



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Textual Authority in Ritual Procedure

Citation for published version:

Dundas, P 2011, 'Textual Authority in Ritual Procedure: The Śvetāmbara Jain Controversy Concerning Īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa', *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 327-350.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10781-011-9129-9>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1007/s10781-011-9129-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10781-011-9129-9)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Published In:

Journal of Indian Philosophy

Publisher Rights Statement:

© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2011 Dundas, P, 2011, Textual Authority in Ritual Procedure: The Śvetāmbara Jain Controversy Concerning Īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa', *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, vol 39, (no. 3), pp. 327-350. <http://dx.doi.org/> DOI 10.1007/s10781-011-9129-9

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Textual Authority in Ritual Procedure: The Śvetāmbara Jain Controversy Concerning *Īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa*

Paul Dundas

Published online: 28 April 2011
© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2011

Abstract The ceremony of *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* in which a renunciant or lay person repents for any violence inflicted on living creatures during motion is one of the central rituals of Jain disciplinary observance. The correct procedure for this ritual and its connection to *sāmāyika*, temporary contemplative withdrawal, were discussed during the first millennium CE in the Śvetāmbara Āvaśyaka literature. The *Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi* and the *Mahāniśītha Sūtra* offer two alternative orderings, with the former text prescribing that *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* be carried out after *sāmāyika* and the latter text recommending that no religious activity should be engaged in without being preceded by *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa*. The validity of these apparently contradictory ritual structures was debated by Dharmasāgara of the Tapā Gaccha and Jayasoma of the Kharatara Gaccha in the context of intra-Śvetāmbara controversy over scriptural hermeneutics in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Keywords Āvaśyaka · *Pratīkramaṇa* · Repentance · *Sāmāyika* · *Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi* · *Mahāniśītha Sūtra* · Śvetāmbara Jain sectarianism · Dharmasāgara · Jayasoma

According to the fifteenth century Śvetāmbara Jain teacher Ratnaśekharasūri, *pratīkramaṇa*, the ceremony of reflection upon faults committed and subsequent repentance for them, is the very door which leads to deliverance from rebirth.¹ Perhaps not all Jains today would express themselves in such emphatic terms, but there can be no doubt that this particular observance, one of the six Āvaśyaka, or

¹ Ratnaśekharasūri, commentary on *Vandanapratīkramaṇāvacaūri*, p. 42b. In this study, unless otherwise stated, the term ‘Jain’ designates Śvetāmbara *mūrtipūjaka*.

This article is for W.B. Bollée.

P. Dundas (✉)
University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK
e-mail: P.Dundas@ed.ac.uk

‘Obligatory’, acts, which can best be described as modes of ritualised behaviour couched in the form of repeated devotional or disciplinary exercises whose purpose is to effect moral transformation, stands at the centre of regular practice because of its acceptance across Jainism’s sectarian boundaries throughout the tradition’s history. For, at a basic level, the performance of *pratikramaṇa* is regarded as structuring the daily, fortnightly, monthly and annual regimen of renunciants and, at least ideally, the routine behaviour of laypeople.²

Notwithstanding this, the most frequently investigated area of Jain ritual performance in recent years has been image worship. In particular, Humphrey and Laidlaw’s theoretical study of ritual as a general phenomenon based on their examination of the various procedures involved in the performance of Jain *pūjā* has brought this topic to the attention of a wide scholarly audience in disciplines such as anthropology and religious studies which might otherwise have been ignorant of Jainism and this particular dimension of its practice. For Humphrey and Laidlaw, Jain image worship, in which there occurs, at least ostensibly, a particularly wide range of improvisatory activity, is a more productive area for consideration than *pratikramaṇa* which characteristically manifests itself in a form which might be described as ‘tightly scripted’.³ The large number of popular Hindi and Gujarati guides to the performance of *pratikramaṇa* in circulation within the Jain community, which illustrate necessary bodily postures and provide word by word explanations nations of largely unintelligible (to the laity) Prākṛit formulae, no doubt supports Humphrey and Laidlaw’s judgement that this observance is not carried out by lay people as regularly as the prescriptive texts of renunciant origin suggest it ought to be, and that, as a rule, its ritual forms have to be learnt by rote or imitation by most performers. Accordingly, adopting a position based solely on consideration of *pūjā*, Humphrey and Laidlaw argue that repeated observation of actual practice and the reception of relevant information through traditional oral didacticism are more decisive in shaping lay Jain ritual performance than textual authority and learned mediation.⁴

This is unquestionably an attractive and perhaps near inevitable conclusion in the context of a consideration of the physical activities involved in image worship. The variety and apparent spontaneity evinced in the enactment of Jain *pūjā* and the diverse interpretations of its various component parts articulated by participants might well suggest that as a ritual it possesses an almost tangible element of authenticity by comparison with what might appear to be the more predetermined and calculated *pratikramaṇa* observance with its markedly inner orientation as a form of reflection upon action.⁵ The range of procedures observable in any performance of *pūjā*, Humphrey and Laidlaw claim, are not ‘defective forms of the

² Cf. Humphrey and Laidlaw (1994, p. 41) The six Āvaśyakas are *sāmāyika*, temporary contemplative activity; *caturviṃśatistava*, praise of the twenty-four Jinas; *vandanaka*, homage to the teacher; *pratikramaṇa*, repentance; *kāyotsarga*, ‘abandonment of the body’ in a temporarily assumed standing posture; and *pratyakhyāna*, temporary renunciation of eating and other activities. Most Jain lay people only perform *pratikramaṇa* with any degree of commitment at the annual Saṃvatsarī ceremony of communal seeking of forgiveness.

³ For this description, see Laidlaw (1995, p. 204).

⁴ See Humphrey and Laidlaw (1994, p. 200).

⁵ Cf. Bruhn (1981, p. 21).

narrated model, but more like a reshuffling of the pack of ritual acts',⁶ whereas *pratikramaṇa*, which is described by its performants 'almost exclusively in terms of the effects it has',⁷ affords no real space for individual improvisation. Nonetheless, as a wider interpretation of Jain ritual, Humphrey and Laidlaw's *pījā*-derived generalisations might well be held to be deficient owing to an underrating of the role of learned specialists throughout the history of Jainism in guiding and reinforcing the conduct of formalised religious observance by means of interpretation and manipulation of authoritative textual evidence, very often as part of the strategy involved in shaping sectarian allegiances.⁸

It is in the nature of things near impossible to conclude to what extent customary practice in Jainism has been determined by textual prescription or vice versa, and of course Humphrey and Laidlaw are describing Jain image worship in its contemporary context. However, it would be difficult for any informed student of Jainism in its historical round as an evolving system of knowledge and practice to reject the likelihood of decisive influence being exerted on the actual performance of rituals such as *caityavandana*, that is, temple- and image-oriented devotion and worship, and *pratikramaṇa*. Centuries of renunciant scrutiny of the *Āvaśyaka Sūtra* (ca. fifth cen. CE), the main codification of Śvetāmbara Jain liturgy, generated a substantial body of exegetical material of varying sorts which is the central resource for an understanding of the historical development of the procedures and purposes of ritual in Jainism.⁹ A product of intellectual reflection and organisation by medieval monastic intellectuals this *Āvaśyaka* literature may well be, but it would surely be injudicious to neglect to incorporate its perspectives into any consideration of Jain ritual which has pretensions to be thorough.

This study, then, is avowedly a contribution to the study of the *Āvaśyaka* literature in the broadest sense by addressing late examples of this pervasive textual phenomenon which relate to ritual performance. It focuses on one particular aspect, or perhaps sub-type, of *pratikramaṇa*, namely *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa*, the act of repentance for injury to living creatures caused by walking, and its positioning within the broader structure of observance of the *Āvaśyakas*.¹⁰ Specifically, I will consider the dispute which emerged in the sixteenth century as to whether *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa* as a purificatory ritual determining the moral quality of subsequent actions necessarily precedes or succeeds *sāmāyika*, the *Āvaśyaka* observance of temporary contemplative withdrawal. The study will thus also supplement the discussion of Śvetāmbara Jain polemics between the rival renunciant disciplinary orders, the Kharatara Gaccha and the Tapā Gaccha, adumbrated by me elsewhere.¹¹

⁶ Humphrey and Laidlaw (1994, p. 140).

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

⁸ Cf. Gengnagel, et al. (2005, p. 16–17). Note, however, that in Jainism learned monastic specialists would have been disbarred from the actual physical performance of image worship.

⁹ See Balbir (1993) and Bruhn (1981).

¹⁰ *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa* is occasionally taken as standing for *pratikramaṇa* per se. For the various types of *pratikramaṇa*, see *Āvaśyaka Sūtra* section 4 and cf. Caillat (1975, p. 134).

¹¹ Dundas (2007).

By way of introduction I now provide some contextualisation of the historical background and purpose of the observance to be discussed.

Pratikramaṇa and Īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa

The literal meaning of Prākṛit *paḍikkamaṇa*, the form underlying Sanskrit *pratikramaṇa*, is ‘going back’, signifying a return from evil action to a state of moral probity.¹² In this sense, accepted throughout Jain tradition, the term can be regarded as having been located at the outset within a similar semantic space to, as well as sharing an approximate linguistic shape with, the Buddhist expressions *pāṭimokkha* (the Pāli equivalent of Sanskrit *prātimokṣa*), which with its possible original sense of ‘purgative’¹³ implies a restoration of ethical equilibrium (in this case among the renunciant community), and *paṭikamma*, ‘atonement’.¹⁴ More generally, *pratikramaṇa* involves inner examination and self-criticism conjoined with a predetermined liturgical recitation which acknowledges transgressions towards other creatures and provides an expiation for these in the form of a request for forgiveness. As such, *pratikramaṇa* can be regarded as a variety of observance qua disciplinary exercise which, like comparable practices in other religious traditions, at once both shapes and transforms moral disposition.¹⁵ However, while it most significantly relates to an inner state of awareness, *pratikramaṇa* possesses enough observable formal aspects (e.g. use of liturgy, an iterative performative structure) to justify it being termed a ritual as generally understood by scholarship.¹⁶

Some early Jain canonical texts assert that the followers of Pārśva, regarded as the twenty-third Jina of this time cycle, were unfamiliar with *pratikramaṇa*,¹⁷ and it has been claimed that the introduction of this observance was part of a reform of practice initiated by the twenty-fourth Jina, Mahāvīra.¹⁸ Leaving aside the

¹² Cf. Caillat (1975, p. 133), Kalyāṇavijaya (1973, p. 5) and Sukhlalji (1993, p. 3).

¹³ See Gombrich (1991).

¹⁴ See *Pali-English Dictionary* 1952: s.v. *paṭikamma* and also *paṭikaroti*, for which Attwood (2008, pp. 283, 291) plausibly suggests ‘counteracts’ as the most satisfactory rendering in early Buddhist texts.

¹⁵ Cf. Asad (1993, p. 134).

