 Bhadrabahu and also to think that there is a reason to believe that the Niryukti follows the Uttarādhyāyanasūtra 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 Bhadrabahu because he is believed to be earlier than Prajñāpanā.