

Jain Itihas Society.

JAIN ITIHAS SERIES

NO. 1.

*A Lecture on Jainism, delivered before the Dharma
Maha-Mahotsava or Great Religious Assemblage
at Muttra, by Lala Benarsi Dass,
M. A., Head Master, Victoria
College, Lashkar, Gwalior, on
29th December, 1901.*

Jainism was ably represented by B. Benarsi Dass,
M. A.—*The Pioneer.*

Agra :

PRINTED AT THE MOON PRESS.

1902.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

Introduction	1
Jainism misunderstood	4
Causes of misunderstanding	5
Antiquity of the Jains	7
Jainism never originated after Shankar Acharya						<i>ib</i>
Jainism is not an off-shoot of Buddhism	8
Hindu Scriptures...	9
Buddhist Works	16
Jain Shastras	19
Buddha not a disciple of Mahavira	21
Buddha an older contemporary of Mahavira	<i>ib</i>
Antiquity of the Jains further	23
Jainism not a product of Brahmanism. Both product of the common atmosphere of ancient India	24
Ancient India much misunderstood	25
Ancient India in Jain Shastras	29
MaxMuller's opinion	<i>ib</i>
No borrowing in ancient India	32
MaxMuller's opinion.	<i>ib</i>
Hinduism and Brahmanism misnomers	34
Jainism was not founded by Parshva Nath but by Rishabha Deva	36
Buddhist Works	<i>ib</i>
Jain Shastras	37
Hindu Scriptures...	37
Inscriptions at Muttra	40

Ancient India once more	43
Yoga Darshana	<i>ib</i>
Samkhya Darshana	48
Mahabharata	51
Charvaka Darshana	52
Tenets of the Jains	55
Ratna Trayi	59
Eleven Pratimas	<i>ib</i>
Dasha Lakshani Dharma	63
Twelve Anuprekshas	64
Charitra of a Muni	68
Why the Jain monks are naked and why the Jains worship naked images	69
Winding up	73
Letters	77
Office-holders and other workers of the Jain Itihas Society...	83

A LECTURE ON JAINISM.

GENTLEMEN,

I stand before you this noon to speak on a religion which was preached in this Bharat-varsha in time out of mind by the Kshatriyas, a religion that was preached neither by the Brahmans, nor by the Vaishya, nor by the Sudras, but I say, by the Kshatriyas. I stand before you to speak on a religion that was preached not by such Kshatriyas as hunt life, sacrifice life, and eat life, but by Kshatriyas who made a universal proclamation "Ahimsa Paramo Dharmah!" "Destroy no living creature! Injure no living creature! This is the highest religion;" who have said thus, spoken thus, declared thus, and explained thus: "As is my pain when I am knocked, struck, menaced, beaten, burned, tormented, or deprived of life; and as I feel every pain and agony from death down to the pulling out of a hair; in the same way, be sure of this, all kinds of living beings feel the same pain and agony as I, when they are ill-treated in the same way. For this reason, all sorts of living beings should not be beaten, nor treated with violence, nor abused, nor tormented, nor deprived of life.'

Gentlemen, I stand before you this noon to speak on a religion whose glory the dumb creatures, the cows, the goats, the sheep, the lambs, the hens, the pigeons, and all other living creatures, the beasts and the birds

sing with their mute tongues ; the only religion which has for thousands of years past advocated the cause of the silent-tongued animals ; the only religion which has denounced slaughter of animals for sacrifice, food, hunting, or any other purpose whatsoever ; the only religion which has fully acted up to the principle of Ahimsa Paramo Dharmah ! and carried it out faithfully and loyally ; and making hundreds of people its converts, has saved myriads of lives that should have been otherwise massacred for providing them with food, if they were life-eaters, and for the purpose of their sacrifices and hunting, if they were addicted to these evils also.

Gentlemen, I stand before you to speak on the Daya-Maya Dharma, Jainism, which saved lives not only by making thousands of people its converts from the moment when the Rishi Rishabha first preached it, down to the present date, but which also moved the heart of even non-Jain Rajas and kings who issued Firmans and proclamations to save the slaughter of animals wherever Jains lived. We not only read that such Jain Rajas as the celebrated Asoka (and he was a Jain according to Raja Tarangini, Ain-i-Akbari, Asoka Avadhana, the inscriptions at Girnar, and Jain traditions, before he became a Bauddha) proclaimed from the icy Himalaya down to Cape Comorin, from Gujerat to Behar, that no animal should be killed for any purpose whatsoever, but we also read that such Mahomedan kings as the mighty and tolerant Akbar issued Firmans that no animal should be

slaughtered during Paggusan days in places where Jains dwelt. Hindu Rajas like the Maharana Shri Raj Singh of the ten thousand villages of Mewar issued commandments to their nobles, Ministers, Patels and Patwaris : “(1) That from time immemorial the temples and dwellings of the Jains have been authorised ; let none, therefore, within their boundary, carry animals to slaughter—This is their ancient privilege. (2) Whatever life, whether male or female, passes their abode for the purpose of being killed is *amarah* (is saved.) ” Even now we find in many places privileges granted to the Jains that on Panchami, Ashṭami and Chaturdashi, no animal should be slaughtered where Jains live. Nay, even the Bharbhooja cannot burn his Bhar on these sacred days. In my native place the butcher cannot cross the Jain lane with baskets containing flesh. And this Daya-māya Dharma, Jainism, was preached by Kshatriyās, and neither by the Brahmans, nor by the Vaishyas, nor by the Sūdrās. Some persons who are groping in the dark in this respect say that Jainism is a religion of the Banias, or that it is a religion of the Shravagīs, or that it is a religion of the Vaishyas. But no ! They are ignorant, they are wrong, they are misinformed ! who say thus, who speak thus, who talk thus. Jainism is a religion of the Kshatriyas. All Jain Tirthankaras from the Digambara Rishi Rishabha down to the Digambara Rishi Vardhaman were Kshatriyās, born in noble families, such as those of the Ikshvaku Vansā, Hafi Vansa, &c.

Gentlemen, Jainism is also a religion whose glory the dumb creatures sing with their mute tongues, for, tell me, gentlemen, what other religion has proclaimed the total prohibition of animal slaughter for any purpose whatsoever, and what other religion is practically so very punctilious about animal life. Then, gentlemen, I stand before you this noon to speak on Jainism, a religion which was founded and continued by Kshatriyas, and a religion which can properly claim to head the list of religions that have for their motto Ahimsa Paramo Dharmah !

This Jainism has been most pitiable mis-understood. Its origin has been mis-understood, its tenets have been mis-understood, its philosophy has been mis-understood, and its antiquity has been mis-understood. And in short it has been mis-understood wholesale. It has not only been mis-understood, but spitefully found fault with. People not only mis-understand it, but also cast slurs upon it out of spite, out of enmity, and out of faction. Some have called it a Nastika religion. Some have called it a religion of the Banias and Shravagis. Some have regarded it as an offshoot of Buddhism. Some have looked upon it as a religion that took its rise upon the revival of Brahmanism under Shankaracharya. Some have regarded it as a product of Brahmanism. Some have called Mahavira its founder. Some have called Parshva Nath its originator. Some

have looked upon it as a bundle of uncleanly habits. Some say that the Jains never bathe, that they never clean the teeth. Some blame the Jains for worshipping naked images. Nay, some mischiefmongers have gone to extremes. They have said "If an elephant comes in your face, no matter that it crushes you to death, but do not enter a Jain temple to save yourself." Some say that there is no such thing as Jain philosophy.

All this is due to trifling with, mildness, and faction; trifling with of the western scholars, mildness of the Jains, and faction between the Hindus and the Jains. Western scholars have done us much good. They have brought to light much of the Vedic and Buddhistic literature. They have made other wonderful discoveries. For all this we are grateful to them. But this should not prevent me from expressing my idea that they trifle with religions. They play with religions. This you can easily see, at least, in the case of Jainism. While one scholar holds that Jainism is a religion only twelve centuries old, a second says that it is a branch of Buddhism, and a third asserts that it is a product of Brahmanism. Some regard Mahavira its founder, others call Parshva Nath its author. Religions are not things to be thus trifled with. They have a halo of sanctity around them. They are, as it were, under a spell, and conflicting opinions thus pronounced break that spell, and de-

Causes of mis-under-
standing.

prive ancient religions of their antiquity and sanctity. We ought to approach religions with reverence.

Gentlemen, perhaps you know the story of the boys and the frogs. Some boys were pelting the frogs with stones. An old frog raised its head and said : " O boys, what is play to you is death to us." Similarly, old Jainism may say : " O scholars, what is play to you is death to us." It is a trifle, no doubt, for a scholar to pronounce a certain opinion, but it may result in the death of the sanctity and the antiquity of a certain religion.

The Jains also have been acting too mildly. They have been seeing their religion cruelly dealt with. They have been seeing themselves confounded with the Buddhists and the Charvakas. They have been seeing all sorts of obnoxious opinions pronounced with regard to themselves. But they have been tolerating all this patiently, never caring to say a word in their defence.

The jealousy between the Hindus on the one hand and the Jains and the Buddhists on the other, is also much to blame. But I should ignore it here. I ought rather to rejoice that under the benign rule of the British Government we have now offered to us an opportunity to meet in this Maha-Mandal, the Hindus, the Jains, and the Buddhists all together under one canopy, and a chance to defend our religions, and to make a true representation as to what those religions are. Indeed, I regard this moment a lucky, and this

place a blessed one, because we have now and here an opportunity to exchange thoughts on our respective faiths.

Gentlemen, I have said above that a great misunderstanding has arisen as to our religion, and that many blemishes and slurs have been cast upon it. Now I shall briefly try to remove some of these misunderstandings and to wash away these blemishes and slurs.

First as to our antiquity. Jainism never originated after Shankaracharya. Those writers like Lethbridge and Mountstuart Elphinstone, who say that on the decline of Buddhism, Jainism originated in the 6th century and died in the 12th, though some of the Jains are still found, greatly err. They show their ignorance not only of Jain Shastras, but also of the sacred Texts of the Hindus and the Buddhists. These writers ought to know that Shankaracharya himself held debate with the Jains at a place near Ujjain, as is recorded by Madhava and Ananda Giri in their Shankar-Dig-Vijaya, and by Sadananda in his Shanka-Vijaya-Sara. Nay, Shankar has himself recorded that Jainism existed at a very early date, for in his Bhashya on the Vedanta Sutas of Badarayana, he says that Sutas 33—36 of 2nd Pada of 2nd Adhyaya apply to the Jains. Ramanuja, another Bhashyakara of the Shariraka Mimamsa of Badarayana, is also of the same opinion in his Shri-bhashya.

Now when Shankaracharya thus speaks of the Jains, how could they come into existence after him?

I hope writers like Lethbridge and Mountstuart Elphinstone shall never in future regard Jainism as coming into existence in the 6th century A. D. It will be the great delight of the Jains if the misleading passages in the works of such writers shall be struck off, for they are creating a great misunderstanding. Lethbridge's history is taught in schools and young generations derive false notions regarding Jainism from that book.

Now let us see if Profs. Wilson, Lassen, Barth, Jainism is not an offshoot of Buddhism. Weber and others are right in speaking of the Jains as a branch of the Buddhists. But before so doing we should note that although they speak of Jainism as branching off from Buddhism in the early centuries of its origin, they do not say, How? When? Under what circumstances? What led to this branching off? What was the cause of this branching off? Nay, some of them have the candidness to confess that at the time when they were writing their opinions they knew very little of Jainism. For instance, Barth in his *Religions of India*, 1892, speaks of Jainism as "one of the least known among those which have performed an important part in the past of India," but "which is as yet known to us only in a sort of abstract way, and in regard to the historical development of which we are absolutely in the dark."

Again he candidly confesses that to answer the question "At what period did the sect attain a really

independent existence?" "We must first be able to determine the character of primitive Jainism, and that is a problem which we will be able to face only after we attain access to the canonical books of the sect. Up to the present time our sources of information on the matter are limited to external testimonies." Weber also says in his History of Indian Literature, "Our knowledge of the Jains is otherwise derived from Brahmanical sources only." Under these circumstances can the opinion of these scholars be expected to be of much weight to us? Certainly not. The opinion of scholars who know almost nothing of Jainism cannot but be unsound, the more so when there is no evidence to support their conclusions except the weak argument of resemblance. These scholars were so much struck with the similarity between Jainism and Buddhism that they regarded the one as a copy of the other and since they knew little of the former they considered it as an offshoot of the latter, till they came to know more of it. This is in itself a very unsound argument. One sect may copy wholesale from the other, yet that is no ground for saying that the former took its rise from the latter or *vice versa*. This, however, should not detain us. Let us see if there is any mention of the Jains as a branch of the Buddhists in the sacred books of the Hindus, the Buddhists, or the Jains.

The Hindu Acharyas never speak of the Jains as a branch of the Buddhists. They
 Hindu scriptures. always speak of them as two inde-

pendent sects. In Madhava's Shankar-Dig-Vijaya it is said that Shankar held debate not only with the Jains near Ujjain, but also with the Buddhists at Benares. So it is also recorded in Ananda Giri's Shankar-Dig-Vijaya, and in Sadananda's Shankar-Vijaya Sara. Madhava in his Sarva-Darshana Sangraha, enumerates Jain Darshana as one of the sixteen Darshanās or philosophies current in the Deccan in the 14th century, as also Buddhism. Sadananda of Kashmere in his Advaita-Brahma-Siddhi speaks of both the Jain and the Buddhist systems. It is worthy of notice that he enumerates, the four sub-divisions of the Buddhists as (1) Vaibhashika, (2) Sautrantika, (3) Yogachara and (4) Madhyamika, but he does not include the Jains among them. Madhava in his Sarva-Darshana Sangraha does the same. These four sub-divisions of the Buddhists are frequently spoken of and widely known but the Jains are never included among them. In Siddhanta Shiromani, the author separately speaks of and criticises the Jain and the Buddhist view of astronomy. Varaha-Mihira, who according to Dr. Kern and others, lived in the 6th century A. D., makes very important references both to the Jains and the Buddhists in his Brihat-Samhita. He tells us that the Nagna or Jain worship Jin while the Sakya or the Buddhists worship Buddha.

