

IN DEFENSE OF ICONS IN THREE LANGUAGES THE ICONOPHILIC WRITINGS OF YAŚOVIJAYA

John E. Cort¹

The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were a period of vast change in north Indian Jainism, changes so far-reaching that scholars are only beginning to grasp their significance. This period saw the rise of a large number of new sects, lineages and congregations, all of which articulated new visions of what Jainism was and should be. Seemingly every aspect of Jain doctrine and practice came under scrutiny, and was the subject of intense debate and disagreement among competing Jain groups. Among these disputed subjects was the status and orthodoxy of icons and their worship.

Within the Digambara communities there was the continuing influence of the *bhaṭṭārakas*, the landed pontiffs, and the elaborate ritual culture that would later come to be called the Bīsapantha ("Twentiers"). In the urban centers of northwest India arose the lay movement known as Adhyātma ("Spiritualism"), that borrowed elements from both the existing Digambara and Śvetāmbara traditions, and that helped lay the groundwork for the rise of the Terāpantha in the early eighteenth century (Cort 2002). In Bundelkhand in central India a Digambara aniconic community developed around the charismatic Tāraṇ Tāraṇ Svāmī (1448–1515) (Cort 2006).

¹ An earlier version of this essay was presented at the 13th World Sanskrit Conference in Edinburgh, July 12, 2006. My thanks to Paul Dundas, Peter Flügel, Kristi Wiley, and J. B. Shah for their assistance. All translations are mine, unless noted otherwise.

In this essay I use the term "icon" instead of "image" to translate the various Indic terms - *mūrti*, *pratimā*, *bimba*, *vigraha* - for three-dimensional sculptural representations of Jinās that are worshiped either in temples or in home shrines. Whereas earlier (Cort 2001: 219, n. 2; 2005: 4388) I chose "image" over "icon," or else simply used the relevant Indic term, in this essay I intentionally use "icon" in order to bring across into English the emotional and spiritual power of the Indic terms.

Yaśovijaya's use of both classical and vernacular languages creates a difficult dilemma in transliterating his discussions into English. I have used both Sanskrit and Prakrit transliterations, in which the medial and final short -a is spelled, and Hindi and Gujarati transliteration, in which it is omitted. I have sought to represent the classical or vernacular spellings and pronunciations according to the different social and intellectual milieus. I ask the reader's forbearance with my inevitable inconsistencies in transliteration.

The Śvetāmbara communities saw even more new movements. In Ahmedabad and the surrounding area, the layman Loṅkā (c. 1415–1489) started a new iconoclastic sect (Flügel 2008). While his immediate followers partially re-integrated back into the icon-worshipping mainstream of Śvetāmbara society as the Loṅkā Gaccha, a lineage that always had an at best uneasy relationship with other Śvetāmbara groups, the iconoclastic movement was revived by five separate mendicants who broke away from the Loṅkā Gaccha and started their own groups. The five further splintered, and formed a spectrum of lineages and lay followers that in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries would come to be known as Ḍhūṇḍhiyās ("Seekers") and Sthānakavāsīs ("Hall-Dwellers") (Flügel 2000, 2003, 2007, 2008, forthcoming). Another offshoot of the Loṅkā Gaccha was the Bījā or Vījā Mata, about which little is known. Roughly the same time as Loṅkā, also in Gujarat, saw the rise of the largely lay sect that followed the teachings of Kaḍuā Śāh (1438–1507) (Dundas 1999).

The various lineages, *gacchas*, that comprised the mainstream Mūrtipūjaka fold saw an increasing number of splinters. The Tapā Gaccha during this period rose to a position of prominence in Gujarat under the leadership of its *ācāryas* Ānandavimalasūri (1491–1540), Vijaya Dānasūri (1497–1566), Hīravijayasūri (1527–1596), Vijaya Senasūri (1548–1615), and Vijaya Devasūri (1578–1652). But it was by no means a unified organization. There were many localized, domesticated and largely autonomous branches of the Tapā Gaccha. Ānandavimalasūri reinstituted the practice of full-fledged mendicancy, but the lineage also saw the continued practice and re-emergence of patterns of laxity. Under the influence of powerful lay leaders, especially the *nagarśeṭh* Śāntidās of Ahmedabad, the Tapā Gaccha split into multiple domesticated groups. They eventually came to form the thirteen *besnās* or "seats" of the *śrīpūjyas*, domesticated pontiffs. This development in turn generated a response, the creation of a small group of full-fledged mendicants known as *saṃvegī* ("[liberation]-seekers") under the leadership of Paṇṇyāsa Satyavijayagaṇi (1623–1699).

Pārśvacandrasūri (1480–1565) broke away from the domesticated Nāgorī Tapā Gaccha and formed the eponymous Pārśvacandra Gaccha, which played an important if still only dimly perceived role in helping shape the Loṅkā Gaccha and Sthānakavāsī canons of scripture. Other Mūrtipūjaka *gacchas* such as the Kharatara, Añcala (or Acala), Pūrṇimā, and Upakeśa Gacchas vied for the loyalty of lay congregations, merchant leaders, and Rajput and Muslim royalty. Finally, there were dozens of local domesticated lineages, known to us only through a handful of inscriptions on icons consecrated by their

monks, and very rarely from texts or manuscripts.

The differences among these many groups are still not well understood, and much will probably never be known. Only a few of the groups generated educated intellectuals who wrote texts and thereby left us an investigable historical record. Most of the texts that were written were in the vernacular, and a large number remain unedited and even unread in the manuscript libraries of western India. But the large number of extant and published texts dealing with issues of sectarian identity is clear evidence of the turmoil of the times.

Late Medieval Tapā Gaccha Intellectual and Ritual Culture

Among the most important Jain intellectuals of this period - and, arguably, all of Jain history - was Mahopādhyāya Yaśovijaya (1624–1686).² He was a prolific author on seemingly every topic that could be of interest to a seventeenth-century Jain. To study all of his output would be a task of many years, and new manuscripts of his texts continue to be unearthed in the Jain libraries of western India. He composed in four different languages: Sanskrit, Prakrit, Gujarati, and Hindi.³ In some cases issues of audience and subject matter determined his choice of language, but we lack a full understanding of the strategies behind his intentional polyglossalia.

As with many of the Jain authors of his time, the thread that ties together his vast oeuvre can be simply stated as a concern to define Jain orthodoxy and orthopraxy. Some of this involved restating positions that had been articulated for over a millennium, as seen in his frequent quoting from all levels of scripture and commentary, as well as many of the "church fathers" such as Haribhadra, Abhayadeva and Hemacandra. The turbulent times in which he lived also generated many new issues, and therefore new challenges as to what was and was not orthodox and orthoprax Jainism. Among these was the status of icons and their worship.

In the introduction to her translation of the defense of icons by St. Theodore of

² The best source on Yaśovijaya remains Kāpaḍiyā's extensive 1966 biographical study. This should be supplemented by the many essays devoted to individual texts in Pradyumnavijaygaṇi et al. 1993. See also Koṭhārī and Śāh 1999 for a recent comprehensive bibliography of publications of his texts.

³ The only language important for late medieval Jain literary culture in which Yaśovijaya evidently did not compose anything was Apabhramsha. This is not surprising, for Apabhramsha was used much more by Digambara than Śvetāmbara authors.

Studion, who in the early ninth century expanded and refined the first elaborate theology of Christian icons advanced a century earlier by St. John of Damascus, Catherine Roth (1981: 8) has written of a pattern in the development of Christian doctrine:

“The Church has usually made explicit formulations of doctrine only when forced to do so by the pressures of controversy. For this reason, dogmatic arguments tend to be formed by opposition with the arguments of the adversaries. This is true not only of the early councils' teachings on trinitarian theology and on christology, but equally on the defense of icons. The arguments in favor of icons were developed in reaction to iconoclastic criticisms.”⁴

Just as the Christian theology of icons developed in large part, especially in its philosophical sophistication, in response to several centuries of increasingly sophisticated iconoclastic critiques, so the Śvetāmbara theology of icons developed largely in response to the arguments against icons by Loṅkā and his followers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It is noteworthy that whereas the rise of iconoclasm within the Śvetāmbara tradition resulted in the development of a sophisticated Śvetāmbara Jain theology of the icon, the lack of any corresponding iconoclastic tradition among the Digambaras means that there has not been an equally sophisticated Digambara theology of the icon.⁵

The comparison with the Christian iconoclastic controversy holds in one further element. The eventual victory of the Christian iconophiles means that we have at hand no complete iconoclastic texts. As Charles Barber (2002: 83) has recently summarized the situation,

“One of the primary losses that followed upon the iconophile victory in the

⁴ See also Kenneth Parry 1996: 1: "Without the phenomenon of iconoclasm there would be no Byzantine theology of the image. Presented with the crisis of iconoclasm in the eighth and ninth centuries, Byzantine theologians were obliged to formulate a theory of image-making capable of meeting every objection from the opposition."

⁵ As I have noted elsewhere (Cort 2006: 272), the fifteenth century Digambara Tāraṇ Tāraṇ Svāmī and his followers have been more aniconic than iconoclastic. Only in the 1940s was there a brief flurry of iconoclastic rhetoric, with a response in defense of icons, but neither side in the debate exhibited the degree of sophisticated argumentation that one sees in the Śvetāmbara case.

debate over the limits of Christian visual representation is the iconoclasts' own complete presentation of their arguments. We depend upon the fragmentary quotes that appear in iconophile refutations for traces of the iconoclastic position. Cast in a negative light, these fragments become unworthy and illogical mutterings by reactionary and conservative negators of an iconophile tradition.”

In the Jain case there was no total victory for the iconophiles, as the iconoclastic Sthānakavāsīs and Terāpanthīs are still very much alive and well. But, for complex reasons I will not go into here, only traces remain of the original iconoclastic arguments.⁶ For the most part, to gain any adequate sense of the criticisms advanced by Loṅkā and his successors we depend on the writings of the iconophilic authors - foremost among them Yaśovijaya, but also others such as the Tapā Gaccha author Dharmasāgara and the Kharatara Gaccha author Samayasundara - which we must then flesh out with what we know of later Sthānakavāsī iconoclastic arguments.

The fifteenth-century iconoclasts were not the first Jains to articulate doubts about icons. Scattered throughout the Śvetāmbara textual tradition, all the way back to the early commentarial layers of the early centuries of the Common Era, we find discussions that indicate a degree of anxiety about icons, temples, and the worship of icons. While we do not know who it was that either explicitly opposed icons, or less explicitly voiced anxiety about them, a careful reading of, for example, the narratives of the "Living Lord" (Jīvantasvāmī) icon of Mahāvīra, and the ethical discussions of the unavoidable violence involved in digging a well in order to get life-sustaining water, indicate that there were such voices.⁷

Further, there has long been a tension in Jain doctrine and practice between two modes of spirituality. On the one hand we find an acceptance of human embodiment and the related need to use material objects in the religious life. Jainism is not an idealist philosophy, but instead has always accepted the reality of physical matter. On the other hand, however, the definition of the liberated soul as pure spirit, unencumbered by and

⁶ See Flügel 2008 for a summary of what is surmised of Loṅkā's views on idols.

⁷ On the Jīvantasvāmī narratives see Cort 2010a: 155-216; on the example of the well see below, and Dundas 2002: 249.

unattached to matter, has provided grounds for more dualistic attitudes that often slide into a total rejection of the material in favor of the spiritual and immaterial. This tension has been articulated in terms of the relationships between *dravya* and *bhāva* ("matter" and "spirit"), *nīścaya* and *vyavahāra* ("absolute" and "relative" levels of truth), and *jñāna* and *kriyā* ("knowledge" and "ritual").

Not until Yaśovijaya do we see a full-fledged theology of the icon. Yaśovijaya's formulation has been so influential, at least within Tapā Gaccha circles, that it has been adopted wholesale by Tapā Gaccha intellectuals in the past two centuries in their defense of icons against the renewed criticisms of various iconoclastic groups, both from within the Jain fold such as the Sthānakavāsīs and Terāpanthīs, and from without, such as the Ārya Samāj.

Yaśovijaya did not develop this defense of icons all on his own. A generation earlier the Tapā Gaccha intellectual Mahopādhyāya Dharmasāgaragaṇi (d. 1596) had refuted the criticisms of icons by Loṅkā and his followers. While Yaśovijaya disagreed with Dharmasāgara on some important issues, there are common elements in their defenses of icons as well.

Yaśovijaya was one of a number of mendicants who did much to define Tapā Gaccha ritual, devotional and intellectual culture in the seventeenth century, a formulation that has continued to the present. Much of the ritual culture I present in my 2001 *Jains in the World* was given shape during this period. Yaśovijaya was among the small group of *saṃvegī* ascetic mendicants who followed the five great vows (*mahāvratā*) of a mendicant in their fullest form. This lineage, which in the twentieth century has grown to be almost the only expression of Tapā Gaccha mendicancy, was founded and led by Yaśovijaya's contemporary Paṇṇyāsa Satyavijayagaṇi. While Satyavijaya did not, as far as we know, author any texts, he was instrumental in establishing the foundation for the continued existence of the full-fledged mendicant lineage.

A slightly older contemporary of Yaśovijaya, and possibly a colleague, was the mystical poet Muni Labhānanda, better known by his *nom-de-plume* Ānandaghana (1603–1673). His exact affiliation with and position in the Tapā Gaccha is vague.⁸ He represents a style of anti-institutional, free-lance ascetic renunciation that has always played an important role in Jain spirituality, but which is rarely well recorded. We know

⁸ The conflicting arguments for his having been a member of either the Tapā Gaccha or the Kharatara Gaccha are summarized by Sudarśanāśrī 1984: 76–79.

of Ānandaghana because of his mystical and doctrinal hymns, many of which are still sung today.⁹

A contemporary of both Yaśovijaya and Ānandaghana was Ācārya Jñānavimalasūri (1637–1725). As an *ācārya* he consecrated many icons, and led a number of congregational pilgrimages (*saṅgha yātrā*). He composed dozens of Gujarati texts, many of them hymns and vernacular explanations (*bālāvabodha*) of doctrinal texts.

