

SOME ASPECTS OF JAINA MONASTIC JURISPRUDENCE

Dr. S. B. DEO, M.A., Ph.D.

Jaina monachism has a long career full of periods of progress as well as of days of adversity. Right from the days of Pārśvanātha to date it has developed and maintained its hold on a considerable mass of people, unlike Buddhist monachism which was wiped out from the land of its birth.

The development of any monachism depends principally on two factors, viz., the forces of its own internal development and the external forces of society trying to influence the monastic practices. The former includes philosophical dissension or slight deviation in the rules of monastic practices, each party justifying its own stand, or the impact of the zeal of a strong church-leader impelled by the idea of organising and stabilising the church. The social forces affecting monastic practices consist of royal interference, peculiar circumstances, orthodox social structure or a powerful laity.

It is to the credit of Jaina monachism that inspite of its tussle with both these factors it has maintained its orthodoxy in monastic practices and formulated the rules of its monastic jurisprudence retaining the orthodox core through centuries of its survival in India.

In dealing with the rules of Jaina monastic jurisprudence, however, two things may be borne in mind. First is that the entire Jaina canonical literature is said to have undergone series of redactions before it was finally reduced to a systematic grouping at the council of Valabhī. Moreover, there are differences about this version of the canon between the Digambaras and the Śvetāmbaras. This aspect handicaps a systematic study of the development of monastic jurisprudence from a historical point of view. Another thing is that in only a few cases we get circumstantial details that led to the formulation of rules of Jaina monastic jurisprudence. For instance, the *Cheda Sūtras* simply present a list of rules of monastic behaviour and punishments for their violation without giving us any other details. Of course, the commentaries do come to our help, but the actual texts dealing with monastic jurisprudence of the Jainas fail, in many cases, to provide us with the background that conspired to the formulation of a particular rule. The Buddhist texts, like

Mahāvagga and others, do give us details regarding the formulation of the rules of Buddhist monastic jurisprudence.

Inspite of these limitations, however, rules of Jaina monastic jurisprudence show a steady growth impelled by both internal and external influences. These influences increased as Jaina monks, giving up their isolation, came more in contact with the society at large.

The Aṅgas which are considered to be the oldest stratum of Jaina canonical literature, consist of some texts viz., *Ācārāṅga*, *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* etc., which depict Jaina monachism more as a philosophical and ethical system rather than as an organised and stabilised church, controlled by a church hierarchy. It was but natural in initial stages to concentrate more on ethical basis—as the Jaina church even now does—with a view not only to attract new recruits, but also to emphasise the purity of monastic behaviour in contrast with other prevailing systems. The Aṅgas, therefore, do not give many details about Jaina monastic jurisprudence as are found in the *Cheda Sūtras* and the *Niryuktis*.

What, then, is the picture that we get in the Aṅgas ?

The Aṅgas do mention various officers in the Jaina church hierarchy, such as *seha*, *sāmaṇera*, *thera*, *uvajjhāya*, *āyariyauvajjhāya*, *pavattī*, *āyariya* and *gaṇi*. Though the *Thāṇaṅga* gives a list of ten different types of *Thera*,¹ the qualifications of an *āyariya*,² the five privileges of an *āyariyauvajjhāya*,³ various types of *āyariya*,⁴ and the *gaṇāvacchedaka*, nowhere do we get details regarding their church-duties and the legal position they held in church disputes. No doubt the qualifications of a *gaṇin*, *ācārya* and a *gaṇadhara* are found in these texts, but these qualifications are more of a general ethical nature rather than of a person equipped with the power of wielding his authority over his subordinates. As said above, in the initial stages of Jaina monachism, more emphasis was laid on ethical standards which were taken to be the primary qualifications of an officer of church hierarchy.

Regarding the persons disqualified to enter the monastic order, it is to be noted that the *Thāṇaṅga*⁵ gives but three such persons while the commentary adds seventeen more to the list.