¹⁶ Cf. Flügel (1994, p. 510). According to Asad (1993, p. 62), ‘Ritual is....directed at the apt performance of what is prescribed, something that depends on intellectual and practical disciplines but does not itself require decoding.’

¹⁷ *Sūtrakṛtāṅga Sūtra*, 2.7 sū. 872. According to *Sūtrakṛtāṅga Sūtra* 2.2 non-Jains were distinguished by their failure to perform *pratikramaṇa* and *ālocanā*, ‘confession’. The relative frequency in the Ardhamāgadhī canon of the phrase *āloiyā-ppaḍikkamta*, ‘confessed and repented’, suggests that originally *pratikramaṇa* was not performed without the attendant confessional ritual of *ālocanā*. See Ohira (1994, pp. 158–159). Canonical works legislating for renunciant behaviour such as the *Kalpa* and *Vyavahāra Sūtras*, which may date from around the third-first cens. BCE, do not refer to *pratikramaṇa* as an independent ritual. See Caillat (1975, p. 133).

¹⁸ However, Professor Bansidhar Bhatt in a public lecture at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, March 11, 2009, has convincingly demonstrated the dubiety of any genuinely historical Pārśva tradition and the unlikelihood of any connection between Mahāvīra and a predecessor of this sort.

impossibility of identifying a precise historical point of origin for *pratikramaṇa*, it might be more appropriate to view the observance as having represented early in the development of Jainism a form of ascetic repentance imposed at intervals as a penitential expiation or atonement psychologically necessary for a renunciant movement which from its inception was uneasy about the near inevitability of infringements of the fundamental vow of non-violence entailed by basic physical actions which could lead to the destruction, whether inadvertent or not, of life forms of all sorts. It might then be understood as having been gradually ritualised within a group of regularly practised vow-like obligatory actions incumbent on renunciants and lay people as indicators of Jain sectarian identity.¹⁹ The liturgy for *pratikramaṇa*, which in some form may go back to near the beginning of Jainism, gradually became embedded within an extended textual structure which was given final shape by around the fifth century CE within the *Āvaśyaka Sūtra*,²⁰ a compilation which was both a product and a source of dogmatic and ritualistic developments relating to the *Āvaśyakas*.²¹ The importance of *pratikramaṇa* within the *Āvaśyakas* was such that, as well as being an independent ritual, many commentators regarded it as standing by synecdoche for all six observances.²²

The Prākṛit expression *iriyāvahiḃyā* signifies ‘relating to the path of (disciplined/controlled) movement’ and can be identified in early Jainism as the first of the five ‘rules of conduct’ (*samiti*) which enjoins the exercise of full attention in respect to

¹⁹ A significant example of the laity’s involvement in *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa* which is regularly referred to by later writers occurs at *Bhagavatī Sūtra* 12.1 where the layman Pokkhali, who is visiting another layman, Saṃkha, who is engaged in austerities within a communal fasting hall, ‘performs *pratikramaṇa* for his going and returning’ (*gamaṇāgamaṇāe paḍikkamaī*) prior to entering. See footnote 64. Lay *pratikramaṇa* is described as being located within other disciplinary activities at *Bhagavatī Sūtra* 8.5.2. See Deleu (1970, p. 292) and cf. Ohira (1994, pp. 1 and 22) for the date of the core of the *Bhagavatī Sūtra* to around the first cen. BCE–third cen. CE. While it remains an open question as to whether material relating to lay performance was incorporated into the *Āvaśyaka Sūtra* at a later stage of its consolidation (cf. Balbir 1993, p. 35), Jain tradition itself voiced no serious doubts about *pratikramaṇa* and the *Āvaśyakas* in general being carried out by laymen. See *Anuyogadvārasūtra*, 29 v. 3 p. 80: *samaṇeṇa sāvaṇeṇa ya avassakāyavayaṇi havati jamhā/amto aho-nisissa u tamhā āvassayam nāma*. The fourteenth century Kulamaṇḍanasūri, *Vicārāmṛtasārasaṃgraha*, p. 57, refers to a number of teachers who confirm that *pratikramaṇa* is performed by laymen.

²⁰ See Ohira (1994, p. 11) for the independent development of its chapters. *Uttarādhyāyana Sūtra* 26.42 and 50 refers to the performance of *pratikramaṇa*. However, Ohira (1994, p. 1) does not regard this as belonging to the oldest stage of the scriptural canon.

²¹ Cf. Bruhn (1981, p. 21) for the *Āvaśyaka Sūtra* as a text which emerged both in the context of ritual and for ritual. Ohira (1994, p. 5) views the ‘process of ritual making’ as having taken place decisively in the fourth–fifth centuries CE.

²² See, for example, Kulamaṇḍanasūri, *Vicārāmṛtasārasaṃgraha*, p. 55 and Cf. Sukhlalji (1993, pp. 8 and 17) and Laidlaw (1995, p. 198) for the contemporary situation. However, the salience of *sāmāyika* within the other *Āvaśyakas* suggests that it can be regarded as the most important of these observances. Cf. Balbir (1993, p. 35).

walking or general movement (*iriyā*).²³ While it is no doubt noteworthy that this expression was to be employed within the Ardhamāgadhī canon to designate correct renunciant behaviour, to be contrasted with *saṃparāiya*, ‘dangerous’, that behaviour which is followed by the non-renunciant,²⁴ for our purposes it is the linkage of *iriyāvahiya* with the observance of repentance as eventually formalised within the *Āvaśyaka Sūtra* which is significant, with the former term, whether or not taken in conjunction with the term *virāhaṇā*, ‘harming’, coming to signify ‘violence committed while engaged in physical movement’.²⁵ The relevant formula for *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* (using the Sanskrit expression henceforth; the form *airyāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* is also found) occurs in the fourth section of the *Āvaśyaka Sūtra*, the so-called *paḍikkamaṇasutta* (which is itself divided into four sections relating to the main potential areas of infringement in the renunciant regime),²⁶ under the Prākṛit rubric given in the Jaina-Āgama-Series edition of *gamaṇāgamaṇāīyārapaḍikkamaṇasuttaṃ*, ‘Sūtra of repentance for infringements relating to going and coming’:

*icchāmi paḍikkamiṃ iriyāvahiyaē virāhaṇāe gamaṇāgamaṇe pāṇakkamaṇe
bīyakkamaṇe hariyakkamaṇe osāuttiṃgapaṇagadagamaṭṭimakkadāsaṃtāṇāsa-
mkkamaṇe, je me jīvā virāhiyā egiṃdiyā beṃdiyā teṃdiyā caurimdiyā*

²³ See *Uttarādhyāyana Sūtra* 24.4–24.8. *Daśavaikālika Sūtra* 5.1.87–89 makes clear what was most likely the original context of *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa*, namely the necessity of a monk to purify himself from the inevitable violence caused by alms seeking. This passage presents *iriyāvahiya/īryāpathikī* in terms of a general formula (described below) which is then followed by a specific act of *pratīkramaṇa* for the transgressions committed during this particular occasion of the alms round:

*siyā ya bhikkhu icchejjā sejjam āgamma bhottuyam/sapiṇḍapāyam āgamma uḍuyam paḍilehiyā.
viṇaṇeṇa pavisitā sagāse guruṇo muṇi/iriyāvahiyaṃ āyāya āgao ya paḍikkame.
ābhoettāna nīsesaṃ aiyāraṃ jahakkamaṃ/gamaṇāgamaṇe ceva bhattapāṇe va saṃjāe.*

‘Supposing that the monk should wish to eat after having come back to his quarters, he should, having returned with the collected alms, duly inspect it, come in respectfully to [the place] where [his] Guru is [seated], approach with the *airyāpathikī*-formula and, bowing down, in due order, without concealing anything, confess any transgression which he might have been guilty of during his going or returning or his collecting food and drink’ (Schubring 1977, p. 211).

In his commentary Haribhadra explains (p. 120) the phrase *iriyāvahiyaṃ āyāya* as signifying recitation of the formula beginning ‘*icchāmi paḍikkamiṃ iriyāvahiyaē*’ (see below).

²⁴ See Jacobi (1895, p. 364, n. 2), Johnson (1995, pp. 41–44) and Ohira (1994, pp. 142 and 144–145).

²⁵ The *Āvaśyaka Cūrni*, Vol. 2, p. 72 ll. 2–8, delineates the connection between *īryāpathikī* and violence as follows:

*....esa saṃbaṃdho iriyāvahiyaē, icchāmi paḍikkamituṃ iriyāvahiyaē virāhaṇāe,’ īra gatapre-
raṇayoḥ’ īraṇāṃ īryā gamaṇam ity arthaḥ etto jātā pathikā, īraṇe pathikā iriyāvahiyaē, ko ‘saul
virādhana, ite gacchantassa pathi jā kā virādhana tā iriyāvahiya. icchāmi paḍikkamituṃ ti
puvvabhaṇitaṃ, esa saṃkhevatho iriyāvahiyaē, vistaratas tu gamaṇetyādi, tattha iriyāvah-
iyāvīrādhanaṃ evaṃ gamaṇaṃ aṇṇattha, gaṇtuṃ acchati, pāḍhādi kareti na vā, gatvā paḍucca
taṃ tattha paḍikkamati, āgamaṇe jaṃ tato niyyatati, tattha vi paḍikkamati, taṃ hi gamaṇāgamaṇe
jaṃ pāṇakkamaṇaṃ kataṃ, bīyakkamaṇaṃ vā kataṃ, pāṇaggahaṇeṇa beṃdiyādi sūyitā, bīya-
ggahaṇeṇaṃ bījā jīvā, na nijīvā, evaṃ ihāvitam bhavati, haritakkamaṇeṇaṃ vaṇapphatikāyo
sūito.*

This explanation is followed by the authoritative *Śrāddhapratīkramaṇasūtravṛtti*, also known as the *Vandāruvṛtti*, p. 13b, of Devendrasūri (thirteenth century). See also Kulamaṇḍanasūri, *Vicā-rāṃṭasārasaṃgraha*, p. 51, for *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* having as its sphere of reference the first renunciant vow of non-violence.

²⁶ See Balbir (1993, p. 36).

*pañcimdyā abhihayā vattiyā lesiyā saṃghāyā saṃghaṭṭiyā pariyāviyā kilā-miyā uddaviyā ṭhāṇāo ṭhāṇaṃ saṃkāmiyā jīviyāo vavaroviyā tassa micchā mi dukkaḍaṃ.*²⁷

‘I want to make *pratikramaṇa* for injury on the path of my movement, in coming and in going, in treading on living things, in treading on seeds, in treading on green plants, in treading on dew, on beetles, on mould, on moist earth, and on cobwebs; whatever living organisms with one or two or three or four or five senses have been injured by me or knocked over or crushed or squashed or touched or mangled or hurt or affrighted or removed from one place to another or deprived of life—may all that evil have been done in vain.’²⁸

There is no reference to the status of the agent in this formula, whereas a monk is manifestly the agent in the third section describing homage to the teacher (*van-dana*), while a layman is the agent in the sixth section describing abandonment (*pratyākhyāna*) of inappropriate entities which might lead to future erroneous behaviour.²⁹ However, as will be seen, later textual discussion came to consider *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa* almost exclusively in terms of its position in lay practice.

