

EDITORIAL

The Satkhandagama-sutras of Puspadanta and Bhutabali and the Dhavalâ Commentary thereon by Virasena occupy a unique position in Jaina literature. Their palm-leaf Mss. Were preserved only in the Jaina Bhandaras (or Mss.-Collections) at Moodabidri in South Kanara. They were not studied there for centuries together but remained only as objects of reverence and worship. How the transcripts of these great works, looked upon as Paramagama, came out is a thrilling episode; it has been narrated in the Introduction to the Vol. I of the first edition; and it is reproduced in this revised edition as well.

The late lamented Sheth Shitabrai Laxmichandji of Bhelsa (Vidisha) gave a donation for the publication of these great scriptures; and consequently, when we took up the study and critical editing of them, the society showed a variety of reactions. The sensible scholars of the new generation heartily welcomed it; and even some Panditas and Sastris of the older generation, such as the late Pt. Devakinandanaji, Pt. Hiralalaji Shastri, Pt. Phoolachandaji Shastri and Pt. Balachandaji Shastri offered active co-operation. But a section of scholars expressed severe opposition. Their contention was that to print the scriptures like the Satkhandagama was a sacrilege, a disrespect of the scriptural knowledge. It was also argued that the house-holder (Grhastha or Srâvaka) is not entitled even to read the Siddhanta texts; only the monks (who have relinquished the worldly ties) can read them. Some Panditas even doubted the ability of English-educated Babus (a term used as against Panditas, in those days) like us to understand and

critically edit difficult Siddhanta texts. Despite all this opposition, we, along with our colleagues, firmly pursued our project; and when, within a year, the first Volume, namely, the Satprarupana, was published, it was a surprise to all. The function of the publication of the first Volume was celebrated with great eclat by the Jaina community of Amraoti under the leadership of the late Singhai Pannalalaji. Thereafter, the Panditas began to take more interest in these texts; and then followed almost waves of competition to publish them. The late Pandit Bansidhar Shastri, Sholapur, started its publication in his own printing Press; but he could not progress beyond two or three fascicules. A little later, the Jaina sastrartha Samgha, Mathura, undertook the publication of the Kasayaprabhrta (Jayadhavala-Siddhanta); and the publication of the Mahabandha (Mahadhavala-Siddhanta) was started by the Bharatiya Jnanapitha. Afterwards Pt. Br. Sumatibai Shaha, Sholapur, brought out an edition containing only the Sutras and Hindi Translation; and Pt. Hiralalji Shastri edited the Kasaya-prabhrta along with Curnisutras and Hindi paraphrase. In this way, the famous Siddhanta texts, Dhavala, Jayadhavala and Mahadhavala, which had remained only objects of worship for centuries together, became easily available for study to the entire world of inquisitive scholars. Thus was ushered in what may be called a renaissance in the history of (the study of) Jaina Literature.

On behalf of the Jaina Sahityoddharaka Fund, established by the late Sheth Laxmichandji, the critical editing-cum-publication of the Satkhandagama with its Tika, Hindi translation, etc., was completed in Sixteen Volumes during the period of twenty years, from 1939 to 1959.

Even before the last Volume was published, the copies of some of the earlier Volumes were exhausted; and there was a demand from the readers for their republication. But the Board of Editors was determined not to expend their energy and time on reprinting the earlier Volumes unless all the Volumes were out once. There was also the idea that, when the second edition is taken up, every effort should be made to check the printed text in the light of the readings of the palm-leaf Mss. preserved at Moodabidri. The text adopted in the first edition was based on the Nagari copies of the Kannada transcript (of the palm-leaf Mss.) which was secretly smuggled out. Right from the start, we were aware of our limitations; and repeatedly we were urging the Bhattaraka Maharaja of Moodabidri to help us in correctly presenting the text; but, to begin with, there was no response. Still, after the publication of the third Volume, there was a significant change in his attitude. He indicated to us that, if we so wished, facilities would be made available for verifying the text in comparison with the palm-leaf Mss. We looked upon this as a great blessing (punyopalabधि) and a boon. The palm-leaf Mss. are written in Old-Kannada script which could be read by few scholars (now-a-days). Luckily we got the co-operation of the late Pandit Lokanath Shastri in this direction; and the variant readings received from him were included in an Appendix of the Third Volume. The readings supplied by him were used while fixing the text itself in subsequent Volumes.