Along with this, we do get references to various church units such as a *gaṇa*, *kula* and *sambhoga*. It is stated that *āyariyauvajjhāya* could leave his *gaṇa* under five reasons, to wit⁶: if he was unable to main-

tain moral discipline of the group, if he could not wield control over the members of the *gaṇa*, if he was unable to recollect and preach sacred lore in a proper manner and at the proper time, if he was attached to a nun, and lastly if he was unable to pull on due to his friends or relatives leaving the *gaṇa*. In this case also it is to be noted that inspite of these rules, the *Aṅga* texts do not give the actual process of the dismissal of an officer of the church. Moreover, the texts of the *Aṅgas* as also of the *Mūlasūtras* are not very much informative regarding the relation of these church units.

Within this framework of church units and church officers, the monks led their religious life. But sometimes they did commit transgressions. The *Bhagavati*⁷ says that the monks committed transgressions either out of pride, or carelessness, or under influence of bodily pains (*āure*), or under calamities, or in a place which had a mixed group of heretics and other (*saṅkīṇṇa*), or due to unexpected circumstances (*sahasakkāra*) or out of fear, or hatred.

Any transgression done out of any of the above reasons had to be confessed and a suitable *prāyaścitta* had to be taken for it. The *Bhagavatisūtra*⁸ and *Thāṇaṅga*⁹, out of the *Aṅga* group of texts, refer to the ten *prāyaścittas*. They are, *ālocanā* (confession), *pratīkramaṇa* (condemnation of the transgression), *tadubhaya* (confession and condemnation), *viveka* (giving up of transgressions), *vyutsarga* (making *kāyotsarga*), *tapas* (undergoing fasts), *cheda* (cutting of the *paryāya* or the seniority), *mūla* (re-consecration), *anavasthāpya* (temporary expulsion) and *pārāñcita* (expulsion from the Order).

It is to be noted that inspite of these various *prāyaścittas*, the texts of the *Aṅgas* fail to give concrete examples of the actual execution or test cases of these rules of monastic jurisprudence. Moreover, whatever details are found regarding the *prāyaścittas* are to be found mostly in the commentaries. For instance, the confession of faults was to be done not in a way as to create sympathy in the mind of the teacher so that he might give less punishment (*ākampaittā*). The monks were not allowed to go to another guru who was known for his liberality in giving less punishment (*aṇumānaittā*). Confessing only those faults which were seen by the teacher (*jaṁ dīṭṭham*), confessing only the major faults (*bāyara*) or only the minor ones (*suhuma*), confessing in a way as was not likely to let the *ācārya* hear properly (*channa*), doing so in a very

loud voice (*saddāulayaṃ*), confessing the same fault before different ācāryas (*bahujaṇa*), doing so before a person who was not well-versed (*avvatta*), and confessing a fault before the guru who has done the same fault himself (*tassevi*)—all these were deemed as faults of improper *ālocanā*.¹⁰

Besides this, some details regarding the ninth *prāyaścitta* are found.¹¹ It (*aṇavatṭhappā*) was prescribed for committing the theft of co-religionists, or of heretics or for striking somebody with a slap. The last—*pārāñcita*—was threefold: *duṭṭha*, *pamatta* and *annamannaṃ karemaṇe*. The first was committed when a monk harassed or condemned the ācārya or the gaṇadhara or the sacred canon, or had intimacy with the nuns, or murdered the king or had illicit relations with the queen. The second was committed by a monk who was extremely careless regarding rules of food and sleep (*pañcamanidrāpramāḍavān*), and the third was done when the monk indulged in homo-sexuality. Besides these, masturbation, sexual intercourse, taking a night-meal and accepting food from the host or from a king were deemed major faults. It may be noted that these explanations are based on the commentaries. The texts proper do not give such details. They only refer to the various punishments.

The way of dealing with the transgressor who had again committed a fault while he was undergoing a punishment for a previous one, was called *ārovaṇā*. In this case, it seems, the punishment was increased either by a month (*māsiyā ārovaṇā*), or by thirty-five days (*sapañcarāi māsiyā*), or by forty days, or by two months, or by sixty-five days, or by three or four months. The maximum period was of six months. No details, however, regarding the faults under which this increase was made, or regarding the treatment given to the transgressor, are to be found.¹²

Another method of purifying the transgressor was called the '*parihāra-viśuddhi*'. The commentators explain it as follows:¹³

In a group of nine monks, four underwent the *parihāra*, the other four waited upon them (*anuparihārīka*) and the ninth acted as the guru.