Authoritative Source Texts for the Dispute Concerning *Īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa*

Caityavandana, the nexus of devotional, ritual and contemplative activities performed in some variety of shrine and oriented towards an image of the Jina, combines elements of at least three of the Āvaśyakas³⁰ and was accordingly one of

²⁷ Text slightly regularised. The Jaina-Āgama-Series edition has, no doubt as a misprint, a *daṇḍa* for ‘*mi*’ at the conclusion of the formula.

²⁸ Williams (1963, p. 204). See also Cort (1995, p. 328) and Sukhlalji (1993, p. 26). The circumstances dictating the performance of *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa* are summed up at *Āvaśyaka Niryukti* v. 1533: *gamaṇāgamaṇavihāre* [Śāṃṭipūrī ed v. 1548. *gamaṇāgamaṇa vihāre*] *sutte vā sumiṇadamsaṇe rāo/nāvā naisaṃtāre* [Mumbai and Śāṃṭipūrī eds. *nāvānaisaṃtāre*] *iriyāvahiyaḍḍikkamaṇaṃ*. My translation of the first line is tentative and partly against Haribhadra’s commentary: ‘In respect to going, coming and (random) proceeding, or in respect (to movement when) sleeping, in respect to having a dream (involving violence) during the night, with respect to crossing a river by boat, *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa* (should be performed)’. In his commentary Haribhadra states that after *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa kāyotsarga* must be performed for 25 breaths. A variant of this verse occurs at *Vyavahārabhāṣyapīṭhikā*, v. 110 where for *–vihāre* there occurs *–viyāre*, ‘voiding the bowels’, and for *iriyāvahiyaḍḍikkamaṇaṃ* there occurs *pāyachchitaṃ viussaggo*, ‘*kāyotsarga* should be performed as expiation’.

The phrase *gamaṇāgamaṇa* is taken by later writers as effectively a synonym for *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa*. Thus Kulamaṇḍanasūri, *Vicārāṃṭṣārasaṃgraha* p. 55, interprets it as occurring at *Bhagavati Sūtra* 12. 1 (see footnote 19), although it is not explicitly referred to: *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇasya gamaṇāgamaṇaśabdena Bhagavatyāṃ śāṅkhopakhyaṇake Puṣkaliśrāvakaḥkṛtatvena darśitavāt, gamaṇāgamaṇaśabdasya ceryāpathikīparyāyatayā Bhagavatyāṃ eva teṣu teṣu ākhyānakeṣu ca prasiddhatvāt*.

²⁹ Cf. Balbir (1993, pp. 34–35).

³⁰ Cf. Williams (1963, 18) for *caityavandana* containing elements of *samāyika*, *caturviṃśatistava* and *vandanaka*. The term *caitya* most broadly indicates a locus of sacrality and in this context can denote a shrine or the image housed within it.

the main areas of interest of the Āvaśyaka literature as it expanded.³¹ Most likely, consideration of the ritual role of *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* became more focussed in this particular area where the laity was particularly involved by dint of their necessary regular walking or being conveyed from home to temple and so moved further away from its original context of renunciant alms-seeking.³² It is no doubt predictable that *caityavandana* should involve some kind of preparatory inner-oriented ritual to complement such obvious physical requirements as bodily cleanliness and the wearing of fresh clothes, and indeed standard practice for the extended form of this mode of worship did in fact come to require the preliminary performance of *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa*.³³ But what is the relationship between *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* and the performance of *sāmāyika*, the period of contemplative activity whereby the layman can temporarily replicate what is, at least ideally, the lifelong demeanour of the monk, and which is conceived of as one of the most important, if not the most important of the Āvaśyakas, occupying a salient position in *caityavandana*?³⁴ Does *sāmāyika* itself, and indeed the other Āvaśyakas, require preliminary moral purification?

Three main sources, dating from the first millennium CE and regularly invoked as authorities in subsequent considerations of lay behaviour, can be identified as fundamental for the question of the relationship between *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* and *sāmāyika*, as well as other devotional and disciplinary activities. While none of these falls into the category of early scripture, with two in fact being commentarial, all were regarded by Śvetāmbara intellectuals as *āgama*, part of authoritative textual tradition.

The first source occurs in the *Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi* (Āv Cū), the earliest prose commentary to be found within the exegetical literature which took shape around the *Āvaśyaka Sūtra*, which is usually dated to the seventh century because of its traditional association with Jinadāsa.³⁵ The passage in question is to be found in the section devoted to the ‘vows of instruction’ (*śikṣāvratā*) and relates to the performance of the disciplinary exercise of *sāmāyika*.³⁶ Here the Āv Cū describes the

³¹ This material built upon Haribhadra’s *Lalitavistara* commentary on the *Caityavandana Sūtra* which is virtually identical with a portion of the fifth *kāyotsarga* section of the *Āvaśyaka Sūtra*. See Bruhn (1981, pp. 31–32).

³² See, for example, the *Ceyyavaṃḍana mahābhāsa* of Śāntisūri (eleventh century) which analyses (vv. 364–372) the structure, meaning and purpose of the *īryāpathikīsūtra*, describing it as being uttered as an act of repentance taken in front of the renunciant teacher or an image of the Jina (v. 365).

³³ Devendrasūri, *Śrāddhadīnakṛtya* v. 29, pp. 51ff, describes the ‘traditional’ (*sampradāyat*) procedure of the ‘complete’ (*utkrāṣṭa*) *caityavandana* necessarily being preceded by *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa*. See also Devendrasuri’s pupil Dharmakīrti’s commentary *Saṅghācāravidhi* on his teacher’s *Caityavandanabhāṣya*, p. 243. Cf. Williams (1963, p. 198) where this form of *caityavandana* is designated ‘best’ (*uttama*) as opposed to the ‘next best’ (*madhyama*) and ‘least satisfactory’ (*jaghanya*).

³⁴ The *sāmāyasutta*, the declarative formula enunciated prior to the performance of *sāmāyika*, which is represented by section two of the *Āvaśyaka Sūtra*, is also integrated into the *pratīkramaṇa* section. Cf. Balbir (1993, p. 35). See also Jaini for a useful, if largely Digambara, perspective on *sāmāyika*. Jaini (2000).

³⁵ To be precise, the Āv Cū is a commentary on the mnemonic verses (*niryukti*) on the *Āvaśyaka Sūtra*. Cf. Balbir (1993, pp. 81–82).

³⁶ Āv Cū, vol. 2, p. 299. While the passage no doubt derives from a monastic author, the context is very much that of lay practice; Jain monks do not formally perform *sāmāyika*, since the life of the initiated renunciant is regarded as being the continual enactment of that particular observance. See Williams (1963, p. 131).

various procedures and mental dispositions involved when a layman of modest means (*aṇiḍḍhipatto*) (to be contrasted with the prosperous or aristocratic layman whose religious activities involve more public ceremony) sets out with a view to performing *sāmāyika* in the presence of monks. Firstly the *Āv Cū* refers to the performance of *sāmāyika* itself, reproducing its liturgical formula in abbreviated form,³⁷ and then proceeds to stipulate that ‘if there are any sacred places or images (in the vicinity), then he (i.e. the layman) should pay homage to them first’ (*jai cetiyāim atthi to paḍhamaṃ vaṃdati*). After this, taking a whisk or covering his mouth with the edge of a cloth, actions emblematic of non-violence,³⁸ ‘he then performs *pratikramaṇa* for/because of violence brought about by walking (to the presence of the monks)’ (*pacchā iriyāvahiyaē paḍikkamai*). On completion of this, having confessed (*āloittā*), the layman pays homage to the teacher and the other monks according to precedence (*jahāratnikatayā*). Having offered homage to the teacher once again, he sits down after carefully inspecting the ground for life forms and either asks suitable religious questions or devotes himself to the study of a scriptural text. If there are no monks or images accessible, the *Āv Cū* states, the layman can still perform *sāmāyika* at home or in a fasting hall.³⁹

In prescribing the correct procedure for the performance of *sāmāyika*, the *Āv Cū* undoubtedly presents *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa* as being carried out after (*pacchā*) that particular disciplinary exercise. However, the immediacy of the connection between the two components of what must be regarded as an extended ritual structure is interrupted by the introduction of the possibility of a variant context, namely the presence of sacred places or objects requiring an act of worship which accordingly takes place between *sāmāyika* and *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa*.

The second source occurs at *Mahāniśītha Sūtra* (MNS) 3.26.⁴⁰ This text, which today may exist in a form only approximate to a lost or superseded original, dates from around the eighth or ninth century. Although the authenticity of the MNS was deemed suspect by many medieval Śvetāmbara teachers and is regarded as an apocryphal scripture by modern scholarship, it was emphatically viewed as authoritative by both the Tapā and Kharatara Gacchas, the renunciant orders which were to debate most intensely over the question of *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa*.⁴¹ The passage in question represents the most extended source from the first millennium CE outside the *Āvaśyaka* literature for the moral circumstances conditioning the performance of *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa*. It presents Mahāvīra as informing his

³⁷ *karemi bhaṃte sāmāyiaṃ-duvihaṃ tivihenaṃ jāva sāhūpajjuvāsāmitti*. For the full formula, see *Āvaśyaka Sūtra* p. 42 and cf. Williams (1993, p. 132).

³⁸ *sāhūṇaṃ sagāsāto rayaharaṇaṃ nisejjaṃ vā maggati, aha ghare to se oggahitaṃ rayaharaṇaṃ atthi, tassa asati pottassa aṃṇaṃ*.

³⁹ The *Āv Cū*’s description is replicated by Haribhadra (ca. eighth century) in his commentary on the *Āvaśyaka Nirukti*, vol. 2, p. 228. Cf. Williams (1993, p. 33). However, Haribhadra omits the stipulation ‘*jai cetiyāim atthi...*’, a point not unnoticed by later writers. See footnote 60. As mentioned below, the polemicist Dharmasāgara offers a controversial interpretation of *pacchā iriyāvahiyaē paḍikkamai*. See footnotes 61 and 74.

⁴⁰ See the edition and translation by Deleu in Deleu and Schubring (1963, pp. 63, 137–138) and the edition by Puṇyavijaya and Pagariya, pp. 52–3.