Even before the entire work was published, there shot up another controversy. In the first Volume, in order to interpret Sutra No. 93 in a consistent Manner, it was felt necessary that the word 'samjada' be

added on to the available “samjadasamjada”; but the consequent doctrinal implications disturbed the minds of some Panditas; and they started saying that such an addition was unjustified. There were sessions of oral discussions, followed by a chain of writings covering replies and counter-replies; some of them were published in the form of independent books too. In order to have a conclusive satisfaction, we got carefully scrutinised the readings on the palm-leaves; and it was found that the two different Mss. had the word ‘samjada’ proposed to be added by us. Thus the two points were clear: first, our critical editing was based on (principles of) sound judgment and sensible understanding; and secondly, still there remains the urgency of consulting the palm-leaf Mss. directly, because the variant readings received from Moodabidri and included at the end of the third Volume did not present the additional ‘samjada’.

In the meanwhile, there was a programme of inscribing these works on copper-plates; and, in that connection, there too arose a controversy whether the term ‘samjada’ be added or not, even though the presence of that term in the palm-leaf Mss. was already confirmed. Further, efforts were made to take photographs of all the palm-leaves of these works. This was also successfully done; and all these photographs are now preserved in the Sastra-Bhandara at Phaltan (Maharashtra).

When the publication of the Satkhandagama was completed in Sixteen Volumes in 1959, the Editors felt anxious about the arrangements of finally editing the text critically, especially of those Volumes which were no more available, after collating it with the

photographs. After much thought and deliberation, it was decided that the responsibility of bringing out the second edition be entrusted to the Jaina Sanskrit Samrakshaka Sangha, Sholapur. This proposal of ours was heartily accepted by Sheth Laxmichandji and other members of the Managing Committee before whom it was put. The details of the agreement reached between the Institutions of Bhelsa (Vidisha) and Sholapur are given in the Prakasakiya Vaktavya or the Publishers' Note.

Pamca-namokara-mantra

Lately, the Pannavana-sutta is nicely edited and published (Jaina Agama Granthamala-9, Parts 1-2, Sri Mahavira Jaina Vidyalaya, Bombay-26, 1969-1972). It is an important text belonging to the Upanga category of the Ardhamagadhi canon; and it bears a good bit of resemblance with the Satkhandagama-sutra in contents and style. The detailed Introductions in English and Gujarati by the Editors: Muni Shri Punyavijaya, Pandit Dalsukh Malvania and Pandit Amritlal M. Bhojaka are quite important. Two topics, which are relevant in the present context, deserve to be noticed here. On page 235 of the Introduction in English, there is a discussion about the Mangalacarana of the Prajnapana and about the Pancanamaskara-mantra; and it purports, in short, to say that, in the earliest Jaina works, the entire Mantra is not mentioned. In later literature it is employed in its entirety; still, nowhere, there is any specific mention of its author. The Satkhandagama-sutras open with this Pancanamaskara-mantra; and it is indicated by virasena in his Dhavala Commentary that its first author is Puspadanta himself. In the Introduction of the Second Volume and

elsewhere, it has been already stated, on the authority of the Commentary on the First Sutra, that Virasena held the view, without any doubt, that this (Pamcanamokara) Mantra was an inseparable part of the Satkhandagama-sutra and its author is Puspadanta himself. According to the Commentator (i.e., Virasena), the Mangala is of two types, one nibaddha and the other anibaddha; and their definitions are thus explained. When the author of the Sutras composes the Mangalacara himself, that is called 'nibaddha-mangala'; and when he adopts the Mangala-patha composed by others, it is named as 'anibaddha-mangala'. In view of this distinction, the Commentator describes the pancanamaskara-mantra used here as 'nibaddha-mangala', and the longish Mangala-patha, 'namo Jinanam', etc., given at the beginning of the Fourth Khanda, Vedana, as 'anibaddha-mangala', because this latter was not composed by the Sutrakara himself but was composed by Gautama Ganadhara and has been reproduced here. so there is no scope for doubt so far as the opinion of the author of Dhavala is concerned.