The undergoing of *parihāra* involved fasts of various magnitudes in different seasons for a total period of six months, and the whole group was purified in eighteen months.

From the foregoing details one thing is clear and that is that even though the ten forms of *prāyaścittas* are named in the texts of the *Aṅgas*,

no detailed explanation about the nature of the punishment, the mode of implementing it and the authority vested with the power of implementing it, is to be found. Only the commentaries, which are later than the text, come to our help.

The picture changes and assumes a fullness when we come to the *Cheda-sūtras* and the *Niryuktis*. In these texts we have details about the qualifications of various officers, the standing (*pariyāya*) necessary for different posts, the list of faults for which different punishments are to be given, the method of implementing these and so on. In short, these texts present—as the following discussion will show—an organised Jain church with a codified manual of rules of monastic jurisprudence.

For instance, a monk of sixty years was called as *jāithera*, one well-versed in the *Ṭhāṇaṅga* and the *Samavāyaṅga* was termed as *suyathera*, and he who had twenty years of monk-life was designated as *pariyāyathera*.¹⁴ Thus, considerations of age, learning and standing as a monk were at the basis of this classification. An *upādhyāya* was a person who had at least three years' standing in monkhood to his credit besides other academic and moral qualifications.¹⁵ The *āyariyauvajjhāya* was one who had five years' standing and the knowledge of the *Cheda-sūtras* like *Dasā*, *Kappa* and *Vavahāra*.¹⁶ Besides this, at the time of appointing an *āyariyauvajjhāya*, if no other proper person was available, then a person who was fit for that office but whose standing in monkhood was cut short (*nivuddhāvāsa-pariyāe*) due to some transgression committed by him, was reinitiated the same day, and made the *āyariyauvajjhāya*. But he was to show good conduct and had to earn the confidence of other monks. Thus, conduct by the person as well as confidence in him by others were the chief items that were taken into consideration, and the principle of not imposing an officer unpopular to the rest of the members of the church was very wisely carried out.

Similarly, various other rules regarding the misbehaviour and the suspension or dismissal of *āyariyauvajjhāya* are to be found for the first time in the *Vavahārasutta*.¹⁷ Thus, if he broke the vow of celibacy while holding office, then he was debarred from holding any post in the church hierarchy throughout his life. The same was the case if he became worldly while holding office, or turned out to be liar, deceitful, sinful or impure. If, however, he broke celibacy after leaving his office, then he was suspended for three years.

Similar details are to be found regarding the *Gaṇāvacchedaka*.¹⁸ This officer and the *ācārya* required eight years standing, the knowledge of *Thāṇaṅga* and *Samavāyaṅga* and excellent moral conduct. Further, a distinction was made between *ācāryas* some of whom either confirmed or initiated candidates.

The offers in the church hierarchy were bound by explicit rules of seniority and succession. The term used to denote seniority was *paryāya* and it was based on the number of years spent in the order as a monk. In order to avoid conflict between age and seniority, certain rules had to be framed to avoid bad feeling between different members of the church. With a view, therefore, to put this into practice, the *āyariyauvajjhāya* waited for four or five days if during that period another monk older in age completed his studies. Then he first confirmed the elder and then the younger even though the latter had completed his studies earlier. Such superiors who deliberately confirmed the younger earlier than the older monk even though both had completed their studies, had to undergo the punishment of *Cheda* or *Parihāra*.¹⁹ So also if two monks of different *paryāyas* wandered together and if the monk with greater *paryāya* had no disciples while the other with less *paryāya* had, then the latter with his disciples had to remain under the control of the former who had greater *paryāya* to his credit.²⁰

In spite of these rules of seniority, the *ācārya* was allowed to appoint his successor if the former was seriously ill, or had entered householder-ship again. But in order to have no occasion for favouritism by which there was a chance of unfit persons stepping into the office, the rest of the monks were given supreme powers to ask the newly appointed successor to quit office if they thought that he was unfit for the post. If he quitted the office, well and good; then he was not to undergo any punishment for that. But, if in spite of the request of the rest of the monks, he persisted to hold on, then that person had to undergo *Cheda* or *Parihāra*.²¹ Thus the working of the church went on on purely democratic lines in those days.