Another contemporary of Yaśovijaya was Upādhyāya Sakalacandragāṇi (fl. 1587–1604). Among his many texts are two that have remained central to Tapā Gaccha ritual culture. He is credited with compiling from older sources the *Pratiṣṭhā Kalpa*, the ritual manual for the consecration and installation of icons that is still used today. He also composed the text of the vernacular Gujarati *Sattar Bhedī Pūjā*, the "Seventeenfold Worship," which is performed in the context of icon and temple consecrations, as well as annually in every temple on its anniversary. It serves as an expiation for all the ritual faults (*āśātanā*), intended and unintended, that have taken place in the temple, and so serves a role in the temple cult similar to that of *pratikramaṇa* in the meditative and renunciatory lives of Jains.

Three more contemporaries of Yaśovijaya bear mentioning. Among the many texts by Upādhyāya Vinayavijaya (d. 1675) is his *Subodhikā Ṭīkā* on the *Kalpa Sūtra*, which he wrote in 1640. This commentary is recited annually in the Tapā Gaccha performance of Paryuṣaṇ, and is the primary way that this important Mūrtipūjaka canonical text is vectored into contemporary Tapā Gaccha ritual and intellectual culture (Cort 2001: 152). At the time of his death in 1675 Vinayavijaya was writing a Gujarati telling of the popular story of King Śrīpāl and his virtuous wife Queen Mayṇasundarī, the *Śrī Śrīpāl Rājāno Rās*. He died before it was completed, and this task was finished by Yaśovijaya. This remains the most popular of the many tellings of this story, which explains the centrality of the *siddhacakra* in Jain ritual culture.¹⁰

Upādhyāya Meghavijayagaṇi (fl. 1653–1704) was a prolific author of Sanskrit texts who was active in the latter part of the seventeenth century. He composed a number of long Sanskrit *mahākāvyas*, and technical treatises on grammar, logic and astrology.

⁹ A translation of a selection of his songs is under preparation by Imre Bangha and Richard Fynes, with the title, *It's a City Showman's Show! Transcendental Songs of Ānandghan*.

¹⁰ See Kelting 2009: 79–105 on the story of Śrīpāl and Mayṇasundarī.

His *Yuktiprabodha* was an extended critique of the Digambaras, in particular the Adhyātma movement led in Agra by Banārsīdās. He also composed praise hymns, and the *Arhad Gītā*, an exposition of the basic principles of Jain spirituality that echoed the structure of the Brāhmaṇical *Bhagavad Gītā*.¹¹

Finally was Mahopādhyāya Mānavijaya (1651–1714). In 1675 he wrote the Prakrit *Dharma Saṃgraha*, a text briefly outlining the proper conduct of both mendicants and laity. It provided the framework for an extended commentary (*vr̥tti*) on these subjects that Mānavijaya wrote under the direct guidance of Yaśovijaya. Yaśovijaya then wrote a further commentary (*ṭippaṇa*) on the text himself.¹²

Not all of these intellectual contemporaries of Yaśovijaya were part of the small movement to return to the full-fledged ritual observance of mendicancy. While the *saṃvegī* movement clearly saw itself as distinct and special, as marked by its decision to wear yellow colored robes in order that everyone could clearly distinguish them from the white-robed and laxer Tapā Gaccha monks, the degree of cordial interaction and cooperation among monks of both persuasions warns us against reading an overly ideological or agonistic interpretation onto the *saṃvegī* movement. To give just one small example, Satyavijaya requested permission from his guru Ācārya Vijaya Siṃhasūri, whom later sources view as lax, to adopt formally the stricter mendicant rules through the rite of *kriyoddhāra*.²

¹¹ Vinayasāgar 1968 gives a lengthy study of fifty-three texts in Sanskrit and Gujarati by Meghavijaya. Vinayasāgar 1968: 372f., A. P. Śāh 1945: 2–4, and Becardās Doṣī 1937: 5f. all write that almost nothing is known about Meghavijaya except that he took *dīkṣā* under Kṛpāvijaya, in direct lineage from Ācārya Hīravijayasūri. Kalyāṇvijay 1965: 83f., and directly following him Ratna Prabha Vijaya (1950: 207–08), are of the opinion that he was originally a disciple of Meghajī Rṣi of the Loṅkā Gaccha, and so presumably was one of the twenty-eight mendicants who entered the Tapā Gaccha in 1603 when Meghajī Rṣi and his immediate mendicant community took second initiations under Ācārya Vijayasenasūri. Kalyāṇvijay gives no evidence to support his assertion, however. Vinayasāgar estimates that Meghavijaya was born between 1628 and 1633, making the connection with Meghajī Rṣi unlikely.

¹² Information on these seventeenth-century mendicants comes primarily from Darśanvijay 1950 and Ratna Prabha Vijaya 1950 (who is largely dependent upon the former author), in addition to sources found in the notes.

² In earlier writings I have been guilty of adopting in an uncritical manner the perspective of the nineteenth and twentieth *saṃvegī* "reformers," whose criticism of the domesticated monasticism of the *yatis* was oftentimes quite harsh, and has resulted in both the near extinction of the *yati* institution, and a common perception among contemporary Jains (and therefore scholars of Jains) that all monks other than *saṃvegīs* were fallen and corrupt. This is not the place for a full revisiting of this issue; but I suspect that for many times and places in Jain history, Jain mendicancy has demonstrated a widespread acceptance of a range of

Yaśovijaya's Writings in Defense of Icons

Within this collective Tapā Gaccha intellectual and institution-building effort Yaśovijaya was the star. His writings in defense of icons were part of an agenda to define Jain orthodoxy and orthopraxy that both shaped Yaśovijaya's career and was shared with a number of contemporaries.¹³

While references to and discussions of icons and their worship are found in a number of Yaśovijaya's works, he devoted eight texts exclusively to this subject.¹⁴ The most important of these was his Sanskrit *Pratimā Śataka*, "One Hundred Verses on Icons," which he wrote in 1657. On these verses Yaśovijaya wrote an extensive commentary, his *Brhadvyṛtti*, "Extended Commentary." He employed an extensive array of citations from Śvetāmbara scriptures and other authoritative texts; H. R. Kāpaḍiyā lists ninety-one texts from which Yaśovijaya quoted (1966: 248–50). Much of the text was directed against the critique of icons on the part of the followers of Loṅkā, whom Yaśovijaya pejoratively called the Lumpakas, the "breakers" or "destroyers."¹⁵ He also

styles of asceticism and worldly involvement, perhaps not unlike the long-standing interplay between cenobitic and eremitic monasticism in Buddhist societies. In contemporary Tapā Gaccha discourse, the term *yati* has strongly pejorative overtones. This has not always been the case. See in particular the comments of the historically astute Muni Jñānsundar (Devguptsūri 1948: 4–19), who wrote of the many important contributions domesticated monks have made to the preservation of Jain culture and society.

¹³ A major impetus behind these writings was the need to argue for the Tapā Gaccha understanding of what is true Jainism against the many competing visions. I suspect that another factor was the need to articulate a defense of Jain orthopraxy (and to make orthopraxy also an orthodoxy) in response to the extensive out-conversions among merchant castes in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries due to the missionizing of the Puṣṭi Mārga Vaiṣṇavas, who spread throughout western India during this time. To give just one example, whereas there were many Jains among the Modh Vāṇiyā merchant caste of Gujarat in earlier medieval times, it is now an almost exclusively Vaiṣṇava caste.

¹⁴ A full accounting would include the many mentions of icons and their worship in his shorter devotional hymns and longer devotional *pūjās*, as well as in more programmatic texts such as his extensive manual for mendicant and lay conduct, the *Ṭippaṇa* on Upādhyāya Mānavijaya's *Dharma Saṃgraha*; his survey of rival religious systems, the Gujarati *Daśmatādhikāre Vardhmān Jin Stavan*; his survey of contemporary mendicant practice, the *Sīmandhar Svāmīnuṃ Sāḍā Traṇ So Gāthānuṃ Stavan*; and texts on practical religious questions such as his Gujarati *108 Bol*. See Kāpaḍiyā 1966 on these and related texts. A complete *florilegium* of Yaśovijaya's defense of icons would indeed be a massive tome.

¹⁵ Peter Flügel 2008: 185, n. 8 cites Albrecht Weber and Dalsukh Mālvaṇiyā, who interpret "Lumpaka" to mean "breaker" or "destroyer." He also cites the Sthānakavāsī Ācārya Hastīmal's objections to the use of this term in place of Loṅkā's real name.

took to task the slightly earlier Tapā Gaccha intellectual Dharmasāgara, as well as Pārśvacandrasūri, on specific points concerning icon worship.

The *Pratimā Śataka* was the subject of one further commentary, the *Laghuvṛtti*, "Shorter Commentary," composed by Bhāvaprabhasūri in 1737. Bhāvaprabhasūri was a *yati* of the Pūrṇimā Gaccha who lived at the *gāḍī* (seat) at Ḍhaṇḍher Vāḍo in Patan, a seat which still exists today, although only on the farthest margins of Jain society (Cort 2001: 45). Bhāvaprabhasūri's commentary added little new to our understanding of the *Pratimā Śataka*, and in many places simply paraphrased Yaśovijaya's commentary.

The other Sanskrit text that Yaśovijaya devoted entirely to the subject of icons was his *Pratimā Sthāpana Nyāya*, "The Suitability of Establishing Icons." This is a short, fragmentary prose text that runs to seven-and-a-half pages in the printed edition of 1920. In it Yaśovijaya argued that establishing and worshiping Jina icons leads to a good rebirth, not a bad one. In the opening of the text he wrote that the Jina "in due course grants liberation to people who [perform] *pūjā* according to the seventeenfold ritual,¹⁶ as was done by the laywoman Draupadī, the Vijaya deities, and the deity Sūryābha, [all of whom performed *pūjā*] according to the rite that was within the framework of the scriptures [*sūtra*], and was explained in the scriptures."¹⁷ Yaśovijaya here affirmed that the descriptions of Draupadī, the Vijaya deities and the sun god Sūryābha worshiping icons as found in the Śvetāmbara scriptures are authoritative precedents for the contemporary performance of that worship.¹⁸

¹⁶ The seventeenfold (*sattar bhedī*) worship ritual is performed at the time of the consecration of a temple or icon, and again on an annual basis to cleanse the temple of the negative karmic residue from any intentional or unintentional faults in the performance of daily worship by all the members of the congregation. As I mentioned above, the Gujarati text of the seventeenfold ritual, the *Sattar Bhedī Pūjā*, that is still in use today in Tapā Gaccha temples, was composed by Sakalacandragāṇi, a contemporary of Yaśovijaya.

¹⁷ *he prabho . . . sūtroktamaryādayā sūtrapratipāditavidhinā draupadīśrāvikā
vijayadevatāsūryābhadevādīkṛtasaptadaśabhedavidhinetyarthaḥ pūjāṃ vidhatām bhaktyā
niṣpādayatām viracayatām tvaṃ muktupadavīdātetyanvayaḥ* (*Pratimā Sthāpana Nyāya*, p. 3).

¹⁸ The story of Draupadī - considered by the icon-worshipping Jain tradition to be a pious Jain laywoman, who exhibited right faith (*samyaktva*) in her worship of Jina icons in a Jina temple at the time of her wedding - is found in *Jñātādharma-kathāḥ Sūtra*, the sixth of the canonical Āṅgas. The story of Sūryābha, and his worship of the eternal Jina icons in heaven, is found in the *Rājaprasānīya Sūtra*, the second of the Upāṅgas. The descriptions of their worship are quite similar, indicating that there was textual interaction. Kalyāṇvijay 1966: 13–16 provides the relevant passages. Yaśovijaya discussed the example of Draupadī at *Pratimā Śataka* 65–67, and that of Sūryābha at *Pratimā Śataka* 11–15. The description of the worship of eternal icons of the Jinas by the Vijaya deities is found in the *Bhagavatī* and *Jīvājīvābhigama Sūtras*, the

Yaśovijaya's one Prakrit text on icons was his twelve-verse *Kuvadiṭṭhantavisaikaraṇa*, "The Explanation Using the Example of the Well," to which he added a Sanskrit commentary, the *Tattvaviveka*, "Investigation of the Essentials." With ample citation of Abhayadeva and Haribhadra, Yaśovijaya argued that the negative *karma* one accrues from harm to earth-bodies in digging a well is more than outweighed by the good *karma* that derives from providing water for the needs of many living beings. In a similar manner, the negative *karma* accrued through the use of water, flowers, and other living things in *pūjā* is more than outweighed by the good *karma* one accrues from this laudable ritual activity.

Yaśovijaya composed five texts in Gujarati devoted to icons. In 1667 he spent the rainy-season retreat (*cāturmāsa*) in Idalpur, a suburb of Ahmedabad. There he wrote his *Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan*, "Hymn of a Bill of Exchange in the Form of a Hymn to Mahāvīra," in order to convince the Sthānakavāsī layman Meghjī, son of Dośī Mūlājī, of the appropriateness of icon worship.¹⁹ This Gujarati text is nearly as wide ranging in its topics as the Sanskrit *Pratimā Śataka*, and would appear to serve to bring the arguments of the Sanskrit text written a decade earlier into a more accessible Gujarati. Since the text was directed at a Sthānakavāsī layman, Yaśovijaya omitted his arguments against Dharmasāgara and Pārśvacandrasūri. In 1792 Muni Padmavijaya, a mendicant in the *saṃvegī* branch of the Tapā Gaccha, wrote his *Bālāvabodha* commentary on Yaśovijaya's text in the city of Radhanpur in north Gujarat, "for the benefit of myself and others."²⁰ According to Padmavijaya, he based his text upon a *Bālāvabodha* commentary written by Yaśovijaya himself, but no manuscript of this text is known to be extant. Padmavijaya's text is largely in Gujarati, with a *praśasti* in Sanskrit.