शाक्यान् सर्वं हितस्य, शान्तमनसो नग्नान् जिनानां विदुः
(१८ श्लो० अ० ६१)

Gentlemen, note here what Varaha-Mihira said in the 6th century that the objects of worship of the

two sects, were altogether different. Similar is the reference made in Hanūman-Nataka. There Rama is spoken of as one whom the Jains call Arhat and whom the Buddhists call Buddha.

बौद्धावुद्ध इति प्रमाण पटवः—

अहं त्रितयजैनशासन रताः । (३ श्लो. १ अंक)

Varaha-Mihira further tells us that the images of Buddha and of the Deva of the Arhatas, i. e., the Jains should be differently constructed.

भाजानु लम्बबाहुः श्रीवत्साङ्गः प्रशान्त मूर्तिश्च । दिग्वासा
स्वरूपोरूपवांश्चकार्योऽर्हता देवः ॥ (४५ श्लोक ५८ अ.)

पद्माङ्कित कर चरणः, प्रसन्न मूर्तिस्तुनी चकेशश्च ॥ पद्मासनो
पविष्टः, पितेव जगती भवेद्बुद्धः ॥ (४४ ॥ अ. ५८).

In Bhagavata Buddha is spoken of as the founder of Buddhism and the Digambara Rishi Rishabha as the author of Jainism. But the most important testimony that the Jains and the Buddhists were different is recorded by the Rishi Vyasa or Badarayana, the author of the Shariraka Mimamsa and the Mahabharata. That sage, as I have said before, criticises the Jains in Sutras 33—36 of 2nd Pada of 2nd Adhyaya. He also criticises the Buddhists in Sutras 18—32. In Mahabharata the Jains and the Buddhists are spoken of as distinct. There is a reference in this ancient monument to many religions in Anugita of the Ashvamedha Parva, and the Jains and the Buddhists are two of them. See Anugita Adhyaya 49, Shlokas 2—12. I quote here

Max Muller's translation of the passage, "We observe the various forms of piety to be as it were contradictory. Some say piety remains after the body is destroyed. Some say that it is not so. Some say that everything is doubtful, and others that there is no doubt. Some say the permanent principle is impermanent, and others too that it exists, and others that exists and does not exist," and so on. Upon this Nilkantha remarks, "some hold that the self exists after the body is lost; others, that is, the Lokayatas or Charvakas, hold the contrary. Everything is doubtful is the view of the Syadvadins; nothing is doubtful that of the Tairthakas, the great teachers. Everything is impermanent, thus say the Tarkikas; it is permanent, say the Mimamsakas; nothing exists, say the Syadvadins. Something exists, but only momentarily, say the Saugatas or Buddhists," and so on. The word "Syadvadins" in Max Muller's Translation applies to the Jains. Nilkantha's full Tika upon the text referring to the Jains runs thus :—

सर्वं संशयित मितिस्थाद्वादिनः

सप्त भङ्गीनयज्ञाः (२ श्लो. ४६ अ.)

"Everything is doubtful, this is the religion of the Syadvadins who know the Sapta-Bhanganāya." This applies to the Jains. The Syadvadins are the Jains as is admitted by Barth in his Religions of India, p. 148, and as is mentioned in Amarakosha in a Kshepaka Shloka.

नैयायिकत्वस्यपादः स्याद्वादिनः आर्षकः (२ काण्ड ब्रह्मवर्ग between 6—7).

The Sapta-Bhanginayajnas are the Jains. The Sapta-Bhanginaya is an object of frequent attack by the Brahmans. If they find anything in Jainism which they think they should attack, it is this Sapta-Bhanginaya. It is this Sapta-Bhanginaya which is criticised by Badarayana in Sutra 33.

“नैक स्मिन्न सम्भवात्.”

It is this Sapta-Bhanginaya upon which Shankar bases his victory over the Jains near Ujjain as it recorded by Madhava in his Shankar-Dig-Vijaya. It is this Sapta-Bhanginaya which is criticised in Svarajya Siddhi, as a Pandit has recently told me. Now I ask you, gentlemen, if the Jains and the Buddhists were spoken of as different sects, as early as the time when the Mahabharata and the Vedanta Sutras were composed, how could the Jains be regarded as an offshoot of the Buddhists?

As for other references to Jainism in Brahmanical writings I may refer you to Mahabharata, Adi Parva, Adhyaya 3, Shlokas 26—27, where the Shesha Naga steals away the Kundala of Utanka in the disguise of a Nagna Kshapanaka.

सोऽपश्य दृष्ट पयिनग्नं क्षपणकम् २६ एतस्मिन्नन्तरेऽक्षपणक
स्त्वरमाण उपसृत्यते कुण्डले गृहीत्वा प्राद्रवत् २६.

Nilakantha explains Kshapanaka as Pakhanda Bhikshuka. A Nagna Pakhanda Bhikshuka must mean a Digambara Jain monk. It is a pity that the Brahmans introduce Jain monks on occasions when some bad duty is to be performed. For instance, see also Mudra-Rakshasa-Nataka, where a Jain monk has

to perform the unpleasant duty of secretly acting as a messenger.

The author of the Advaita-Brahma-Siddhi explains Kshapanaka as a Jain monk.

“क्षपणका” जैनमार्ग सिद्धान्त प्रवर्तका इतिकेषित् (पृ. १६८ Calcutta Edition.)

In Shanti Parva, Moksha Dharma, Adhyaya 239, Shloka 6, we find reference to the Sapta-Bhanganaya of the Jains. The Shloka runs thus:—

एतदेवंचनै वंचनचोभे नानुभेतथा । कर्मस्थाविषयं नूयुः सत्वस्थाः
समदर्शिनः ॥ ६ ॥

In Shanti Parva, Moksha Dharma, Adhyaya 264, Shloka 3, Jajali calls Tuladhara a Nastika,

“नास्तिक्यमपि जल्पसि” which is explained by Nilakantha as one against slaughter in Vedic sacrifices.

नास्तिक्यं हिंसात्मकत्वेन यन्ननिन्दा

This shows that even as early as when the Mahabharata was composed, or even earlier, there were Nastikas who were against slaughter in Vedic sacrifices. They cannot be the Samkhyas, for they are not Nastikas. They must be sects similar to the Jains.

In Yoga-Vasishtha in the Vairagya-Prakarna Rama desires to be as calm as Jin. The Shloka runs as follows :—

नाहंरामो नमेवाज्ज्ञा भावेषु न च मे मनः । शान्त आसितुमिच्छा
मिस्त्रात्मनीवजिनो यथा, ॥ (अ० १५, श्लो ८)

In Ramayana we read in Bala-kanda, Sarga 14, Shloka 22 that Dasharatha fed the Shramanas.

तापसां भुज्जते चापि श्रमणा भुज्जते तथा

This word is explained by Bhushana Tika as Digambara.

“अमणादिगम्बराः अमणा वात वसनाः” इति निघण्टुः

In the Tilaka Tika Shramana is explained as a Bauddha Sannyasin. It is, however, more frequently used for a Bauddha than for a Jain monk, and we should not attach much importance to it. It may be that Dasharatha fed both the Jain and the Bauddha monks

In Shakatayana's Unadi Sutra the word Jin occurs.

“इण् सिज् जिदीडुणविभ्यो नक्” (सू. २८६ पाद ३)

This is explained by the author of the Siddhanta Kaumadi as Arhan (जिनोऽर्हन्) which is a term used for the founder of Jainism.

It is true that Amara Kosha gives the words, Jin and Buddha, as synonyms, and that in Medini Kosha Jin means (1) Buddha, the founder of Buddhism, and (2) Arhan, the founder of Jainism, but wherever the word Jin occurs it ought to be taken as a name of the founder of a religion which derives its name from it rather than for the founder of a religion which owes its name to Buddha. This should specially be the case where the Vrittikara explains the term Jin as Arhan as in the case of the Unadi Sutra above referred to. From this it would follow that the word Jin in the Unadi Sutra is used for the founder of Jainism. And when did Shakatayana live? He is cited by Yaska in his Nirukta. Yaska lived many centuries before Panini, who lived before Patanjali, the author

of the Mahābhāṣya. Patanjali, they say, lived in the second century B. C.

I must not omit to mention that in Brahmanical writings both the words Jin and Arhan are used for the founder of Jainism, though the latter is used more frequently than the former. For instance, in Brihat Samhita of Varaha-Mihira the Nagna are called the followers of Jin.

In Raja Tarangini Asoka is said to have adopted Jin-shāsana:—

यः शान्तं वृजिनी राजा प्रपन्नो जिन शासनम् ।

शुष्कले चवितस्ताची तस्तारस्तूप मण्डले ॥

(राज तरङ्गिणी, प्रथमस्तरंगः)

It is from this word that we are called Jains.

The word Arhan occurs in Hanuman-Nataka, Ganesha-Purana, Bhagavata-Purana, &c. It is from Arhat that the Jains are called Arhats.

Let us now turn to Buddhist works. Therein Mahavira, the 24th Jain Tirthankara, is spoken of as a contemporary of Buddha, and as one of his six opponent teachers. In Svetambara Jain works like the Kalpa Sutra, Acharanga-Sutra, Uttaradhyayana, Sutra-Kritanga and others, Mahavira is spoken of as a Gnatrī-putra. The Gnatrīkas were the clan of Kshatriyas to which Mahavira belonged. The Gnatrīkas are frequently mentioned in the above-mentioned Jain works as also in others. Mahavira is also called a Vaisalika or

Buddhist Works.

a native of Vaisali; a Vaideha or a prince of Videha, a Kashyapa, or one of that Gotra. But he is frequently called Nattaputta, *i. e.*, Prakrit Natta=Sanskrit Gnatrika and Prakrita Putta=Sanskrit Putra. The Gnatrikas are also mentioned as Nadikas or Natikas in Buddhist works. The Jain Nirgranthas or Prakrita Niganthas are also frequently met with in Buddhist works, and they are there mentioned as the followers of Nigantha Nattaputta, our Mahavira. Some very important points of our creed are also referred to in Buddhist works, for instance, the Dig Vrita, the disuse of cold water by the monks, the doctrine of Action, and the doctrine of Kriyavada, &c. These are put into the mouth of Natta Putta, our Mahavira, or Nirgranthas, our Jain Gurus. Even the word Sāvaka or Shravaka meaning a lay Jain occurs in some passages:

This wonderful discovery is due to Bühler and Jacobi. I have myself read Mahavagga and Mahaparinibhana Sutta in the Sacred Books of the East. I have also read translations of passages in which our Gnatriputra or the Nirgranthas, or their creed, or the word Shravaka occurs. They are cited by Jacobi in Vol. XLV. of the Sacred Books of the East. The Buddhist works from which the passages have been cited are, besides Mahavagga and Mahaparinibhana Sutta, Anuguttara Nikaya, Samanaphala Sutta of the Dighnikaya, Sumangala Vilasani, a commentary by Buddhagosha on Brahmagala Sutta of the Digh Nikaya and Magghim Nikaya. The Oriental also mentions Lalita-Vastra. All these works were composed before the

birth of Christ. Max Müller in his *Six Systems of Philosophy and Natural Religion* and Oldenberg in his marvellous *The Buddha* also speak of Natta Putta as identical with Mahavira, who was one of the six Tirthaika Teachers and a contemporary of Buddha, though they mention him as founder of Jainism or the Nigantha sect which is by no means the case. But why should I cite their authority? From Mahavagga and Mahaparinibhana Sutta, and the translations of other passages quoted by Jacobi from other Buddhist works which I have read, I can safely hold on behalf of the Jains whom I represent here that the Natta Putta, the Niganthas, their creed, the Shravakas (in some passages) mentioned in Buddhist works are Jain. Nay in Buddhist works even the Chaturyama Dharma or the four Great vows of Parshva Nath is also referred to and wrongly put into the mouth of Mahavira, the Natta Putta. The Gotra of Sudharma Acharya and the place of Nirvana of Mahavira are also mentioned by the Buddhists.

I must not omit to mention the important fact that the term Nirgrantha is exclusively applied to a Jain monk. The words Shramana and Brahmana are used both by the Buddhists and the Jains for their monks, but the word Nirgrantha is used only by the Jains. It is also noteworthy that Barth who regards Jainism as a branch of Buddhism speaks of the Nirgranthas that are referred to in the Edicts of Asoka as the ancestors of the Jains. He is also struck with the discovery of Jacobi and Bühler, though, he says, that he should wait till further proof is forth-coming. He wrote in

1892 and the further proof was furnished by Jacobi in 1895 in S. B. E., Vol. XIV.

Now, Gentlemen, when the Jains are thus spoken of in the Buddhist works of the 4th or 3rd century before Christ, how could they be regarded as a branch of the Buddhists?

Let us now turn to Jain Shastras. In Darshana Sara, written by Deva-Nanda Acharya in Samvat 990 at Ujjain, it is said that in the Tirtha of Parshva Nath (that is during the period between the Arhatship of Parshva Nath and Mahavira) Buddha Kirti, a monk learned in the Shastras, a disciple of Pihitashrava, was doing Tapa on the bank of the Saryu in Palash Nagara. He saw some dead fish floating by him. He thought there was no harm in eating the flesh of dead fish because there was no soul therein. He left his Tapa, assumed red garments, and preached Bauddha religion.

सिरि पासणाइमित्ये । सर उतीरेपलासणयरत्ये ॥

पिहि आसवस्ससीहे । महालुब्धो बुद्धकित्तिमुणो ॥६॥

निमि पूरणा सणैया । अहिगयपव्वज्जाव त्रीं परमभट्ठे ॥

रतं वरं धरिता । पब दियं तेण एयत्तं ॥७॥

मंसस्सनात्थि जीवो । जहाफले दइयदुइ संकराए ॥

तम्हातं मुणित्ता । भखंतोणार्थ पाविट्ठो ॥८॥

मज्झणवज्जणिज्जं दव्व दवं । जइजलत्तइ एदं ॥

इतिलोए घोसित्ता । पव्वत्तियं संघ सावज्जं ॥९॥

अण्णोकरेदि कम्मं । अण्णोतंभुंज दीदि सिद्धंतं ॥

परिकथिज्जणणूणं । वसिकिच्चाणिस्थ भुववण्णो ॥१०॥

This Gatha of the Darshana Sara is cited as an authority by Swami Atma Ram, a Svetambara Sadhoo, in his Ajnana Timira Bhashkara and other works and by Pandit Shiva Chandra, a Digambara, in his Prashna-Uttara Dipika, and by almost all other living Pandits of the day as an authority for the view that Buddha was originally a Jain monk, who being corrupt in thought, recommended the use of flesh, and having assumed red garments, started a religion of his own.