Besides this, changing the *gaṇa* also was confined within the framework of certain rules. For instance, those who wanted re-entry or had come from another *gaṇa* after committing moral faults, were first to undergo confession, condemnation of faults, had to determine not to repeat these faults again, undergo a *prāyaścitta* for it, and then be the member of the old *gaṇa* or a new one.²²

The person who was punished with either the *aṇavatṭhappā* or *pārāñciya* could be consecrated again at the express desire of the gaṇa (*gaṇassa pattiyaṃ siyā*), irrespective of the fact whether that punished person had followed the life of a householder or otherwise after his dismissal. Thus a vote of confidence in him by the rest of the members of the gaṇa was taken as a sufficient qualification of that person for his claim to re-enter his old group. Along with this power of re-admitting a person to the gaṇa, the right of driving out (*nijjūhaṇa*) a person from the gaṇa was also exercised by the members of a gaṇa.²³

As noted elsewhere, the same list of ten *prāyaścittas* is to be found even in the *Cheda-sūtras*. But the elaboration of the *vavahāra* (procedure towards a transgressor) is to be found in these *Cheda-sūtras* where concrete cases are cited and different *prāyaścittas* are prescribed for them. Especially, the last four, viz., *cheda*, *mūla*, *aṇavatṭhappā* and *pārāñciya* come to prominence.²⁴

Cheda has been explained by Schübring as “the loss of a part of the monk’s ecclesiastical rank among his brethren, which dates from his second reception, the definitive consecration to the vow”.²⁵ This cut in the *pariyāya* differed with the rank of the person in authority. For instance, the minimum cut in the case of a monk was of five days while for an *ācārya* it was fifteen days.

Complete *cheda* led to *mūla*. In the *mūla*, the monk lost all his period of monkhood right since his entering the order, and he had to begin anew his career as a monk.

It should be noted that the *Cheda-sūtras* seldom refer to *mūla*, while the *Jitakalpa* does not give much details about it.

Aṇavatṭhappā was that in which the monk’s entire *pariyāya* was wiped out. In this case, before the monk was re-initiated, a period was given to him in which he had to make sincere efforts for qualifying himself for re-entry to monkhood. If he failed to do so, then he was not allowed to enter monkhood again.

This “temporary excommunication” (*aṇavatṭhappā*) was inflicted on such monks who stole something belonging to their co-religionists, or belonging to persons of other sects, or those who struck others with a fist.²⁶

Pārāñciya was the final and the greatest punishment. It denoted the expulsion of the monk from the order and thus putting an end to his

life as a monk. Those who were of a criminal nature (*duṭṭha*), indifferent to rules of behaviour (*pamatta*), and sodomites were punished with *pārāñciya*.²⁷

In this matter, three terms may be distinguished from one another, viz., *pārāñciya*, *samukkasaṇa* and *ñijjūhaṇa*. The first denoted the driving out of a person from the order of monks, the second implied the expulsion of a person holding office if he lost the confidence of his followers, and the third term represented the omission of a person from a particular gaṇa or group of monks.

Another term often found in the *Cheda-sūtras* is "*parihāra*". It was twofold : *ugghāiya* and *aṇugghāiya*. These are explained by Schübring as follows : "The expressions *ugghāiya* and *aṇugghāiya* denote conditional sentences passed on persons for transgressions. They represent the intervention of a period (*udghāta*), in which the punishment is softened or made mild between the different periods of expiation, perhaps also the pronouncement of the sentence and its carrying out".²⁸

The monk who was undergoing the *parihāra* was completely isolated from the rest of the monks. No common begging of alms or taking food together with other monks was allowed. One who did so had himself to undergo *parihāra* for a month.²⁹ Due consideration, however, was shown to the transgressor undergoing *parihāra* if he fell ill.³⁰

It is to be noted that at every time, the accused was given the opportunity to explain his own position. Therefore, it was laid down that the church officers should put more faith in him who confessed the fault of his own accord rather than in some others who reported the fault to the elders. For it was said that the procedure of dealing with the transgressor was based fundamentally on truth (*saccapaṇṇā vavahārā*).³¹

These rules were guiding the communal life of not only an ordinary monk as a member of an ascetic community, but more so the life of officers like an *upādhyāya* or an *ācārya*. For instance, deliberate postponement of confirmation of a novice, the violation of morals when holding office, refusing to leave office when others justifiably demand for it, changing the nature of a fault and giving less punishment for it—all these were liable for punishment.³²

Thus the *Cheda-sūtras* and the *Niryuktis* supply us with more details about the rules of Jaina monastic jurisprudence and their actual applica-

tion. These groups of canonical texts give us the impression that the Jaina church was organising itself on a planned basis.

