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intensive forms occur in interpolated passages; the two noticed (both read by
the Northern recension) are dodhāyamāna App. 1.18.1.7 and āṇavalyamanā
App. 1.19 1.18 (also Mbh. 1.92.26c, 3.98.18c, 186.98c, 4.21.42c, etc., cf
āṇavalyam Rām. 1.59.31b). Intensive forms are also very rare in the text of
the Sundara and Yuddha kāṇḍas. From the Yuddhakāṇḍa may be noted the
irregular form jāṅmrbaṁśaṇā at 48.50a.

The following are the instances of denominative bases which occur in the
text of the Critical Edition of the Ayodhya, Aranyakā and Kīśkindhā kāṇḍas:
avyā (abhāvyāyam 2.8.1a and abhāvyāyitum 4.15.19b), pratikāraya (apratikārayam
2.45.63b), cīṛyā (cīṛyasya 2.58.5c), dirghaya (dirghayam 2.94.14d) namasya
(namasyānī 2.2.32a, etc.), niṣpatraya (niṣpatreyitum 4.11.47d, which the Tilaka
commentary glosses paṭrāṅkāḥ kartuṃ; Monier-Williams also notes the base
for the Mahābhārata), mahiya (mahīyamāna 2.14.26c, etc.) and saḍāyaya
(saṭdāpayet 2.53.3d). There are, of course, other stems which are clearly
denominative in origin though no longer classified as such, for example, kirt
(kirtaya 2.52.9f and apritiṣṭhitata 2.94.16b), pāl (pālayasya 2.8.8b, etc.) and
mantr (2.4.1c et passim). But altogether the denominative is of such rare
occurrence as to play no significant role in the verbal system of the Rāmāyaṇa.

PRAJÑĀPAṆĀ AND ŚĀṬKHANḍĀGAMA

By
DALSUKHBHAL D. MALVANIA, Ahmedabad

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

Out of the 36 ‘Padas’ contained in Prajñāpanāsūtra, the names of six
‘Padas’ (23-27, 35) occurring in the Prajñāpanāsūtra itself are ‘Karma’ (23),
Karmabandhika (24), Karmavedakā (25), Vedabandhika (26), Vedavedakā
(27), Vedanā (35). It is interesting to compare these names with those of the
concerned Khaṇḍas of the Śāṭkhāndāgama, suggested by the commentator.
The concerned Khaṇḍas of the Śāṭkhāndāgama discuss the topics more in detail and
more minutely than the Padas of Prajñāpanāsūtra. Thus in Prajñāpanāsūtra,
the discussions centre round the Jīva while in Śāṭkhāndāgama they centre round
the Karma.

Prajñāpanāsūtra prominently employs question-answer style adopted in
Ágāṇa Sūtras. And at many places it is clear that the questions and answers are
of Gaṇatama and Mahāvīra respectively. But Śāṭkhāndāgama employs the scientific
method the constituents of which are Uddeśa, Nirdeśa and Vīdhāga. Only
occasionally we come across the questions and answers.1

Prajñāpanāsūtra which is of the nature of compilation is a work of one
Ācārya. But the case with Śāṭkhāndāgama is different. Prajñāpanād contains

1 The topics like ‘Bandhasvāmītīvāsa,’ Śāṭkhāndāgama Book VIII, occasionally
employ question-answer style.
no Cūlikā. But in Śatkhandāgama Cūlikās have been added.1 We know not as to who made this additions and when. But the term Cūlikā itself suggests that it is a later addition. The similar thing has happened even in case of Āgamas like Daśāvatāra Cūlikā.

Prajñāpānāsūtra is written in the style of original Sūtra while Śatkhandāgama employs commentarial or expository style in addition to it. In the Śatkhandāgama many a times the discussion is conducted through ‘entrances’ to exposition; this suggests commentarial style. That is to say, after having suggested the entrances to exposition by the words ‘anuṣodhana’ the exposition is conducted through all such ‘entrances’ one by one.2 Moreover, the terms like Kṛti, vedana, karma are explained through the method of Nikāyas, viz. nāma, sthāpanā, dravya and bhāva. In doing so has clearly followed the style of exposition found in the Nyāyakusumāna.3 The employment of terms like ‘anugama,’ ‘sahānaparivāra,’ ‘niddesa,’ ‘vihāsa’ all (vibhāsa) also points to its commentarial style. Everywhere in Śatkhandāgama a discussion on those particular margājñāvāras (topics of investigation) begins through the words ‘gadiyauvādena,’ ‘veriyauvādena,’ ‘kayauvādena’ etc.4 This system is rarely found in the Prajñāpānāsūtra. Only two words ‘disīnauvādena’ and ‘khetīnauvādena’ occur in it. But the word ‘gatyanuvādena’ has not been employed in the discussion on gati, etc.