Thus you will see, gentlemen, that in Brahmanical writings the Jains are nowhere spoken of as a branch of the Buddhists even as early as when Badarayana wrote, and that was the time when Buddha himself lived; that in Buddhist scriptures the Jains are spoken of as contemporary of Buddha or as a sect older than the newly arisen Bauddhas; and that according to Jain Shastras Buddha was a Jain monk, a disciple of Pihitashrava. How are the Jains to be regarded as an offshoot of the Buddhists then? Have not Weber, Wilson, and others done us great injustice in calling us an offshoot of the Buddhists? Certainly they have. We, Jains, can, however, respectfully make allowance for them, for their conclusions were due to haste. They are, after all, great scholars, and we should forget what they have said, though by their innocent but hasty opinions we have generally come to be regarded as a branch of the Buddhists. They never studied the antiquity of Jainism in the light of Jain, Buddhist and Brahmanical Texts.

Gentlemen, I should not omit to tell you that Buddha was never a disciple of Mahavira according to Jain Shastras as is said by Hunter and others. Buddha not a disciple of Mahavira. The Jains call him a disciple of Pihitashrava. Colebrooke, Stevenson, Major Delamaine, Dr. Hamilton and others confounded Gautama Buddha with Gautama Indrabhuti of the Jains, the chief Ganadhara of Mahavira, and since Gautama Ganadhara was a disciple of Mahavira, it was said that Gautama Buddha was also a disciple of Mahavira. This, however, was never said by the Jains, but by those who confounded Buddha with Indrabhuti, though this mistaken view was attributed to the Jains. According to the Jains Buddha was a disciple of Pihitashrava.

Gentlemen, I should not also omit to tell you what I may call the discovery of a strange coincidence between Jain and Buddhist Scriptures in one respect. Buddha an older contemporary of Mahavira. I have told you above that in Buddhist works Mahavira is spoken of as one of the six opponent teachers of Buddha, that is, the Buddhists call him a contemporary of Buddha. The Jain Shastras tell a similar story.

It has been said above that Buddha Kirti was a disciple of Pihitashrava who lived in the Tirtha of Parshva Nath. Swami Atma Ram traces the Pattavali of the Kavala-gachha from Swami Parshva Nath thus:-

Shree Parshava Nath

„ Shubha Datta Ganadhara

Shree Hari Dattaji
 „ Aryasamudra
 „ Swami Prabha Surya
 „ Keshi Swami.

He further tells as that Pihitashrava was one of the Sadhus of Swami Parabha Surya. We know from Uttara Dhayana Sutra and other Jain works that Keshi was of the party of Parshva Nath and that he lived in the days of Mahavira. Buddha-Kirti being a disciple of Pihitashrava must have also been a contemporary of Mahavira, though it seems an older contemporary.

Again we learn from Dharma Pariksha of Swami Amita-gata Acharya written in Samvat 1070 that Mogglayana a disciple of Parshva Nath started Bauddha religion out of enmity with Mahavira. He regarded Buddha, the son of Shuddhodhana, as Paramatman. This was owing to Kala Dosha.

रुष्टः श्रीवीरनाथस्य तपस्वी मौडिलायनः ॥
 शिष्यः श्रीपार्श्वनाथस्य विदधे बुद्ध दर्शनम् ॥६८॥
 शुद्धोदनं सुतं बुद्धं परमात्मानम ब्रवीत् ॥
 प्राणिनः कुर्वते किं न कोप वैरि पराजिताः ॥६९॥
 (धर्म परीक्षा अध्याय १८)

The word Shishya in this Shlōka must mean Shishya-para Shishya.

In Mahavagga (pp. 141-150 S. B. E., Vol. XIII.) we read that Mogglayana and Sari Putta, were two

Brahmans, the followers of Sangaya, the Paribbagaka (wandering ascetic). They went to Buddha in spite of the remonstrances of Sangaya and became his disciples. Thus Mogglayana being a disciple of a disciple of Parshva Nath according to Dharma Pariksha, this Sangaya the preceptor of Mogglayana, must have been a Jain, and must have belonged to the party of Parshva Nath like Keshi. And since Mogglayana was an enemical contemporary of Mahavira and he was also a disciple of Buddha himself, Mahavira and Buddha must have been contemporaries. It would, however, seem that according to the above two Jain Shastras and Shrenika Charitra, Buddha had already commenced to preach his new doctrines before Mahavira's Arhatship began.

As we know that Mogglayana was never the founder of Buddhism, the Shloka in Dharma Pariksha must be taken to mean that Mogglayana helped Buddha more than others in scattering his doctrines, a view which is confirmed by Buddhistic works, Mogglayana and Sari Putta being the two leading disciples of Buddha.

Let us now trace the antiquity of the Jains further. Let us now see if Jainism is a product of Brahmanism, and if it was started by the Swami Parshva Nath. This is the opinion of some scholars like Colebrooke, Buhler, and Jacobi. We are grateful to some of these scholars. We are specially grateful to Böhler and Jacobi. We are thankful to them for the wonderful discovery they have recently made, but at the same time we are

Antiquity of the
Jains further.

forced to proclaim with extreme pain that they do us great injustice if they regard Jainism as a product of Brahmanism, or if they look upon Parshva Nath as its founder. In so doing they would be simply illustrating the proverb "From the frying pan into the fire." They would be saving us from one difficulty but involving us into another. They would be playing Lassen, Weber, Barth, and Wilson as far as Jainism is concerned. These latter scholars were struck with the similarity between Jainism and Buddhism, and since they knew very little of the former, they regarded it as an offshoot of the latter. Bühler and Jacobi too are struck with the similarity between Jainism and Brahmanism and since they knew not all about the former they looked upon it as a branch of the latter. But may we not again point out here that this opinion is hasty and ought to have been reserved till further study—we mean the study of the Hindu Shastras. These two excellent scholars know that to disprove Jainism as an outcome of Buddhism, they discovered material in the Buddhist Texts themselves. They found that Jainism was not spoken of in Buddhist Scriptures as a religion posterior to Buddhism, but as a faith of the Nirgranthas who existed before Buddha. Let them now study Jainism in Hindu Scriptures. Let them now see what evidence the Hindu Shastras afford as to the antiquity of Jainism. Let

Jainism not a product of Brahmanism. Both product of the common atmosphere of ancient India.

them now see whether Jainism is a product of Brahmanism, or whether both are not a product of the

common atmosphere of ancient India.

Gentlemen, allow me to say here that ancient India has been much mis-understood

Ancient India much mis-understood.

Of course, you should not think that I am speaking like a haughty scholar.

I am neither a scholar nor a shadow of a scholar. I am a common student. My study of this question has been very brief. It was sometime ago that I received several questions through my patron, J. W. D. Johnstone, Esq., F. R. G. S., Inspector-General of Education, Gwalior State, in charge of Census Operations, from Captain C. E. Luard, Census Superintendent, Central India. Through the help of my friends I answered the questions but at the same time I was inspired to study the antiquity of Jainism. Since then we have been studying this question, and from what we have read as yet, I say that ancient India has been much mis-understood. This is an idea that has occurred to my mind, and I do not want to hide it. People have commonly supposed that there was nothing else in ancient India but Brahmanism. What this Brahmanism was they never explain. If they mean by Brahmanism each and everything that existed in ancient times in India, they are right in their supposition. But if they mean by Brahmanism the Vedic religion or the religion of Vedic sacrifices, I do not see how they can be justified in supposing that there was nothing else in ancient India but Brahmanism. These Vedic sacrifices were not all that existed in ancient India. There were, no doubt, people who said :—

“अग्नीषोमीयं पशुं हिंस्यात्”

"One should slaughter such animals as have Agni and Soma for their Devas." But at the same time there were people who proclaimed :—

“माह्न्याद् सर्वभूतानि ”

"One should not slaughter any animal."

There were also people who preached :—

There is no heaven, no final liberation, nor any soul in another world.

Nor do the actions of four castes, orders, &c., produce any real effect.

The Agnihotra, the three vedas, the ascetic's three staves, and smearing one's self with ashes,

Were made by nature as the livelihood of those destitute of knowledge and manliness.

If a beast slain in the Jyotishtoma rite will itself go to heaven,

Why then does not the sacrificer forthwith offer his father ?

If the Sraddha produces gratification to beings who are dead,

Then here, too, in the case of travellers when they start, it is needless to give provisions for the journey.

If beings in heaven are gratified by our offering the Sraddha here,

Then why not give the food down below to those who are standing on the house top?

While life remains let a man live happily, let him feed
on ghee even though he runs in debt;

When once the body becomes ashes, how can it ever
return again ?

If he who departs from the body, goes to another world,
How is it that he comes not back again, restless for
love of his kindred ?

Hence it is only as a means of livelihood that Brah-
mans have established here

All these ceremonies for the dead,—there is no other
fruit anywhere.

The three authors of the Vedas were buffoons, knaves
and demons.

All the well-known family of the Pandits, Jarphari,
Turphari, &c.

And all the obscene rites for the Queen commanded
in the Asvamedha,

These were invented by buffoons, and so all the
various kinds of presents to the priests,

While the eating of flesh was similarly commanded
by night-prowling demons (Sarva-Darshana-Sam-
graha, Cowell and Gough, pp. 10 and 11.)

These pleasure-seeking revilers of the Vedas were
the Charvakas.

Dr. Rajendralal Mitra says in his preface to the
Yoga-Sutras that in the Sama-Veda there is a re-
ference to a Yati who condemned sacrifices, and whose
wealth was transferred to Bhrigu. According to
Aitareya-Brahmana some such Yatis were punished by
being thrown before jackals.

In Rig-Veda, Ashtaka 3, Adhyaya 3, Varga 21, Rik 14, people are mentioned who lived in Kikata or Magadha, and who condemned Yajna, Dana, &c.

Again, gentlemen, our forefathers in ancient India were not all the advocates of the philosophy of Badarayana. They were not all believers in one neuter Brahman. There were many of them who said like Kapila "ईश्वरासिद्धे," "Isvara has not been proved."

In Rig-Veda Mandala 8, Adhyaya 10, Sukta 89, Rik 3, Bhargava Nami Rishi says that there is no such thing as Indra. No one has seen him. Whom should we praise when there is no Indra? It is simply Loka-vada that they say that there is such a thing as Indra. In reality there is none.

In Rik 4, Indra tries to prove his existence and says that he brings destruction upon his enemies.

In Mandala 2, Adhyaya 2, Sukta 12, Rik 5, Grit-Samada Rishi says that there are people who say there is no Indra, but that in fact there is one.

There were again people in ancient India who believed like the Jains in a future life, but there were others who denied it. In the Brahmins, says Barth, the question is sometimes asked if there is really another life. In Rig-Veda, Ashtaka 6, Adhyaya 4, Varga 32, Rik 10, there is mention of Ahardrish Yenknata, i. e., usurers who see the sun in this world, but who in the next go to a Loka where there is

pitch darkness: They were the Nastikas who denied such a thing as the next world, because they had not seen it.

The true state of ancient India is represented in Jain Shastras. It is said therein that when the Digambara Rishi Rishabha was proclaiming to the world, "Ahimsa Paramo Dharmah!" and was doing good to mankind, Devas and animals by his Nirakshari Vani, there were also 363 Pakanda teachers who were preaching religions of their own, and one of them was Shukra or Brihaspati, the founder of the Charvaka religion. Certainly this seems to me the true state of affairs in ancient India. In time out of mind by the end of the 3rd Kala there was not only one teacher of one view of life, but there were 363, nay more, who preached their different doctrines and who explained this life and this world as they appeared to them.

This opinion bears the sanction of Prof. Max Müller and almost all other scholars. Writing in 1899 when seventy-six years old and when he had neither the eyes nor the memory which he had at twenty-six and when he could expect younger men to help him as he gladly used to do in his youth to his preceptors and Gurus, that noble philosopher says :

"It would be a mistake to imagine that there was a continuing development into the various meanings assumed by or assigned to such pregnant terms as-

Prajapati, Brahman, or even Atman. It is much more in accordance with what we learn from the Brahmins and Upanishads of the intellectual life of India to admit an infinite number of intellectual centres of thought scattered all over the country, in which either the one or the other view found influential advocates."

"The Sutras or aphorisms which we possess of six systems of philosophy, each distinct from the other, cannot possibly claim to represent the very first attempts at a systematic treatment, they are rather the last summing up of what had been growing up during many generations of isolated thinkers."

"As far back as we can trace the history of thought in India, from the time of King Harsha and the Buddhist pilgrims back to the descriptions found in the Mahabharata, the testimonies of the Greek invaders, the minute accounts of the Buddhists in their Tripitaka; and in the end the Upanishads themselves and the hymns of the Vedas, we are met everywhere by the same picture, a society in which spiritual interests predominate and throw all material interests into the shade, a world of thinkers, a nation of philosophers."

"To the present days these six different systems of philosophy have held their own in the midst of a great multitude of philosophical theories propounded by the thinkers of India."

"Nor could the fact that some of the Sutras quote and refute the opinions of other Sutras, be accounted

for without admitting a growing up of different philosophical schools side by side during a period which preceded their last arrangement."

"In the Upanishads and Brahmanas, though there is a common note running through them all, there is yet great latitude and want of system, and a variety of opinions supported by different teachers and different schools. Even in the hymns we meet with great independence and individuality of thought, which occasionally seems to amount to downright scepticism and atheism. We must keep all this in mind if we wish to gain a correct idea of the historical origin and growth of what we are accustomed to call six philosophical systems of India."