In this connection, it would be proper to explain another point as well. In the Namokaramantra, the first expression 'namo Arihamtanam' has, in some places, also an alternative reading 'Arahamtanam'. In view of the nature of the Prakrit language, there is nothing surprising in this. But, as in the Satkhandagama, this very reading Arihamtanam is found at the beginning of the Prajnapanasutra; and the commentators, Haribhadra and Malayagiri, have accepted the same. Virasena, the author of the Dhavala and Jinabhadra, the author of the Visavasyakabhasya, have adopted this

very reading and explained its etymology in various ways; and finally, they have noted its Sanskrit counterpart Arhat of which too the definition is given. According to the author of Dhavala:

अरिहाद् अरिहता, रजोहाद् वा अरिहता रहस्याभावाद् वा अरिहता। अतिशय-
पूजार्हत्वाद् वा अर्हतः

Thus the author of Dhavala does not have before him any reading 'arahamta' even as an option (Satkha, Vol. I, p. 42 ff.). So it stands proved that the long-standing scriptural tradition is in favour of the reading Arihamtanam. In the expression Namō Ariyanam of this very Mangala, rya is substituted by riya; and likewise we get the changes: arya > ariya; varsa > varisa.

Satkhandaḡama and Prajnapanasutra

In one of the sections of the Introduction (pp.223 f.) of the Pannavana-sutta, there is a discussion comparing the Prajnapana with the Satkhandaḡama. It is pointed out that both these works have got significant similarities: i) The subject matter of both of them is a doctrinal discussion about Jiva and Karman. ii) The basic source for both of them is the Srutanga Drstivada. iii) They are compiled in the form of Sutras. iv) Here and there, in both the works, the Sutras assume the form of Gathas. v) Some Gathas are common to both; and they are found also in the Niryuktis and Visavasyakabhāṣya, etc. vi) Both the works are of the nature of compilation and have common words and expressions. vii) The topic Alpa- bahutva is almost identical and it is called Mahadandaka. viii) In the discussion on Gatyagati,

there occur, in both, the discussions on the acquisition of the position of Tirthakara, Cakravartin, Baladeva and Vasudeva. ix) The topics or Padas (23-27 and 35) Karma, Karma-bandhaka, Karma-vedaka, Veda-bandhaka, Veda-vedaka and Vedana of the Prajnapanana remind us of the Six Khandas of the Satkhandagama, namely, Jiva-sthana, Ksudraka-bandha, Bandha-svमित्वा, Vedana, Vargana and Mahabandha. These common points between the two works are undisputable; and they indicate a common tradition in view of their maning and exposition.

Despite these common points, both the works possess many a speciality of their own. I) The Prajnapanana contains 36 sections called Padas; and according to the subject matter, their sub-sections like Prajnapanana, Prarupana, etc. But in the satkhandagama, the same six Khandas are there; and under them, the fourteen Jiva-samasas (Gunasthanas) and fourteen Margana-sthanas are discussed at length, in their order; all this is completely absent in the Prajnapanasutra. ii) The Prajnapanana has single authorship, while it is accepted that Puspadanta and Bhutabali are the authors of the Satkhandagama; and it might be inferred that many of its appendices (culikas) were added later on, as in the case of some canonical texts like the Daeavaikalika. iii) The discussion of the subject matter in the Satkhandagama is more detailed and profound, systematic and well-planned as against that in the Prajnapanana. iv) The question-and-answer style is employed more in the Prajnapanana than in the, satkhandagama. v) The Prajnapanasutra is written in the style of original Sutra, while the satkhandagama presents a commentarial style employing the Anuyogadvaras. Here the Niksepas

like Nama, Sthapana, etc., as in the Niryuktis; Anuyogadvaras like Sat, Samkhya, etc., as in the Tattvartha-sutra; and such terms like Praruupana, Nirdesa, Vibhasa, etc., are used : all these are the characteristics of the Bhasya style employed here. Further are employed Gatianuvada, Indriya-anuvada. etc., too. vi) The exposition of Alpa-bahutva, under the title Mahadandaka, in the satkhandagama (VII. 79), is more systematic under 78 Padas with such predicated as 'vattaissamo', 'kadavvo'; while in the Prajnapanana such predicates are not used and the exposition is loose presenting 98 Padas, some of which are primary and some secondary divisions. vii) In the Prajnapanana-sutra, under Sthanapada, the description as to where, in the universe, living beings of various types dwell is loosely discussed at length, but the same in the Satkhandagama (VII. Pp. 299, etc.) is present in the order of Margana-sthanas, comparatively in short and in a systematic style. viii) In the Prajnapanana the Alpa-bahutva is described through 26 Dvaras, and therein the topics of Jiva and Ajiva are intermingled in a haphazard manner. In the satkhandagama, however, the same are systematically presented under fourteen Marganas. The names of Marganas like Gati, Indriya, etc., are found here and there in the twenty-six Dvaras of the Prajnapanana-sutra, but a clear-cut specification of 14 Marganas is absent. The same holds good about the use of Sthiti, Sparsa, Kala, etc. ix) The Prajnapanana-sutra has the same three Gathas (99-101, p. 25), which are found also in the satkhandagama (XVI, Sutras 122-24). In the satkhandagama these are introduced with the words 'lakkhanam bhanidam', which indicate that they are quotations. Some of their readings are correct in the Prajnapanana, but incorrect in the satkhandagama.