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

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

1 Śatkhandāgama Book VI contains 9 Cūlikās. Book I, Book XI, 2 and Book XII, 3.
2 In the Sūtras (Book XIV) it is explicitly stated that—“etō uvarimangadaito gūlikā nāma.”
3 Śatkhandāgama Book I Sū. 5; Book IX Sū. 45; Book X Sū. 1; Book XI Sū. 1 & 165; Book XII Sū. 1; Book XIII Sū. 2 etc.
4 The employment of this method is noticed in Śatkhandāgama from Book IX Sū. 45 to Book XIV.
5 Ibid, Book I Sū. 7; Book III Sū. 1 etc.
6 Ibid, Book I Sū. 7; Book IX Sū. 71.
7 Ibid, Book I Sū. 8; Book III Sū. 1 etc.
8 Ibid, Book VI Sū. 2 (p. 43), Book VI Sū. 1 (p. 145); Book XIV Sū. 1.
9 Prajñāpānāsūtra 193-224; 276-324; 326-329.

saṅgrahani gāthās. Gāthās 99-101 of Prajñāpānāsūtra occur in Śatkhandāgama. The gāthās as found in Śatkhandāgama are as follows:

Book XIV
Sū. 121 “tathā imāṁ saṁśānavākākṣanaṁ bhavat
Sū. 122 saṁśānavākṣanaṁ saṁśānavākṣanaṁ ca
sāṁśānavākṣanaṁ saṁśānavākṣanaṁ bhavat
Sū. 123 evaṁ suṣṭaṁ bhavat bhāvaṁ saṁśānavākṣanaṁ eyaṁ
Sū. 124 samagāṁ varāṇatipāṁ samagāṁ teśūṁ saṁśānavākṣanaṁ
samagāṁ suṣṭaṁ samagāṁ uṣṭaṁ samagāṁ

It is noteworthy that Śatkhandāgama quotes these gāthās having employed the term ‘bhavat’ suggestive of quotation, while Prajñāpānāsūtra does not use any such term. In Prajñāpānāsūtra they are given in a reverse order. Moreover, the gāthā occurring in the concerned sūtra 122 gives the reading ‘lakṣaṁbhāyaḥ’ while Prajñāpānāsūtra gāthā 101 gives the reading ‘lakṣaṁbhāyaḥ’ eyaṁ’. Though the gāthā occurring in the Sūtras 123 and Prajñāpānāsūtra gāthā no. 10 are identical, the reading of this gāthā given by Prajñāpānāsūtra is more correct than the one offered Śatkhandāgama. The reading as we find in Śatkhandāgama is in disorder and corrupt. Once again the gāthā occurring in Sūtras 124 and Prajñāpānāsūtra gāthā 99 are one and the same but both the works give different readings. In this case too Prajñāpānāsūtra gives correct reading.

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

“āha bhante savājīvappābhāhūḥ mahādāndayāḥ vattati-sam-savājīvavā gabbha bahavakṣaṇī kāmānusā”...

And the end is as follows: “śajjī vissāsāya 96, samātratthā vissāsāya 97, savājīvā vissāsāya 98. Sūtra 334.

Even in Śatkhandāgama there occurs Mahādāndayā. There its beginning is—“etō savājīvāvā mahādāndayā kādvārī bhavati savājīvāvā manusapajjātā gabbhavakṣaṇī ”. And its end is—‘nigodayā vissāsāya’ Book VII Sūtra 1-79.

The difference that we find in the two expositions—one in Śatkhandāgama and another in Prajñāpānāsūtra—is that Prajñāpānāsūtra mentions 58 divisions of living beings while Śatkhandāgama mentions 78 divisions. The fact that some divisions are primary and some secondary should be considered to be the reason of this difference. But the important thing is that both the works give one name ‘Mahādāndayā’ to this discussion. This suggests the common tradition.