The other Gujarati texts are short hymns. He composed the *Jin Pratimā Sthāpan*

tenth Aṅga and third Upāṅga respectively. The latter text contains an extensive description of the eternal icons on the continent of Jambūdvīpa; the same account is found in brief in the former text, which then refers to the latter for the full description (Ohira 1994: 85).

¹⁹ The identification of Meghjī as a Sthānakavāsī is by Padmavijaya in the late eighteenth century. He uses the term "Sthānakavāsī" extensively in his text, indicating that it was more widespread at this time than Peter Flügel 2008 and others have hypothesized.

²⁰ *svaparnā upkār māte* (Padmavijaya, *Bālāvabodha* on *Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan*, p. 297).

Padmavijaya (1749-1806) was a prolific author of Gujarati texts, and also thoroughly trained in the Prakrit and Sanskrit Śvetāmbara scriptural tradition. Information on him is found at Devluk 1992: I: 348-49.

Stavan ("Hymn on Establishing the Jina Icon"), also known as the *Kumati Latā Unmīlan* ("Uprooting the Creeper of Willful Ignorance"), in 1662. In ten verses Yaśovijaya recited the basic history of icon worship in the Śvetāmbara tradition from Bharata, son of Ādinātha, at the beginning of the third spoke of this cycle of time, through the fourteenth century restoration of Śatruñjaya by Karam Śāh. As a result of its focus on Śatruñjaya, this hymn is also known as the *Śatruñjay Uddhār Jin Bimb Sthāpan Stavan* ("Hymn on Establishing the Jina Icon during the Renovation of Śatruñjay"). The argument here was quite simple, yet at the same time demonstrates how pre-modern Jains could exhibit an understanding of historical "facts" as being fully authoritative, an understanding that shows striking similarities with modern social scientific historicist theory. In the refrain, Yaśovijaya addressed his willfully ignorant, or heretical (*kumati*) audience, saying, "O ignorant one! Why do you uproot icons? They are established in accord with the Jina's teaching."²¹

Yaśovijaya composed three texts, of fifteen, nine, and seven verses, called *Jin Pratimā Sthāpan Sajjhāy* ("Primer on Establishing the Jina Icon"), also known as *Jin Pratimā Adhikār Sajjhāy* ("Primer on the Authority for the Jina Icon").²² The *sajjhāy* (Sanskrit *svādhyāya*) is a commonly found genre in the Śvetāmbara Mūrtipūjaka tradition, to which insufficient scholarly attention has been paid. They are short vernacular verse texts - catechisms, if you will - that are easy to memorize and lay out the basic points of Jain doctrine on any given topic. They seem to be especially studied by *sādhvīs* (nuns). In those *samudāys* (lineages) of the Tapā Gaccha that forbid *sādhvīs* from studying many of the classical texts, the *sādhvīs* learn and retain their doctrinal training from *sajjhāys*. Just as a Sanskrit or Prakrit *sūtra* text is designed to be easy to memorize, so that a preacher can easily deliver the authoritative root text verbatim to an audience, and then expound upon it according to what he has studied, a vernacular *sajjhāy* can be memorized and sung by any mendicant or lay person in order to have at hand the basic tenets of Jain orthodoxy.

In the fifteen-verse text, Yaśovijaya briefly laid out almost all of the arguments in favor of icons that he developed at much greater length in his more philosophically oriented texts, although he again left aside his arguments against Dharmasāgara and Pārśvacandrasūri. The refrain is similar to that of the *Jin Pratimā Sthāpan Stavan*, as

²¹ *ho kumati! kāṃ pratimā utthāpī? e jin vacane thāpī* (*Kumati Latā Unmīlan*, refrain).

²² I have not yet seen the two shorter *sajjhāys*.

Yaśovijaya simply said, "O ignorant one! Why do you uproot icons?"²³

Yaśovijaya's Theology of the Icon

Let me now turn to the contents of Yaśovijaya's defense of icons - what I am calling, with an obvious nod to the extensive parallel literature in the western and especially the eastern orthodox Christian traditions, a "theology of the icon." There are four basic elements to Yaśovijaya's defense of icons. First, he argued the necessity of icons based on the Jain hermeneutical tool of the *nikṣepas*. Second, he showed that icons and icon-worship are not the source of harmful binding *karma* due to *hiṃsā* or harm; rather, they are the cause of meritorious *karma*. Third, he cited passages from a large number of early Jain texts that depict Jains worshiping icons. This element in his argument also entailed a discussion of what constitutes Jain scripture, and the meaning of the contested term *caitya*. Finally, he advanced the evidence of history, to show the universality of icon worship in Jainism.

Nikṣepa

Nikṣepa, literally "putting down . . . a word . . . in order to subject it to a systematic consideration" (Alsdorf 1974: 257), is a distinctively Jain hermeneutical tool, the importance of which in Jain intellectual culture has been underemphasized.²⁴ In the words of Ludwig Alsdorf, whose 1973 article remains the best English language introduction to the topic, the *nikṣepa* is a "system of subjecting key words to an investigation by applying a scheme of fixed viewpoints" (ib.). The system was first developed in the *Nijuttis*, the earliest level of commentaries on the scriptures. Every key word in the text, starting with the title, was analyzed according to four categories or perspectives.

²³ *kumati! kāṃ pratimā uthāpī? (Jin Pratimā Sthāpan Sajjhāy, refrain).*

²⁴ In addition to Alsdorf's concise discussion, see Bhatt's 1978 monograph, the density of which has probably contributed to scholars choosing to avoid the study of *nikṣepa*.

I myself missed the significance of *nikṣepa* in interpreting the long-standing Tapā Gaccha dispute over calendrical interpretation (Cort 1999). In particular, one layman with whom I discussed the dispute after the publication of my article said that in his opinion it boiled down to a difference in the weight one places on *bhāva* and *kāla* (while *kāla* ["time"] is not in the classical list of four *nikṣepas*, it is often included among them), i.e., whether one places more emphasis on the spirit and intention (*bhāva*) behind a regular religious observance, or on being sure that it is performed at the karmically most efficacious time (*kāla*).

To quote Alsdorf again (ib., p. 258),

“*Nāma* is the designation; what is considered first of the *nikṣepa* object is its purely linguistic side, the designation as such. *Sthāpanā* is the pictorial or material representation of the animate or inanimate, concrete or abstract *nikṣepa* object, its effigy or representation. *Dravya* denotes the substantial, material, concrete, non-mental aspect, *bhāva* the mental, psychical, spiritual, religious one.”²⁵

As Alsdorf himself noted, there are striking similarities between *nikṣepa* and other elements in the mature Jain epistemological tradition with its strong perspectival emphasis, such as the seven *nayas* or "viewpoints" in the *sapta-bhaṅgi-naya*. It also fits well within the larger South Asian tradition, with its preference for context-sensitive rather than context-free ways of thinking (Ramanujan 1989, Hallisey 1996).

When using *nikṣepa*, the interpreter applies each of the four categories or lenses to the object at hand. *Nāma* involves a thorough philological explanation of the term, both in terms of etymology and specific usage. *Sthāpanā* involves explaining the particular form in which the object is manifest in this instance. *Dravya* involves explaining the more basic material aspects of the object. The difference between *sthāpanā* and *dravya* is that between mode or form and substance; for example, the *sthāpanā nikṣepa* of a Jina icon involves its iconography and craftsmanship, whereas the *dravya nikṣepa* involves analyzing whether it is made of wood, metal, stone, or some other material. Finally, *bhāva* involves investigating the object in terms of its mental states and abilities, as well as its deeper spiritual significance in the literal sense, as pertaining to spirit or soul (*jīva*, *ātman*).

Yaśovijaya started both the *Pratimā Śataka* and the *Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnum*

²⁵ Bhadrāṅkarvijayaṅgi 1991: 70 gives a slightly different set of definitions:

1. *Nāma nikṣepa*: [consideration of] the name (*nāma*) of a thing, without its form (*ākāra*) or qualities (*guṇa*), is called the *nāma nikṣepa*.
2. *Sthāpanā nikṣepa*: [consideration] of a thing with its name and form but without its qualities, is called the *sthāpanā nikṣepa*.
3. *Dravya nikṣepa*: [consideration] of a thing with its name and form, and with its past and future qualities, but without its present qualities, is called *dravya nikṣepa*.
4. *Bhāva nikṣepa*: [consideration] of the name, form, and present qualities of a thing, is called *bhāva nikṣepa*.

Stavan with a simple statement that all four of the *nikṣepas* are equally important in the worship of the Jina. In the second verse of the *Pratimā Śataka* he said, "The three [*nikṣepa*] starting with *nāma* [i.e., *nāma*, *sthāpanā*, and *dravya*] are collectively the cause for [the fourth *nikṣepa*,] the spiritual apprehension (*bhāva*) of the Lord."²⁶ In the *Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnum Stavan* he more explicitly asserted the importance of *sthāpanā nikṣepa*, that is, the icon of the Jina: "On the basis of the five levels of scripture I investigate the *sthāpanā nikṣepa*, by which one attains bliss."²⁷

At issue here is how one uses the *nikṣepa* methodology to understand the liberated and therefore disembodied Jina. An iconoclastic understanding of the Jina is that since he is now in a state of pure soul, enjoying the four infinitudes of perfection, one must give precedence to the *bhāva nikṣepa*. In terms of *dravya nikṣepa*, the disembodied Jina no longer is associated with matter. Nor, therefore, from the perspective of *sthāpanā nikṣepa*, can one speak of the Jina having a material form. Both the *dravya nikṣepa* and the *sthāpanā nikṣepa* are relevant only to the past life of the Jina, when he was still connected with matter due to *karma*, and not to the present, when he has broken all connections with matter. The icon does not represent the Jina in his pure *bhāva nikṣepa*, but only in his impure and no longer appropriate *sthāpanā nikṣepa*. As such, the icon is worthy of neither veneration (*vandana*) nor worship (*pūjā*).

This iconoclastic interpretation has been advanced by Sthānakavāsīs for several centuries. Presumably it was also the one advanced by the Lumpakas, for Yaśovijaya took issue with it. He argued on three levels.

The first was simply to assert that the scriptural authority for the *nikṣepa* methodology requires one to view all four as equal, not to prioritize *bhāva* over the other three. In the second verse of the *Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnum Stavan* he cited the canonical *Anuyogadvāra Sūtra* and *Sthānāṅga Sūtra* that there are four *nikṣepas*, and that they are authoritative.²⁸ In several of his vernacular hymns he underscored the equality of all four

²⁶ *nāmāditrayameva bhāvabhagavattādrūpyadhikāraṇaṃ (Pratimā Śataka 2).*

²⁷ *ṭhavaṇṇ nikṣep pramāṇ pañcāṅgī parkhī lahu āṇand re (Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnum Stavan 1).*

²⁸ *śrīanuyogadvāre bhāṣyā / cār nikṣepo sār //*
cār satya daś satyā bhāṣyā / ṭhānāṅge nirdhār re //
(Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnum Stavan 2).

The full passages are provided by Padmavijaya, pp. 8–9:

jattha ya jaṃ jāṇejjā nikkhevaṃ nikkhive ṇiravasesaṃ /

nikṣepas, and therefore the validity of worshiping icons, by simply saying that according to the scriptures the icon (*pratimā*) is the equivalent (*sarkhī*, *sarikhī*) of the Jina himself, and so worship of the icon is therefore the same as worship of the living Jina. For example, in the *Kumati Latā Unmīlan* he wrote, "People should worship the Jina icon thrice daily as equivalent to the excellent Jina himself."³⁰

The second argument is one that is found, *mutatis mutandi* *s*, in most religious traditions that have had to defend the use of material forms against dualistic critiques that prioritize the spiritual (or mental) over the physical. In his commentary to the second verse of the *Pratimā Śataka*, Yaśovijaya explained that without reverence (*ādara*) for the three *nikṣepas* of *nāma*, *sthāpanā* and *dravya*, it is not possible to come to revere the *bhāva nikṣepa*.³¹ As embodied beings, we must use our embodiment, in the form of the first three *nikṣepas*, in order gradually to come to an experience of the purely spiritual, the *bhāva nikṣepa*. Without the foundation of the other three it is not possible to attain the fourth.

Finally, Yaśovijaya turned the table on the Lumpakas by applying the methodology of the *nikṣepas* to the scriptures themselves. The Lumpakas argued that in the absence of a living Jina, the scriptures are the sole authority in the current time. Yaśovijaya noted that in the auspicious benediction at the beginning of the *Bhagavatī Sūtra*, one of the most important of all Śvetāmbara scriptures, the *gaṇadhara* Sudharmā, in addition to venerating the five worthy lords of Jainism - Jina, Siddha, Ācārya, Upādhyāya, and Sādhu - venerated the scriptures themselves, and the Brāhmī script in

jattha vi ya na jāṇejjā caṭṭhakeyaṃ ṇikkhīva tattha //
(*Anuyogadvāra Sūtra* 8).

One should fully apply to a subject, whatever *ṇikkhevas* [*nikṣepas*] are known about that subject. And to those (subjects) whose *ṇikkhevas* are not known, one should apply the four (viz. *nāma*, *ṭhavaṇā* [*sthāpanā*], *ḍavva* [*dravya*] and *bhāva*) (Hanaki 1970: 2).

caṭṭhvihe sacce pannatte taṃ jahā ṇāmasacce ṭhavaṇasacce ḍavvasacce bhāvasacce.

Understand that truth is fourfold as follows: *nāma* truth, *sthāpanā* truth, *dravya* truth, and *bhāva* truth (*Śthānāṅga Sūtra* 308).

³⁰ *e jin pratimā jinvar sarkhī pūje trividh tume prāṇī* (*Kumati Latā Unmīlan* 10). See also *Jin Pratimā Sthāpan Sajjhāy* 15, quoted below.