Taking into account the above points of agreement and difference, the authors of the Introduction of the Prajnapana-sutra have expressed their opinion that on the one hand both the works agree in their inheritance of traditional doctrines and also, to a certain extent, in their method of treatment; but, on the other hand, in view of the classification of topics, the style, system and method of exposition and the use of technical terms, the Prajnapana is prior to and a work earlier than satkhandagama. To strengthen this view, they have considered the age of the composition of these works. As to the date of composition of the satkhandagama, they have accepted the same as fixed in the Introduction of Volume One, namely 683 after the Nirvana of Mahavira or sometime in the second century of the Vikrama era. But, in fixing the date of Prajnapana, they have not found any undisputed historical facts and evidence; so they had to depend on certain indications of doubtful validity noted below.

1) In the Prajnapana-sutra, after the benedictory verses, there are two Interpolated Gathas which, after offering salutation to Ajjasama (Arya-Syama), mention that he was the 23rd in the Vacaka lineage and he presented this sruta-ratna from the ocean of scriptural knowledge. From this, it is inferred that Arya Syama is the author of the Prajnapanasutra.

2) According to the Pattavalis, there flourished three Kalakacaryas, and it is the first Kalaka that was Syamacarya.

3) The death of the first Kalaka according to the Dharmasagariya Pattavali, but the birth of him according to the Kharatara-gacchiya Pattavali, falls in 376 years after the death of Mahavira.

Based on these three points, it is concluded that the Prajnapanasutra was Composed by syamacarya in the fourth century of the Viranirvana era, i.e., about One hundred years before the Vikrama era, and accordingly some three hundred Years earlier than satkhandagama.

The above arguments may be scrutinised here:

1) Not even the name of the Pannavana-sutta occurs in those two interpolated Gathas. The gift of the sruta-ratna made by Syamacarya can imply some other Grantha-ratna. If Haribhadra comments on them, calling them interpolately, it proves only this much that during his time, in the 8th century A. D., Syamacarya was already well-known. What evidence have we to ascertain by whom and at what time these were interpolated ? The Gathas specify that Syamacarya was the twentythird in the Vacaka lineage. Where is the discussion as to when this lineage started and what would be the period for the 23rd person in that line ? The earlier genuine Gatha clearly says the Pannavana was preached by the revered Jina for the spiritual (nivr^{tti}) benefit of pious saints; while the interpolatory Gathas speak of the highly gifted (durdhara, dhira, etc.) monk Syamacarya donating some un-specified Srutaratna to his pupils. Can the authorship specified in the original and interpolatory passages be said to be the same ?

2) The tradition of the Pattavalis is not ancient; the age of their composition and their authority are not beyond doubt; and they are mutually inconsistent as well. They do not clearly establish with whom of the three Kalakacaryas Syamacarya should be identified. Based on these, Dr. U. P. Shaha expressed his inconclusive opinion (p. 232) that syamacarya mentioned eleventh in the line and Kalakacarya, destroyer of King Gardabhilla, became identical, if the first two Kalakas were regarded as one identical person. Thus to identify syamacarya with Kalaka and then to fix his date are attended with many hurdles.

3) When were Dharmasagariya and Kharatara-gaccha Pattavalis composed, What are their sources, what is the reason for their mutual contradictions ? Unless These questions are satisfactorily explained, how can the dates given by them be authoritative and how can Kalaka be taken as identical with syamacarya.