1 At other places also the word Mahādāndayā is used in Śatī. See Book XIV, Sūtra 634-635, Sūtra 30, VI Sū. I, p. 140, 142.
The second Pada of *Prajñāpanāsūtra* is "Stānapada". Therein it is described as to where in the Universe living beings of various types or grades—beginning with those possessed of one sense-organ and ending with those who are emancipated souls-dwell. In the chapter called 'Kṣetrasaṅgama' of the second part (Khaṇḍa) of *Śaṭkhaṇḍa-gāma* this very topic is discussed. The only difference that we find is that *Śaṭkhaṇḍa-gāma* discusses this topic through points of investigation (margāṇāsthāna), viz. Gati etc.; while *Prajñāpanā* discusses this topic taking one by one various grades of living beings—from those possessed of one sense-organ to the liberated. In *Prajñāpanā*, the treatment of this topic is lengthy while in *Śaṭkhaṇḍa-gāma* it is brief.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prajñāpanāsūtra</th>
<th>Śaṭkhaṇḍa-gāma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Diśā²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Gati</td>
<td>1 Gati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Indriya</td>
<td>2 Indriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Kāya</td>
<td>3 Kāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Yoga</td>
<td>4 Yoga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Veda</td>
<td>5 Veda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Kāśāya</td>
<td>6 Kāśāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Leśyā</td>
<td>10 Leśyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Samyaktva</td>
<td>12 Samyaktva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Jāha</td>
<td>7 Jāha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Darśana</td>
<td>9 Darśana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Sañhya</td>
<td>8 Sañhya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Upayoga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Āhāra</td>
<td>14 Āhāra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

The sthiti (life-span) of living beings is expounded in various ways in the *Śaṭkhaṇḍa-gāma*. In the Kālāṇugama (Book VII, p. 114 ff.) the kāla-sthiti (life-span) of living beings is expounded through 14 dvārās (points of investigation) beginning with gati. But in the *Prajñāpanā* it is discussed through 24 divisions and sub-divisions of living beings—known as 24 gaṇḍakas (*Prajñāpanā, Sthitipada IV*).
Aaain, similarity of treatment in regard to avagāhāna (occupation of space, antara (gap) etc. is found in both the works. We refrain from dealing with this point. It will suffice to suggest that the detailed and fine comparison of these two works is worth undertaking. That is to say, these two works are the solid means to know the stages of development of thought regarding living beings and Karma. We want to draw the attention of the scholars to this fact.

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

Moreover, one striking point of similarity is to be noted. In the discussion on gatāyātā (transmigration) there occurs, in both the works, the discussion on the acquisition of the position of Tīrthāṅkara, Cakravarti, Baladeva, Vasudeva. The only difference is that Prajñāpāṇi adds two more positions viz. Māyādīkā and Raṇa. (Prajñāpāṇi Sū. 1466-68), Saṅkha.VI, Sū. 216, 220.

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

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

Prajñāpāṇi represents the first trend while old works on Karma like Karmapakṣaṭī, Saṅkhāraṇāgama, etc. represent the second trend. The state of affairs being what it is, it becomes very difficult for us to determine the chronological order of these works. In the 15th Cent. and even after when the Saṅkhaṇāvāst tradition tried to present in the form of thokada works, written in Gujarāṭi the ideas and thoughts of Āgamas, it presented the margaṇaśāsthaṇas etc. in such a way as could be easily grappled by an ordinary reader. And in the Aṅga work named Saṅkhaṇāṅga too a particular item is presented keeping in view the number of its constituents. But let us remember that even in the days of Saṅkhaṇāṅga the ideas relating to living beings and Karma were presented in a complicated manner. So, style of treatment—i.e. its simplicity or otherwise—cannot be a determining factor in fixing up the chronological order of these works. This is so because the nature of the style was dependent on the objective of the author and not on the nature of the subject-matter—simple or subtle. Hence we would be making a great blunder in fixing up the chronological order of Prajñāpāṇi and Saṅkhāraṇāgama if we were guided only by the fact that the treatment of the subject-matter in the Saṅkhāraṇāgama is more detailed and subtle than that found in Prajñāpāṇiśāstra. Therefore we should tackle differently the problem of their chronological order. We should first study such works independently and only afterwards we should try to fix their chronological order. According to both these works, literature of both these types is rooted in Dṛṣṭivāda. This means that innumerable Ācāryas have variously presented the subject-matter of Dṛṣṭivāda itself to achieve different objectives. This presents one more difficulty in fixing up the chronological order of the works on the basis of the nature of the treatment of the subject-matter simple or subtle. If one were
not to take into consideration all these facts he can easily—but wrongly—conclude that as the discussions in Prājñāpana are more simple and brief than those in Saṅkhādāgama the former is prior to the latter. But on account of the difficulty as already pointed out it is not proper to fix Prājñāpana prior to Saṅkhādāgama. So, we have given up this manner of fixing up the chronological order of the works on the basis of the nature of their treatment. Now, it becomes necessary for us to employ the different method for fixing up their chronological order. Only after we have done so, we can utilise the argument based on the nature of treatment.