³¹ *nikṣepatrayā'nādare bhāvollāsasyaiva kartumaśakya* (Yaśovijaya, *Brhadvṛtti on Pratimā Śataka* 2).

which the scriptures were written down.³² Yaśovijaya asked, "If it is acceptable for Sudharmā to venerate the script, then how can the Lumpakas argue that it is forbidden for a Jain mendicant to venerate an icon of the Jina?"³³ He explained that in fact the written syllables which Sudharmā venerated are the *sthāpanā nikṣepa* of scriptural knowledge itself. Further, said Yaśovijaya, no one argues that it is forbidden to venerate the physical embodiment of the scripture in the form of written texts, i.e., the *dravya nikṣepa* of *śruta*.³⁴ In his commentary to the *Pratimā Śataka* he argued that it is illogical for the Lumpaka to accept the veneration of the contemporary physical form of the Jina's teachings as a manuscript, but forbid the equivalent veneration of the contemporary physical form of the Jina himself as an icon.

Hiṃsā

The second major theoretical issue around which the debate concerning icon worship in Jainism centered was *hiṃsā*. In brief, Loṅkā and his followers argued that the worship of icons is inevitably tied up in harm (*hiṃsā*) to living beings, and so is karmically detrimental to the person performing the worship. Among the standard offerings in *pūjā* are animate objects such as flowers and fruit. Another standard act in *pūjā* is the anointing (*abhiṣeka*, *snātra*) of the icon, which involves harm to the beings in the water. The performance of *āratī*, waving a lamp in front of the icon, and the waving of incense (*dhūpa*) both involve fire, and so harm beings in the air. The Lumpakas in essence likened *pūjā* to the Hindu rite of sacrifice (*yajña*). For centuries Jains had elided the difference between the Brāhmaṇical *yajña*, which usually was a vegetarian offering into a fire, and the less elite rite of *bali-dāna*, or sacrificial offering of living beings such as chickens, goats and buffalo. Jains lumped all of this together into a single violent act, and Hemacandra had termed the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra* a *hiṃsā śāstra* or "scripture of

³² *ṇamo arahantāṇaṃ / ṇamo siddhāṇaṃ / ṇamo āyariyāṇaṃ / ṇamo uvajjhāyāṇaṃ / ṇamo loe savvasāhūṇaṃ / ṇamo baṃbhīe livīe / ṇamo suyassa* (*Bhagavatī Sūtra*, vol. 1, p. 1).

³³ *prajñaptau prathamāṇi natāṇi lipimapi brāhmīmanālokāyaṇ / vandyā'rhatpratimā na sādhubhiriti brūte yadunmādavān //* (*Pratimā Śataka* 3c–d).

³⁴ *baṃbhī lipī śrīgaṇadhardeve / praṇamī bhagavāi āde //* *jñān taṇi te thavaṇi athvā / dravyaśruta avivāde re //* (*Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan* 7).

violence" on the basis of this conflation of Brāhmaṇical sacrifice and violence.³⁵ Echoing this, Loṅkā and his followers characterized the Jain practice of icon worship as nothing more than an ethic of harm (*hiṃsā dharma*), and in contrast defined their rejection of idols and idolatry as an ethic of compassion (*dayā dharma*) for all living beings.

Yaśovijaya addressed this critique in multiple ways, and his defense of the entire ritual culture of icon worship from the charges of it being suffused with *hiṃsā* represents the most complex aspect of his defense of icons. My discussion here will only touch on the main elements of his argument.

At its most basic, Yaśovijaya's position was simply stated in verse eleven of his fifteen-verse *Jin Pratimā Sthāpan Sajjhāy*, when he said, "They [the opponents of icon worship, the Lumpakas] say, 'In worship of the Jina [icon] there is harm (*hiṃsā*) to immobile beings (*thāvar, sthāvara*).' But there is no such sin (*pāp*), so come and worship."³⁶

This was not an argument; it was simply a statement of faith. Explaining why there is no strongly binding negative *karma* involved in icon worship was therefore Yaśovijaya's task. At this point Yaśovijaya advanced two interrelated arguments. The first was that the negative *karma* one accrues in the act of icon worship is more than outweighed by the positive *karma*. The second was that one must not look only at the external action. Despite the stereotypes, held both by Indian philosophical traditions other than Jainism, and by many scholars of Jainism, that Jain *karma* theory is more concerned with action than intention, we find that Yaśovijaya prioritized intention over action, without going so far as to eliminate the Jain doctrine of the physical basis of *karma*.

Yaśovijaya advanced various examples to demonstrate that the benefit from *pūjā* outweighs the harm. The most famous of these is the "example of the well," the *kūpa drṣṭānta*. This is an ancient defense of icons and other religious activities that inevitably entail harmful action. As Yaśovijaya wrote in the second verse of his *Kuvadiṭṭhantavisaikaraṇa*, "Understand that icon worship is like digging a well; the welfare of both oneself and others arises from it, and it is not marked by a total initiation

³⁵ Hemacandra, *Yogaśāstra* 2.35. See Babb 2004 on Jain condemnations of the sacrificial paradigm of Brāhmaṇical Hinduism.

³⁶ *thāvar hiṃsā jin pūjāmāṃ jo tuṃ dekhā dhūje /
to pāpī te dūr deś thī je tuj āvī pūje re //*
(*Jin Pratimā Sthāpan Sajjhāy* 11).

of harm."³⁷ He expanded on this in his commentary to say that digging a well makes pure water available. This is an act deserving of praise (*anumodana*), just as are ablution (*snāna*) and the other ritual acts in *pūjā*, which lead to merit (*puṇya*) for both oneself and others.³⁸ In his detailed exposition of this point, Yaśovijaya quoted extensively from Haribhadra's *Pañcāśaka* and *Ṣoḍaśaka*, Hemacandra's *Yogaśāstra*, the *Bṛhat Kalpa Sūtra Bhāṣya*, the *Mahāniśītha Sūtra*, the *Niśītha Bhāṣya*, and other authoritative Śvetāmbara texts.

One of texts he quoted, the *Mahāniśītha Sūtra*, states that the karmic benefit (*phala*) from icon worship is equal to that from gifting (*dāna*) and other basic rites within Śvetāmbara mendicant ritual culture.³⁹ Yaśovijaya discussed this in the *Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan*. According to the canonical *Aupapātika* and *Bhagavatī Sūtras*, just as the kings Kuṇika and Udāyana were awakened to right faith through the act of *dāna*, so the laypeople of Tuṅgīya attained right faith through their physical offerings to Jina icons.⁴⁰ The key is that the recipient of the *dāna* be a suitable recipient (*supātra*); in this

³⁷ *saparovayārajaṇagaṃ jaṇāṇa jaha kūvakhaṇaṇamāññiṭṭhaṃ /*
akasiṇapavattagāṇaṃ taha dāvvaṭṭhaṃ di viṇṇeo //
(Kuvadiṭṭhantavisaiikaraṇa 2).

Compare *Pratimā Śataka* 61:

atrāsmākamidaṃ hṛdi sphurati yaddravyastavedūṣaṇam
vaigunīyena vidhestadapyupahataṃ bhaktyeti hi jñāpanam /
kūpajñātaphalaṃ yato' vidhiyutāpyuktakriyā mokṣadā
bhaktyaiva vyavadhānataḥ śrutadharāḥ śiṣṭāḥ pramāṇaṃ punaḥ //

On this the following proof is manifest in my heart. One should understand that what appear to be faults in material worship due to their not being virtuous are in fact destroyed by devotion (*bhakti*). Just as there is fruit in the example of the well, so the proper rituals when done according to the rules lead to liberation. This [primacy of] *bhakti* has been proven by the lineage that goes back to the enlightened disciples.

³⁸ *yathā janānāṃ kūpakhananaṃ nirmalajalotpādanadvārā svaparopakārajanakamādiṣṭaṃ evaṃ*
akṛtsnaprapravarttakānāṃ kṛtsnasaṃnyame'pravṛttimatāṃ grhiṇāṃ dravyastavo'pi snānapūjādikaḥ
karaṇānumodanadvāreṇa svaparayoḥ puṇyakāraṇaṃ vijñeyaḥ (Tattvaviveka, p. 68).

³⁹ On *dāna* in Jainism, see Dundas 2002a and Heim 2004.

⁴⁰ *kuṇik rāy udāyan kīdhāṃ vandanamah suvivek /*
ṇhāyā kayavalikammā kaḥiyā tuṅgīya śrāddh anek //
(Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan 4.4).

case, *dāna* leads to the donor attaining the first *guṇasthāna* or rung on the path to liberation.⁴¹ If *dāna* is therefore a laudable activity for a Jain layperson, despite the inevitable harm involved, then so is icon worship. Yaśovijaya repeated this in his Gujarati *Jin Pratimā Sthāpan Sajjhāy*, in which he said, "In confession (*paḍikamaṇ*, *pratikramaṇa*), gifting (*dān*) to a mendicant, and in his traveling (*vihār*) there are special kinds of faults (*doṣ*) due to harm (*hiṃsā*). But when one weighs the gain and loss, why should one feel such enmity (*dveṣ*) toward an icon?"⁴²

The issue of the inevitable harm associated with the basic actions of a mendicant is one upon which he also expanded in the *Pratimā Śataka*. In particular, he devoted an extensive discussion to the unavoidable harm in a mendicant crossing a river. But this harm does not mean that mendicants do not cross rivers. Rather, there are ritual means for dealing with the negative *karma* accruing from the *hiṃsā* to water-bodies. We see here, as in many other places in Yaśovijaya's writings, a concern to balance a strict adherence to Jain doctrine with the practicalities of everyday life, whether as a mendicant or a layperson.

Yaśovijaya gave a final example of an action in which the benefit far outweighs the harm. In verse thirty-eight of the *Pratimā Śataka* he explained that the incidental harm caused when a mother rushes to snatch her infant from the jaws of a snake is inconsequential, for it prevents much greater suffering. In the same way the harm involved in icon worship is inconsequential in comparison to the degree that it is a means to lead people out of the world of rebirth.⁴³

All of Yaśovijaya's examples stressed the need to look not just at external actions in which there appears to be harm. He was not a scriptural or doctrinal literalist. For Yaśovijaya it was always more important to understand the intention behind an action

⁴¹ *pātrādānthī śubh vipāk jyam lahe subāh kumār /
pāhele guṇasthāne bhadraḥ paṇ tyam jinpūjā udār //*
(*Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṇ Stavan* 4.11).

⁴² *paḍikamaṇe muni dān vihāre hiṃsā doṣ viśeṣ /
lābhālābh vicārī jotāṇ pratimāmāṇ syo dveṣ re //*
(*Jin Pratimā Sthāpan Sajjhāy* 12).

⁴³ *gartādaṅgaviḡharṣaṇairapi sutāṇ māturyathāhermukhāt
karṣantyā nahi dūṣaṇaṇ nanu tathā duḡkhānalārcirbhṛtāt /
saṃsārādapi karṣato bahujaṇān dravyastavodyogina-
stīrthasphātikṛto na kiñcana mataṇ hiṃsāṃśato dūṣaṇaṇ //*
(*Pratimā Śataka* 38).

than to focus on the mechanics of the action. He said in verse fifty-nine of the *Pratimā Śataka* that there is no *hiṃsā* from actions performed for the sake of *dharma* as long as the intention (*āśaya*) is true (*sad*).⁴⁴

At the heart of Yaśovijaya's argument concerning *karma* and *hiṃsā* is a distinction among three kinds of harm. He said in the *Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan*, "*Hiṃsā* is seen in the noble deeds of a layman. But when one considers the distinctions among *hetu*, *svarūp*, and *anubandh*, then [the Sthānakavāsī position] is destroyed."⁴⁵ In other words, those who argue that icon worship is pervaded by *hiṃsā*, and is therefore detrimental to the karmic state of the worshiper, lack an adequate understanding of the nature of *hiṃsā* and *karma*. They conflate all types of *hiṃsā* into only the most harmful sort.

Yaśovijaya drew on a number of earlier sources to develop a tripartite classification of *hiṃsā*. To the best of my knowledge, Yaśovijaya was the first to use this specific terminology.⁴⁶

First there is *hetu hiṃsā*. This results from actions that are performed for worldly reasons. They might not involve the intentional taking of life, but they certainly do not involve conscious protection of lives.

The second is *svarūpa hiṃsā*. This results from actions performed in the pursuit of *dharma*. Since one must distinguish between the *dharma*s of mendicants and laity - in the words of Yaśovijaya's disciple Mānavijaya in his *Dharma Saṃgraha*, between the *dharma* of the *sādhu* and the *dharma* of the *grhastha* - one must also distinguish between types of *svarūpa hiṃsā*. For a layperson, who has not renounced the use of the material world, certain types of *svarūpa hiṃsā* will be acceptable that are not acceptable for a mendicant, who has renounced the use of the material world. In both cases dharmic

⁴⁴ *dharmārthaṃ sṛjatāṃ kriyāṃ bahuvidhāṃ hiṃsā na dharmārthikā /
hiṃsāṃśe na yataḥ sadāśayabhṛtāṃ vāñchākriyāṃśe param //*
(*Pratimā Śataka* 59a–b).

In his autocommentary Yaśovijaya glossed *sadāśaya* by *śubhabhāva*.

⁴⁵ *ārya kārya śrāvāknāṃ je che tehmāṃ hiṃsā dīḥ /
hetu svarūp anubandh vicāre nāśe dei nij pīḥ //*
(*Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan* 4.18).

⁴⁶ Muni Jambūvijay in discussion on 9 August 1996 confirmed this opinion. Yaśovijaya also described the three in chapter eight of his *Sīmāndhar Svāmīnuṃ Sādā Traṇ So Gāthānuṃ Stavan*.

actions should be undertaken in such a way both that no lives are lost, and instead lives are protected. Nonetheless, it is the rare action that is totally free of *hiṃsā*. It is not possible to avoid all *svarūpa hiṃsā* until the thirteenth *guṇasthāna*; but *svarūpa hiṃsā* by itself does not prevent the arising of omniscience.

Finally there is *anubandha hiṃsā*. This results from actions done from inexcusable ignorance. Lives are lost, and there is inadequate, if any, concern to protect lives. An action involving *anubandha hiṃsā* cannot be considered part of *dharma*.