"That such opinions (Charvaka) existed at an earlier time, we can see in some of the hymns in which many years ago I pointed out these curious traces of an incipient scepticism..... There are some tenets of the followers of Brihaspati which seem to indicate the existence of other schools of philosophy by their side.

The Brihaspatyas speak as if being interpreted they differ from others as others differ from them. Traces of an opposition against the religion of the Vedas (Kautsa) appear in the hymns, the Brahmanas, and the Sutras, and to ignore them would give us an entirely false idea of the religious and philosophical battles and battle-fields of ancient India."

Such, gentlemen, was the opinion of Prof. MaxMüller when he was seventy-six. I regret I have no time to dilate upon the subject further. But you will easily see from the little I have told you that ancient India has been much mis-understood. In ancient India there was not any one single religion or philosophy, but many religions and philosophies, three hundred and sixty-three or more. Who can tell the exact number? How can you say then that Jainism is a product of Brahmanism? How can you say that the Jains borrowed from Kapila or Kanada or Patanjali, Gautama or others? Is it not possible that all borrowed from the common atmosphere of ancient India? Is it not possible that the Vedantists, the Samkhyas, the Jains, the Charvakas and other sects, many of which have been buried into oblivion for ever, had all their advocates in ancient times? This idea of borrowing is very strange. Those who say that the Jains borrowed ought to prove when and how they borrowed. They ought to prove who borrowed. Why should they simply throw out guesses and create mis-understanding? There is no such thing as borrowing in ancient India. This again bears the sanction of the noble Prof. Max Müller. He says :—

“ If we are right in the description we have given of the unrestrained and abundant growth of philosophical ideas in ancient India, the idea of borrowing so natural to us, seems altogether out-of-place in ancient India. A

MaxMüller's opinion.

wild mass of guesses at truth was floating in the air, and there was no controlling authority whatever, not even, as far as we know, any binding public opinion to produce anything like order in it. Hence we have as little right to maintain that Buddha borrowed from Kapila as that Kapila borrowed from Buddha. No one would say that the Hindus borrowed the idea of building ships from the Phœnicians or that of building the stupas from the Egyptians. In India we move in a world different from that which we are accustomed to in Greece, Rome, or Modern Europe, and we need not rush at once to the conclusion that because similar opinions prevail in Buddhism and in the Samkhya philosophy of Kapila, therefore, the former must have borrowed from the latter, or, as some hold, the latter from the former."

"It cannot be urged too strongly that there existed in India, a large common fund of philosophical thought, which like language, belonged to no one in particular, but was like the air breathed by every living and thinking man. Thus only can it be explained that we find a number of ideas in all, nearly all, the systems of Indian philosophy which all philosophers seem to take simply for granted, and which belong to no one in particular."

"Besides this conviction that suffering can be removed by an insight into its nature and origin there are some other ideas which must be traced back to that rich treasury of thought which was opened to every thinking man in India. These common ideas

assumed, no doubt, different guises in different systems, but this ought not to deceive us, and a little reflection allows us to perceive their common source."

"And the longer I have studied the various systems, the more have I become impressed with the truth of the view taken by Vignana-Bhikshu and others that there is beyond the variety of the six systems a common fund of what may be called national or popular philosophy, a large Manasa lake of philosophical thought and language, far away in the distant North, and in the distant Past from which each thinker was allowed to draw for his own purposes."

This is, gentlemen, the dictum of Prof. Max Müller when he was seventy-six years old. It is a pity that this noble scholar could not study Jainism. His whole life was passed in bringing to light the Vedic and Buddhistic literature, and he could not spare time to read poor Jainism. If he said that Jainism was started by the Nirgrantha Nattaputta, it was because, I presume, he found it to be the safest to adopt this opinion. This opinion is not the result of his study of the antiquity of Jainism. Let me, however, not digress. Let me simply tell you here that there is no borrowing in ancient India. Different Rishis held different views of life, and the Darshanas that you now find, embody the opinions of those Rishis.

Gentlemen, let me also submit here that the terms ~~Hinduism and Brah-~~ ^{Hinduism and Brahmanism} ~~manism mis-nomers.~~ ^{as generally used appear to me misnomers.}

What is Hinduism? The religion of the Hindus. But who are the Hindus? They say those Aryas who lived on the banks of the Indus. But were all these Aryas the followers of the Vedic Dharma, the doers of sacrifices? Were not also among them Aryas who objected to these sacrifices? Were not also among them the fore-fathers of the Jains, the Charvakas, and many other sects forgotten now? Are we not Hindus in that sense? Why should the Vedic religion, the religion of sacrifices, be called Hinduism then?

Again what is Brahmanism? The religion of the Brahmans. But what is meant by the religion of the Brahmans? A religion founded by the Brahmans or a religion to be observed by the Brahmans? In the former case there is no such thing as a religion founded by the Brahmans. We know that the Kshatriyas were also great teachers, nay, in some cases greater than the Brahmans, and who can say what part the Kshatriyas played in founding a religion which is exclusively called the religion of the Brahmans? We know that the teaching of Krishna and the example of Rama might be made his solace in life by any person breathing on earth. Who can say what other Kshatriyas like Rama and Krishna played a part in ancient India to found the religion now called Brahmanism.

If you say Brahmanism means a religion to be observed by the Brahmans, it cannot represent the Vedic religion in that case too. The Vedic religion

was not intended for the Brahmans alone but for the Dvijanma, the Brahmans, the Kshatriyas, and the Vaishyas.

If you say that Brahmanism is a religion that knows Brahman, how would you then apply this term to those sections of the Hindu philosophy, the Samkhya and the Purva Mimamsa, for instance, from which that Brahman is absent?

Hinduism and Brahmanism appear to me misnomers then, if you apply the terms to the Vedic religion, the religion of sacrifices, or even to Hindu philosophy. There is no such thing as Hinduism or Brahmanism in ancient times. There is, of course, Vedic religion, and out of this Vedic religion Jainism never comes.

Let us now see if Jainism was founded by Parshva Nath. Let us now see if Parshva Nath is spoken of as the founder of Jainism in any of the Buddhist, the Jain or the Hindu scriptures.

Jainism was not founded by Parshva Nath but by Rishabha Deva.

The Buddhist Texts are silent on the point and this was to be expected because Buddhism was started only in the days of the last Tirthankara, Mahavira. In Buddhist scriptures there is mention only of Mahavira at the head of the Nirgranthas. Mahavira is not mentioned therein as the originator of the Nirgrantha creed but simply as the leader of the Nirgranthas so far as Dr. Jacobi has been able to ascertain.

Buddhist works.

In Jain Shastras it is said that when Rishabha

Jain Shastras,

Deva left the world, four thousand other Rajas followed him and be-

came Digambara; but they could not adhere to his strict Charitra, and three hundred and sixty-three of them became the founders of Pakhanda religions. One of these was Sukra or Brihaspati. This was at the end of the 3rd Kala. Thus according to Jain Shastras Rishabha Deva was the first preacher of Jainism. As I have said above the tradition, that three hundred and sixty-three Rajas being corrupt preached three hundred and sixty-three Pakhanda religions, should be understood to represent the intellectual state of ancient India at a very early date. There was at that time a great intellectual activity, an infinite number of intellectual centres of thought being scattered all over the country.

Let us now see if there is any confirmation of this

Hindu Scriptures,

Jain tradition in Brahmanical works. In Bhagavata Purana, Skandha 5, Adhyaya 3—6 we read of Rishabha. It is said in that sacred work that of the fourteen Manus Swayambhu Manu was the first. When Brahma saw that the world did not multiply, he created Swayambhu Manu and Satya Rupa, the latter becoming the wife of the former. Swayambhu Manu begot Priyavarata, who begot Agnidhra, who begot Nabhi. Nabhi married Maru Devi and their issue was Rishabha Deva. This Rishabha in the Bhagavata is said to be a Digambara and the founder of Jainism. And see when Rishabha

was born. In the beginning of the world when Brahma created Swayambhu Manu and Satya Rupa. He was fifth in descent from them. He lived by the end of the first Kritayuga and twenty-eight Kritayugas are to pass in this Manvantara. This Rishabha preached Jainism. In Shlokas 9—11 of the Sixth Adhyaya, the author of the Bhagavata speaks of one Arhat, a Raja of Konka, Venka, and Nata, who, he says, hearing of the Charitra of Rishabha from his countrymen, would start in Kaliyuga a religion the followers of which would hate the Brahmanas and go to hell.

यस्य किलानुचरितमाश्रमातीतमुपाकर्ण्यैकोङ्कवेङ्ककुटकारा
राजाहन्नामोपशिक्ष्यकलावधर्मउत्तम्यमाणेभवितव्येनविमोहितः
स्वधर्मपथमकुतोभयमपहायकुपयपाखण्डमसमञ्जसंनिजमनी-
षयामन्दःसम्प्रवर्तयिष्यते ॥८॥

ये नहवावकली मनुजापसदादेव माया मोहिताः स्वविधि
नियोगशौचचारित्रविहीनादेवहेलनान्यपब्रतानि निजनिजच्छ
यागृण्णानाअस्नानानाचमनाशौचकेशोत्तुञ्चनादीनि कलिनोऽधर्म
बहुलेनोपहतधियो ब्रह्मब्राह्मणयज्ञपुरुषलोकविदूषकाः
प्रायेण भविष्यन्ति ॥१०॥

तेचह्यर्वाक्तनयानिजलोकयात्रयान् परस्परयाश्वस्तास्तमस्यन्धे
स्वयमेव प्रपतिष्यन्ति ११ पंचमस्कन्ध अ० ६.

No such Raja has ever lived, nor in any other Brahmanical writing where the word Arhat occurs is he spoken of as a Raja of Konka, Vanka, and Nata, so far as I have been able to ascertain. Arhat means praiseworthy if the word be derived from Arh to praise;

or it means killer of the enemies, if the word be Arihanta. This word occurs in Shiva Purana. There was no such Raja as Arhat. Rishabha himself was Arhat or Arihanta. He was praiseworthy and killer of the enemies, the Karmans. If Arhat preached Jainism in Kaliyuga, why is Rishabha called a Jin Deva in Vachaspathya and Adi-Jin Deva in Shabdārtha Chintamani. I am told in some Upanishads Rishabha is called Arhat. There was no such Raja as Arhat. Rishabha himself was Arhat. It is owing to mutual jealousy that the author of the Bhagavata makes Arhat copy the Charitra of Rishabha and start Jainism in Kaliyuga. Perhaps he did not like to give Jainism an earlier antiquity. But even if according to him the Charitra of Rishabha was copied, it was that Charitra upon which Jainism was built. In this sense too Rishabha sowed the seeds of Jainism.

We have also the authority of Nilakantha, the celebrated commentator of the Mahabharata to support the above view. In Mahabharata, Shanti Parva, Moksha Dharma, Adhyaya 263, Nilakantha says in his commentary on Shloka 20 that the Arhats or the Jains were taken in by the good Acharana of Rishabha

पुराणे वा “ ऋषभादीनां महायोगिनामाचारं दृष्ट्वा आर्हता
दयो मोहिताः पाञ्चण्ड मार्गं मनुगताः ” । इत्युक्तम्.

Gentlemen, this Adhyaya is worth reading. In this you will find a dialogue between Tula Dhara and Jajali; the former advocating the cause of Ahimsa and

refuting all arguments for Vedic sacrifices, the latter defending the slaughter of animals in Yajna.

Thus according to Brahmanical works Rishabha was the founder of Jainism. It was he who for the first time preached those doctrines which became the foundation-stone of Jainism. In none of the Hindu Shastras, so far as I have been able to enquire, Parshva Nath is spoken of as the founder of that religion. I had a talk on this subject with many learned Shastris and they all told me that Rishabha was the founder of Jainism.

Thus, gentlemen, you will see that according to Jain and Brahmanical writings Rishabha was the founder of Jainism. Is it not strange then, that writers like Colebrooke, Bühler and Jacobi should propound their own theories and call Parshva Nath the founder of our Dharma? In matter of religion they ought to be guided by our own traditions and not invent their own hypotheses. You know religion is religion. It is dearer than life to a man, and, in my humble opinion, scholars ought not to trifle with religions. Their word is law. Their opinion is authority. In matter of religion then, they ought not to be hasty in giving opinions. They ought to have regard for the traditions of others. They ought to have regard for the feelings of others.

Gentlemen you should note that it is not only in accordance with our traditions handed down to us in Jain and Hindu Shastras, that we call Rishabha the founder of Jainism, but there is also material evidence discovered by Dr.

Inscriptions at Muttra.

Führer at Muttra, an evidence nearly two thousand years old, to support those traditions. You know Prof. Bühler has edited many inscriptions of the Jains in *Epigraphia Indica*, vols. I and II. These inscriptions are two thousand years old. They bear the Samvat of the Indo-Scythian Kings, Kanishka, Huvashka, and Vasudeva. In these inscriptions we read that images were dedicated by lay Jains to Rishabha. For instance, see the following inscriptions :—

No. VIII.

“Success! In the year 40 (60) of the great king (and) supreme king of kings, Deva Putra Huvashka, in the fourth month of winter on the tenth day,—on that (date specified as) above, (this) meritorious gift (was made) for the sake of great happiness by Datta, the wife of Ka Pasaka, an inhabitant of...vata, (at the request) of.....ganin, the venerable Kharnna, pupil of the preacher, the venerable Vriddhahasti out of the Kottiyagana, the Sthanikiya Kula (and) the Sakha of the Aryya-Veriyas (the followers of Arya-Vajra). May the Divine (and) glorious Rishabha be pleased.”

P. 386, vol. I.

No. XIV.

“Success! The pupil of the venerable Jeshtahasti (Jyeshthahastin) out of the Kottiyagana, the Brahmasika Kula, the Uchche-nagari Sakha and the arina sumbhaga (was) the venerable Mahala; the pupil of the venerable Jeshtahasti (Jyeshthahastin)

(was) the venerable Gadhaka ; at the request of his female pupil, the venerable Sama, (was dedicated) an image of Usabha (Rishabha), the gift of Gulha, the daughter of Varma (and) the wife of Jayadasa.”

P. 389, vol. I.

No. XXVIII.