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

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

“bhagavān Ārya Śyāma pitā itham eva sūtram racayati” (Comm. p. 72).

“bhagavān Ārya Śyāma paṇha” (Ibid, p. 47), “savesāṃ api prāvacanikāsānuśānam maṅgalya bhagavāna Ārya Śyāma upadhyāya” (Ibid, p. 385), “bhagavān Ārya Śyāma pratipattu” (Ibid, p. 385). ¹ This points out his greatness. From these two gāthās it becomes clear that Ārya Śyāma belonged to Vācaka lineage (vaṁśa), and was well versed in Pārvaśūpita. In the composition of Prājñāpana-sūtra he had displayed his talent to such an extent that even Āgā and Upaniṣa works recommend the readers to refer to Prājñāpana for detailed discussions on various subjects.

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

From the Paṭṭavalis we know the fact that there were three persons bearing the same name Kālakāśya. The first Kālaka is that whose death (according to Dharmasāgārya Paṭṭavali; birth according to Kharutarangacchhya Paṭṭavali) ¹ occurred in 376 V.N. (i.e. 376 years after the death of Lord Mahāvira). The second Kālaka is that who destroyed the King Gardabhillaka and who flourished in V.N. 453 (17 years before the commencement of Vikrama Era). The third Kālaka is that who flourished in V.N. 993 = 523 V.S.) and who changed the day of Śaṅkavatsari from the 5th day of Bhadrapada to the 4th.

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

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

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

In prājñāpanasūtra the exposition of the divisions of living beings is found in verses instead of in prose.² And these verses occur even in the Uttarādhyāyana-sūtra and Niryuktī. From this it is proved that these verses are not added in the Prājñāpanasūtra after its compilation but they are included by the compiler himself while composing the work. So, we can definitely say that Prājñāpana is later than Uttarādhyāyana-sūtra. It is interesting to note that Niryuktī gāthās occur in Mūlaśāstra and Saṅkhādāgama. Hence it is very difficult to decide as to who—Junior or Senior Bhadrabhū—composed them. But many of them

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

² These verses occur, with minor changes, in the XXXVI Chapter of Uttarādhyāyana.
seem to be *saṅgrahaṇī gāthās*, current in the tradition, which afterwards, were included in the *Niruktī* by the author himself. Thus the problem of the date of the *Niruktī* has its own difficulty. And according to scholars, *Uttarādhyāyanaśūra* has gradually assumed its present form. The narrative story-part, the didactic-part and the philosophical part—these three parts are noticeable in the *Uttarādhyāyanaśūra*. Scholars are of the opinion that these three parts are composed at different periods of time. But it is generally held that it, assumed its present form in 3rd-4th Century B.C. And *Praṇāpanā*, being composed after *Uttarādhyāyana*, should be of a later date, than that of *Uttarādhyāyana*. Moreover, this much we can definitely hold that the gāthās contained in the *Ācāraṇī-Niruktī* (Refer to *Praṇāpanā* Sa 7, Note 1) are preserved in their original form. It is so because therein the mention is made of the 36 names of *Prthivi* (*earth*) and the number of these names is really 36. These very gāthās occur in the *Uttarādhyāyanaśūra*. There too 36 names are hinted at in the phrase “bhaya chattisamāhīya”. Inspite of this hint or reference it enumerates 40 names (*or types*) of *Prthivi*. Hence the question arises as to when these four types were conceived and added to the 36. The four types were included in the gāthā but the original reference to 36 remained there side by side. *Āc. Śilāṅka has explained only the 36 divisions mentioned in the *Ācārāṅga-Niruktī*. But the *Ācārāṅga-cūṇi* enumerates 40 divisions. This clearly proves that the additional four divisions came to be included in the 36 after the composition of the *Niruktī*. The structure of the concerned gāthā shows that it is a *saṅgrahaṇī gāthā*. In spite of this, some may raise a question as to whether this *saṅgrahaṇī gāthā* is from the pen of the author of *Niruktī* or it is a traditionally current gāthā which he included in the *Niruktī*. The possible answer to this question is that he included the traditionally current gāthā in his work, the reason being that it is found in the *Uttarādhyāyana* too.

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

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

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