It is possible to renounce both *hetu hiṃsā* and *anubandha hiṃsā*, for these are forms of harm which arise because the person has not generated the right intention of *ahiṃsā*. But it is impossible to renounce *svarūpa hiṃsā*. If icon worship is performed with the right intention - if it is performed for *dharma*, for the pursuit of the Jain path, not out of any selfish worldly ends - then it results in neither *hetu hiṃsā* nor *anubandha hiṃsā*, but only in *svarūpa hiṃsā*. Any negative *karma* from this is negligible, especially in comparison to the significant accrual of positive *karma*, or merit (*puṇya*). The mendicant strives to attain a state in which there is no karmic bondage at all; but this is possible only for one on the very highest rungs of the *guṇasthānas*, the enlightened soul who has overcome all desires (*rāga*) and so is desireless (*vītarāga*). This state is far beyond that of the pious layman. He still acts based on desires; but if his desires and his intentions are pure, then his actions will result only in *puṇya*, which still advances him along the religious path. Yaśovijaya wrote in the *Pratimā Śataka*, "It is said in the scriptures that *karma* done out of desire is merit, while that done without desire is true religion (*dharma*). Having understood this, the true perspective is not that there is [only] a single path for the wise person."⁴⁷

We see here that Yaśovijaya clearly understood that there are two ways to be an orthodox and orthoprax Jain. On the one hand there is the path or *dharma* of the mendicant, of whom there are strict expectations that all conduct be aimed at a maximum avoidance and elimination of *hiṃsā*. Equally valid is the path or *dharma* of the layperson, who has to live in the world and so cannot be expected to live as renunciatory a life as a mendicant. This is, of course, a viewpoint very much in line with most orthodox Jainism. But where the line is between levels of inevitable *hiṃsā* that are and are not acceptable for a layperson has always been a matter of disagreement within the Jain community. In

⁴⁷ *puṇyaṃ karma sarāgamanyaduditaṃ dharmāya śāsteṣvati /
śrutvā śuddhanayaṃ na cātra sudhiyāmekāntadhīryujyate //*
(*Pratimā Śataka* 95a–b).

the case of icons, Yaśovijaya viewed the amount of *hiṃsā* as acceptable, whereas the iconoclastic followers of Loṅkā did not.

Scripture

In his Gujarati *Daśmatādhikāre Vardhmān Jin Stavan* ("Hymn to the Jina Mahāvīra on the Subject of Ten [False] Sectarial Views"), Yaśovijaya exclaimed that the followers of Loṅkā who opposed icon worship kept complaining that icon worship traduced the central Jain ethic of compassion, but then undermined the very basis of mendicant life due to their ignorance of the scriptures: "'Compassion, compassion,' the complaint issues from their mouths. But they do not see the authority of scripture."⁴⁸ An on-going source of contention between the Mūrtipūjaka and iconoclastic branches of the Śvetāmbara tradition has been their different understandings of what constitutes authoritative scripture. A number of scholars in recent years have pointed out that even among the Mūrtipūjaka lineages there have been different ways of understanding scripture, that the Sthānakavāsī and Terāpanthī canons of thirty-two or thirty-one texts were not created in order to excise references to icons, and that the iconoclastic lineages have not rejected all levels of commentary out of hand.⁴⁹ I will not attempt to untangle all the issues here. Instead, I will simply point out some of the key features of Yaśovijaya's discussion of scripture, and indicate what they might tell us about possible alternative understandings of scripture among the followers of Loṅkā who were contemporary with Yaśovijaya.

In brief, we can identify two broad issues. First is how to deal with references to icons and icon worship in the root *sūtras* themselves. This involves disagreements as to which texts are authentic and authoritative. It also involves a long-running philological disagreement over the meaning of the key term *caitya* in the earliest textual levels. The second issue concerns the authority of the four levels of commentary upon the *sūtras*: *niryukti*, *bhāṣya*, *cūrṇi*, and *ṭīkā*.

One of the most important texts in the Mūrtipūjaka traditions has been the *Mahānīśītha Sūtra*.⁵⁰ Its textual history is complicated, and among Mūrtipūjakas it has

⁴⁸ *dayā dayā mukhthī pokārtājī dekhe nahi āgam pramāṇ* (*Daśmatādhikāre Vardhmān Jin Stavan*, p. 139b).

⁴⁹ See, among others, Folkert 1993: 41–94. Dundas 1996 and 2007: 73–102, and Flügel 2008.

⁵⁰ On this text see the translation and study by Deleu and Schubring 1963, the study by Kalyāṇvijay 1966, and the comments by Dundas 2007: 83–8.

not always been accepted as fully authoritative. To quote Paul Dundas (2002: 76):

“[A]lthough the sixteenth-century image-worshipping Śvetāmbara Dharmasāgara regarded the . . . *Mahāniśītha* as having been produced by Mahāvīra's disciples and so viewed acceptance of it as one of the touchstones of adherence to a correct form of Jainism⁵¹ . . . sectarian suspicions of the text would have undoubtedly been aroused by the fact that it is written in Mahārāṣṭrī, a dialect of west Indian *belles-lettres*, rather than the scriptural language Ardhamāgadhi and that it also contains references to goddesses and magic spells not found elsewhere in the canon which suggest a much later period of composition. The story of the rescue and restoration of a dilapidated manuscript of the *Mahāniśītha* from a temple in Mathurā seems little more than an attempt to concoct an antiquity for it, and the Sthānakvāsīs and Terāpanthīs accordingly refuse to accept its authority.”

In a number of places Yaśovijaya cited the *Mahāniśītha* in defense of icons. For example, in verse nine of his *Jin Pratimā Sthāpan Sajjhāy* he wrote, "The fruit of worshipping a Jina icon is the same as that of gifting (*dān*) and the other (rites). This is found in the *Mahāniśītha*. Your ignorance is shaped by a succession of darkness. What goes on in your mind?"⁵²

A rejection of the authority of the *Mahāniśītha*, therefore, was an easy way to undermine his arguments. But in the verse immediately preceding this, Yaśovijaya had written, "[When you say] 'Veneration of a Jina icon is hateful (*dveṣ*)', you ignore the deep meaning of the *sūtras*. The scriptures are enumerated in the *Nandī*. How can you dispute this?"⁵³

Yaśovijaya referred here to the list of the Jain scriptures found toward the end of

⁵¹ Elsewhere Dundas 2007: 83 quotes Dharmasāgara as saying that only those who accept the *Mahāniśītha* as authoritative belong to the true *tīrtha* or Jain community.

⁵² *jinpūjā phal dānādik sam mahāniśīthe lahiye /
andh parampar kumativāsna to kim manmāṃ vahiye re //*
(*Jin Pratimā Sthāpan Sajjhāy* 9).

⁵³ *ek jin pratimā vandan dveṣe sūtra ghaṇāṃ tuṃ lope /
nandīmāṃ je āgam saṅkhyā āpmatī kām gope //*
(*Jin Pratimā Sthāpan Sajjhāy* 8).

the *Nandī Sūtra*, one of the two texts on scriptural hermeneutics accepted as authoritative by all the Śvetāmbara lineages.⁵⁴ Since the list includes the *Mahānīśītha*, he argued that the latter text must be accepted as authoritative.

A similar disagreement occurred over the status of the *Āvaśyaka Sūtra*. In the *Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan*, Yaśovijaya cited the hymn to the twenty-four Jinas found in this text in the context of the necessary rite of veneration of the twenty-four Jinas (*covīśatthaya*), and the performance of *kāūsagg* before the *sthāpanā nikṣepa* of the Jinas in the form of icons, as further proofs of the authenticity of icon worship.⁵⁵ He established the authenticity of the *Āvaśyaka Sūtra* by citing the *Bhagavatī* and *Nandī Sūtras*, both of which refer to it as authoritative.⁵⁶ He then responded to the objection that the *Āvaśyaka Sūtra* existed in so many recensions that none of them could be authoritative. Here Yaśovijaya said that this is sheer ignorance, and calls on the authentication of tradition (*paramparā*) to establish the meaning of the text.⁵⁷

References to icons are found not only in texts such as the *Mahānīśītha* and *Āvaśyaka* whose authenticity is disputed. They are also found in texts that are firmly in the iconoclastic canon. Four references to icons come in for extended discussion here. These are the description of Draupadī worshiping a Jina icon in the *Jñātādharmakathāḥ*, the description of the sun god Sūryābha worshiping a Jina icon in the *Rājaprasnīya Sūtra*, the description of the layman Ānanda worshiping a Jina icon in the *Upāsakadaśāṅga*

⁵⁴ See *Nandī Sūtra*, p. 180; see also p. 72.

⁵⁵ *covīśatthayamāṃhi nikṣepo nām dravya doḃ bhāvu /
kāūsagg ālāve ṭhavaṇā bhāv te saghle lāvu re //* (*Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan* 1.4).

In the Hymn to the Twenty-four the *bhāva nikṣepa* is based on both the *nāma* and *dravya nikṣepas*. At the time of undertaking *kāūsagg* there is the *sthāpanā*, from which one there is the full *bhāva*.

⁵⁶ *pustak likhit sakal jīm āgam tis āvaśyak eh /
bhagavatī nandī sākhe sammat tehmāṃ nahīm sandeh re //* (*Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan* 1.5).

In the text the scriptures are written, and among them is the *Āvaśyaka*. This is seen clearly in the *Bhagavatī* and *Nandī*, so of this there is no doubt.

⁵⁷ *sūtra āvaśyak je ghargharnuṃ kaheṣe te ajñānī /
pustak arath parampar āvyuṃ māne tehaj jñānī re //* (*Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan* 1.4).

Ignorant people say that the *Āvaśyaka Sūtra* exists in many recensions. But wise people accept the meaning of the text that comes from the tradition.

Sūtra, and the description of the magically flying *carāṇa* mendicants worshipping the fifty-two eternal (*śāśvata*) icons of the Jinas on the eighth continent of Nandīśvaradvīpa in the *Bhagavatī Sūtra*. Each of these passages provides its own problems for the iconophilic defense. Yaśovijaya argued that Draupadī worshiped an icon of a Jina, not some other deity, and that at the time of her worship she possessed right faith.⁵⁸ Similarly, he argued that Sūryābha had right faith just as a human can.⁵⁹ The iconoclastic argument was that before her marriage Draupadī was not yet a true Jain and so lacked right faith, and that as a deity Sūryābha lacked right faith as well. They cannot, therefore, serve as exemplars for the practice of contemporary Jains who do have right faith.

A major point of disagreement concerns the meaning of the word found in the various passages for icon: *caitya*.⁶⁰ The iconoclastic argument is that this term does not refer to an icon; rather, it refers either to a knowledgeable mendicant (*jñānī*), or else to knowledge (*jñāna*) itself in the abstract. Yaśovijaya replied to this in a number of places. In verse forty-nine of the *Pratimā Śataka* he wrote, "Those who say that the meaning of the word '*caitya*' is '*jñāna*' do violence to the evidence."⁶¹ In his commentary he explained

⁵⁸ *draupadīe jin pratimā pūjī sūtramāṃ sākḥ ṭharāṇī /
chaṭṭhe aṅge te vīre bhāḥkhyuṃ gaṇadhar pūre sākḥī // (Jin Pratimā Sthāpan Stavan 3).*

Draupadī worshiped a Jina icon. This is firmly established in scripture. It is in the sixth Aṅga [*Jñātādharmakathāḥ*] spoken by Vīra, and which was witnessed in full by the *gaṇadhars*.

*draupadīye jin pratimā pūjī chaṭṭhe aṅge vāce /
to suṃ ek dayā pokārī āṇā viṇ tuṃ māce re // (Jin Pratimā Sthāpan Sajjhāy 7).*

Draupadī worshiped a Jina icon. This is told in the sixth Aṅga [*Jñātādharmakathāḥ*]. This was a great compassion, as one is freed to the state of not eating [liberation].

See also *Pratimā Śataka* 65–67.

⁵⁹ *sūriyābh sūri pratimā pūjī rāyapaseṇī māṃhi /
samakit viṇuṃ bhavjalmāṃ paḍṭāṃ dayā na sāhe bāṃhi re // (Jin Pratimā Sthāpan Sajjhāy 6).*

The god Sūryābha worshiped an icon. This is in the *Rājaprasānīya*. Without right faith one falls into the ocean of rebirth, if one does not hold onto compassion.

See also *Pratimā Śataka* 11–15.

⁶⁰ This has continued to be a major point of disagreement between Mūrtipūjaka and Sthānakavāsī authors into the modern times. I discuss some of the twentieth-century arguments at Cort 2010: 104-09.