“(Adoration) to divine Usabha (Rishabha)! At the request of Sadita, female pupil of..... dhuka, a preacher in the Varanagana, Nandika Kula and..... Sakha.”

P. 206—207, vol. II.

Now just see that nearly two thousand years ago Rishabha had come to be regarded as the first Jain Tirthankara. And when did Mahavira and Parshva live? The date of Mahavira's Moksha is 526 B. C. and Parshva attained Nirvana 250 years earlier. Thus inscriptions cut a few centuries after these two Tirthankaras, bear testimony to Rishabha's being a Jain Tirthankara. Had Mahavira or Parshva been the founder of Jainism, how could people living two thousand years ago dedicate images to Rishabha?

Gentlemen, it is my sad duty to tell you this noon that our holy religion has been much trifled with. Some writers have regarded it as originating in the 6th century. Some have called it a branch of Buddhism, others have confounded it with the Charvaka religion. Some have called Mahavira its founder, others have called Parshva Nath its author. We never expected such ill-treatment at the hands of

scholars. We never thought that scholars would harm a religion that is kind to all. But ah ! In this naughty world virtue is often in misery.

Gentlemen, before winding up this part of my lecture, let me once more return to Ancient India once more. ancient India. Let me once more assure you that in ancient times in this noble country there were not only those who said, "स्वर्ग कामोयजेत," "whoever desires paradise should sacrifice." But there were also many sects which attached no importance whatever to them, or rather who denounced them wholesale. It is a pity that all such sects have not come down to us, that most of them have become extinct for ever. But still there are a few whose philosophy has reached us, and, I think, these sects are quite sufficient for our purposes, to prove that in India in ancient times Vedic sacrifices and slaughter of living creatures in Yajna were not the only means of heaven and salvation ; but that people resorted also to the contrary means for the very purposes, that while one sect asserted that they could cross over the ocean of the world by Himsa, others urged that Ahimsa was the only way to Nirvana.

Let us first look to the philosophy of the ancient Yogis. This has been systematised for us by the Rishi Patanjali in the Yoga-Sutras. We also possess Yoga Shastra by the Jain Acharya, Hema Chandra, the celebrated author of the Hema Chandra Kosha, but as the Yoga-

Sutras of Patanjali are better known, let us examine them, and let us see if any importance is paid therein to Vedic sacrifices as a source of obtaining eternal bliss.

Gentlemen, in the Yoga-Sutras of Patanjali there is no reference to Vedic sacrifices as being helpful. On the contrary you find in Pada 2, Sutra 30, mention of Yama as including ahimsa, satya, asteya, brahmacharya, and aparigraha.

अहिंसा सत्यास्तेय ब्रह्मचर्याः परियहायमाः ॥१॥

This Yama is reckoned as accessory to Yoga. In Sutra 31, these five restraints that form Yama are called Mahavrata if they are observed in all conditions of the Chitta.

एते जाति देशकाल समयानवच्छिन्नाः सार्व भौम महाव्रतम् ॥३१॥

"These are the great austerities of all stages, irrespective of jati, desha, kala, and samaya."

"They are imperative in all conditions or stages, of the thinking principle, irrespective (anavachchhinna) of these four conditions of kind, &c., i. e., it does not mean that 'I shall not kill a Brahman,' but that 'I shall not for any purpose whatsoever, kill any one, at any place, at any time.' The others should be explained in the same way. Thus when the practices are universal without any qualification, they are called 'great austerities' (Mahavrata.) Their interrupted observance is not so." (Translation of Yoga Sutras, Dr. Rajendra Lal Mitra, p. 93).

A Yogi is to vow that he will not kill any one, for any purpose whatever, at any time, and at any place. And so far satya, asteya, &c. Such vows of his are called Mahavratas. In Sutra 35 it is said.

अहिंसा प्रतिष्ठायां तत् सविधौवैर त्यागः ॥३५॥

“In the neighbourhood of him who is confirmed in (Ahimsa) non-slaughter, there is abandonment of enmity, or harmless abidance even on the part of the naturally cruel, such as of serpents and mungooses. The meaning is those that are addicted to injury give up their injurious nature.”

Thus, gentlemen, you will see what a great importance is attached to Ahimsa in Yoga Darshana. A Yogi to gain his object must abandon Himsa of all kinds, at all times, at all places, and for all purposes whatsoever. By so doing he becomes so influential, that if animals hostile to each other approach him, they give up their enmity at once.

Throughout the Yoga-Sutras it is no-where said that sacrifices will help a Yogi. It is Ahimsa, Satya, Asteya, Brahmacharya, and Aparigraha that are to assist him.

In Sûtra 36 it is said :—सत्य प्रतिष्ठायां क्रिया फलम् ॥

“In the confirmed in veracity (there is) asylum of the fruit of works.”

“Works (kriyah) are the sacrifices which, when performed, yield the fruits, heaven, &c. The Yogi who practises veracity rises to such greatness that he attains

the fruits without performing those works, and at his bidding they may be attained by any one so-ever; without performing those works."

(तद्वचनाद् यस्य कस्य चित् क्रियामकुर्वतोऽपि क्रिया फलं भवति)

"Veracity or abstinence from falsehood is here described to be as meritorious as the sacrificial rites enjoined in the Vedas, *i. e.*, by practising veracity with unswerving faith one acquires the same merit which the sacrifices yield, and that without its being tainted by the cruelty which attends sacrifices."

Gentlemen, this Sutra is very significant. It is a direct denial of the efficacy of the Vedic sacrifices by the followers of Yoga. It is rather a retort by a Yogi to one who vindicates the claims of Vedic sacrifices. "In the confirmed in veracity (there is) asylum of the fruit of works."

"Let us not practise sacrifices," says a Yogi, "for they are tainted by cruelty. Let us in their place practise Satya. Let us be truthful. Our veracity will help us to obtain all that sacrifices are supposed to give. Nay, if we practise truth, we shall acquire such great merit that at our bidding the so-called fruits of sacrifices may be acquired by any one soever."

Perhaps you might say, gentlemen, that the above Sutra does not deny the efficacy of the Vedic sacrifices. If so, why does the Yoga-Darshana altogether prohibit the slaughter of animals, and why does it recommend Ahimsa in all conditions of the Chitta, at all times, at

all places? If sacrifices were efficacious, they should also have been reckoned as accessory to Yoga. But strange to say, this is not so.

Gentlemen, certainly the sects practising Yoga in ancient times must have been against Vedic sacrifices and slaughter of animals for any purpose whatsoever. You see the confirmation of this view at least in the case of one sect of the Yogis, the Jains. You must remembar that the Jains are the great Yogis. All Jain Tirthankaras were great Yogis. All Jain monks were great Yogis. A Jain cannot obtain Moksha without practising Yoga. Yoga is a necessary condition for killing the Karmans and attaining Nirvana. Just see our images in our temples. They are practising Yoga. Look to their Asana and Dhyana. Just see how they are absorbed in meditation. This is the characteristic of Jain images. If you find any images practising Yoga, it is the Jain. The Hindu-images are not so. It is a pity that most people have failed to understand Jainism. People blame the Jains for worshipping naked images, but they never look to the Asana and Dhyana of those images. They never think that the Rishis being altogether absorbed in meditation, could not think or care to wear clothes. Then, gentlemen, the Jain Rishis were great Yogis and you know that their faith is

Ahimsa Paramo Dharmah !

Here, gentlemen, I am struck with one circumstance. A Yogi is to practise the five Mahavratas or

great vows. Are these not the five great vows of the Jains? And do we not know that the five great vows were first enjoined by Mahavira? Before him there were only four great vows of Parshva Nath, *viz.*, ahimsa, satya, asteya, and aparigraha, and the last included Brahmacharya. Mahavira, because the saints in his days were prevaricating and slow of understanding enjoined Brahmacharya as a separate fifth vow. Thus "The law taught by the great Parshva Nath recognises but four vows, while that of Vardhamana enjoins five" (Uttaradhyayana, Lecture XXIII. 23) Dr. Jacobi tells us that in Samanaphala Sutta, a Buddhist work, these four great vows of Parshva Nath are wrongly put into the mouth of Mahavira. Did Patanjali borrow from Mahavira? The four as well as the five great vows must have been the common property of all Yogis in ancient India.

Let us now turn to the Samkhya Darshana of Kapila. In the Sutra 6 it is said
 The Samkhya Darshana. "अविशेषोभयोः"

"And there is no difference between the two." That is, there is no difference between the visible and the Vedic means of removing Dukha or pain. The two are equal. Why? Because the Vedic sacrifices are tainted by cruelty. The slaughter of animals in sacrifices must produce bad fruit and the Prusha must suffer for it.

In fact a follower of Kapila is a faithful adherent to the Sruti. "One should not kill any animal."

"माहिंस्यात् सर्वाभूतानि"

He does not accept the view that the Sruti that "One should kill those animals which have Agni and Soma for their Devas,"

“ सग्नी षोमीयं पशुमाल भेत ”

is an exception to the Sruti, "One should not kill any animal,"

“ माहिंस्यात् सर्वाभूतानि ”

He does not believe that all Himsa is Himsa except the Himsa in a Yajna. On the contrary he holds the universal proposition that all Himsa is Himsa, and Vedic sacrifices being tainted by Himsa cannot free the Purusha from pain. If Himsa recommended in the Vedas were not Himsa, he says, there should have been no necessity for Yudhishtira to perform Prayashchitta for slaughter in battle, for that was enjoined in the Vedas as a Dharma of the Kshatriyas.

Again in Samkhya Karika 2, we read

दृष्ट वदानुश्रविकः स ह्यविशुद्धिं क्षयातिशय युक्तः ॥

The Anushravika means of removing Duhkha is like the visible means, because it is tainted by Avishuddhi or Himsa not enjoined by the Shastras.

Here too we again meet with the same objection on the part of a follower of Kapila that the Sruti

“ सग्नी षोमीयं पशुमाल भेत ”

is not an exception to the Sruti “ माहिंस्यात् सर्वाभूतानि ”

Gaudapada in his Bhashya of Samkhya Karika supports the view of Kapila on the authority of the

Mahabharata also. He cites a Shloka from a dialogue between a father and his son in which the latter says

तातैतद्बहुशोभ्यस्तं जन्म जन्मान्तरेष्वपि ।

त्रयीधर्ममधर्माद्यं न सम्यक् प्रतिभाति मे ॥

"O father, I have studied Vedic Dharma in this life and the past. I do not like this Vedic Dharma, full of Adharma."

Vignana-Bhikshu in his Bhashya of Kapila-Sutras cites the authority of the Markandeya Purana to the same effect.

तस्माद्यास्यान्यहंतात दृष्ट्वै मं दुःख सन्निधिम ।

त्रयीधर्ममधर्माद्यं किं पाक फल सन्निभम् ॥

"O deer, seeing that the Vedic Dharma is full of misery, why should I follow this Vedic Dharma, full of Adharma? This Vedic Dharma is like Pakaphala which is full of poison, though outwardly it looks very handsome."

Gentlemen, you know the well-known story in which Kapila is made to hold a debate with the Vedas. It is said that a certain student returned to his house after his study of the Vedas was complete. As was customary, a cow was to be sacrificed in his honour. Kapila objected to this. Then the Vedas entered the belly of the cow and held discussion with Kapila. This is certainly a valuable tradition to show that Kapila was one of those ancient Rishis who objected to the slaughter of animals in sacrifice for any other purpose whatsoever, and who recommended Ahimsa to be an essential element of a true Dharma.

In Samkhya Karika it is not only the slaughter of animals in Yajna which is forbidden, but also the throwing of seeds in the fire. It seems the Sāmkhyas too like the Jains prohibited the destruction of seeds.

In Mahabharata too in many places ancient Rishis are said to have been of opinion that Ahimsa Dharma was the true Dharma. One of the most pathetic of the references to the Ahimsa Dharma in this holy work is the dialogue between Tula Dhara, a Vanikputra, and Jajali, a Brahman, in the Moksha Dharma of the Shanti Parva. Jajali had done *tapa* for a long time, and had grown too proud. The Rakshasas and the Pishachas informed him that even Tula Dhara who was a greater *tapasvi* was not so proud as he. Jajali went to Benares to hold debate with Tula Dhara and the latter said "O Jajali, you have done *tapa* for a long time, still you do not know what true Dharma is." He then explained Ahimsa to be the essence of a true Dharma. If Jajali doubted it, he might ask the birds in his pig-tail as to what the truth was. Jajali having put the question, the birds with one voice exclaimed that Ahimsa was the essence of a true Dharma and bore good fruits in this and in the next world. "Ahimsa withholds all faith from the man who practises it and brings destruction upon him. A person who causes fear to no creature is fearless of all. But one, who produces fear like a serpent in a house, does not find Dharma in this and in the next Loka." Tula Dhara further said that Raja Nahusha had killed a bullock

and the result was that all the Rishis in his dominions had to suffer. These Rishis averted the hundred and one evils that befel them in consequence of the slaughter, and spread them in the world. Horrible is the consequence of the slaughter of living creatures?

Gentlemen, it is in his commentary upon this dialogue that Nilakantha mentions that the Arhatas were taken in by the good Acharana of Rishabha who preached the Daya Maya Dharma in contrast to Vama-Deva who recommended that in affliction one might eat the flesh of a dog.

यथा—अवर्त्याशुन आम्नाणि पे चे, यः पूजयितुं पित्रुदेव मनु-
थान् ये च आम्नाणि शुनः, इति श्रुतिस्मृतिभ्यां वामदेवस्य श्रेष्ठतम
स्यापि बीभत्स आचार आपदिश्व मांस भक्षण रूपः प्रदर्शितः ॥

पुराणे वा—ऋषभादीनां महायोगिना माचारं दृष्ट्वा आर्हता-
दयो मोहिताः पाखण्ड मार्गं मनुगता इत्युक्तम् ॥

It is also here that Nilakantha quotes a Smṛiti saying,

महोक्षं वामहाजं वाश्वोत्रियायोप कल्पयेत् ॥

"We should sacrifice a fat bullock or a fat he-goat in honour of a Vedic," and a Śruti appealing

"मागा मनागामदितिं वधिष्टाः"

"Don't kill the guiltless cow."