⁴¹ See Dundas (2007, pp. 83–85).

disciple Gautama that unwillingness or inability to acknowledge harm done to living creatures could compromise intentness upon significant forms of observance such as temple worship (*ciivamḍaṇa*) and scriptural study (*sajjhāya*) which lead to diminution of karma. In a style modelled on the *Cheda Sūtras*, the canonical texts prescribing correct renunciant behaviour, Mahāvīra concludes his sermon thus:

So, Gautama, if one has not performed *pratikramaṇa* for violence caused by moving, it is not fitting for those wishing to enjoy the fruits of religious action to engage in any activity such as worship in temples, study of the scriptures and so on (*tā Goyamā ṇaṃ appaḍikkantāe iriyāvahiyaē na kappai ceva kāuṃ kiṃci ciivamḍaṇasajjhāyāyaṃ phalāsāyaṃ abhikankhugāṇaṃ*).⁴²

The third source can be regarded as a brief ancillary confirmation of the point made by the MNS, although chronologically it may actually antedate that work. In his commentary on *Dasavaikālika Sūtra*, *cūlikā* 2 v. 7b, which states that a monk should regularly practise the sixth Āvaśyaka of *kāyotsarga*, the ascetic restraint of ‘abandoning the body’, and devote himself to scriptural study,⁴³ Haribhadra (ca. eighth century) comments, ‘The implication of the expression ‘He should practise *kāyotsarga*’ is that (the monk) should not undertake anything else without performing *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa* since that action would be rendered impure’ (*‘kāyotsargakārī bhavet’ īryāpratikramaṇam akṛtvā na kiṃcid anyat kuryāt, tadaśuddhatāpattāv iti bhāvah*).⁴⁴

Neither the MNS nor Haribhadra’s commentary on the *Dasavaikālika Sūtra* make any reference to lay practice and do not refer specifically to the performance of *sāmāyika*. However, they do offer the general judgement that any religious action or devotional exercise must be prefaced by *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa* in order to be efficacious.

To sum up. The Āv Cū prescribes that *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa* must be performed after *sāmāyika*, with the proviso that if there are any temples or images in the vicinity, worship should first be offered to them. The MNS and Haribhadra, on the other hand, stipulate that no religious activity should be engaged in without *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa* being a preliminary to it.

Early Sectarian Perspectives on *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa*

The evidence suggests that originally there was broadly standardised practice in the performance of the various types of *pratikramaṇa* throughout the Śvetāmbara Jain community. However, some time towards the end of the second half of the first millennium CE there appears to have emerged some sort of *Pratikramaṇa Sūtra*, a manual of regular and general religious observance for the specific use of the laity.

⁴² Later writers often cite this passage with the reading *ciivamḍaṇasajjhāyājhāṇāyaṃ*, that is, including meditation (*jhāna*) as one of the relevant religious activities. See, for example, Dharmakīrti’s *Saṅghācāravidhi* commentary on Devendrasūri’s *Caityavandanamahābhāṣya*, p. 182 and Ratnaśekharasūri, *Śrāddhavidhiprakaraṇa* (see footnote 54).

⁴³ *abhikkhaṇaṃ kāussaggakārī sajjhāyajoge payao havijjā*.

⁴⁴ Haribhadra, commentary on *Dasavaikālika Sūtra*, p. 188 ll.3–4.

Of indeterminate origin, partly deriving from the *Āvaśyaka Sūtra* and partly introducing new material,⁴⁵ and with its canonical status seemingly disputed frequently,⁴⁶ this text eventually evolved into a wide range of differing versions among the various Śvetāmbara image-worshipping *gacchas*, or renunciant orders, which appeared after 1000 CE.⁴⁷ It was at this time that there also commenced the proliferation of lengthy texts produced by monks to legislate for lay observance (*śrāvā-kācāra*) within their particular sectarian lineages.⁴⁸

It would appear that most of the *gacchas* invoked the Āv Cū to support the practice of performing *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* after the enunciation of the formula declaring the intention to carry out *sāmāyika*.⁴⁹ Certainly this ritual sequence was maintained from the outset by the Kharatara Gaccha,⁵⁰ and an inspection of some other significant Śvetāmbara works dating from around 1000–1300 confirms that the

⁴⁵ See Bruhn (1981, p. 31) and Kalyāṇavijaya (1973, pp. 7–8) who refers to the absence of a specifically lay *pratīkramaṇa* ritual in codified form before the middle of the tenth century, and cf. Folkert (1993, 91–94).

⁴⁶ The *Pratīkramaṇa Sūtra* seems to have been regularly stigmatised as non-canonical (a position rejected by Devendrasūri, *Śrāddhadīnakṛtya* 6.235 autocomm. p. 67) and its authorship was attributed to a potter (reported by *Guruttavpradīpa* 6.18). Kulamaṇḍanasūri, *Vicārāmṛtsārasaṃgraha* pp. 55–57, argues for the anonymity of its authorship and its status as *āgama*.

⁴⁷ See Kalyāṇavijaya (1973, pp. 8–10).

⁴⁸ See Williams (1963, p. 1). Texts on lay orthopraxy were of course produced in the first millennium CE, but they lack the amplitude of those composed after 1000 CE.

⁴⁹ See Kalyāṇavijaya (1973, pp. 8–10).

⁵⁰ See, for example, Jinadattasūri, *Sandehadolāvalīprakaraṇa* v. 65, with Prabodhacandra's commentary, pp. 91b–92b. The *Sandehadolāvalīprakaraṇa* consists of replies given by Jinadattasūri (twelfth century), one of the most important of the early teachers of the Kharatara Gaccha, to a series of questions concerning practice. Jinadattasūri is asked about a possible situation in which, after the *sāmāyika* formula has been uttered, for some reason there comes about injury (*phusaṇa*) to some minute life form. His reply is that confession should be carried out (*ālojjā*) which thus ensures that the performance of *sāmāyika* is not invalidated for the layman (*bhaṅgo se natthi sāmāe*). The commentator Prabodhacandra (thirteenth cen.) amplifies this assessment by explaining that if there has taken place any chance destructive contact with a life form such as a fire-bodied organism (*tejaskāya*), then *sāmāyika* itself should not be repeated but *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* should be carried out again, after which confession should be performed in front of one's teacher and whatever penance (*prāyaścitta*) he imposes be accepted. The implication here is that *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* has already been performed after *sāmāyika*. Prabodhacandra goes on to refer to the Āv Cū and the *vṛtti* (that is, Haribhadra's commentary on the *Āvaśyaka Niryukti*) as authorities for *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* being performed after *sāmāyika*. He disposes of the possible objection that because the *sāmāyika* formula is technically *siddhānta*, a scriptural text, through being composed (*praṇīta*) by the *gaṇadharas*, the disciples of the Jina, recitation of it is consequently inappropriate if *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* has not been first performed, let alone actual performance of *sāmāyika*. Prabodhacandra claims that in that case infinite regression of *pratīkramaṇa* would be entailed, presumably because the *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* formula is part of the *Āvaśyaka Sūtra* and is therefore itself *siddhānta*.

See also Jinaprabhasūri's fifteenth century manual of customary practice for the Kharatara Gaccha, the *Vidhimārgaprapā* p. 6 (*Sāmāyaggahaṇapāraṇavihi*) which advocates *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* being performed after *sāmāyika*.

sequence was mandatory in customary practice elsewhere.⁵¹ Particularly noteworthy, as later Kharatara polemicists were to point out, is the prescription of this sequence on the basis of the *Āv Cū* by Devendrasūri (thirteenth century), one of the earliest and most influential Tapā Gaccha teachers, in his highly authoritative conspectus of lay behaviour, the *Śrāddhadīnakṛtya*.⁵² Another prominent Tapā Gaccha teacher, Ratnaśekharasūri, who was leader of the order in the fifteenth century, gives in the second chapter of his manual of lay behaviour, the *Śrāddhavidhiprakaṛaṇa*, the sequence of the performance of the six *Āvaśyakas* at the morning and evening twilight times (*sandhyā*) as *sāmāyika*, *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa*, *kāyotsarga*, *caturvīṃsatistava*, *vandana* and *pratyākhyāna*.⁵³

However, Ratnaśekharasūri elsewhere refers to the authority of the MNS as justifying the performance of *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* prior to *sāmāyika* in the presence of the teacher, which is then followed by what he styles simply *pratīkramaṇa*, signifying by his account the sixfold *Āvaśyaka*.⁵⁴ It is this apparent variation in the prescription of practice concerning the location of *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* with regard to *sāmāyika* and the hermeneutics required to confirm the basic authority and consistency of the *Āv Cū* and the MNS which lay at the heart of a dispute between the Kharatara and Tapā Gacchas which gained momentum in the second half of the sixteenth century.

The Tapā Gaccha Defence of the Priority of *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa*

The first identifiable Tapā Gaccha polemical text, the *Gurutattvapradīpa*, which dates from the thirteenth century, asserts as a broad principle in the course of a rejection of the claims of the Tristutika Gaccha that *sāmāyika* cannot be engaged in if *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* has not already been carried out, quoting in support the MNS which, as we have seen, stipulates that no act of worship, study or any other

⁵¹ See Abhayadevasūri (eleventh century), commentary on Haribhadra, *Pañcāśakapraṛaṇa* 1.15, p. 23a: *evaṃ sāmāyikaṃ kṛtvāyāṃ pratīkrānto vanditvā pṛcchati vā paṭhati vā*, Hemacandra (eleventh cen.), *Yogaśāstra* 3.82 autocomm. p. 479b: *... tadā svagr̥he 'pi sāmāyikaṃ kṛtvā īryāṃ śodhayan sāvādyāṃ bhāṣāṃ pariharān*; and p. 482a: *evaṃ kṛtasāmāyika īryāpathikīyāḥ pratīkrāmāti paścād gamānam ālocya yathājyeṣṭham ācāryādīn vandate...*; and Yaśodeva (twelfth cen.) who in commenting on Devagupta, *Navapadapraṛaṇa* v. 95, pp. 242b–243a largely gives a Sanskrit version of the *Āv Cū* (*Āvaśyakacūṇyādyuktasāmācārī tv iyam*) for the sequence 'homage to monks, *sāmāyika*, *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* and *ālocanā*'.

⁵² Devendrasūri, *Śrāddhadīnakṛtya* 6. 231 autocomm. p. 62: *sādhusāṣikāṃ punaḥ sāmāyikaṃ kṛtvā īryāṃ pratīkrāmāyāgamānam ālocayet*. Devendrasūri follows this (pp. 63–65) with a full citation of the *Āv Cū* to confirm the complete procedure for the performance (*vidhi*) of *sāmāyika*.

⁵³ Ratnaśekharasūri, *Śrāddhavidhiprakaṛaṇa* p. 394: *sāmāyikaṃ kṛtvā [sic] īryāṃ pratīkrāmāya kāyotsargaṃ ca vidhāya caturvīṃsatistavaṃ bhaṇitvā vandanaṃ ca datvā Śrāvakaḥ pratyākhyānaṃ karoti iti ṣaḍvidhatvam*.