⁶¹ *jñānaṃ caityapadārthamatra vadataḥ pratyakṣabādhaikato / (Pratimā Śataka 49a).*

that the claims that *caitya* means *jñāna* in the *Praśnavyākaraṇa*, the tenth Aṅga in the canon, are patently wrong: "Those [icon]-smashers who would say that the meaning of the word *caitya* in the *Praśnavyākaraṇa* is knowledge are single-minded and do violence to the clear authoritative evidence."⁶² He repeated this in the fifth verse of his *Jin Pratimā Sthāpan Sajjhāy*, where he wrote, "For the meaning of '*caitya*' in service to a *muni*, see the tenth Aṅga [*Praśnavyākaraṇa*]."⁶³ Similarly, in the *Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan*, Yaśovijaya asked, "On what basis do you say that the meaning of *caitya* is *jñān*?"⁶⁴ In the next verse he stated that when the flying mendicants worshiped the *caityas*, they worshiped eternal icons (*pratimā*).⁶⁵ Later he said, "The meaning of the word "*caitya*" is "icon" [*pratimā*]; there is no other [meaning]."⁶⁶

Not all the descriptions of the worship of Jina icons occur in the *sūtras*. In fact, there are relatively few descriptions in the *sūtras* themselves, and far more in the various levels of commentaries. The authority of the commentarial tradition therefore also entered into the debate. Peter Flügel (2008: 228f.) has recently shown that it is inaccurate to say that iconoclastic authors completely reject the commentaries. This point had earlier been made, albeit in a much more combative context, by Muni Jñānsundar (1936: 34–36), who showed how modern Sthānakavāsī and Terāpanthī authors relied upon the Sanskrit commentaries.⁶⁷ Kalyāṇvijay (1966c: 475f.) has described how it was only in the twentieth century that Sthānakavāsī authors began the systematic study of Sanskrit

⁶² *atra praśnavyākaraṇapratīke caityapadārthaṃ jñānaṃ vadato lumpakasyaikata ekasmin pakṣe pratyakṣabādhā pratyakṣapramāṇabādhāḥ (Bṛhadvṛtti on Pratimā Śataka 49).*

⁶³ *caitya arth veyāvacch muni ne dasme aṅge dākhyuṃ re / (Jin Pratimā Sthāpan Sajjhāy 5b).*

⁶⁴ *caitya śabdno jñān arath te kaho karvo kuṇ hete / (Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan 1.23a).*

⁶⁵ *rūcakādīknā caitya namyā te sāsaya paḍimā kahie / (Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan 1.24a).*

⁶⁶ *caitya śabd taṇo arath te pratimā nahi koī bījo re / (Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan 3.3a.).*

⁶⁷ Whereas Flügel seeks to correct a scholarly misperception, Jñānsundar's intention was to show that the Sthānakavāsīs and Terāpanthīs were hypocrites who denied the validity of commentaries and then relied upon them for their own exegesis of the scriptures.

grammar and the Sanskrit commentaries. It is clear that the followers of Loṅkā did not attribute to the layers of commentary the full authority granted by most Mūrtipūjaka intellectuals.⁶⁸

This was indicated when Yaśovijaya wrote in the *Jin Pratimā Sthāpan Sajjhāy*, "Investigate the *īkā*, *cūrṇi*, *bhāṣya*, investigate the *niryukti*. Investigate the *sūtra*. [They all] explain the basis of the icon. This will drive off a bad rebirth."⁶⁹ Two verses later he again stated that icons are seen to be legitimate if one studies the full body of the scriptures, which are described as being "five-limbed" (*pañcāṅgī*): "Know that the Jina icon is equal (*sarikhī*) to the Jina. Know this from the five-fold (*pañcāṅgī*) [scriptures]."⁷⁰

Yaśovijaya explained the five layers a bit more fully in his *Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan*, where he wrote: "O Lord, in the fifth Aṅga [*Bhagavatī Sūtra*] you say that there are three kinds [of *anuyog*, exposition]: the first is the meaning of the *sūtra*, the second is said to be [that of the *sūtra*] mixed with the *niryukti*, and the third is the entirety."⁷¹ By "entirety" he referred to all five scriptural levels. By saying that it was Mahāvīra himself who gave the explanation of how the knowledge is transmitted in the scriptures, Yaśovijaya said that all five levels together constitute the ultimate Jain authority.⁷²

⁶⁸ Even among Mūrtipūjakas there has not been unanimous acceptance of all the commentarial layers as authoritative. Helmuth von Glasenapp 1925: 352 wrote that Pārśvacandrasūri also rejected as authoritative some of the *niryuktis*, *bhāṣyas*, and *cūrṇis*, in addition to some of the *cheda sūtras*. Glasenapp does not indicate his source for this, although I suspect that it was Albrecht Weber's 1882 partial summary of Dharmasāgara's *Kupakṣakauśikāditya*. As Jñānsundar 1936 noted, and others have followed him, there clearly was a relationship between Pārśvacandrasūri's approach to scripture and commentary and those of the early followers of Loṅkā, a relationship that still remains largely unexplored and so unclear.

⁶⁹ *īkā cūrṇi bhāṣya uvekhyāṃ ūvekhī niryukti /
pratimā kāraṇ sūtra uvekhyāṃ dūr rahī tujh kugati* re //*
(*Jin Pratimā Sthāpan Sajjhāy* 13).

* The printed edition reads "*mugati*," an obvious misprint.

⁷⁰ *jīn pratimā jīn sarikhī jāṇe pañcāṅgīnā jāṇ /
(Jin Pratimā Sthāpan Sajjhāy 15a).*

⁷¹ *sūtra arath pachele bījo kahyo nijuttie re mīs /
niravaśeṣ trījo aṅg pācme em kahe tuṃ jagdīs //*
(*Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan* 6.16).

⁷² In his commentary, Padmavijay devoted nineteen pages (pp. 259-77) to supporting this understanding of scripture, with copious quotations from many canonical texts.

A similar explanation of the scriptures as being fivefold is found in a hymn by Yaśovijaya's slightly older contemporary Ānandaghana. In a verse from his *Covīśī* (also *Caubīsī*), a set of twenty-four hymns devoted one each to the Jinas, he wrote, "*cūrṇi, bhāṣya, sūtra, niryukti, vṛtti*, and the experience of the authoritative tradition of teachers: these are known as the limbs of the Doctrine Man. Whoever cuts one off will attain a bad rebirth."⁷³

Paul Dundas (1996: 73) has summarized Ānandaghana's point:

“[T]he *sūtra* text is here not privileged by being depicted as the head or the most important part of the doctrine-man and is instead understood by Ānandghan as merely an equal participant in a broader and interrelated nexus involving root scripture, commentary and interpretation.”

Clearly Yaśovijaya and Ānandaghana were responding to an alternative understanding of scripture, one that either prioritized the original *sūtras* over the later four layers of commentary, or else rejected the commentarial layers altogether.⁷⁴ The commentarial layer that was particularly at issue was that of the *niryuktis*, the very earliest layer. Yaśovijaya devoted three verses of his *Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnum Stavan* to explaining the necessity of reading the *sūtras* with the aid of the *niryuktis*:

“*Sūtra* and *niryukti* are said to be of two kinds in the third [chapter of the] *Anuyogadvāra* [*Sūtra*]. Those who don't accept this are fraudulent and deceitful. Who can support them? The meaning that is tightly bound in the *sūtra* is expanded in the vast *niryukti*. How can those who do not avail

⁷³ *cūrṇī bhāṣya sūtra niryukti vṛtti parampar anubhav re /
samaypuruṣnām aṅg kahyām e je chede te durbhav re //*
(Ānandaghan, *Nemināth Jin Stavan* 8).

Kalyāṇvijay 1966c: 465f. gives a slightly different sense of the meaning of the fivefold scripture: "In the scriptures (*āgam*) the following are the names of five layers: (1) *sūtra*, (2) *artha*, (3) *grantha*, (4) *niryukti*, and (5) *saṅgrahaṇī*." The latter four encompass nearly the entirety of the subsequent Śvetāmbara textual tradition.

⁷⁴ Ānandaghana's inclusion of the tradition (*paramparā*) of teachers as equally authoritative, a point we have seen echoed by Yaśovijaya, is also important. Both authors implied that the followers of Loṅkā, by having broken with the established tradition, cut themselves off from the authoritative teachings of that tradition.

themselves of this expansion adequately study the path? Those who say that the *niryukti* has been lost are stupid. Why then hasn't the *sūtra* been lost as well? Those who accept the readings that have come [from the teacher tradition] are at peace.”⁷⁵

The very nature of the *sūtra* genre is its brevity; one needs the more expansive *niryukti* to receive the full meaning. This was, of course, something that Yaśovijaya knew well, as most of his own longer compositions - including the *Pratimā Śataka* and the *Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan* itself - required extensive prose commentaries that were wrapped around brief verse cores. Yaśovijaya here also tied the ability to understand the received scriptural tradition of the *sūtras* and the four layers of commentary to the established lineage of teachers.

In the sixth section of the *Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan*, Yaśovijaya articulated the orthodox Tapā Gaccha position that there are limitations on the ability and authorization of laypeople to recite the *sūtras* on their own. To gain access to the necessary *sūtras* - the six *āvaśyakas* - a layperson must first undergo the *upadhāna tapas*, as described in the *Mahāniśītha Sūtra*.⁷⁶ Ideally this should lead to the person taking formal renunciation.⁷⁷ While it is not expressly forbidden for a layperson to study the scriptures on his own, he will not obtain their full meaning.⁷⁸ Clearly, Yaśovijaya argued, this disqualified as authoritative the interpretations advanced by the layman Loṅkā and his followers, for they were flying blind, so to speak, in the absence of proper guidance from authorized teachers.

⁷⁵ *sūtra nijutti re veu bhede kahe trījuṃ anuyogdvār /
kūḍā kapaṭī re je māne nahīm tehne kavaṇ ādhār //
baddh te sūtre re arth nikāciyā nijjuttie apār /
upadhimām na gaṇaṇādik kihām lahe te viṇu mārg vicār //
jo niryukti gāi kumati kahe sūtra gayām nahīm kem
jeh vācnāe āvyuṃ te save māne to hoe khem //
(Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan 6.17–19).*

⁷⁶ On this, see Dundas 2007: 85–8.

⁷⁷ *iriyādinām re paṭ updhān che teṇe āvaśyak śuddh /
grhī sāmāyik ādi śrut bhāṇe dīkṣā lei aluddh //
(Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan 6.7).*

⁷⁸ *sūtra bhāṇyā koi śrāvaka navi kahyā laddhaṭṭhā kahyā tei /
(Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan 6.8a).*

History

References to events and people in Jain universal history are peppered throughout Yaśovijaya's writings on icons. For example, in the *Pratimā Śataka* he said that since it was not wrong for Bharata, the son of the first Jina Ādinātha, to build the first temple of this era, then neither was it wrong for contemporary people to build temples.⁷⁹ In the *Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan* he pointed out that Ādinātha, when he was the first king of this era of time, before he renounced the world and became the first Jina, created sculpture and the other arts for the benefit of living beings. This is an obvious justification for the sculptural work of the icon-maker, just as Ādinātha's creation of writing authorized the work of a scribe in copying manuscripts of the scriptures.⁸⁰ The above-mentioned discussions of the worship by Draupadī, Sūryābha, Ānanda, and the *carāṇa* mendicants, also are fully "historical" for Yaśovijaya and his fellow icon-worshipping Jains.

Yaśovijaya's clearest use of history as a proof for icon worship came in his ten verse *Jin Pratimā Sthāpan Stavan* of 1662. This short hymn is a listing, in Gujarati verse, of key precedents from Jain history for the building of temples and worshipping of icons. He started by referring to the many restorations of Śatruñjay, the first of which was done by Bharata.⁸¹ He devoted a verse to the Mauryan King Samprati, grandson of Aśoka. Samprati is credited by Jain sources for enabling the spread of Jainism outside of its homeland in northeastern India. In addition to making it possible for mendicants to travel outside this area, he spread Jain culture by building 125,000 temples and installing 12,500,000 icons.⁸² In the ninth century Vimal Śāh built his famous temple atop Mount Ābū, in which he installed 1,000 icons. Two hundred years later was King Kumārpāl, the

⁷⁹ *jñātaiḥ śalyaviṣādibhirnu bharatādīnāṃ niṣiddhā yayā /
kāma no jinasadyakāraṇavidhīrvyaktāṃ niṣiddhastayā //*
(*Pratimā Śataka* 22.a–b).

⁸⁰ *likhan śilpaśat gaṇit prakāśyāṃ traṇ prajāhit het /
pratham rāy śrī ṛṣabhjñede tihāṇi paṇ e saṅket //*
(*Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan* 4.15).

⁸¹ See Cort 2010a: 144.

⁸² See Cort 2010a: 137–42.

great Jain king of the Caulukya or Solankī dynasty. During his reign he built 5,000 temples and installed 7,000 icons. A century after him came the brothers Vastupāl and Tejpal, ministers who basically ran the Vāghelā kingdom. They are credited with 5,000 temples and 11,000 icons. During that same time Dhanno Saṅghvī [Dharṇā Śāh] built the magnificent temple at Rāṇakpur.⁸³ A century later Samro Śāh renovated Śatruñjay, which had been damaged by the troops of the Delhi Sultan. A final restoration of Śatruñjay was effected in the fourteenth century by Karam Śāh.

Yaśovijaya's litany is a very interesting example of a pre-modern use of history as an authoritative proof (*pramāṇa*). According to Yaśovijaya, the very fact that all these famous Jains of the past built temples and installed icons, including many of the temples and icons that Yaśovijaya and his fellow Jains saw around them in the seventeenth century, served as a validating proof that icons and their worship are acceptable in Jain ritual culture. While history was a powerful argument for the Christian defenders of icons during the iconoclastic controversy (Sahas 1986: 60f.), to my knowledge Yaśovijaya was the first to use history as a proof in the Jain defense of icons.

Dharmasāgara and Pārśvacandrasūri

Most of Yaśovijaya's writings on icons were devoted to defending them from the criticisms of Loṅkā and his followers. But these were not the only disputed aspects of the Mūrtipūjaka ritual culture of icon worship. Much earlier in the millennium, the Kharatara Gaccha had argued that women should not be allowed to perform those parts of icon worship that involve touching the icon, due to the inherent impurity of a female body (Balbir 2003b: 263). The A(ṇ)cala and Pūrṇimā Gacchas argued that since a mendicant has totally renounced the material world, he should not be involved in the consecration of a Jina icon. He might be present at the event, but he should not perform the actual consecration (Balbir 2003a: 57; Dundas 2009). Yaśovijaya addressed neither of these disputes in the texts under review here.⁸⁴ He did, however, address two issues on which

⁸³ Yaśovijaya made an uncharacteristic mistake here. Vastupāl and Tejpal were active in the first third of the thirteenth century, while Dharṇā Śāh built the temple at Rāṇakpur in the mid-fifteenth century.

⁸⁴ In his *Daśmatādhikāre Vardhmān Jin Stavan* Yaśovijaya briefly disputed the Kharatara position on women performing *pūjā* by pointing out the scriptural description of the laywoman Draupadī worshipping Jina icons thrice daily: *drupadī jñātrā śrutre puje jin pratimā traṇ kāl re* (*Daśmatādhikāre Vardhmān Jin Stavan*, p. 139a). In this text his critique of the A(ṇ)cala and Pūrṇimā Gacchas concerned calendrical issues, not issues of icon worship.

he disagreed with near contemporaries in the Mūrtipūjaka tradition, one in his own Tapā Gaccha, and the other in a rival lineage.