The post-canonical texts present a still wider horizon, a still more consciousness for public opinion in the form of the laity and an admirable adjustment to circumstances.

Formerly, generally children below eight years of age were not allowed entry to the church. But the *Nisīha-cunṇi* expressly states that six types of children could be ordained, viz., if all the members of a family wanted to join the order, if all the relatives of a monk were dead and only a child was left over, an orphaned child, an orphaned issue of a *sejjāyari*, the issue of a raped nun, and if there were chances of benefiting the *kula*, *gaṇa* or the *saṃgha* through state officers, then also a child could be initiated.³³

Eunuchs were not normally allowed entry to the church. But if he was dear to the king, or able to look after the welfare of the *gaccha* in cases of royal disfavour, or if such a one was an able physician who could look after the ill, then he was initiated. But even then by hook or crook he was to be driven out of the *gaccha*.³⁴

It seems, therefore, that the church tried to please the ruling power and avoided, as far as possible, enmity with the king. On the contrary, it did not lose any opportunity of getting benefit out of it for the spread of the Order.

It is to be noted that, besides the moral and academic qualifications of various church officers, some other necessary qualifications were expected of them. For instance, an *ācārya* was to be a person, according to *Bṛhatkalpa-bhāṣya*, who had knowledge of regional etiquettes. He was expected to have toured through various regions at least for twelve years.³⁵

The other officers seem to have remained the same, though there seems to have been a slight degradation in the academic qualifications in later period. For the *Bṛhatkalpa-bhāṣya* speaks of "half-instructed goblins" hurrying up to pose like an *ācārya*.³⁶ This might have been the case probably due to the rise of several *gacchas* which were headed by *ācāryas*.

These *gacchas* were also bound by certain rules. The *ācārya* looked to the upkeep of the morale of the members of the *gaccha*. If, inspite

of repeated warnings, the disciples indulged in bad ways then they were driven out. If, however, they begged pardon, they were re-admitted after having undergone the punishment of *māsa-laghu*.

If the dissenters were in a majority, and they refused to fall out, the minority-group left the place without the knowledge of the majority group.³⁷

The post-canonical texts, besides describing the principal ten *prāyaścittas*, bring to prominence an elaborate system of fasts (as punishment) like the *caturlaghu*, *māsalaghu*, *māsaguru* (which were further distinguished as *kālalaghu*, *kālaguru*, *tapolaghu* and *tapoguru* etc.), and the *pañcarāndiya* which the transgressor had to undergo for purification.

The *Cūrṇi* to the *Bṛhatkalpa-bhāṣya* (v. 359), according to Schübring,³⁸ explains *vavahāra* (the procedure of treating the transgressor), as expiatory fasts of varied durations which were divided into nine categories like the following :

Name of punishment	Duration	Nature of the fast
<i>Guruo</i>	1 month	<i>Aṭṭhamena</i>
<i>Gurugatarāo</i>	4 months	<i>Dasamena</i>
<i>Ahā-guruo</i>	6 months	<i>Duvālasamena</i>
<i>Lahuo</i>	30 days	<i>Chatṭhena</i>
<i>Lahutarāo</i>	25 days	<i>Cautṭhena</i>
<i>Ahā-lahuo</i>	20 days	<i>Āyāmbilena</i>
<i>Lahusao</i>	15 days	<i>Ega-tṭhanena</i>
<i>Lahusatarāo</i>	10 days	<i>Purimaḍḍhena</i>
<i>Ahā-lahusao</i>	5 days	<i>Nivvīna</i>

This system of expiatory fasts was further elaborated by complex distinctions as follows :

A monk was not expected to accept any raw fruit, but if he accepted it :
 in a settlement (*niveśana*), then he had to face *catvāro laghavaḥ* ;
 in a *pāṭaka*, then *catvāro guravaḥ* ;
 in a row of houses, *ṣaḍlaghavaḥ* ;
 in a village, *ṣaḍguravaḥ* ;
 at the gates of a village, *cheda* ;
 outside the village, *mūla* ;
 at the boundary of the village, *pārāñcika*.