⁵⁴ Ratnaśekharasūri, commentary on *Vandanapratīkramaṇāvacūri* pp. 19b–20a: *sāmāyikakaraṇāya gṛhītarajoharaṇanāmuḥapotiḥ suśrāvakaḥ 'Goyamā, apadikkamīṭe iriyāvahiyāe na kappai kiṅci cīvaṃdaṇasajjhāyijhānāṇāṃ kām ityādi Mahānīśīthavacanāt prathama īryāpathikīṇ pratīkrāmāya samyagvidhinā gurvādisākṣikāṃ sāmāyikāṃ nirmāya tataḥ ṣaḍāvaśyakalakṣaṇaṃ pratīkramaṇam kurvānaḥ...* For *pratīkramaṇa* as equivalent to all six *Āvaśyakas*, see footnote 22.

religious activity can take place without being preceded by this disciplinary exercise.⁵⁵ Through its argumentative tone and strategy the *Gurutattvapradīpa* was a major inspiration for Dharmasāgara (died 1599), the most vociferous advocate of the claims of the Tapā Gaccha to be the central lineage in Jainism, and it was this particular monastic intellectual who adumbrated a fully argued defence of the necessary ritual priority of *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa*.⁵⁶

The main components of Dharmasāgara's argument are set out in his earliest work, the *Tattvatarāṅginī*, which was written in 1558. They are as follows: (1) It is a doctrinal principle (*pravacana*) that *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa* stands in a causal relationship to *sāmāyika* and therefore can only precede it; if it were to come after, that would effectively entail that repentance for acts of violence is carried out within the actual performance of *sāmāyika*. (2) There is a clear alignment between the MNS and Haribhadra's commentary on the *Daśavaikālika Sūtra* in confirming that no religious action ought to be engaged in without first performing *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa*, whereas the Āv Cū is in actuality referring to a specific case within a different ritual context. That is to say, the worship described in the Āv Cū is not part of the regular structure of the performance of *sāmāyika* and therefore cannot provide appropriate exemplification of that particular disciplinary exercise in its entirety.⁵⁷

These arguments were given more developed shape in the *Īryāpathikīṣaṭṭrimśikā* (ĪṢ), 'Thirty-six Verses on *Īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa*', a verse text with autocommentary written in 1572 which Dharmasāgara was to describe in his highly polemical *Pravacanaparīkṣā* as the fully authoritative source for the terms of the debate.⁵⁸ Dharmasāgara argues from the outset by reference to the MNS and Haribhadra's commentary on the *Daśavaikālika Sūtra* that *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa* has to come at the beginning of all major devotional and disciplinary activities which involve a degree of preliminary physical movement on the grounds that engaging in these rituals requires mental purity. In this respect, the situation is equivalent to ascending a building which at the outset necessitates placing one's foot on the first step of a staircase. As there can be no effect without a cause, so there can be no religious activity, such as *sāmāyika*, which is not based on an appropriate mental, verbal and physical disposition on the part of lay practitioners whose minds would otherwise be characteristically preoccupied with violence. Here Dharmasāgara refers specifically to the necessity of performing a close inspection (*pratīlekhaṇa*) of the mouthshield prior to engaging in *sāmāyika* in

⁵⁵ *Gurutattvapradīpa*, 7.24 p. 124: *īryāpathikīyām apratikrāntīyām na yuktam sāmāyikādānam*. For the *Gurutattvapradīpa* and its possible authorship, see Dundas (2007, p. 106) and cf. *Catalogue of the Jain Manuscripts of the British Library* (2006, p. 463). For the Tristutika Gaccha, also known as the Āgamika Gaccha, see Balbir (2002, pp. 271–272).

⁵⁶ For Dharmasāgara, see Dundas (2007, pp. 114–126).

⁵⁷ *Tattvatarāṅginī*, pp. 36–44.

⁵⁸ *Pravacanaparīkṣā* 8.82 autocomm. p. 97. For discussion of *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa*, see *Pravacanaparīkṣā* 4.224–4.227. Cf. also Dharmasāgara's *Auṣṭrikamatotsūtradīpikā*, p. 15 and also *Soḍaśaśloki*, p. 4: *sāmāyika* is vitiated by reverse procedure (*viparītakriyā*) if *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa* is performed after it.

order to ensure bodily purity and states that this formal procedure itself requires to be validated by the purifying effect of *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* (ĪṢ, vv. 2–7).

Dharmasāgara attributes the claim that *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* is to be performed after *sāmāyika* to the misapprehension by members of what from his perspective are heretical Śvetāmbara renunciant orders⁵⁹ that the description given by the Āv Cū of the procedure for performing *sāmāyika* relates to a context which overrides the general prescription given by the MNS about the necessary priority of *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* to religious actions such as *caityavandana* (ĪṢ, vv. 7–10). In response to this, Dharmasāgara asserts that no obvious purpose can be identified either in *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* being performed after *sāmāyika* or in prohibiting it coming before (ĪṢ, v. 11). No doubt the Āv Cū is to be regarded as referring to a specific example; however, the MNS should be deemed not so much to be expressing a general statement which can be superseded by a special instance as unexceptionally signifying in broad terms that all religious activity (*dhammaṇuttḥāṇaṃ*) is to be undertaken after the purification effected by *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* (ĪṢ, vv. 12–13).

The context of the Āv Cū's phrase *pacchā iriyāvahiyaē paḍikkamai*, 'then he performs *pratīkramaṇa* for violence brought about by movement', is clarified accordingly. While *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* is certainly there described as coming after *sāmāyika* has been performed by the layman in the presence of monks, in the overall performative configuration depicted by the Āv Cū it is in fact preceded by another ritual, namely *caityavandana*, as is indicated by the statement *jai cetiyāim atthi to paḍhamam vaṇḍati*, 'if there are sacred objects, he pays homage to them first'. In this example, then, *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* is not formally connected with the performance of *sāmāyika*, of which Dharmasāgara's heretical opponent claims that it is a component part, but rather is completely disconnected from it.⁶⁰ Thus it can be held that the prescription of the Āv Cū does not bear upon the same context as that described in the MNS, since the former text is in fact simply referring to the layman's act of proceeding to a sacred place (ĪṢ, v. 14).

By his interpretation of the two sources just referred to, the heretic is in effect claiming that there are two types of *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa*, one carried out before and the other after *sāmāyika*. For Dharmasāgara, this would effectively also entail the existence of two types of *sāmāyika*, a view which would obviously flout scriptural tradition and customary practice totally (ĪṢ, vv. 16 and 18). Dharmasāgara's argument at this juncture is not entirely convincing, however, since to strengthen his position about the inappropriateness of interpreting the Āv Cū passage as an overall description of the performance of the *sāmāyika* observance in which *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* might incorrectly be taken as the subsequent component, he posits an idiosyncratic meaning for *pacchā iriyāvahiyaē paḍikkamai* of 'then he

⁵⁹ Dharmasāgara here refers specifically to the Paurṇamīyaka Gaccha which originated at the beginning of the twelfth century. See Dundas (2009).

⁶⁰ To the possible objection that there is absence of any reference to *caityavandana* in Haribhadra's commentary on the *Āvaśyaka Niriyukti* (see footnote 39), Dharmasāgara elsewhere effectively argues that its presence has to be understood. See *Pravacanaparīkṣā* 4.226 autocomm. p. 420.

ceases from motion'.⁶¹ This was to be seized upon by his Kharatara respondent, Jayasoma, as a significant technical weakness in his position.

Dharmasāgara continues by accusing his opponent of applying the 'principle of the half-senile woman' (*ardhajaratīnyāya*), a kind of 'halfway house' inconsistency, in that he sometimes invokes textual authority and sometimes disregards it.⁶² By way of illustration, Dharmasāgara refers to the Kharatara teacher Jinavallabhasūri (eleventh/twelfth centuries.) who in his *Pauṣadhavidhiprakaraṇa* prescribes that in a nocturnal fasting (*pauṣadhika*) context *īryāpathikīpratikamaṇa* should be carried out before *sāmāyika* when it is performed in the last watch of the night, which obviously contradicts the prescription of the Āv Cū (ĪṢ, v. 19, v. 24 autocomm. and p. 37b).⁶³ The heretic accepts this without demur, Dharmasāgara claims, yet perversely refuses to countenance *īryāpathikīpratikamaṇa* coming first in another ritual context.

The possibility that the MNS might be the only source which supports the position that *īryāpathikīpratikamaṇa* comes prior to *sāmāyika* is rejected by Dharmasāgara who claims that the Āv Cū also supports this stance if the stipulation *pacchā iriyāvahiyāe paḍikkamai* be taken as merely denoting the 'alternative sense' (*bhinnārtha*) of cessation from movement when *caityavandana* is being performed (ĪṢ, v. 23).⁶⁴ Logic demonstrates that *sāmāyika* cannot itself be pure without that purity of mind which can only be gained by the conditioning influence of *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa*. However, and no doubt in a manner highly revealing of the actualities of the situation being debated, Dharmasāgara makes clear that in the last resort it is the great teachers of the central Śvetāmbara renunciant lineage who have definitively established the ritual in question, which should not therefore be located in authoritative texts only. As elsewhere in his writings,⁶⁵ Dharmasāgara insists (ĪṢ, vv. 24–33) that incorrectly established teacher-pupil lineages, which base their arguments solely upon scriptural writings which require legitimate mediation, totally invalidate claims about issues of practice. Indeed, in his summing up of the correct performance of *sāmāyika*, Dharmasāgara asserts that a description of the full procedure of this ritual is simply not to be found in texts, but is merely indicated by name alone or a cluster of words; that is to say, the correct practice of *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa* is ultimately a feature of customary practice.⁶⁶

⁶¹ ĪṢ, v. 15a: *kiṃ tu pahagamaṇakiriāpaḍisehapayāsayaṃ imam vayaṇaṃ*. See also ĪṢ, v. 15 autocomm. p. 23b and vv. 16–17 with autocomm. Dharmasāgara's point seems to be that an act of *caityavandana* will mean that the layman must cease from moving on his way.

⁶² For this principle, see Jacob, pp. 7–8.

⁶³ Jinavallabhasūri, *Pauṣadhavidhiprakaraṇa*, p. 43: *tao rāte caramajāme uttheūṇa iriyāvahiyaṃ paḍikkamiya Sakkatthaēṇa ceie vaṃḍiya puvvaṃ va pottim pehiya namukkārapuvvaṃ sāmāyasuttaṃ kaḍḍhiya saṃdisāvīya sajjhāyaṃ kuṇai jāva paḍikkamaṇavelā*.

⁶⁴ See footnote 61. In support of his position Dharmasāgara also cites (ĪṢ, v. 22) the *Saṅghācāravidhi* commentary on Devendrasūri's *Caityavandanabhāṣya*, p. 127 by his pupil Dharmakīrti with reference to the layman Pokkhali in the *Bhagavatī Sūtra* (see footnote 19): *śrutvaivam alpam api Puṣkalina 'nucirṇam īryāpratikramaṇataḥ kila dharmakṛtyam/sāmāyikādi vidadhīta tataḥ prabhūtaṃ tatpūrvam atra ca padāvanimārjanaṃ triḥ*.

⁶⁵ See Dundas (2007, pp. 94–100).

⁶⁶ ĪṢ, pp. 36b–37a.