As far as the evidence is presented, it is not clear where Kalakacarya is called the author of the Prajnapanasutra ? To propose an identity of syama Arya with Kalaka Acarya is catching, because 'syama' and 'kala' mean black; but such a procedure is methodologically defective. To reach such a conclusion, we need independent sources to specify Syamarya as well as Kalakacarya as the authors of the Prajnapanana: then alone identity can be proposed; and then the question of the date can be tackled.

Really speaking, it would be a great asset for the history of Jaina literature, if the composition of any Jaina work could be assigned to the

second or first century before the Vikrama era. There is hardly any work in the available Jaina Prakrit literature which holds any prospects in this direction, because the linguistic tendencies there do not belong to the first stage of the Middle-Indo-Aryan, but they belong to the second stage which did not come into vogue prior to the second century of the Vikrama era. For instance, we have in the Pannavana: loc. (loke), bhayavaya (bhagavata), suya (sruta), ditthivaya (drstivada) thii (sthiti), veyane (vedanâ); here intervocalic consonants are being lost replaced by ya-sruti. This tendency is not noticed in the Prakrit languages prior to the second century A.D. The earlier phase of Prakrits is found in the Pâli Tripitaka, in the inscriptions of Asoka, Kharavela and those of the Sunga and Andhra dynasties and in the plays of Asvaghosa, where we do not notice the tendency of dropping the medial consonants. This tendency began after the second century, and this indeed became the distinguishing feature of Mâhârâstri (Prâkrit). As it is found in plenty in Jaina prâkrit literature Pischel and other scholars named the dialect of Jaina Prâkrit works as Jaina Mâhârâstri and Jaina Saurasenî. In the light of this linguistic study, the composition of the Pannavanâ-sutta can in no way be assigned to the period earlier than the second century.

The claim that the Pannavanâ is older than the Satkhandâgama is not indisputable. The points of agreement between these two works conclusively prove that both of them have a common heritage. This is true not only of these two works but also of all the canonical (including procanonical) works of the Digambara and Svetâmbara traditions and schools. Their soul is the same, but their body and physical structure are different. In this connection, the observation of Virasenâcârya, the

author of the Dhavala, deserves our attention (Satkhandāgama, Vol. I, p. 60). There are two kinds of authors, Artha-kartā and Grantha-kartā. So far as the Satkhandāgama is concerned, the Artha-kartā is the revered Mahāvīra, but-the Grantha-kartā stands for Gautama and other saints down in succession to Puspadanta and Bhutabali. The composition of the Satkhandāgama is based on the very preachings of Mahāvira on which that of the Prajnāpanā-sutra is based. But it was natural that there arose differences in style and classifications, etc., according to the traditions of (different) schools. In texts of fixed traditions; chronological priority or posteriority can be inferred from the development in style, etc.; but in independent traditional inheritance such an inference proves invalid; and, on this point, the editors of the Prajnāpanā-sutra have themselves laid sufficient stress. They say (Introduction, p. 230):

“The style of treatment i.e., its simplicity or otherwise, cannot be a determining factor in fixing up the chronological order of these works. This is so because the nature of the style was dependent on the objective of the author and on the nature of the subject-matter, simple or subtle. Hence we would be making a great blunder in fixing up the chronological order of Prajnāpanā and Satkhandāgama if we were guided only by the fact that the treatment of the subject-matter in the Satkhandāgama is more detailed and subtle than that found in Prajnāpanā-sutra.”

It would not be out of place to clarify another point also. The Svetāmbara Scholiasts primarily confined themselves to the

Ardhamāgadhī canon and pursued the resurrection, compilation and expansion in their composition. But the Digambara saints, accepting that the original Agamas were lost, started composing works in a new style with some independence; in this pursuit learned Acāryas used their intellectual gifts without any restraint (or inhibition). As a result of this, the authors of the Satkhandāgama acquired the knowledge of the traditional lore (Siddhānta) from Dharasenācārya; and, on the strength of their intellectual gifts, Developed the five-fold Mangala from two-fold one, namely, ‘Namo Arahamtānam’ and ‘Namo sava sidhānam’ found on the Khāravela inscription. Such efforts must have been made in different regions, in different circles of learned monks and at different ages. When one scrutinises the Cattāridanoaka, it has a four-fold Mangala. The third item mentioning Sāhu could easily get expanded, along with the organisation of ascetic community, to include Acarya, Upādhyāya and Sarva-sādhu. One of the early Tamila Kāvya, Jīvakacintāmani, adopts the Cattāri-mangalam in the benedictory verses instead of five-fold Mangala. Likewise possibly, it is these authors that systematised, for the first time, Jīva-samāsa (Gunasthāna) Mārganāsthāna and the various Anuyoga-dvāras and, on their basis, gave a systematic exposition of the entire Siddhānta. May be, to begin with, their systematisation was naturally met with some opposition or neglect, but gradually this very systematisation, on account of its being more methodical, pervaded the entire gamut of Jaina Siddhānta, and proved acceptable to all. The authors of the Satkhandāgams have not omitted any item from the Siddhānta inherited by them; and they have given due place to useful traditional Gāthās in their works. By such introductory words as ‘bhanidam’, etc., they have indicated that these