Not only that but these punishments increased the more, the higher the position the person held in the church hierarchy. For instance,

Normally, monks were not allowed to stay in a place full of seeds. But if they stayed there then the following *prāyaścittas* were prescribed :³⁹

Designation	Prāyaścitta	Nature
<i>Ācārya</i>	<i>Laghuko māsa</i>	<i>Tapasā kālena ca laghukah</i>
<i>Upādhyāya</i>	” ”	<i>Tapasā gurukah</i>
<i>Vṛṣabha</i>	” ”	<i>Kālena</i> ”
<i>Bhikṣu</i>	” ”	<i>Tapasā kālena ca laghukah</i>

The details regarding other types of *prāyaścittas* were more or less the same with the difference that the last three or four *prāyaścittas* are further elaborated. For instance,

Cheda was prescribed for the following offences :⁴⁰

(a) getting proud of one's penance, (b) being unable to carry out penances, (c) having no faith in penance, (d) losing control over oneself even after penance, (e) indulging in sexual intercourse and (f) frequently breaking the *uttaragūṇas*.

Mūla was prescribed for the following offences :⁴¹

(a) breaking any of the five great vows, (b) constantly breaking the *mūla* and *uttargūṇas*, (c) accepting householdership or heretical faith out of pride, and (d) causing impregnation or abortion.

Anavasthāpya items remained the same, but the monk who was punished with this sentence had to undergo various fasts upto the fourth or the sixth meal. He had to undergo this mode of life for the maximum period of twelve years. Moreover, he had to bow down to all, had to live in one corner of the monastery and no verbal contact was allowed to him with other monks.

The *Bṛhatkalpa-bhāṣya*⁴² gives details about *pārāñcika* which are the same as those given in the *Thānaṅga*.

Both the *Jītakalpa-bhāṣya*⁴³ and the *Bṛhatkalpa-bhāṣya*⁴⁴ give more details about the implementation of *pārāñcika*. For instance, the monk who was accused of *āśatanā pārāñcika* stood out of the *gaccha* for a minimum period of six months and a maximum period of a year. On the other hand, he who had to face the *pratisevanā pārāñcika* had to go out for a minimum period of one year and a maximum period of twelve years.

It may be noted that only the *ācārya* could pronounce the punishment of *pārāñcika* against a monk. The defaulter had to lead a secluded life for twelve years. If, however, he fell ill, then either the *ācārya* or the *upādhyāya* had to wait upon him.

Under certain cases, the punishment of the monk punished with *pārāñcika*, was commuted. If such a monk was successful in pleasing the king who on that account stopped giving trouble to the monks, then at the request of the king, the Saṃgha could even go to the length of setting the defaulter free from the blot by cancelling the rest of the punishment.

The most important thing to be noted is that the *Jitakalpa* and its *Bhāṣya* seem to refer to the fact that *anavasthāpya* and *pārāñcika* went out of use after Bhadrabāhu, the *caturdaśapūrvadhārin*. This can be corroborated by the fact that these texts mostly refer to fasts of various magnitudes as punishments for transgressions of different types committed by the monk, and the *Bṛhatkalpa-bhāṣya* often refers to them. In cases of transgressions regarding improper company,⁴⁵ using improper roads,⁴⁶ seeking improper residence, selecting improper clothing,⁴⁷ wearing them improperly,⁴⁸ improperly coating the bowl,⁴⁹ and in several other matters we find that these smaller expiatory fasts were mostly prescribed. One instance⁵⁰ will suffice here. Normally a monk was not to eat raw fruit. But if he took with permission the fruit belonging to a heretic then he had to undergo *caturlaghavaḥ*, and

if belonging to the Bhogika.....	<i>Caturguru</i>
if belonging to the Grāma.....	<i>Ṣaḍlaghu</i>
if belonging to the Vanik.....	<i>Ṣaḍguru</i>
if belonging to the Gosthī.....	<i>Cheda</i>
if belonging to the householder....	<i>Mūla</i>
if belonging to the police.....	<i>Anavasthāpya</i>
if belonging to the king.....	<i>Pārāñcika</i>

One more aspect of these later texts should be noted and that is that they give abundant exceptions to the general rule in cases of peculiar circumstances—either social, political or climatic. Due to these, the monks had to adjust their behaviour without transgressing the core of monastic life. It is quite likely, therefore, that due to that such a system of expiatory fasts for transgressions came in vogue. On this basis, rules of Jaina monastic jurisprudence took a new look, and they were made more accommodative.