The Kharatara Gaccha Defence of the Posteriority of *Īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa*

Although Dharmasāgara was confronting what was clearly a long established cluster of arguments, there does not seem to exist any extended textual evidence for his notional opponent's position prior to the *Īryāpathikīṣaṭṭriṃśikā* (ĪSJ) of Jayasoma, who held the monastic rank of *gaṇin* in the Kharatara Gaccha.⁶⁷ This work was written in 1583 and, as its title suggests, was modelled on and a direct response to Dharmasāgara's polemic of eleven years previously which the Kharatara monk views as an aggressive expansion of the position briefly set out in the *Gurutattvapradīpa* (ĪSJ, pp. 20b–21a).

In the ĪSJ Jayasoma systematically engages with the various points made by Dharmasāgara, defending the priority and thereby centrality of *sāmāyika* as a disciplinary exercise, albeit in a manner which his opponent would have regarded as highly illogical. His basic argument is that Dharmasāgara assumes a non-existent contradiction between the stipulations of the Āv Cū (one must perform *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* after *sāmāyika*) and the MNS (one should not engage in any religious action if *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* has not been performed), leading him to various misconceptions, including the positing of an idiosyncratic meaning for *īryāpathikī*, namely 'the act of going' (ĪSJ, p. 25b).

For Jayasoma (ĪSJ, v. 3 with autocomm.), as for Dharmasāgara, *sāmāyika* does not have its intended effect, elimination of karmic accretions (*nirjarā*), unless it is performed in accordance with a formal ritual structure (*vidhi*) and without any recourse to improvisation (*sacchamda*). However, Jayasoma asserts that the procedure for the full ritual can in fact be understood on the basis of texts alone, and he makes no specific appeal, as does Dharmasāgara, to teacher lineage as the ultimate source of the ritual, beyond linking earlier Kharatara teachers such as Jinadattasūri with correct performance of it. The texts to which Jayasoma refers⁶⁸ make clear that *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* comes after the enunciation of the *sāmāyika* formula and that interruption by the 'obeisance' (*praṇipāta*) formula, known as the *Śakrastava*, which is utilised in *caityavandana*, is not a relevant issue (ĪSJ, vv. 4–7).⁶⁹ To confirm that this is indeed a standard feature of common practice of the ritual, Jayasoma invokes not the evidence of actual lay behaviour but a story collection by

⁶⁷ The printed edition of the ĪSJ, p. 10 lacks v. 17, with the conclusion of the autocommentary on v. 16 being assigned the number '17' and the following *mūla* verse designated '18'. An inspection of the manuscript of the ĪSJ (Or.13541) in the British Library shows that v. 16 of the printed edition is there designated as '17' (f.9a l.12), while the conclusion of the autocommentary is also designated as '17' (f.9b l.13). It appears that a lapse of concentration on the part of the producer of what the editors of the *Catalogue of the Jain Manuscripts of the British Library* (2006, pp. 468–469) suggest may be the autograph version of the ĪSJ has been partly reproduced in the printed edition.

⁶⁸ As well as the Āv Cū and Haribhadra's commentary on the *Āvaśkaka Niryukti*, Jayasoma refers to the *Pañcāśaka Cūrṇi* (presumably Yaśodeva's Prākṛit exposition of 1115 which was based on Abhayadevasūri's commentary on the first three chapters of the *Pañcāśakaprakaraṇa*; for this, see Tripāṭhī 1975, pp. 204–205) and Yaśodeva's commentary on the *Navapadaprakaraṇa*. See footnote 51.

⁶⁹ For the *Śakrastava*, see Williams (1963, p. 193).

Abhayadevasūri's pupil Vardhamanasūri (eleventh century) which describes a narrative protagonist who had already performed *sāmāyika* before going on to carry out *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa*.⁷⁰

Jayasoma does concur with Dharmasāgara in identifying the scenario presented in the *Āv Cū* as involving a special case, but he claims that this cannot invalidate the, for him, primary ritual principle that *sāmāyika* precedes the performance of *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa*, irrespective of whether *caityavandana* occurs before or after it (*ĪṢJ*, v. 8).⁷¹ Dharmasāgara's assertion that there is a relationship of cause (*kāraṇa*) and effect between *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* and *sāmāyika* is unsustainable on the grounds of lack of textual support. In actuality *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* can be regarded as the 'motive' (*hetu*) only of an observance such as scriptural study simply through conventionally occurring before it, while there cannot be any context whatsoever in which *sāmāyika* is actually performed to bring about *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* (*ĪṢJ*, v. 9). As for the apparent example of *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* preceding *sāmāyika* which Dharmasāgara claims to have located in the Kharatara teacher Jinavallabhasūri's description of the procedure for a nocturnal *pauṣadha* fast, this can be discounted by reference to that particular observance's location in a much more developed ritual structure, namely nocturnal *pauṣadha*, *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* performed the following morning, inspection of mouth shield, act of homage, and *sāmāyika*.⁷²

Jayasoma claims that even though the practice of performing *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* as a formal act of repentance prior to *sāmāyika* has been established in other orders by ostensibly reasonable people, this in effect entails assigning *īryāpathikī* a new ritual function. To establish this position, Jayasoma addresses the exact purport of the MNS's statement *apaḍikkamṭāe iriyāvahiyāe na kappai ceva kāuṃ kiṃ ci*, 'it is not appropriate to perform anything when *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* has not been carried out', which he argues has not been fully contextualised by those who understand it in purely general terms without reference to other works which deal with more specific prescriptions for ritual performance. (*ĪṢJ*, v. 10) No doubt the MNS's injunction does encompass ritual and disciplinary activities such as *caityavandana*, scriptural study and meditation (*dhyāna*), but this must be balanced by reference to injunctions relating to specific examples which, as established in grammatical discourse and universally accepted in other intellectual disciplines, have greater force than general rules (*ĪṢJ*, vv. 12–13).⁷³ This is precisely the status of the injunction concerning *sāmāyika* in the *Āv Cū* and Haribhadra's commentary on the *Āvaśyaka Nirukti*.

⁷⁰ Jayasoma gives (*ĪṢJ*, p. 5a) a Prākṛit quotation from this work which he calls *kathākośagrantha*, but what seems to be the only accessible story collection by Vardhamānasūri, the *Dharmaratnakaraṇḍaka*, contains only Sanskrit narratives.

⁷¹ Jayasoma argues against Dharmasāgara that the MNS is in fact describing a specific case. See below.

⁷² Jayasoma here refers to the *Pañcāśaka Cūrṇi*. See footnote 68.

⁷³ For the intellectual principle *apavādair utsargā bādhyante*, see Jacob (1995, Sect. 3, pp. 13–14). Dharmasāgara had rejected at *ĪṢ*, vv. 12–13 the applicability of this point to the matter under dispute. See above.

Jayasoma next addresses (ĪŚJ, vv.18–20) the sense of the phrase *pacchā iriyāvahiṃyāe paḍikkamai* found in the Āv Cū, commentaries, rejecting as grammatically implausible Dharmasāgara's assignment of the meaning 'act of going, movement' to *īryāpathikī*, which would be at variance with the stipulation in the MNS passage, and confirms the phrase as yielding the grammatically conventional sense 'then one performs *pratikramaṇa* because of violence brought about by walking'.⁷⁴ Jayasoma further assails Dharmasāgara's position by pointing to cases where the founding teachers of his lineage, the Tapā Gaccha, namely Devendrasūri and his pupil and commentator Dharmakīrti, have taken the MNS's statement *pacchā apaḍikkamaṃtāe iriyāvahiṃyāe* in specific rather than general terms in that they prescribe *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa* for the complete (*pratipūrṇa*) form of *caityavandana*, but not the other two types.⁷⁵ Scriptural examples can also be found, Jaysoma points out, of gods, kings and monks performing *caityavandana* which is not preceded by *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa* without it being conveyed that this is in any way unusual or incorrect (ĪŚJ, v. 14).⁷⁶

Jayasoma would appear to concede that in practice *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa* can be performed before *sāmāyika* when he states that the practice of ancient teachers cannot be inferred from the behaviour of laymen of his own time (ĪŚJ, vv. 22–23). Nonetheless, for him it is undeniable that prominent members of the Tapā Gaccha such as Devendrasūri and Kulamaṇḍanasūri have affirmed that *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa* comes after *sāmāyika*⁷⁷ and that it is to be viewed as the purificatory prelude only to disciplinary practices such as scriptural study (ĪŚJ, v. 24). Dharmasāgara's general position is that there has to be purity of the three modalities of mind, body and speech before any religious observance can be engaged in and that accordingly *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa* must always be performed at the outset to effect this. Jayasoma, however, argues that physical purity is engendered through wearing a mouth shield, purity of the mind is effected through prohibiting immoral thoughts by means of the ritual expression '*niṣṭhi*',⁷⁸ and purity of speech comes about because there are all three types of purity (that is of body, mind and speech) when the mouthshield is carefully inspected (ĪŚJ, p. 19a).⁷⁹ In other words,

⁷⁴ See also ĪŚJ, v. 6 autocommentary p. 3a. For the ĪŚ, see footnote 61. Jayasoma upbraids Dharmasāgara for defective knowledge of grammar in not accepting that *iriyāvahiṃyā/īryāpathikī* is a derivative form based on *īryāpatha*, 'physical movement, posture', which in standard Jain usage invariably denotes 'violence relating to movement', irrespective of whether a concomitant word for violence is directly expressed or not, and also of glossing over the fact that the case-ending of *iriyāvahiṃyāe* represents an ablative of cause.

⁷⁵ See footnote 33.

⁷⁶ Cf. ĪŚJ, vv. 14–15 for the disciplinary fast called *upadhāna* being performed without *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa* and also to the *Pañcanamaskāra* mantra being intoned immediately before certain observances.

⁷⁷ Jayasoma (ĪŚJ, v. 26) claims that Dharmakīrti is at variance with his teacher Devendrasūri in interpreting *Bhagavatī Sūtra* 12.1 as exemplifying *īryāpathikīpratikramaṇa* before *sāmāyika*.

⁷⁸ Uttering this expression is enjoined as a necessary preliminary to entering a temple for worship.

⁷⁹ *potikāpratīlekanāyāṃ śuddhitrāyasyāpi sattvād vacanaśuddhītvam api tadavastham eva*. I am not certain that I have interpreted this passage correctly, although the overall purport of Jayasoma's assertion is clear.

īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa is not invariably necessary to effect in advance the appropriate ritual disposition.