Nilakantha observes that the Śruti is stronger than the Smṛiti, because the word "guiltless" occurs therein.

The Cārvakas were also against the slaughter of animals, for they preached,

Cārvaka Darshana.

“ If a beast slain in the Jyotishtōma rite will itself go to heaven, Why then not the sacrificer forthwith offer his own father.”

Again,

“ While the eating of flesh was similarly commanded by night-prowling demons.”

Gentlemen, it is a pity that scholars have written the history of Vedic religion in ancient India. But none of them has yet collected facts to build up the history of non-Vedic religions, especially, of religions that said

“ माहिंस्यात् सर्वाभूतानि ”

“ One should not slaughter any animal”. No one has yet ascertained what schools belonged to the Vedic religion and what to the non-Vedic, and what was the number of the adherents of each. It is altogether an absurd argument to say that only Vedic religion prevailed in ancient India. It is altogether unsafe to throw out such guesses. It might be that both Vedic and non-Vedic religions prevailed to an equal extent. Or who can say but that the number of the adherents of the latter exceeded that of the former. From the absence of material evidence we are not entitled to draw any conclusions. You know Buddhism is nearly extinct in India now. But can you infer from this that Buddhism has never been the prevailing religion of India? Can you say that Buddhism never prevailed from one corner of India to another? Certainly that a certain religion is absent from India in these

days is no safe argument for the supposition that it never for certain prevailed in former times. We know that the Brahaspatyaś are called Lokayatas. It may be that their religion being pleasant found a world-wide acceptance in ancient India though it is altogether extinct now.

Gentlemen, it is a well-known fact that the literature in ancient India was mnemonic. Much of this literature has been lost. The Brahaspatya Sūtras existed once. They have been lost. The Sūtras of many other schools of philosophy have been lost, and it is therefore, that we know nothing about them. It is only the Vedic literature of ancient India much of which has been preserved by the careful Brahmans. But if the literature of other schools of philosophy has not reached us, and if we know nothing about them except from occasional references to them in Brahmanical writings, we are not entitled to propound our own theories about the extent to which they prevailed in ancient times. We know in our own case that our Śāstras were reduced to writing after the time of Asoka, but that our verbal literature existed before him admits of no doubt. The Jains were not so careful as the Brahmans in preserving their traditions. Thus, much of our ancient lore is lost. Or it may be we may be able to discover Śāstras hitherto unknown throwing light upon our ancient history. But that our Śāstras were reduced to writing after Asoka is no argument to suppose that the Jains had no literature upon which these

Shastras were based, or that they had no ancient history. It may be, and it is a fact according to Jain Shastras, that in the 4th Kala, which ended by the time of the Moksha of Mahavira, Jainism was in much greater force than it is now.

I would now pass a few remarks on the philosophy and tenets of the Jains.

Tenets of the Jains. The Jains say that this world exists from eternity. It has no creator. It consists of Loka and Aloka. The Loka is divided into Urdhva Loka or the heavens, the Madhya Loka or the Earth, and Patala Loka or the hells. There are two things in this world, Jiva and Ajiva. Jivas are of six kinds, Earth Jivas, Fire Jivas, Wind Jivas, Water Jivas, Vinashapati and moving living beings or *tris*. The tris are dwi-indriya, tri-indriya, chatur-indriya, and panch-indriya. The panch-indriyas are divided into Shayani or those having Mana, and Ashayani or those having no Mana. Of all the panch-indriyas man is the most important, for it is only man who can obtain Nirvana. An inhabitant even of the highest heaven cannot obtain Moksha. For being a Jin or Arhat he must be born as man. Ajivas are of five kinds, pudgala, dharma, adharma, kala and akasha.

Living beings are a combination of Jiva or soul and pudgala or matter. This union of the soul with matter is eternal. The Karmans are also matter. The soul under the bondage of the Karmans is moving in a circle of births. The coming of the new Karmans is called Ashrava. Their binding of the soul is called Bandha. To prevent the coming of the

fresh Karmans is called Sambara. To get rid of the past Karmans is called Nirjara. The next stage is Moksha.

These are the seven Tattvas of the Jains to which Punya and Papa being added we get the nava Padarathas. This jiva or soul is omniscient, almighty, eternal, and has innumerable other qualities. The Karmans are also matter. They bind the soul and hide all its gunas or qualities. Under the bondage of the Karmans the soul has forgotten itself, and often thinks itself different from what it is. Such a soul is called Bahir-Atma. These karmans are of eight kinds. The Jnana-Varnya Karman hides the Jnana. The Darshana-Varnya, the Darshana, and so on. One of these Karmans is Ayu Karman. Life and death are nothing but the ending of one Ayu Karman and beginning of another. When one Ayu Karman of a certain living being is over its soul leaves the body, and the living being is said to be dead. The soul enters another body and this is called birth. Thus the soul under the bondage of the Karmans goes on moving from body to body, till the moment comes when it shakes off all its Karmans, and recovering all its gunas becomes a Jin, an Arhat, obtains Moksha, and finds eternal bliss in its own self.

Gentlemen, the whole above-mentioned philosophy of Jainism depends upon the solution of the mysterious puzzle, the mysterious enigma, what is I? What is this world? Whence have I come? Where shall I go? What is the end of all these things? This problem has been solved by different Great Men in different

countries, in different times, in different ways. No two solutions seem to be the same. This leads to the variety of beliefs and religions. The Jain Tirthankaras, the Kshatriya Rishis of ancient times, have also solved this question in the manner above-mentioned. They too have made an answer to the question. "What is I?" "What is this world?" They too have told us that the soul is eternal, the Karmans are eternal, the world is eternal. There is no creator. There is no destroyer. As the soul sows so does it reap. Our fate depends upon ourselves. And, gentlemen, this solution of the Tirthankaras appears to me one of the noblest. This seems to me to be full of the highest moral virtue. For why should we make our heaven depend upon the worship of God or His sons and deputies? Why should we not make it depend upon our own actions? That God must be a peculiar God who is pleased only with our worshipping Him. We also do not accept God as a judge of our actions, for this gives rise to many objections, and places God in a very awkward position. We, Jains, entertain the highest ideal of God as Sarvajna, eternal, all-blissful, &c. We do not regard him as acceptor of flattery, a being killing one and saving another, a being administering justice despotically in proportion to the amount of flattery and worship. We do not regard him as a judge of our actions. Our God is the highest being, the highest standard for our copy, the highest ideal for our imitation. And that God is our own soul after it has attained Nirvana. We recognise man's soul God in

man. Those men greatly err who call us Nāstikas. Certainly they are wrong, totally wrong. We are not Nāstikas. We believe in God. Only our notion of God is different from that of others.

Gentlemen, I have said before that the mysterious puzzle, What is I? What is this world? has been differently solved by different Great men, in different ages, in different climates. The notions of God are also different. Some represent Him as a creator, destroyer and preserver, some say that He judges us only by our faith in His sons and deputies, some say that He judges us in proportion to our worship of Him. Some give one definition of Him and some another. We have our own definition. We say that He is neither a creator, destroyer, and preserver, nor has He sons and deputies. He is almighty, eternal, omniscient, and has infinite gunas. He is the divine soul. We press upon each man his own importance. If every one of us were to realize what he really is and to act up to it, just see what should have his actions been. Thus we believe in God. Only our notion of Him is different. We give the lie to those men who call us Nāstikas. We believe in God.

Gentlemen, may I not also ask you in one word if those men do not err who say that the Jains have no philosophy. Have we no philosophy? Is the above one no philosophy? However, read Madhava's Sarva-Darshana-Samgraha, and he will tell you if the Jains have no philosophy.

Gentlemen, the belief of a Jain in this solution of the puzzle of life is called Samyak Darshana. His knowledge of it is called Samyak Jnana. His conduct according to it is called Samyak Charitra. Samyak Darshana, Samyak Jnana and Samyak Charitra are called Ratna Trayi or Three Jewels.

Samyak Darshana and Samyak Jnana do not call for any remark. There remains Samyak Charitra, or what ought to be the conduct of a Jain to obtain heaven. This Charitra is of two sorts, *viz.*, the Charitra of a Shravaka and the Charitra of a Muni. Gentlemen, here note that there is no such thing as Shravagi. The word is Shravaka, and ignorant people have corrupted it into Shravagi.

Shravakas are of two kinds, *viz.*, Avrati Shravakas or those who cannot observe their Charitra by making vows, and Vratī Shravakas or those who can observe their Charitra by making vows. The Charitra of a Vratī Shravaka consists of eleven Pratimās. These are eleven classes like those in a school. A Shravaka from the first to the sixth Pratima is called a Jaghanya Shravaka. A Shravaka from the sixth to the ninth Pratima is called Madhyama Shravaka, and a Shravaka from the ninth to the eleventh Pratima is called an Utkrishta Shravaka.

1ST. P.—A Shravaka of the first Pratima has to
Eleven Pratimās. make the following vows.

(a) I shall have faith in the true Deva, Guru, and Dharma.

(b) I shall observe the Ashta-Moola-Guna, *i. e.*, I shall abstain from taking flesh, wine, and honey, which are called three makārs, and peple, bara, umar, kathumar, and pakarphala, which are called five udambaras.

(c) I shall keep aloof from seven Vishayas:—
 (1) Gambling, (2) Taking flesh, (3) Taking wine, (4) Sexual intercourse with a prostitute, (5) Theft, (6) Hunting, and (7) Sexual intercourse with another's wife.

(d) I shall daily visit the temple.

This Pratima is called Darshana Pratima (दर्शन प्रतिमा).

2ND P.—A Shravaka of the 2nd Pratima has to make the following vows:—

(a) I shall observe the following twelve vratas:—

(1) I shall abstain from ahimsa or doing injury to any tris jiva.

(2) I shall abstain from sexual intercourse with another's wife.

(3) I shall not commit theft.

(4) I shall fix the amount of property I keep.

(5) I shall not tell a lie.

(6) I shall fix the directions in which I go.

(7) I shall keep aloof from Anartha Danda, or from doing those acts which serve no purpose, but for which one has to be punished.

(8) I shall fix the number of daily enjoyments.

(9) I shall fix daily what countries to visit and how far to go in each direction.

(10) I shall do Samayaka.

(11) I shall keep fast on Ashtami and Chaturdashi.

(12) I shall give four kinds of Dana or charity.

(b) I shall die with Samadhi Marana, i. e., at the time of death I shall forsake love with the world and its concerns.

This Pratima is called Vrata Pratima (व्रत प्रतिमा).

3RD P.—A Shravaka of the 3rd Pratima has to make the following vow:—

I shall do Samayaka thrice a day for fixed periods. This Pratima is called Samayaka Pratima (सामायक प्रतिमा).

4TH P.—A shravaka of the fourth Pratima has to make the following vow:—

I shall keep fast for sixteen *pahars* on each Ashtami and Chaturdashi. This Pratima is called Proshadhopavasa-Pratima (प्रोषधोपवास प्रतिमा).

5TH P.—A Shravaka of the fifth Pratima has to make this vow:—

I shall abstain from eating green vegetables. This is called Sachita Tyaga Pratima (सचित त्याग प्रतिमा).

6TH P.—A Shravaka of the sixth Pratima has to make this vow:—

I shall not take four kinds of ahara or food at night, nor provide others with food at night, nor praise those who take food at night.

Also I shall not have sexual intercourse with my wife in day-time.

This Pratima is called Nisha Bhojana Tyaga Pratima (निशभोजन त्याग प्रतिमा).

7TH P.—A Shravaka of the seventh Pratima has to make this vow:—

I shall keep aloof from sexual intercourse altogether.

I shall also abandon the use of ointments and adornments.

This is called Brahmacharya Pratima (ब्रह्मचर्य प्रतिमा).

8TH P.—A Shravaka of the eighth Pratima makes this vow:—

I shall abandon all sorts of engagements and occupations.

This is called Arambha Tyaga Pratima (आरम्भ त्याग प्रतिमा).

9TH P.—A Shravaka of the ninth Pratima makes this vow:—

I shall abandon all sorts of internal and external Parigrahas.

This Pratima is called Parigraha Tyaga Pratima (परिग्रह त्याग प्रतिमा).

10TH P.—A Shrāvaka of the tenth Pratimā has to make this vow :—

I shall not take part in any worldly or household concern. I shall not take food uninvited.

This is called Anumodana Vrata Pratima (अनुमोदन व्रत प्रतिमा)

11TH P.—A Shrāvaka of the eleventh Pratima is nearly like a Sadhu. He is either an Ailaka Shrāvaka or a Kshullakaka Shrāvaka.

If an Ailaka Shrāvaka he keeps only a Langoti and a Kamandalu, and lives in the jungle in the company of the Sadhus.

If a Kshullaka Shrāvaka he keeps only a Dhoti or Chadara with a Kamandalu, and lives in a Matha or Mandapa or Mandir.

This Pratima is called Uddhishta Vrata Pratimā. (उद्दिष्ट व्रत प्रतिमा)

Besides the above division of the Charitra of a Shrāvaka into eleven Pratimas, every lay Jain is joined to observe the Dasha-Lakshani Dharma.

(1) He should control anger, and should patiently bear all insults and injuries even at the hands of his inferiors and should forgive them. This is called Uttama Kshama Dharma (उत्तम क्षमा धर्म).

(2) He should not give vent to pride. This is called Mardava Dharma (मार्दव धर्म).

(3) He should keep aloof from hypocracy and cheating. This is called Arjava Dharma (आर्जव धर्म).

(4) He should speak the truth. This is called Satya Dharma (सत्य धर्म).

(5) He should keep the soul pure and should not allow dark thoughts to corrupt it. He should also keep the body pure and clean, by washing it. This is called Shaucha Dharma (शौच धर्म).

(6) He should observe the five Anuvratas or minor vows, the five Samatis, and the three Guptis. He should also control the five Indriyas. This is called Sanyama Dharma (संयम धर्म).

(7) He should do twelve sorts of Tapa. This is called Tapa Dharma (तप धर्म).

(8) He should abandon wicked thoughts. He should also abandon love of money and should spend it upon giving four kinds of Dana. This is called Tyaga Dharma (त्याग धर्म).