Yaśovijaya devoted verses seventy through eighty of the *Pratimā Śataka* to addressing some of the positions advanced a century earlier by Dharmasāgara (d. 1596). At the heart of his disagreement with Dharmasāgara was the status of icons that have been consecrated by mendicants in other lineages. According to Dharmasāgara, mendicants in other lineages were by definition heretics and fallen pseudo-monks. The majority within the Mūrtipūjaka tradition has long affirmed that the consecration (*añjana śalākā*) of a Jina icon can be performed only by an *ācārya* or other high-ranking monk. Only he has the spiritual power to make the consecration effective. In ways that are at best obscure, the consecrating mendicant transfers some of his own accumulated merit to the icon itself (Cort 2006b). This merit persists for many years. In a passage by Ṭhakkura Pheru in his 1316 *Vāstusāra Prakaraṇa*, the author averred, "Even if it is broken, an icon which was established more than one hundred years ago by a person of excellent virtues is still fit for worship. The worship of such an icon is not without fruit."⁸⁵

Dharmasāgara took this consensual position among Mūrtipūjakas and applied it, in an argument that was unique in Jain history, to the opposite case. Since the moral qualities of the person consecrating an icon persist in the icon, he argued, one should not worship an icon consecrated by a person either of unknown virtue, or of known bad virtue. Almost all Jain temples are full of icons that have been consecrated by mendicants of many different lineages. Some of these are fully renunciant lineages, others are domesticated *caityavāsī* lineages. In many cases it is not possible to tell who consecrated an icon, as either there is no inscription, or the inscription is so badly worn as to be illegible. But on many icons - nearly all metal icons, and a large number of stone ones - there is a clearly legible inscription detailing who consecrated the icon. In both these cases Dharmasāgara argued that one should only worship icons consecrated by mendicants of known excellent virtue - in other words, mendicants in what he said was the only true Jain lineage, the Tapā Gaccha. Otherwise the bad karmic residue attached to the icon would manifest in the worshiper.

Yaśovijaya disagreed with this position. Similar to his exposition of the three kinds of *hiṃsā*, in which he stressed the importance of inner intention over outer ritual performance, here too he stressed that worship is beneficially fruitful if it is performed

⁸⁵ Quoted from Cort 2003: 138.

with the proper devotional intention (*bhakti bhāva*), regardless of who consecrated an icon.⁸⁶

The other disagreement was with Pārśvacandrasūri (1480–1565), the founder of the Pārśvacandrasūri Gaccha. He formed this group when he broke away from the Nāgapurīya Tapā Gaccha in 1507 in Nagaur (Nāgapura).⁸⁷ Pārśvacandrasūri argued that icon worship at best results in a mixture of good and bad *karma*, and therefore is of only limited spiritual value. Yaśovijaya again argued for the primacy of intention (*bhāva*) over action (*kriyā*). He agreed that in the end it is necessary for a soul to attain a state of total dispassion (*vītarāgatā*) and thereby overcome the affects of all *karma*, both good and bad; but for the layperson, who operates in a world in which there are desires (*sarāga*), icon worship when performed with pure intention results only in the accrual of merit (*punya*).⁸⁸ Again we see Yaśovijaya affirming the validity of lay Jain practices, against a position that unduly prioritized the mendicant path.

⁸⁶ Yaśovijaya repeated this point in his *101 Bol Saṅgrah*, a collection of 101 doctrinal statements. Statements 98 and 99 disagreed with the position advocated by Dharmasāgara (although here Yaśovijaya did not mention Dharmasāgara by name), adducing passages from Haribhadra, Ratnaśekhara, and the *Āvaśyaka Nirukti* in support of his position.

⁸⁷ Despite its name, the Nāgapurīya Tapā Gaccha claimed that it was not part of the Tapā Gaccha. The lineage traced its origins to the twelfth century Vāddevasūri.

The history, practices and doctrines of both the later Pārśvacandrasūri Gaccha and the earlier *caityavāsī* Nāgapurīya Tapā Gaccha remain obscure. As mentioned above, there are obvious points of intersection between Pārśvacandrasūri and the nascent Sthānakavāsī tradition. While Pārśvacandrasūri advanced positions on scripture and *karma* that were at variance with the other Mūrtipūjaka lineages, he still accepted icon worship. There are a number of icons consecrated by him and his successors in temples throughout western India, and he authored a text that expressly disputed Loṅkā's iconoclastic arguments. Unfortunately, only Loṅkā's arguments as found in this text have been published, not Pārśvacandrasūri's rebuttal. See Rāṭhauḍ 1987: 694f. for portions of *Lūṅkāe Pūchel 13 Praśna ane tenā Uttaro*, based on a manuscript in the L. D. Institute of Indology.

My only extended source on Pārśvacandrasūri is an anonymous 1940 hagiography. While it relates many of his miracles, it tells nothing of his distinctive doctrinal positions, except on various calendrical points. The book does aver that Pārśvacandrasūri met Loṅkā and defeated him in a debate in Nagaur in 1508.

⁸⁸ See *Pratimā Śataka* 95 and autocommentary.

Conclusion: In Defense of Icons

We do not know what, if any, immediate response there was from his opponents to Yaśovijaya's elaborate and sophisticated theology of the icon. The iconoclastic and aniconic followers of Loṅkā have left us very little by way of a literary trail until the twentieth century, since for reasons of mendicant propriety it was considered inappropriate for mendicants in the Sthānakavāsī traditions before the twentieth century to engage in literary activity (Flügel 2008: 194). Not until the early nineteenth century, therefore, do we have any clear evidence of public debates between Śvetāmbara iconophiles and iconoclasts, when Muni Vīrvijay (1773-1851), a younger contemporary of Padmavijay in the small *saṃvegī* branch of the Tapā Gaccha, argued with the iconoclastic Sthānakavāsī Svāmī Jeṭhmal in the context of a court case in the Ahmedabad District Court.⁸⁹ This was the first in a series of debates, many of them recorded in Hindi and Gujarati pamphlets and books published by local congregations on inexpensive paper that has by now largely disintegrated. The debates raged especially between the late-nineteenth and mid-twentieth centuries. In all of these, the writings of Yaśovijaya have remained foundational for the iconophilic position. Some of the evidence in favor of icons advanced by later authors reflects the changed global context of colonial India, but most of the theological and textual arguments they employ derive directly from the writings of Yaśovijaya.⁹⁰

While there was much that was original in Yaśovijaya's defense of icons, and his arguments show his usual brilliance and thorough knowledge of the Śvetāmbara textual tradition, it is also clear that he did not create this defense out of thin air. The strength of Yaśovijaya's arguments lay as much in his ability to marshal earlier textual positions and combine them with his own thinking to advance a coherent, well-rounded defense of icons.

It is important to note the number of times Yaśovijaya returned to the defense of icons in his writings. We can take this as evidence that the worship of icons of the Jina was a contentious issue among seventeenth-century Śvetāmbara Jains, even if the other side of the argument is silent in the historical record. It is also noteworthy that he wrote in defense of icons in three languages. He wrote in Sanskrit, still in seventeenth-century

⁸⁹ This case occurred in either 1809 or 1822. Both sides claimed victory in their subsequent recounting of it. See Kāpaḍiyā 1991: 17; K. Śāh 1999: 7; Flügel 2008: 194f.

⁹⁰ See Cort 2010a: 247-72.

India the language of sophisticated intellectual production. He wrote in Prakrit, to root his argument in the scriptural language of the Jains, and thereby give it the luster of scriptural authority. He wrote in Gujarati, in several genres, in order that his argument not be restricted to Sanskrit-reading intellectuals. He wanted his argument to reach as wide a range of mendicant and lay Śvetāmbara Jains as possible; since many of them did not read Sanskrit fluently (if at all), writing in Gujarati was an essential aspect of his program.

Finally, the concerted effort Yaśovijaya dedicated to the defense of icons reminds us of just how central icons have been to Jain ritual, devotional and intellectual culture for centuries (Cort 2010b). If icons were marginal to Śvetāmbara Jain identity, they would not have been the source of concerted criticism and defense. Yaśovijaya's Lumpaka / Sthānakavāsī opponents to a significant extent defined their rejection of aspects of the dominant Śvetāmbara practice around the rejection of icons. Yaśovijaya, therefore, was called to defend icons throughout his career, and in so doing helped shape subsequent Mūrtipūjaka intellectual culture, and also contributed an important chapter to a global history of arguments between iconoclasts and iconophiles.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

101 Bol Saṅgrah of Yaśovijaya. Vijay Śīlcandrasūri (ed.), "Mahopādhyāy Śrī Yaśovijayaṇi kṛt 101 Bol Saṅgrah." *Anusandhān* 7 (1996) 21–42.

—. Mohanlāl Dalīcand Deśāī (ed.). "Yaśovijayaṇi kṛt 108/101 Bol." *Prācīn Madhyakālīn Sāhitya Saṅgrah*. Ed. Jayant Koṭhārī, 470-85. Ahmedabad: L. D. Institute of Indology, 2001. Originally in *Jain Śvetāmbar Konfrans Herald*, June 1914: 177–80; July 1914: 228–32; April 1915: 123–29.

Anuyogadvāra Sūtra. Ed. Muni Puṇyavijaya, Pt. Dalsukh Mālvaṇīā & Pt. Amritlāl Mohanlāl Bhojak. *Nandisuttam and Aṇuogaddārāṇi*. Bombay: Shri Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, 1968. Jaina Āgama Series No. 1.

—. See Hanaki.

Bhagavatī Sūtra. Ed. with English Translation by K. C. Lalwani. Four Volumes. Calcutta: Jain Bhawan, 1973–85.

Covīśī (or *Caubīsī*) of Ānandghan. Ed. Ratilāl Dīpcand Desāī. Bombay: Śrī Mahāvīr Jain Vidyālay, 1970.

Daśmatādhikāre Vardhmān Jin Stavan of Jaśvijay [Yaśovijaya]. *Prācīn Ācāryovaro Viracit Stavan Saṅgrah*, 137–42. Bombay: Motichand Rupchand Javeri, 1923.

Dharma Saṃgraha of Mahopādhyāya Mānavijaya, with *Svopajña Vṛtti*, and with *Ṭippanī* of Yaśovijaya. Ed. Muni Muncandravijay. Three Volumes. Bombay: Jin Śāsan Ārādhnā Ṭraṣṭ, 1984–87.

Jin Pratimā Sthāpan Sajjhāy of Jasvijay [Yaśovijaya]. In: Bhadrāṅkarvijay 1991, 288–90.

Kumati Latā Unmīlan of Jasvijay [Yaśovijaya]. In: Bhadrāṅkarvijay 1991, 287–288.

Kūpa Drṣṭānta Viśadīkaraṇa [*Kuvadiṭṭhantavisaikaraṇa*] of Yaśovijaya, with *Tattvaviveka* of Yaśovijaya. Ed. Ācārya Yaśodevasūri. Bombay: Śrī Yaśobhārati Jain Prakāśan Samiti, 1980.

—. With *Tattvaviveka* of Yaśovijaya. *Bhāṣārāhasyaprakaraṇa*, 53–57. Ahmedabad: Jain Granth Prakāśak Sabhā, 1941.

Nandī Sūtra of Devavācaka, with *Vṛtti* of Haribhadra, *Durgapadavyākhyā* of Candrācārya, and *Viśamaparaparyāya*. Ed. Muni Puṇyavijay. Varanasi: Prakrit Text Society, 1966 (Prakrit Text Society Series 10).

Pratimā Śataka of Yaśovijaya, with *Laghuvṛtti* of Bhāvaprabhasūri, and Gujarati Translation by Mūlcand Nāthubhāī. Bhavnagar: Śā Bhīmśī Māṇek, 1903.

—. With *Laghuvṛtti* of Bhāvaprabhasūri. Ed. Paṇnyās Dānvijaygaṇī. Bhavnagar: Śrī Jain Ātmānand Sabhā. 1915.

—. With *Brhadvṛtti* of Yaśovijaya. Ed. Muni Pratāpvijay. Baroda: Śrī Mukti Kamal Jain Mohan Mālā, 1920.

—. With Gujarati Translation (*bhāvānuvād*). Bombay: Śrī Andherī Gujarātī Jain Saṅgh, 1988.

—. With *Laghuvṛtti* of Bhāvaprabhasūri. Ed. Ācārya Vijay Jinendrasūri. Lakhabaval-Shantipuri: Śrī Harṣpuṣpāmṛt Jain Granthmālā, 1989. .

—. With Gujarati Gloss (*śabdārth vivecan*) by Paṇḍit Pravīṇcandra Khīmji Motā. Ed. Sādhvī Candanbālāśrījī. Three Volumes [through verse 59]. Ahmedabad: Gītārth Gaṅgā, 2002.

—. With *Laghuvṛtti* of Bhāvaprabhasūri, and Gujarati Translation (*bhāvānuvād*) by Sādhvī Saumyajyotiśrījī. Bhivandi: Śrī Arihant Ārādhak Ṭraṣṭ, 2005.

Pratimā Sthāpana Nyāya of Yaśovijaya. Ed. Muni Pratāpvijay. Baroda: Śrī Mukti Kamal Jain Mohan Mālā, 1920.

Sthānāṅga Sūtra, with *Vṛtti* of Abhayadevasūri. Ed. Ācārya Sāgarānandsūri. Re-ed. Muni Jambūvijay. *Sthānāṅgasūtram Samavāyāṅgasūtram ca*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1985 (Lala Sunderlal Jain Āgamagranthamālā Vol. II).

—. Ed. Muni Jambūvijay, Assisted by Muni Dharmcandravijay. *Ṭhāṇaṅgasuttam Samavāyāṅgasuttam ca*. Bombay: Śrī Mahāvīr Jain Vidyālay, 1985. Jaina Āgama Granthamālā 3.