Gāthās are not composed by them but are traditionally inherited: this gives us an idea about their scholarly honesty and scholastic integrity. If any other author just ignores indicating the fact of inheriting such verses and included them along with other verses, this cannot be taken as a proof of his chronological priority. The name of Arya Syāma occurs in interpolatory verses. He is not the author (in the strict sense of the term) of the Prajnāpanā but only a compiler, putting together traditional material. Thus when the authors of both the Satkhandāgama and Prajnāpanā are recording and arranging only traditional material, the term 'bhanidam' has no chronological value.

The Prajnāpana has got some traditional Gāthās common with the Uttarādhyayana and Nijjutti, and these are called Samgrahanī Gāthās (See Prajnāpanā and Satkhandāgama by D. Malvania, JOR, Vol. 19, pp. 35 ff. Baroda 1969). These cannot be used as evidence for relative chronology. If it is accepted that the Prajnāpanā is posterior to the Uttarādhyayana, the age of the Prajnāpanā remains still more uncertain. The Uttarādhyayana, as it stands today, cannot be, en bloc, assigned to the 3rd-4th century B.C. Some of its dogmatical chapters, which are clustered together at the end of the work, especially the 28th chapter etc. can be legitimately looked upon as pretty late, and, in the opinion of some, nearer the age of the Tattvārthasutra. In this context another fact also has to be taken into account: the inheritance of scriptural knowledge was primarily oral; and one should not handle this material as if it is recorded in Mss. and copied by different authors. If any Gāthā is more correct in one text than in the other, it might be the result of the carefulness or otherwise of the copyists; it would be

improper to impute the mistakes to original authors who were learned Acāryas. If the readings are more correct in the Prajnāpanā but incorrect in the Satkhandāgama, one should rather infer from this that the former could not have been the direct source of the latter.

The gist of the above discussion is that, as yet, we have not got any evidence to say that the Prajnāpana-sutra was composed earlier than the Satkhandāgama. The age of Satkhandāgama is 683 years after the Nirvāna of Mahāvīra, i. e., about 200 years of the Vikrama Era; and it is accepted by all. It also stands proved that the inscription, etc., discovered in the Baba Pyara Caves near Girnar or Junagad belong to this period; and possibly it is the same Candraguphā in which Dharasenācārya used to dwell, and he might be the same Dharasena whose demise, According to Sallekhanā, is indicated in the record there.

On the other hand, nothing definite can be said about the author of the Prajnāpanā-sutra. The Acāryas of the Satkhandāgama tradition do not seem to be aware even of his name: for, if they were, how Virasena, the author of the Dhavala, who has mentioned Twelve Angas and fourteen Anga-bāhya texts like the Dasavaikāikālika, Uttarādhyayana, Kalpa, Vyavahāra, Nisitha; etc; (Satkhandāgama Vol. I, p. 96), could fail to take note of such an important text like the Pannavanā. In view of its linguistic features the Pannavanā cannot be dated earlier than the 2nd or 3rd century of the Vikrama era. Incidentally it may also be noted that the Satkhandāgama inclines more towards softening the intervocalic surds (like k and t) than dropping them; according to experts, softening is linguistically an earlier stage