(9) He should remember that in this world there is nothing his but self. This is called Akinchana Dharma (आकिंचन धर्म).

(10) He should remain absorbed in self.

He should not also have sexual intercourse with any woman other than his own wife. This is called Brahmacharya Dharma (ब्रह्मचर्य धर्म).

Every Jain is also enjoined to meditate upon the following twelve subjects. These are

Twelve Anuprekshas.

called the twelve Bhavanas or Anuprekshas.

(1) There is nothing unchangeable in this world. Everything is subject to alteration. I should not; therefore, pay much importance to it, and should regard it transitory.

This is called Anitya Anupreksha (अनित्य अनुप्रेक्षा).

(2) There is none in this world to help me in affliction or at the time of death. I must reap as I have sown.

This is called Ashārāṇa Anupreksha (अशरण अनुप्रेक्षा).

(3) I have in past lives suffered troubles as a man, a deva, a narkī, or a triyāṇcha. I must now make attempt to free myself from them. This is called Sansara Anupreksha (संसार अनुप्रेक्षा).

(4) I am alone in this world. This is called Ekatva Anupreksha (एकत्व अनुप्रेक्षा).

(5) All these things of the world are separate from me. This is called Anyatva Anupreksha (अन्यत्व अनुप्रेक्षा).

(6) What pride should I take in this body which is full of dirty things. This is called Ashuchi Anupreksha (अशुचि अनुप्रेक्षा).

(7) I should think of those thoughts, words, and actions that give rise to fresh karmans. This is called Ashrāva Anupreksha (आश्रव अनुप्रेक्षा).

(8) I should adopt such measures as may prevent fresh karmans from binding my soul in future. This is called Sambara Anupreksha (संस्कार अनुप्रेक्षा).

(9) I should adopt such measures as may help me to shake off my past karmans. This is called Nirjara Anupreksha (निर्जरा अनुप्रेक्षा).

(10) I should think over this world. What does it consist of? What are the Dravyas? What are the Tattvas, &c.? This is called Loka Anupreksha (लोक अनुप्रेक्षा).

(11) In this world all things are easy of acquisition, except the Ratna Trayi Dharma. This is called Bodha-Durlabha Anupreksha (बोध दुर्लभ अनुप्रेक्षा).

(12) Ratna Trayi Dharma is the true source of happiness in this world. This is called Dharma Anupreksha (धर्म अनुप्रेक्षा).

Now, gentlemen, I ask you if in the above sketch of a Shrāvaka's Dharma there appears to you anything which can make you say that Jainism is nothing but an aggregate of uncleanly habits, and if the rules laid down to govern the life of lay a Jain are not truly noble ones. I regret I have no time to explain to you the scope and the spirit of these rules. I would simply ask you if from even a mere sight of them you can say that there is anything therein which can be called uncleanly. Rather do you not find them based upon the noble principle of Ahimsa Paramo Dharmah? Do you not find embodied therein rules of the best morality? Do you not find, I ask you, these rules crying to you again and again, "This world will not serve your purpose. Don't pay much importance to it. Care only for your soul. Keep your connection as little with the world as possible. Even in the midst of the hottest engagements do not forget what you are." Do you not find these rules advising you to be a Yogi, a Muni?

Gentlemen, Jainism is a peculiar religion. It is a religion of the Yogis. It is a religion of those who pay no importance to the world and its concerns, who keep as little relation with the world as possible, and who rising from Pratima to Pratima at last renounce the world and become Nirgrantha. Jainism is of no use to those who are born for the world, who care for eating and drinking. It is only meant for those who believe in a next world and in Moksha, and who pushing away everything that would obstruct their way to Nirvana, become Nagna, Digambar, suffer all kinds of Parisahas or troubles, and regard this world, this life and birth, as a mine of sorrows.

Gentlemen, I would again ask you if there is anything among the duties laid down for a Shravaka which says, "Don't bathe! Don't use the tooth-pick! Remain unclean!" Rather it is an enjoined duty of every Shravaka to bathe and to keep the body pure and clean by washing it. This is one of the commandments of the Dasha Lakshani Dharma. Orthodox Jains always bathe. They not only bathe but bathe each time that they ease nature. Certainly they mis-judge the Jains, who call them unclean. They do them great injustice. It is true that among the Jains there is a class called the Dhoondias who carry the principle of Ahimsa Paramo Dharmah too far. They put *pattis* on lips so that no insects should be killed when they speak or breathe. They also put on dirty clothes and perhaps abstain from bathing. But they form a microscopic minority. They are a branch of the Svetambara

Jains. The leading two sects of the Jains, the Digambaras and the Svetambara Sambagis, should not be confounded with the Dhoondias. They should be judged from their own tenets in which it is strictly enjoined that we should keep the body pure and healthy.

Now a word about the Charitra of a Muni or *Charitra of a Muni.* monk, and I will close this lecture.

A Digambara Jain monk should live naked in the jungle, should sleep on the ground, should walk carefully casting his eyes four cubits before him on the ground, should take food once a day after avoiding forty-six Doshas and thirty-two Antaralas, should snatch away his hair as they grow, should bear twenty-two Parisahas or troubles, should give up fourteen internal and ten external Parigrahas and be a Nir-grantha, and should pass his whole time in Dharma Dhyana and Shukla Dhyana. A Svetambara Jain monk puts on white clothes. He lives in the city and sleeps on a bed.

Shukla Dhyana is Dhyana of self. Dharma Dhyana consists of Dasha Lakshani Dharma, twelve kinds of Tapa, thirteen kinds of Charitra, six Avashaktas, and twelve Bhavanas or Anuprekshas. In fact a Jain monk passes his whole time in killing the past and in preventing the coming of the fresh karmans, and in making his soul karmanless. I wish I had time to explain the position of a Jain monk. I wish I had time to explain the scope and the spirit of the Charitra of a Jain monk. Here I content myself with the explanation of only one circumstance. Why

do the Nirgranthas remain naked? Why do the Jains worship naked images?

Jain monks are naked because Jainism says that as long as one entertains the same idea of nakedness as we do, he cannot obtain salvation. One cannot, according to Jain principles, obtain Moksha, as long as he remembers that he is naked. He can only cross over the ocean of the world after he has forgotten that he is naked. It is this our thought of nakedness that is depriving us of heaven and Moksha. It is only when we have banished this thought from our mind that we can obtain Nirvana.

Jainism attaches a great weight to thought and knowledge. The salvation of Jainism depends upon knowledge and thought. A certain man saw his mother washing Dal of Masha or Urad. He thought his soul was also covered with karmans as the Dal of Masha was covered with its husk. He absorbed himself in meditation to remove this husk. He repeated Masha Tusha! Masha Tusha! i. e., that his soul was like Dal of Masha and his karmans were like husk of Masha. He became a Kevaline and obtained Moksha. Thus it would be seen that in Jainism thought is the chief thing. Thought is the source of our salvation. Thought is the cause of our damnation. As long as a man thinks and knows that he is naked, that there is something like good and evil, he cannot obtain Moksha. He must forget it to obtain Nirvana. This is very well illustrated by the well-known story of the expul-

sion of Adam and Eve from heaven. Adam and Eve were naked and pure. They enjoyed perfect happiness in the garden of Eden. They had no knowledge of good and evil. The devil, their enemy, desired to deprive them of their happiness. He made them eat of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. They at once saw their nakedness. They fell. They were expelled from heaven. It is this knowledge of good and evil, it is this knowledge of nakedness, that deprived them of Eden. The Jains hold the same belief. Our knowledge of good and evil, our knowledge of nakedness, keeps us away from salvation: To obtain it we must forget nakedness. The Jain Nirgranthas have forgot all knowledge of good and evil. Why should they require clothes to hide their nakedness? Why should they not be naked and pure like Adam and Eve, enjoying happiness in the garden of self, and why should they by the knowledge of good and evil, by the knowledge of nakedness, deprive themselves of that everlasting bliss, and suffer a fall in the world? In Hindu Shastras too nakedness is not less highly spoken of. Shukacharya on whose arrival at the court of Parikshit all the many thousands of Rishis including his father and grandfather got up, was a Digambara. Shiva is a Digambara. Dattatreya is a Digambara. The sect of Avadhoots is Digambara or Jat Rup Dhara. Rishabha, one of the 24 Avatars of Vishnu, the founder of Jainism, is a Digambara. In the Vairagya Shataka of the Bhartrihari Shataka, Bhartrihari prays to Shiva or Mahadeva "O Shambhoo when will

that day come that I shall be able to shake off the karmans by being alone, by giving up hypocrisy, by being calm, by using my hands as a vessel, and by being Digambara?" Nakedness is no nakedness to those who have forgot to be naked. We also read that in a certain pool of water some ladies were bathing naked. Shukacharya passed by and they did not hide their nakedness. When Vyasa passed by they at once hid their nakedness. Why was this, enquired Vyasa of the ladies? Because Vyasa saw and knew nakedness, while Shuka did not, was the reply, because Vyasa's eyes fell on their nakedness, but Shuka's did not, and because Vyasa was observing things around him, while Shuka did not. We also read that when Hanuman went to Lanka as a spy, he saw at night some ladies sleeping naked in the palace of Ravana. He had incurred a great sin, thought he. But no, he was innocent, again thought he, because he was pure, and nakedness and nakedlessness were identical to him.

Peculiar are those men whose eyes fall on the nakedness of the monks, and who find fault with them for not wearing clothes and for not having the same knowledge of good and evil as they do. Our eyes should fall on the qualities of the monks. What have we to do with their nakedness? Do you know, gentlemen, the reply the Prime-minister of Raja Ranjita Singh made to a man who had asked him if the Raja was a one-eyed man. He replied he did not know. Why not, asked the other? The minister replied, "Who dare look at the face of the Raja? All eyes fall on his feet.

How could then one know if the Raja was a one-eyed man?" Our eyes too always fall on the qualities of the monks. What have we to do with their body?

This will also explain why we worship naked images. Because the images were of those who were naked. When we go to the temple, we never look to the body of the images. We look to their Dhyana. We contemplate that we ought to be like those Tirthankaras whose images they are, and we ought to absorb ourselves in self as those images are suggesting. We look to the Dhyana of the image and not to the body. One who understands our images will find them absorbed in meditation as it were. We worship this meditation. We worship the image to be reminded of this meditation. There is no idol-worship among us. We have ideal-worship. These images are only a means to remind us of our ideals just as lovers have rings to look at them to be reminded of their sweet-hearts. We never worship stony idols. We worship ideals. We pay reverence to these stony images simply because they are representatives of our ideals. And why should we not pay respect to the images of our beloved ideals who forgot good and evil, who forgetting nakedness obtained salvation, and who leaving behind them for our guidance their example that we might make our lives as sublime as theirs, verified the truth of what Longfellow says :

Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time?

What harm is there in worshipping the naked images of our saviours, the Tirthankaras, for our spiritual good, when we find in them represented the Dhyana of our ideals, and when they serve every morning to remind us of our ideals?

Gentlemen, I hope this will serve as a sufficient answer to those who ask, why the Jains worship naked images? Gentlemen, remember, that our images are naked, that our monks are naked, is another proof of our antiquity. Jainism took rise in days when men were children, when they could be naked like pure and innocent children, and when for their nakedness they were loved as we love our children now. There was not yet such a thing as "idea of nakedness."

Gentlemen, now I wind up. Now I have done with my lecture on Jainism which appears to me one of the noblest religions in the world. Gentlemen, I am proud that I was born a Jain. Jainism is my pride in life and it will be my salvation in death. I wish there were at least half a dozen Jainisms in this world. I wish every religion might save the slaughter of poor animals, the goats, the sheep, the lamb, the cows, the bullocks, &c., whose necks are daily cut to provide flesh-eaters with food. I wish every religion might stop the hunting of the poor deer, the poor peacocks, and other beasts and birds. I wish every religion might save animals from being killed on the oc

casion of Dashehra and other festivals. Ah ! how many buffaloes and sheep are killed for sacrifices? Gentlemen, I am convinced that if this slaughter goes on, if this cutting the throat continues, we, Hindus, who totally abstain from flesh, whose strength mainly depends upon ghee and milk, will be rendered powerless and helpless. Just see how dear ghee and milk are now! and how cheap they once were!. We should save this slaughter then. We should take up the cause of the poor animals, who, if saved, will certainly be grateful to us, if not for our own interest at least for pity's sake. Gentlemen, have pity over the poor creatures. Just see how innocence is killed for nothing. To-day there is a goat, a sheep, or a cow. To-morrow it is no more. Where have they gone? They are reduced to nothing for the sake of the flesh-eaters. Life ceases to exist for the sake of the flesh-eaters. Gentlemen; kindly tell me for my sake if the poor animals dream that they are to be cut the next day. Do the animals that live at this moment know that their time has come, and that they are to be no more to-morrow morning? Gentlemen, also tell me if the cruel animal-killers do not know that life is dear to all, that agony is felt by all. Pity! Pity! Pity! I appeal to nothing but pity. If we have pity let us side with the poor creatures. See in England A. F. Hills, Esqr., D. L., and other gentlemen like Prof. Mayor and Dr. Josiah Oldfield have been leading on a movement whose sole object is to save slaughter and to spread vegeterianism. Let us have a branch of

this movement in India. Let us have an Indian Vegetarian Federal Union and let us save

"The lamb thy riot deems to bleed to-day,
Had he thy reason, would he skip and play?
Pleased to the last, he creeps the flow'ry food
And kicks the hand just raised to shed his blood."

Gentlemen, remember we are Hindus. We are the descendants of those who were Hindus or from whom *him* or *himsa* was *du* or *dur*, *i. e.*, away; (*him*=*himsa* and *du*=*dur*, *i. e.*, away.) Hindus were not those who originally lived on the banks of the river Indus. Hindus were those from whom *himsa* was away. Let us not mis-understand words. Let us interpret them correctly. It is those men who are the slaves of taste who say that Hindus were those who lived on the banks of the Indus. We, Jains, call Hindus those from whom *him* or *himsa* is *du* or *dur*, *i. e.*, away. And gentlemen, are we not correct? Certainly we are. Pity says we are correct. Animals cry we are correct. Let us then be what we are. Let us not be pretenders. Let us be true Hindus or Jains. The two mean the same thing. Let us advocate the cause of the noble principle of the Daya Maya Dharma, and let us proclaim from the Himalaya to Cape Comorin and from Gujerat to Behar, nay, even in foreign countries, as did the Jain Asoka, Ahimsa Paramo Dharmah! Destroy no life, injure no life, this is the supreme religion! Let us engrave in

golden letters on rocks and pillars that no animals should be slaughtered for food, sacrifice, or hunting, or any other purpose whatsoever.