The Aftermath of the Dispute

The dispute just described was pursued by the Kharatara Gaccha into the early years of the seventeenth century when prominent intellectuals such as Guṇavinaya⁸⁰ and Samayasundara⁸¹ were to focus and condense Jayasoma's position. As for Dharmasāgara, he was disciplined by the Tapā Gaccha leadership and some of his works publically impugned and suppressed because of the intensity of the polemical tone he regularly adopted against other Śvetāmbara orders.⁸² There is, however, no significant evidence that the question of the positioning of *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* with regard to *sāmāyika* was a particularly controversial issue within the Tapā Gaccha prior to Dharmasāgara's death in 1601. So the *Hīrapraśnottarāṇi*, which records the answers of Hīravijayasūri, the leader of the order during the height of Dharmasāgara's activity, to a wide range of questions posed by monks and laymen, refers only cursorily to *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa*.⁸³ However, Hīravijayasūri does make clear that, contrary to what had been argued by Dharmasāgara, there are to be found some significant Jain ritual activities which do not necessarily require

⁸⁰ Guṇavinaya, who was a pupil of Jayasoma, wrote his *Dharmasāgarīyotsūtrakhaṇḍana*, 'Refutation of Dharmasāgara's Heretical Views', in 1608 as a response to a work by the Tapā Gaccha polemicist which he calls the *Utsūtrodghāṭanakulaka*. Cf. Vinayasāgar (2003, pp. 131–132). This work is no doubt the *Auṣṭrikamatotsūtradīpikā* which, together with a commentary (*avacūri*), is printed as a kind of appendix to the *ĪṢ* (pp. 38–39). Presumably Guṇavinaya did not refer to this work by its full title because he was unwilling to reproduce the term *auṣṭrika*, '(followers of) the camel herder', a pejorative expression used of the Kharatara Gaccha by its opponents in mocking allusion to a supposed inglorious event in the career of Jinadattasūri.

In the *Dharmasāgarīyotsūtrakhaṇḍana* Guṇavinaya provides a list of sources, including the Tapā Gaccha teacher Devendrasūri's *Śrāddhadīnakṛtya*, similar to that given by Jayasoma (although without including Haribhadra's commentary on the *Daśavaikālika Sūtra*), which establish that *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* is performed after the enunciation of the *sāmāyika* formula. Like Jayasoma, Guṇavinaya views Dharmasāgara as having been led astray by the MNS whose broad prescription about a range of disciplinary and devotional activities is overridden by the special case given in the *Āv Cū* which relates to *sāmāyika* alone.

⁸¹ For Samayasundara, see Candraprabhasūri (1986). In his *Sāmācārīśataka* of 1616 (see Balbir 2003) Samayasundara presents (pp. 1a–6b) Dharmasāgara's position with a greater degree of detail than Guṇavinaya. He then introduces the position of the MNS and Haribhadra's commentary on the *Daśavaikālika Sūtra* as effectively supplementing the main textual evidence supporting the Kharatara position. Samayasundara expresses surprise that contemporary Tapā Gaccha laymen continue against all the textual evidence to perform *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* before *sāmāyika* and points to the fact that both renunciants and laypeople generally engage in *devavandana* (i.e. *caityavandana*) without any formal purificatory ritual, although this is presumably not the complete form of the ritual, but rather the *madhyama* and *jaḡhanya* varieties (see footnote 33). Samayasundara quotes (p. 5a) Dharmakīrti's *Saḡhācāravīdhi* commentary to the effect that whenever a ritual is mentioned in a general prescription, it is the complete form which is intended. Accordingly it can be concluded on the basis of scripture, logic and tradition that *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* is performed after *sāmāyika*.

⁸² See Dundas (2007, pp. 132–134).

⁸³ For example, *Hīrapraśnottarāṇi* p. 38b.

īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa as a purificatory prelude,⁸⁴ and that an act of repentance for possible violence to life-forms is not required when an action (e.g. putting something down with an accompanying ritual of cleaning) is being carried out with full consciousness (*sopayogatayā*).⁸⁵ Nonetheless, senior monks of the Tapā Gaccha did not specifically repudiate Dharmasāgara's position on this particular matter after his death,⁸⁶ and today the overall evidence would seem to be that Tapā Gaccha ritual handbooks prescribe *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* before the performance of *sāmāyika*.⁸⁷

Concluding Observations

No doubt the primary motive behind the dispute delineated above concerning the ritual positioning of *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* is to be located in the realm of sectarian politics, control of lay behaviour by monastic leaderships and the tightening up of allegiances by establishing the correctness of a significant form of customary behaviour in contradistinction to the perceived deficiencies of another group. The actual terms of the debate between Dharmasāgara and Jayasoma centred on scriptural hermeneutics, the manner in which authoritative texts were to be read and juxtaposed with other authoritative texts. As with comparable situations in other religious traditions strongly rooted in a textual culture, there can be identified in the debate a tension, implicit or explicit, between the stipulations of authoritative writings, scriptural and scripture-derived (as in the case of commentaries), and valid styles of interpretation of this testimony, along with attempts to reconcile such evidence with the actuality of a mode of ritual procedure which had slowly become standardised into customary practice. Both Dharmasāgara and Jayasoma employed a degree of exegetical sleight of hand to support their respective positions, with the former positing an idiosyncratic meaning for the term *īryāvahiyā* (*īryāpathikī*)

⁸⁴ *Hīrapraśnottarāṇi* p. 19: there is no fixed opinion as to whether *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* must be carried out as a necessary preliminary to *caityavandana*.

⁸⁵ *Hīrapraśnottarāṇi* p. 46b.

⁸⁶ The *Senapraśna*, which records the views of Vijayasenasūri, Hīravijayasūri's successor as leader of the Tapā Gaccha, in the second decade of the seventeenth century, gives much more consideration to the issue of *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* and would seem to evince some familiarity with Jayasoma's riposte to Dharmasāgara, albeit without making any specific reference to either of them. Vijayasenasūri supports Dharmasāgara's general position and observes that the complete procedure for the *pratīkramaṇa* ritual as performed by members of the Tapā Gaccha derives in part from textual encoding in the commentaries on the *Āvaśyaka Sūtra* and in part from customary practice. See *Senapraśna* p. 69a. The Tapā Gaccha leader further acknowledges that the *Āv Cū* appears to describe *sāmāyika* preceding the performance of *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa*, despite the fact that the testimony of the MNS and Haribhadra's commentary on the *Daśavaikālika Sūtra*, together with logic and traditional customary practice, bear witness to the contrary. However, the *Āv Cū*'s reference to the possible intervening performance of *caityavandana* makes clear that *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* in this example is not ritually connected with *sāmāyika*. For Vijayasenasūri, then, any authoritative writer who presents *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa* as coming after *sāmāyika* is doing no more than reproducing the particular context described by the *Āv Cū*. See *Senapraśna* pp. 18b and 58b.

⁸⁷ John Cort (personal communication). However, for what it is worth as purely anecdotal evidence, two Tapā Gaccha laywomen assured me (personal communication, Muṃbāi, September 11 2008) that the ritual sequence in their personal practice was *namaskāra*, *sāmāyika* and *īryāpathikīpratīkramaṇa*.

when used in the Āv Cū. Dharmasāgara also used the language of logical causality, while Jayasoma invoked a central procedure of secular intellectual discourse (in this case not accepted by Dharmasāgara), namely that a rule relating to a specific issue overrides a general rule, to differentiate between the types of textual prescription involving the performance of *sāmāyika* and the disciplinary procedures framing it. By this interpretation, ritual activity was for both disputants akin to a form of text (as indeed we have often been told it is by modern theorists of ritual),⁸⁸ illogical misreading of which would inevitably bring about heretical practice.

Discourse about ritual obviously has to be distinguished from the manner in which ritual is actually carried out, and so, as mentioned at the beginning of this study, Humphrey and Laidlaw found *pratikramaṇa* a less compelling subject for observation than *pūjā* on the grounds that performance of the latter invariably derived from practical instruction and oral teaching rather than textual prescription. Dharmasāgara and Jayasoma were no doubt preoccupied with textual justification for ritual performance and they unquestionably argued for a fixed sequential order of activities, of whatever configuration, as opposed to any degree of improvisation. In Humphrey and Laidlaw's terms they can be criticised for being textualists whose learned prescriptions about the configuration of ritual procedure are of little more than technical interest.

Yet it might well be responded that Dharmasāgara and Jayasoma were also concerned with the vital matter of ritual misperformance which, as Fuller has pointed out, is sidestepped by Humphrey and Laidlaw in their concern to assess religious action from a purely analytical perspective.⁸⁹ Fuller's criticism derives from observing the keen awareness of the possibility of ritual error evinced by the brahman priests of the Mīnākṣī temple in Madurai as they carry out their various duties of worship and he demonstrates that in this context there is a clear sense of the centrality of correct or incorrect performance of ritual which does not fully mesh with Humphrey and Laidlaw's understanding of ritualised action. The priests of the Mīnākṣī temple are of course trained ritual specialists, versed in the linguistic and physical manoeuvres described in the medieval Śaiva *āgamas* (even if they may not actually have direct familiarity with the literal meaning of these texts), and the ritual that concerns them is that performed by themselves. Dharmasāgara and Jayasoma are not ritual specialists in this sense, but rather legislators for the performance of non-specialists, namely the Śvetāmbara Jain laity. Nonetheless, for the two disputants, textual prescription is crucial to the validation of disciplinary procedures such as *sāmāyika* and discursive knowledge of ritual is an essential prerequisite for assessing the correctness of performance.

It is impossible to gauge accurately when lay customary practice took definitive shape within the Kharatara and Tapā Gacchas and what part learned textual interpretation has played in inculcating it over the last few centuries. Certainly Dharmasāgara at times seems to regard himself as doing little more than providing textual warranty for what he suggests is long established customary practice. However, even if Śvetāmbara Jain ritual actions today are, as Humphrey and Laidlaw

⁸⁸ See Asad (1993, p. 58).

⁸⁹ See Fuller (1997, pp. 22–24).

have argued, imbibed to their lay participants' satisfaction exclusively through exposure to a combination of practical demonstration and a largely oral didactic tradition as opposed to the consultation of authoritative or prescriptive texts, it seems unwise to discount the role at an earlier period of learned specialists who as witnesses to and commentators on lay behaviour concerned themselves with shaping and refining that same behaviour.

Acknowledgments I would like to thank Nalini Balbir, Surendra Bothra, John Cort and Peter Flügel for their friendly assistance in the writing of this study.