than eliding them. This much can be definitely said that the Pannavanā is earlier than its first Commentator Haribhadra (9th century of the Vikram era). And if, on account of its mention in the Nandisutra, it is to be earlier than the Valabhi redaction, then it may be assigned to a period earlier than Vira Nirvāna Sanvat 993 (Vikrama Samvat 523). Another question has to be answered. Why is it that the Prajnāpanā, considered to be so important in view of its contents and assigned to such an early date by the editors, is put under the category of upanga, a division which is quite late and of artificial connection with Angas. The Upānga division came into existence perhaps after the Valabhī redaction; and the works under it contained extraneous and residuary traditional matter not included under Angas. This, to a great extent, explains the relatively discursive contents, collected and compiled by Arya Syāma: i.e., all the material is not thought out by himself (see p. 229, Introduction). In fine, the Prajnāpanā, though it contains a good deal of old material not properly preserved, its present form cannot be dated earlier than the Valabhi Council when it was put under the category of Upānga and interpolatory verses became a source for the name of its so-called author.

Pandit Phoolchanda Siddhanta Shastri has given details about editing the Present Volume in his 'Avasyaka Nivedana.' We are very thankful to him for the pains taken by him in this work. From the table of corrected readings given by him it is clear that he has carefully done the work; and it can be said that the palmleaf, Mss. are no more indispensable. It is a matter for satisfaction, taking into account the material on which the first edition was based, that there are not as many

wrong readings as they were feared to have been. It is not a surprise if some significant various readings are detected; but what is remarkable is that the set-up of the interpretation of the earlier edition stands vindicated to be quite systematic. We have every hope that other Volumes are also soon published in this way with their readings duly scrutinised. Our hope has a solid basis that Shri Walchand Deochandaji, the Secretary of the Samskriti Sangha and his other colleagues are taking a keen interest in the matter and are giving maximum co-operation.

The late Shri N. Chadraraj had prepared the collotions from the photos of palm leaf-Mss. in reading which he was specially trained. In this work he was helped by Prof. J.D.Bhomaj who took down the readings as he read them from one of the Mss. Both Prof. J.D.Bhomaj and Shri. Narendra Bhisikar have given valuable co-operation in seeing the work through the Press and in correcting the proofs:
our thanks are due to all of them.

24-11-1972

Balaghat, M.P.

Mysore

Editors:

HIRA LAL JAIN

ADINATH NEMINATH UPADHYE

POSTSCRIPT

The sad demise of Dr. Hiralalaji has been a severe blow to the studies of the Siddhānta texts. The publication of the Satkhandāgama, along with the Dhavalā commentary, in Sixteen Volumes, was, indeed, a great achievement which bears testimony to his allround scholarship, self-sacrifice, spirit of dedication and unstinted labour. For the last few months, we were exchanging notes on some of the aspects of the Introduction to this revised edition of the First Volume of the Satkhandāgama. He sent his Hindi draft to me on 24-11-72 asking me to put it into English and make necessary corrections, etc. I prepared the English draft with my additions here and there. I sent it to him on 21-2-73 requesting him to approve it with, necessary corrections. It appears from some of his marks that he had read a few pages of it. His son, Prin. Prafulla Kumar Modi, wrote to me (7-3-73) that Doctors had advised him rest for a few weeks. Lately, he had undergone an operation for cataract of the second eye; and he had heart trouble, in addition to diabetes. As I knew his habits and his remarkable will, I had hoped that he would be allright soon to finalise our Introduction. Despite indifferent health and Doctors' advice to take rest, he tried to exact maximum work from himself: he believed that life is worth living only if one uses all one's time purposefully. Such a strain he could not sustain for long; and that quiet end came to this heroic scholar on 13-3-73 ! Thus our joint labours, which went on nearly for the last forty years, in many a literary field, came to a stop. It was my great fortune that I had in him a genial colleague and a 'Kalyāna-mitra'. I feel I have

lost my elder brother in him. The draft of the Introduction was returned to me by his son in the second week of April. To my regret, it could not receive Dr. Hiralalaji's final touches. The Revision of the subsequent volumes of the Satkhandāgama is deprived of his advice and guidance which I got in plenty from him for the First Volume. The Prakāsakīya was duly drafted by him after consulting the documents and sent to the Sholapur office on 6-10-72. The Introduction is signed by both of us, as already approved by Dr. Hiralalaji, on 24-11-1972 (Balaghat, M.P.), because it is the result of mutual discussion. It is with a sad heart that I sign this post-script all alone; and I earnestly wish all peace and satisfaction to the departed soul.

Manasa Gangotri, Mysore

A.N. UPADHYE

May 1, 1973