Gentlemen, before I resume my seat, I thank you very much for the kind patience with which you have heard me.

SANGAMASHERAM,

POONA,

29th September, 1901.

SIR,

The later commentators on Amara Kosa explain *Gautama* as "pupil of Gotama" but Rayamukuta as "pupil of Kapila who was a descendant of Gotama" and Kshira as "born in the Gotra of Gotama." The last appears to be the correct Etymology and if so, Gotama must be the name of an old Rishi. Rayamukuta was probably guided by a tradition which made Buddha or Sakyasiniha a pupil of Kapila, and the explanation of later commentators who had no specific information on the point is conjectural. Vamanacharya makes Amara a Jaina as in common with most of the uncritical Pandits or Satris of the day he confounded the Jainas and Buddhists.

Yours truly,

R. G. BHANDARKAR.

SANSKRIT COLLEGE,

CALCUTTA,

19th October 1901.

DEAR SIR,

In reply to your letter of the 25th ultimo I have to state as follows :—

1. In Amarakosh Buddha is represented as being the son of Suddhodana, relative of Arka (the sun), born of Maya Devi, and belonging to the clan of

Gautama. It is nowhere stated that Buddha was pupil of Gotama. He was born in Gautama gotra, so belonged to the clan of Goutama.

2. There are frequent references to Jainism in books of Tibet and China. Some Jaina Sastras are to be found in Chinese translations made in the early Centuries of Christ.

3. I have published several papers on Buddha's life in Bengali. Professor Oldenberg or Rockhilt's life of Buddha is admirable.

As regards the life of Buddha, spread and fall of Buddhism, several Buddhist sects, &c., I have collected immense materials. I shall publish a book in English soon on the subject.

Yours sincerely,

SATIS CHANDRA, ACHARYYA.

Vidyabhusan, M. A., Professor, Sanskrit College, and Secretary, Buddhist Text Society, Calcutta.

P. S.—The Mahaparinibhāna Sutta, one of the earliest books of the Buddhists composed in the Pali language before 543 B. C., mentions Nirgrantha Natha Putra as being one of the six religious teachers of the time. This Nirgrantha Natha Putra is believed to have been the founder of Jainism.

Sanikarāchāryya, the Reformer of the 8th century A. D., criticises at length the doctrine of Jainism in his Vedānta Sūtra.

There is a celebrated Jaina temple in Calcutta called Parsva Natha temple.

The word Jaina is derived from Jina. The term *Jina* means one who conquered his passions ; a subduer, victor or conqueror.

Vishnu Sarma, the author of Panchatantra, in the 4th B. C., speaks highly of Jina and his followers. Many of the Jainas entered into the Vaishnava and Saiva sects of the Hindus and lost their independence. I am at present very busy. I shall be able to give you more information in December next.

Yours truly,
SATIS CHANDRA, ACHARYA.

LHASA VILLA,
DARJEELING,
19th November 1901.

DEAR SIR,

I must apologise for allowing your first letter to remain unreplied so long. I have read in a Tibetan work the mention of Jain School of Philosophy. A few years ago late Professor Bühler, Ph. D., C. I. E. of Vienna wrote to me to say that the Jains had a profound Scholar in Acharya Kamalasila in the 8th century A. D., and if it was not this eminent Philosopher who was invited to Tibet by King Thirongde-hu-tsan to hold a controversy with a Chinese Buddhist Philosopher named Hoshang Mahayana? This Tibetan King ruled in Tibet about the middle of the

8th century and found Kamalasila's Logic to be more powerful than that of the Chinese Philosopher. He accordingly placed the garland of victory in the Indian Philosopher's neck. From that time the Tibetans became the followers of Kamalasila. Kindly inquire what works Kamalasila wrote so that I may verify the same. I do not know if Jainism flourished in China and if it was taken there.

Acharya Kamalasila's are said to exist in the Jeypore Library and the Bhoswals know of it.

Yours sincerely,

SARAT CHANDRA DAS.

DARJEELING,

8th January 1902.

MY DEAR SIR,

I beg to acknowledge your favour of the 12th December with your printed Circular. Very few people can and will answer the queries which you have drawn from one and single Journal, the Oriental. The books of the Northern Buddhists are replete with references to the six Tirthika Teachers. I am glad to notice from the Circular that the Oriental has also noticed the same from the Southern Buddhist works. The attention of the Jain Itihas Society of which you seem to be the prime-mover should be drawn to the investigation of the historical developments of Jain Dharma. What was it in Buddha's time? Why do the Brahmins speak so adversely of Jainism?

What were the grounds on which Jainism was condemned by Brahmanical Teachers? What are the points of differences in the tenets of Buddhism and Jainism?

I should like to know if you have got in your Library all the published works on Jainism and also the researches made by European Scholars. You should during your College holidays visit Calcutta and study Jain researches contained in its Library. I am quite willing to join your Society as you propose but should like to know that its organization is good and that it will not varnish like a bubble after a few years' existence. You must have co-operators in the great work and also funds. Let me know the constitution and the resources of your Society.

Believe me,
Very sincerely yours,
SARAT CHANDRA DASS.

DARJEELING,
3rd March 1902.

MY DEAR SIR,

I simply rejoice that you have been able to organize a Society which will endure and bring to light the wisdom of the sages of old belonging to Jain persuasion. This will benefit more the members of that creed than the outsiders who will only wonder how persistently life has been valued by the Jainas. The most characteristic difference between the members

of Mahāvira and Goutama Buddha creed will be found in not taking life. The Jain will not kill and will not eat animal food in any shape. A Buddhist be he of the Southern School or of the Northern School while holding the doctrine of not-killing will not scruple to eat meat when it has been offered to him by a householder. I shall not go further in the comparison of these two ancient creeds of India, but only wish every success to your noble endeavours in matters Jain. I only wish I were free and not a Government servant otherwise I should have run to your meeting. With best regards,

I remain,

yours sincerely,

SARAT CHANDRA DASS.

*(B. Sarat Chandra Dass, C. I. E., in the Secretary
of the Buddhist Text Society of India.)*

SHANTI KUNJA,

BENARES CITY.

February 14th, 1902.

DEAR SIR, . . .

It will give me great pleasure to be an Hon. Member of the Jain Itihasa. I see you take the same view of the antiquity of your noble religion as I put forward in a recent lecture.

Sincerely yours,

ANNIE BESANT.

I am not well enough to attend your conference, I am sorry to say.

Office-holders and other workers of the Jain Itihas Society.

PATRONS—*To be elected.*

PRESIDENT—*Elective.*

Vice-Presidents:—

- | | | |
|----------------------------|-----|--|
| BENGAL | ... | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Babu Deva Kumar, Rais, Ar 2. " Gulab Chand, Hony. Magistrate, Chapra. 3. " Pooran Chand Nahar, B. A., Svetambara Jain, Ain Mahal, Azimgunj, District Murshidabad. |
| C. P. | ... | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Shrimant Seth Mohan Lal, Khurai, District Saugor. 5. Shrimant Seth Pooran Sah, Rais, Seoni, Chapra. 6. Rai Bahadur Seth Lakshmi Chand, Svetambara Jain, Katangi, District Balaghat. |
| U. P. OF AGRA
AND OUDH. | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Lala Hulas Rai, Rais, Saharanpore. 8. " Salekha Chand Kirori Mal, Rais, Najeebabad, District Bijnor. 9. Babu Dharma Chand, Rais, Lucknow. |
| PUNJAB | ... | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. Lala Ishvari Prasad, Treasurer, Rais, Delhi. 11. " Banvari Lal, President, Provincial Jain Sabha, Rawal Pindi. |
| RAJPUTANA | ... | 12. Seth Chand Mal, Jeypore. |
| DECCAN | ... | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 13. " Hira Chand Nemi Chand, Hony. Magistrate, Sholapur. 14. " Manik Chand Pana Chand, Johary, Bombay. 15. " Natha Rangji, Aklooj. |

Secretaries:—

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| GWALIOR STATE... | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Babu Benarsi Dass, M. A., Head Master, Victoria College, Lashkar. 2. Pandit Lakshmi Chand, Lashkar, Gwalior. |
|------------------|--|

Joint-Secretary:—

- | | | |
|--------|-----|----------------------------|
| PUNJAB | ... | 1. Babu Devi Sahai, Nahan, |
|--------|-----|----------------------------|

Prantika Secretaries :—

BENGAL	...	1. Babu M. Shri Mal Svetambara
C. P.	...	2. „ Manik Chand, Khandva.
PUNJAB	...	3. „ Kishore Chand, Secretary, Jain Sabha, Rawal Pindi
		4. „ Munshi Ram, Secy., Atmanandi Jain Sabha, Umbala.
RAJPUTANA	...	5. Mr. Jain Vaidya, Jeypore.
		6. Babu Chiranji Lal, B. A., Alwar.
DECCAN	...	7. Annapa P. Chogley, B. A , L. L. B., Belgaum,
C. I.	...	8. L. Munna Lal, Chhawara, Indore.
AJMER	...	9. Pandit Javahar Lal Shastri.
U. P. OF AGRA & OUDH.	{	10. Babu Bisheshwar Dayal Munsarim, Judge's Court, Sitapore.
		11. „ Govind Prasad, Secretary, Jain Sabha, Lucknow.
		13. „ Chetan Dass, Science Teacher, High School, Mozaffarnagar.

TREASURER—*To be elected.*

At the first Meeting of the Itihas Society held at Seoni, Chapara, C. P., the work of the Itihas was distributed as follows :—

No.	Names of Workers.	Nature of work entrusted.	Amount of money sanctioned for the workers.
1	Seth Hira Chand Nemi Chand, Hony. Magistrate, Sholapur.	To collect ancient Jain Shastras.	Rs. 1,000
2	Lala Hulas Rai, Rais, Saharanpore.		
1	Pandit Lakshmi Chand, Lashkar	To collect references to the Jains in Hindu Shastras.	1,000
2	„ Mewa Ram, Khurja ...		
1	Babu M. Shri Mal, Calcutta ...	To collect references to the Jains in Buddhist Texts.	300
2	„ Pooran Chand, Nahar, B.A., Azimgunj, Bengal.		
1	Rai Bahadur Seth Lakshmi Chand, Katangi, Dist. Balaghat	To collect and study Svetambara Jain Shastras.	300
2	Babu Munshi Ram, Umbala ...		
3	Seth Bridhi Chand Oswal, Seoni, Chapara.		
1	Pandit Rishabha Dass, Chhindwara.	To collect references to the Jains in Mahomedan works.	200
2	Babu Behari Lal, Bulandshahar.		
1	Babu Khushal Chand, Seoni ...	To collect coins of ancient Jain Rajas.	150
2	„ Mitra Sen, Hoshagabad...		
3	Mr. Jain Vaidya, Jeypore ...		
4	Babu Bisheshwar Dayal Mun-sarim, Sitapore.		
1	Babu Pooran Chand, Nahar ...	To collect ancient Jain Inscriptions.	30
2	Mr. Annapa P. Chogley, Belgaum		
3	Babu Deva Kumar, Rais, Arrah.		

No.	Names of Workers.	Nature of work entrusted.	Amount of money sanctioned for the workers.
1	Seth Hazari Lal, Chhingwara ...	To collect Samvats on ancient Jain images.	Rs. 200
2	Babu Chiranji Lal, Alwar ...		
1	Babu Chetan Dass, Muzzafarnagar.	To collect references to the Jains in works of European Scholars.	500
2	Babu Devi Sahai ...		
1	Babu Jugal Kishore, Sirsawa, District Saharanpore.	To collect Pattawalis.	200
2	Babu Panna Lal Bakliwal, Bombay.		
3	Pandit Shiva Chandra Sharma, Vaidyaraj, Delhi.		
4	Mitthan Lal Chaudhari, Kivalau, District Seoni.		
1	Pandit Balmukand, Kamathi, Central Provinces.	To collect information regarding Jain sects.	100
2	Babu Kishore Chand, Rawalpindi.		
3	Babu Hukam Chand, Seoni, Chapara.		
1	Seth Lal Chand, Chhindwara ...	To collect information regarding Jain Tirthsthans.	100
2	Babu Govind Prasad, Lucknow.		
3	Babu Kishore Chand, Rawal Pindi.		
1	Pt. Javahar Lal, Shastri, Ajmere	To prepare abstracts of Digambara Jain Shastras.	50
2	Babu Jugal Kishore, Sirsawa ...		
3	Pt. Rishabha Dass, Chhindwara.		
1	Babu Munna Lal Chhawara, Indore.	To collect Jain Shastras which are regarded as an authority by the Hindus.	200
2	Pandit Panjab Rai, Adhyapaka, Muttra.		
1	B. Benarsi Dass, M. A., Lashkar	In charge of Updeshakas.	1,000
2	Lala Nihal Chand, Rais, Nakur, Saharanpore.		

No.	Names of Workers.	Nature of work entrusted.	Amount of money sanctioned for the workers
1	Babu Manik Chand, Khandwa.	} To collect information regarding Jain castes.	200
2	Hakim Kalyan Rai, Updeshak.		
3	Babu Hukam Chand, Seoni ...		
1	Babu Sudarshan Dayal, Nakur.	} To collect traditions regarding the hostility shown by the Hindus & the Buddhists towards the Jains. To prove how the British Government has been a great boon to the Jains.	100
2	Babu Sumer Chand, Sherkot ...		
3	Babu Ajit Prasad, M. A., L. L. B., Lucknow		

MY WISH.

I wish that on this occasion when under the benign rule of the British Government we have every facility to prepare a Jain Itihas, I had the hearty co-operation and support of both the Digambara and the Svetambaras. I wish ~~more~~ ~~that~~