References

Primary Sources

- Abhayadevasūri, commentary on Haribhadra, *Pañcāśakaprakaraṇa*, Bhāvanagar: Śrījainadharmaprasāraśābhā 1912.
- Anuyogadvārasūtra*, Vol. 1, ed. Muni Jambūvijaya, Jaina-Āgama-Granthamālā 18 (10), Muṃbaī: Śrī Mahāvīrajainavidyālaya 1999.
- Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi*, Ratlām: Ṛṣabhdevjī Keśarmaljī Śvetāmbara Saṃsthā 1928.
- Āvaśyaka Niryukti*, in Vijayajinendrasūri (Ed.), *Niryukti-Saṃgrahaṃ*, Śāntīpurī: Harṣapūṣpāmṛta Jaina Granthamālā 1989. *Āvaśyaka Niryukti* with Haribhadra's commentary, reprint of Āgamodaya Samiti edition, Bombay 1981.
- Āvaśyaka Sūtra*. In *Dasaveyāliyasuttam Uttarajjhayaṇīm* and *Āvassayasuttam*, ed. Muni Puṇyavijaya and Pt. Amṛtlāl Mohanlāl Bhojak, Jaina-Āgama-Series no. 15, Bombay: Shri Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya 1977.
- Bhagavatī Sūtra*, ed. Muni Nathmal, Lādnūm 1974.
- Daśavaikālika Sūtra*, ed. E. Leumann, in Schubring: 119–198.
- Devendrasūri, *Śrāddhadīnakṛtya*, Muṃbaī: Jinaśāsana Ārādhana Ṭraṣṭ 1988.
- Devendrasūri, *Śrāddhapatikramaṇasūtravṛtti*, Muṃbaī: Śrī Jinasasana Aradhana Ṭraṣṭ 1988.
- Dharmakīrti, commentary on Devendrasūri's *Caityavandanabhāṣya*, Muṃbaī: Jinaśāsana Ārādhana Ṭraṣṭ 1988.
- Dharmasāgara, *Auṣṭrikamatotsūtrapradīpikā*, Kapaḍvaṃj: Āgamoddhāraka Granthamālā 1961.
- Dharmasāgara, *īryāpathikīṣaṭṭrimśikā*, Līṃvḍī: Āgamodayasamiti 1927.
- Dharmasāgara, *Pravacanaparīkṣā* (two volumes), Surat: Ṛṣabhdev Keśarmaljī Śvetāmbara Saṃsthā Surat 1937.
- Dharmasāgara, *Ṣoḍaśāślokī*, ed. Muni Labhasāgara, in *Dharmasāgaragranthasaṃgrahaḥ*, Kapaḍvaṃj: Āgamoddhāraka Granthamālā 1961.
- Dharmasāgara, *Tattvatarāṅginī*, Indaur: Ṛṣabhdev Keśarmaljī Śvetāmbara Saṃsthā 1934.
- Dharmasāgara, *Utsūtrodghātanakulaka*, in *īryāpathikīṣaṭṭrimśikā*, pp. 38–39.
- Guṇavinaya, *Dharmasāgarīya-utsūtrakhaṇḍana*, Surat: Śrī Jinadattasurījñānbhāṇḍāgār 1933.
- Gurutattvapradīpa*, ed. Muni Lābhasāgara, Kapaḍvaṃj: Mīṭhābhāī Kalyāṇcaṃḍ Peḍhī 1962.
- Haribhadra, commentary on *Daśavaikālika Sūtra*, Piṃḍvāḍā: Bhāratīyapracayatattvaparakāśanasamiti 1980.
- Hemacandra, *Yogaśāstra*, volume two, ed. Muni Jambūvijaya, Muṃbaī: Jain Vikās Sāhitya Maṇḍal 1981.
- Hīrapraśnottaraṇi*, compiled by Kīrtivijaya, Muṃbaī: Jina Śāsana Ārādhana Ṭraṣṭ 1988.
- Jayasomagaṇin, *īryāpathikīṣaṭṭrimśikā*, Surat: Śrī Jinadattasurīprācīnapustakoddhārphaṇḍ 1932.
- Jinadattasūri, *Sandehadolāvalīprakaraṇa* with Prabodhacandra's commentary, Jetaran: Sheth Chhaganlal Hirachand 1918.
- Jinaprabhasūri, *Vidhimārgaprapā*, ed. Muni Jinavijaya, Jaypur/Sāṃcor: Prākṛt Bhāratī Akādami/Śrī Jain Śve.Kharatarā Gaccha Saṅgh 2000.
- Jinavallabhasūri, *Pauṣadhavidhīprakaraṇa*, in *Jinavallabhasūri-Granthāvali*, ed. M.Vinayasāgar, Jayapur: Prākṛt Bhāratī Puṣpa 2004, pp. 35–45.
- Kulamaṇḍanasūri, *Vicārāmṛtsārasaṃgraha*, Surat: Ṛṣabhdevjī Keśarmaljī Śvetāmbarasaṃsthā 1936.
- Mahānīsītha Sūtra*. *Mahānīsītha-Suyakhamdhaṃ*, ed. Muni Puṇyavijaya and R. Pagariya, Ahmedabad: Prakrit Text Society 1994.

- Ratnaśekharaśūrī, commentary on *Vandanapratikramaṅvacūri*, Muṃbaī: Śrī Jinaśāsan Ārādhanaḥ Traṣṭ 1988.
- Ratnaśekharaśūrī, *Śrāddhadhidhiprakarana*, ed. Muni Vairāgyarativijaya and Muni Praśamarativijaya, Khambhāt: Śrī Tapāgaccha Amara Jain Śālā 2004.
- Samayasundara, *Sāmācāriśatakaprakaraṇa*, Muṃbaī: ŚrīJinadattasūriprācīnapustakodhāra Fund Series 1939.
- Śāntisūri, *Ceyavaṃḍaṇamahābhāsa*, Muṃbaī: Jina Śāsaṇa Ārādhanaḥ Traṣṭ 1986.
- Senaprasna*, compiled by Śubhaviyaya, Muṃbaī: Devcand Lalbhāi Jain Pustakodhār Granthamālā 1919.
- Sūtrakṛtāṅga Sūtra. Sūyagaḍaṃgasuttam (Sūtrakṛtāṅgasutram)*, ed. Muni Jambūvijaya, Jaina-Āgama-Series No. 2 (2), Bombay: Shri Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya 1978.
- Uttarādhyayana Sūtra*, ed. J. Charpentier, Uppsala: Archives d' Études Orientales 1922.
- Vardhamānasūri, *Dharmaratnakaraṇḍaka*, ed. Paṃnyās Muncicandriyavijayaṇi, Ahmadābād: Sārdāben Cimabhāi Ejjukeśanal Risarc Semṭar 1994.
- Vyavahārabhāṣyapīṭhikā. Vyavahāra Bhāṣya Pīṭhikā*, ed. Willem Bollée, Mumbai: Hindi Granth Karyalay 2006.
- Yaśodeva, commentary on Devagupta, *Navapadaprakaraṇa*, Muṃbaī: Śrījinaśāna Ārādhanaḥ Traṣṭ 1988.

Secondary Sources

- Asad, T. (1993). *Genealogies of religion: Discipline and reasons of power in Christianity and Islam*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Attwood, J. M. (2008). Did King Ajātasattu Confess to the Buddha, and did the Buddha forgive him? *Journal of Buddhist Ethics*, 15, 279–307.
- Balbir, N. (1993). *Āvaśyaka Studien*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Balbir, N. (2003). Samayasundara's *Sāmācāri-Śataka* and Jaina Sectarian divisions in the seventeenth century. In P. Balcerowicz & M. Mejer (Ed.), *Essays in Jaina philosophy and religion* (pp. 523–277). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Bruhn, K. (1981). *Āvaśyaka Studien* 1. In K. Bruhn & A. Wezler (Eds.), *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus: Gedenkschrift für Ludwig Alsdorf* (pp. 11–49). Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Caillat, C. (1975). *Atonements in the ancient ritual of the Jaina Monks*. Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology.
- Candraprabhasūri. (1986). *Mahopādhyāya Samayasundara: Vyaktitva evaṃ Kṛtītva*. Kalkattā: Keśariyā Eṅḍ Kampanī.
- Catalogue of the Jain Manuscripts of the British Library*. (2006). Eds. N. Balbir, K. V. Sheth, K. K. Sheth, & C. Bh. Tripathi. London: The British Library and the Institute of Jainology.
- Cort, J. E. (1995). The rite of veneration of Jina images. In D. S. Lopez, Jr. (Ed.), *Religions of India in practice* (pp. 598–608). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Deleu, J. (1970). *Viyāhapannatti (Bhagavaī): The Fifth Anga of the Jaina Canon. Introduction, critical analysis, commentary and indexes*. Brugge: De Tempel.
- Deleu, J., & Schubring, W. (1963). *Studien zum Mahānisiṭha Kapitel 1–5*. Hamburg: de Gruyter.
- Dundas, P. (2007). *History, scripture and controversy in a Medieval Jain Sect*. London: Routledge.
- Dundas, P. (2009). How not to install an image of the Jina: An early Anti-Paurṇāmīyaka Diatribe. *International Journal of Jaina Studies*, 5, 1–23.
- Flügel, P. (1994). *Askese und Devotion: Das rituelle System der Terapanth Svetambara Jains*. Dr. phil dissertation, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz.
- Folkert, K. W. (1993). *Scripture and community: Collected essays on the Jains* (J. E. Cort, Ed.). Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.
- Fuller, C. J. (1997). Religious texts, priestly education and ritual action in south Indian temple Hinduism. *Contributions to Indian Sociology (n.s.)*, 31.
- Gengnagel, J., Ute, H., & Raman, S. (Eds.). (2005). *Words and deeds: Hindu and Buddhist rituals in South Asia*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Gombrich, R. (1991). Pātimokkha: Purgative. in The Editorial Committee of the Felicitation Volume for Professor Dr. E. Mayeda (Ed.), *Studies in Buddhism and Culture in honour of Professor Dr. Egaku Mayeda on his sixty-fifth birthday* (pp. 31–38). Tokyo: Sankibo Busshorin.
- Humphrey, C., & Laidlaw, J. (1994). *The archetypal actions of ritual: A theory of ritual illustrated by the Jain rite of worship*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kalyāṇavijaya, P. (1973). *Pratikramaṅ Vidhi Saṃgrah*. Māṇḍvalā: Śrī Māṇḍvalā Jain Saṃgh.
- Jacob, G. A. (1995). *Laukikakusumāñjalih: A handful of popular maxims current in Sanskrit literature*. Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratisthan (reprint).

- Jacobi, H. (1895). *Jaina Sutras* (Part II). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Jaini, P. S. (2000). Sāmāyika. In P. S. Jaini (Ed.), *Collected papers on Jaina studies* (pp. 219–227). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Johnson, W. J. (1995). *Harmless souls: Karmic bondage and religious change in Early Jainism with special reference to Umāsvāti and Kundakunda*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Laidlaw, J. (1995). *Riches and Renunciation: Religion, economy, and society among the Jains*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ohira, S. (1994). *A Study of the Bhagavatīśūtra: A chronological analysis*. Ahmedabad: Prakrit Text Society.
- Pāli-English Dictionary*. (1952). *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary*. London: The Pali Text Society.
- Schubring, W. (1977). *Kleine Schriften*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Sukhlalji. (1993). *Concept of Pratikramaṇa (An Abridged Version of Pt. Sukhlalji's Introduction to Pañca Pratikramaṇa)* (N. J. Shah & M. Sen, Eds.). Ahmedabad: International Centre for Jaina Studies, Gujarat Vidyapith.
- Tripāthī, C. (1975). *Catalogue of the Jaina Manuscripts at Strasbourg*. Leiden: E.J.Brill.
- Vinayasāgar. (2003). *Nalacampū aur ṭikākār Maho. Guṇavinaya: Ek Adhyayan*. Jaipur: Prakṛt Bhāratī Akādāmī.
- Williams, R. W. (1963). *Jaina Yoga: A Survey of the Medieval Śrāvakācāras*. London: Oxford University Press.