Vīr Stutirūp Huṇḍīnuṃ Stavan of Jaśvijay [Yaśovijaya]. With *Bālāvabodhaka* of Muni Padmavijay. Ed. Ācārya Vijay Jinprabhsūri. Ahmedabad: Śrī Kosālāv Jain Saṅgh, n.d.

Yogaśāstra of Hemacandra, with *Svopajñavṛtti*. Ed. Muni Jambūvijay. Three Volumes. Bombay: Jain Sāhitya Vikās Maṇḍal, 1977–86.

Secondary Sources

Alsdorf, Ludwig. “Nikṣepa - A Jaina Contribution to Scholastic Methodology.” *Kleine Schriften*, 257–65. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1974 (Originally: *Journal of the Oriental Institute* 22 1973: 455–63).

Babb, Lawrence A. *Alchemies of Violence: Myths of Identity and the Life of Trade in Western India*. New Delhi: Sage, 2004.

Balbir, Nalini. “About a Jain Polemical Work of the 17th Century.” *Approaches to Jaina Studies: Philosophy, Logic, Rituals and Symbols*. Ed. N. K. Wagle and Olle Qvarnström, 1–18. Toronto: University of Toronto, Centre for South Asian Studies, 1999.

Balbir, Nalini. “The A(ñ)calagaccha Viewed from Inside and from Outside.” *Jainism and Early Buddhism: Essays in Honor of Padmanabh S. Jaini*. Ed. Olle Qvarnström, 47–77. Fremont, CA: Asian Humanities Press, 2003a.

Balbir, Nalini. “Samayasundara's *Sāmācārī-Śataka* and Jaina Sectarian Divisions in the Seventeenth Century.” *Essays in Jaina Philosophy and Religion*. Ed. Piotr Balcerowicz, 253–77. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2003b.

Barber, Charles. *Figure and Likeness: On the Limits of Representation in Byzantine Iconoclasm*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Bhadraṅkarvijaygaṇi, Paṇṇyās. *Pratimā Pūjan*. Hindi Translation by Jastrāj Singhī. Ed. Muni Ratnasenvijay. Madras: Svādhyāy Saṅgh, 1991.

Bhatt, Bansidhar. *The Canonical Nikṣepa: Studies in Jaina Dialectics*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978 (Indologia Berolinensis 5).

Bhayani, H. C. “On the Meaning of the Terms Balānaka and Caitya.” *Aspects of Jaina Art and Architecture*. Eds. U. P. Shah & M. A. Dhaky, 21–24. Ahmedabad: Gujarat State Committee for the Celebration of 2500th Anniversary of Bhagavān Mahāvīra Nirvāṇa, 1975.

Cort, John E. "Jain Questions and Answers: Who Is God and How Is He Worshiped?" *Religions of India in Practice*. Ed. Donald S. Lopez, Jr., 598–608. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.

Cort, John E. "Fistfights in the Monastery: Calendars, Conflict and Karma among the Jains." *Approaches to Jaina Studies: Philosophy, Logic, Rituals and Symbols*. Eds. N. K. Wagle & Olle Qvarnström, 36–59. Toronto: University of Toronto, Centre for South Asian Studies, 1999.

Cort, John E. *Jains in the World: Religious Values and Ideology in India*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Cort, John E. "A Tale of Two Cities: On the Origins of Digambar Sectarianism in North India." *Multiple Histories: Culture and Society in the Study of Rajasthan*. Eds. Lawrence A. Babb, Varsha Joshi & Michael Meister, 39–83. Jaipur: Rawat, 2002.

Cort, John E. "Doing for Others: Merit Transfer and Karma Mobility in Jainism." *Jainism and Early Buddhism: Essays in Honor of Padmanabh S. Jaini*. Ed. Olle Qvarnström, 129–49. Fremont, CA: Asian Humanities Press, 2003.

Cort, John E. "Images: Images, Icons, and Idols." *Encyclopedia of Religion*. Second Edition, 4388–93. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2005.

Cort, John E. "A Fifteenth-century Digambar Jain Mystic and His Followers: Tāraṇ Taraṇ Svāmī and the Tāraṇ Svāmī Panth." *Studies in Jaina History and Culture: Disputes and Dialogues*. Ed. Peter Flügel, 261–309. London: Routledge, 2006a.

Cort, John E. "Installing Absence? The Consecration of a Jain Image." *Presence: The Inherence of the Prototype within Images and Other Objects*. Eds. Rupert Shepherd & Robert Maniura, 71–86. London: Ashgate, 2006b.

Cort, John E. *Framing the Jina: Narratives of Icons and Idols in Jain History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010a.

Cort, John E. “World Renouncing Monks and World Celebrating Temples and Icons: The Ritual Culture of Temples and Icons in Jainism.” *Archaeology and Text: The Temple in South Asia*. Ed. Himanshu Prabha Ray, 268-295. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2010b.

Darśanvijay, Muni. “Pūrvaṇī.” *Paṭṭāvalī Samuccay*, Vol. 2. Ed. Muni Jñānvijay, 200–75. Ahmedabad: Śrī Cāritra Smārak Granthmālā, 1950.

Deleu, Jozef & Walther Schubring. *Studien zum Mahānīsīha, Kapitel 1–5*. Hamburg: Cram, de Gruyter & Co., 1963 (Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 10).

Devguptsūri, Ācārya [Muni Jñānsundar]. *Śrīmad Upakeśagacchīya Śuddhasamācārī*. Phalodi: Śrī Ratnaprabhākar Jñān Puṣpamālā, 1948.

Devluk, Nandlāl (ed.). *Śāsanprabhāvak Śramaṇbhagavanto*. Two Volumes. Second Edition. Bhavnagar: Arihant Prakāśan, 1992.

Dośī, Becardās Jīvrāj. “Prastāvnā”. *Devānandamahākāvya* of Meghavijayopādhyāya. Ed. Becardās Jīvrāj Dośī, 5–9. Ahmedabad: Singhī Jain Granthmālā, 1937.

Dundas, Paul. “Somnolent Sūtras: Scriptural Commentary in Śvetāmbara Jainism.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 24 (1996) 73-101.

Dundas, Paul. “Jainism Without Monks? The Case of Kaḍuā Śāh.” *Approaches to Jaina Studies: Philosophy, Logic, Rituals and Symbols*. Eds. N. K. Wagle & Olle Qvarnström, 19–35. Toronto: University of Toronto, Centre for South Asian Studies, 1999.

Dundas, Paul. “The Meat at the Wedding Feasts: Kṛṣṇa, Vegetarianism and a Jain Dispute.” *Jain Doctrine and Practice: Academic Perspectives*. Ed. Joseph T. O'Connell, 95–112. Toronto: University of Toronto, Centre for South Asian Studies, 2000.

Dundas, Paul. “Haribhadra on Giving.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 30 (2002a) 1–44.

Dundas, Paul. *The Jains*. Second Edition. London: Routledge, 2002b.

Dundas, Paul. *History, Scripture and Controversy in a Medieval Jain Sect*. London: Routledge, 2007.

Dundas, Paul. "How Not to Install an Image of the Jina: An Early Anti-Paurṇamīya Diatribe." *International Journal of Jaina Studies* (Online) 5/4 (2009) 1-23.

Flügel, Peter. "Protestantische und Post-Protestantische Jaina-Reformbewegungen: Zur Geschichte und Organisation der Sthānakavāsī I." *Berliner Indologische Studien* 13/14 (2000) 37–103.

Flügel, Peter. "Protestantische und Post-Protestantische Jaina-Reformbewegungen: Zur Geschichte und Organisation der Sthānakavāsī II." *Berliner Indologische Studien* 15/16/17 (2003) 149–240.

Flügel, Peter. "Protestantische und Post-Protestantische Jaina-Reformbewegungen: Zur Geschichte und Organisation der Sthānakavāsī III." *Berliner Indologische Studien* 18 (2007) 127-206.

Flügel, Peter. "The Unknown Loṅkā: Tradition and the Cultural Unconscious." *Jaina Studies: Papers of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference*. Eds. Colette Caillat & Nalini Balbir, 181-278. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 2008.

Flügel, Peter. "Protestantische und Post-Protestantische Jaina-Reformbewegungen: Zur Geschichte und Organisation der Sthānakavāsī IV." *Berliner Indologische Studien* 19 (2010).

Folkert, Kendall W. *Scripture and Community: Collected Essays on the Jains*. Ed. John E. Cort. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

Glaserapp, Helmuth von. *Der Jainismus: Eine indische Erlösungsreligion*. Berlin: Alf Häger Verlag, 1925.

Hallisey, Charles. "Ethical Particularism in Theravāda Buddhism." *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* (Online) 3 (1996).

Hanaki, Taiken. *Aṇuogaddāraiṃ*. Vaishali: Research Institute of Prakrit, Jainology and Ahimsa, 1970.

Heim, Maria. *Theories of the Gift in South Asia: Hindu, Buddhist, and Jain Reflections on Dāna*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Jñānsundar, Muni. *Mūrtipūjā kā Prācīn Itihāsa*. Phalodi: Śrī Ratnaprabhākar Jñān Puṣpamālā, 1936 (Śrī Ratnaprabhākar Jñān Puṣpamālā 164).

Kalyāṇvijaygaṇi, Paṇṇyās. *Nibandh Nicay*. Jalor: Śrī Kalyāṇvijay Śāstra Saṅgrah Samiti, 1965.

Kalyāṇvijaygaṇi, Paṇṇyās. *Jinpūjā Vidhi Saṅgrah*. Ed. Pt. Śobhācandra Bhārill. Jalor: Śrī Kalyāṇvijay Śāstra Saṅgrah Samiti, 1966a.

Kalyāṇvijaygaṇi, Paṇṇyās. “Mahānīśītha kā Parikṣā.” *Prabandh Pārijāt*, 71-142. Jalor: Śrī Kalyāṇvijay Śāstra Saṅgrah Samiti, 1966b.

Kalyāṇvijaygaṇi, Paṇṇyās. *Paṭṭāvalī Parāg Saṅgrah*. Jalor: Śrī Kalyāṇvijay Śāstra Saṅgrah Samiti, 1966c.

Kāpaḍiyā, Hīrālāl Rasiklāl. *Yaśodohan*. Ed. Muni Yaśovijay. Bombay: Śrī Yaśobhārati Jain Prakāśan Samiti, 1966.

Kāpaḍiyā, Motīcand Girdharlāl. *Paṇḍit Śrī Vīrvijayjīnuṃ Janmacaritra*. Ahmedabad: Paṇḍit Śrī Vīrvijayjī Jain Upāśray, 1991.

Kelting, M. Whitney. *Heroic Wives: Rituals, Stories, and the Virtues of Jain Wifehood*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Koṭhārī, Darśanā, and Dīpti Śāh (eds.). *Upādhyāya Śrī Yaśovijayjī Sāhitya Sūci*. Ahmedabad: Śrī Śrutjñān Pracārak Sabhā, 1999.

N.N. *Śrī Pārśvacandragacch Ṭuṅk Rūp Rekḥā*. Ahmedabad: Śrī Jain Haṭhīsīṅg Sarasvatī Sabhā, 1940.

Ohira, Suzuko. *A Study of the Bhagavatīsūtra: A Chronological Analysis*. Ahmedabad: Prakrit Text Society, 1994.

Parry, Kenneth. *Depicting the Word: Byzantine Iconophile Thought of the Eighth and Ninth Centuries*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996.

Pradyumnavijayaṅi, Jayant Koṭhārī, and Kāntibhāi Bī. Śāh (eds.). *Upādhyāya Yaśovijay Svādhyāy Granth*. Bombay: Śrī Mahāvīr Jain Vidyālay, 1993.

Rajendrasūri, Ācārya Vijay (ed.). *Abhidhāna Rājendra Kośa*. Seven Volumes. Second Printing. Ahmedabad: Śrī Abhidhān Rājendra Koś Prakāśan Saṁsthā, 1986.

Ramanujan, A. K. “Is there an Indian Way of Thinking? An Informal Essay.” *Contributions to Indian Sociology* 23 (1989) 41–58.

Rāṭhaud, Gajsiṁh. *Jain Dharm kā Maulik Itihās*. Vol. 4. Jaipur: Jain Itihās Samiti, 1987.

Ratna Prabha Vijaya, Muni. *Śramaṇa Bhagavān Mahāvīra, Volume V, Part II, Sthavirāvali*. Ahmedabad: Śrī Jaina Siddhānta Society, 1950.

Roth, Catharine P. “Introduction.” *St. Theodore the Studite, On the Holy Icons*, 7–17. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1981.

Śāh, Ambālāl Premcand. “Prastāvnā.” *Digvijayamahākāvya* of Mahopādhyāya Meghavijayaṅi. Ed. Ambālāl Premcand Śāh. Bombay: Bhāratīya Vidyā Bhavan, 1945 (Singhi Jain Series 14).

Śāh, Kavin. *Kavi Paṇḍit Vīrvijayjī: Ek Adhyayan*. Bombay: Author, 1999.

Sahas, Daniel J. *Icon and Logos: Sources in Eighth-Century Iconoclasm*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986 (Toronto Medieval Texts and Translations 4).

Sudarśanāśrī, Sādhvī. *Ānandghan kā Rahasyavād*. Varanasi: Pārśvanāth Vidyāśram Śodh Saṁsthān, 1984.

Vinayasāgar. “Rājasthān ke Saṁskṛt Mahākavi evaṁ Vicakṣaṇ Pratibhāsampann Granthkār.” *Marudhar Kesarī Muniśrī Miśrīmālī Mahārāj Abhinandan Granth*. Ed. Śobhācandra Bhārill, 372–388. Jodhpur: Marudhar Kesarī Abhinandan Granth Prakāṣan Samiti, 1968.

Weber, Albrecht. “Über den Kupakshakauçikāditya des Dharmasāgara: Streitschrift eines orthodoxen Jaina, vom Jahre 1573.” *Sitzungsberichte der Königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1882) 793-814.