Coming to the rules of jurisprudence as applicable to Jaina nuns, one finds that the nuns were always taken to be subordinate to the monks. It is laid down that “a monk of three years’ standing may become the upādhyāya of a nun of thirty years’ standing; and a monk of five years’ standing can become the upādhyāya of a nun of sixty years’ standing”⁵¹ This reminds one of a similar rule from the Buddhist text *Cullavagga* (X, 1,4,) where it is stated that a nun even of a hundred years’ standing should bow down to a monk who has quite recently been initiated. This explains the utterly subordinate position of the nuns of both these sects in their church organisation. The *Vavahāra-sutta*⁵² again lays down that “the ācārya, upādhyāya and the pravartinī—these three are the protectors of the nuns”.

The rules of jurisprudence as applied in the case of nuns were not radically different from those of the monks, hence they need not be repeated here again. One thing, however, may be noted, and that is regarding *parihāra*—i.e. keeping the transgressor separate from the group. According to the *Vavahāra-sutta* (5, 11-12), the nuns underwent this punishment while the *Bṛhatkalpa-bhāṣya* (V, p. 1561) prohibited the nuns from undergoing it.

A survey of these rules of Jaina monastic jurisprudence, however disconnected it may appear, brings one or two aspects to prominence. The first is that, unlike the Buddhist texts, the Jaina texts fail to give exhaustive details regarding the circumstances that led to the formulation of rules. Secondly, the list of the principal ten prāyaścittas is the same in both the canonical and non-canonical or later texts. But the *Cheda-sūtras* and later texts show attempts of codification of rules of monastic jurisprudence and possibly organisation of church. For details, however, we have to depend mostly on commentaries. Even in these, details regarding the process of appointing church officers, the method of trying a monk before an assembly of monks, etc. are not to be found exhaustively. Thirdly, later texts lay more emphasis on expiatory fasts. Possibly the major prāyaścittas were rarely used. Fourthly, the position of nuns always remained subordinate to monks. And lastly, whatever rules of Jaina monastic jurisprudence are to be found were formulated solely with a view to retain the core of orthodoxy and purity of monastic life undisturbed. This orthodoxy and purity are still the coveted merits of Jaina monachism.

REFERENCES

1. p. 516a.
2. *Bhag.* p. 382a; *Ṭhāṇ.* p. 142b.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 329ab.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 239b, 240a.
5. p. 164b.
6. *Ṭhāṇ.* p. 331b.
7. p. 919ab; *Ṭhāṇ.* p. 484a.
8. p. 920b.
9. p. 484a; 355b.
10. *Ṭhāṇ.* p. 484a.
11. *Ibid.*, pp. 162b-164b.
12. *Smv.* p. 47b; *Ṭhāṇ* pp. 199a ff.
13. *Bhag. comm.* pp. 351-52; *Ṭhāṇ. comm.* pp. 168ab.
14. *Vav.* 10, 14.
15. *Ibid.*, 3, 3-4.
16. Schübring, *Die Lehra der Jainas*, article 141.
17. 3, 9-25.
18. *Vav.* 3, 7.
19. *Ibid.*, 4, 15.
20. *Ibid.*, 4, 24.
21. *Ibid.*, 4, 13-14.
22. *Ibid.*, 6, 10-11.
23. *Ibid.*, 2, 6-17.
24. For exhaustive details, see the author's thesis "*The History of Jaina Monachism from Inscriptions and Literature*".
25. *I.A.*, 39, p. 262, f.n. 25.
26. *Bṛh. Kalp.* 4, 3; *Jitakalpa* 87-89.
27. *Bṛh. Kalp.* 4, 2.
28. Introduction to German edition of *Vavahāra* and *Nisiha Sutta*.
29. *Nis.* 4, 112.
30. *Vav.* 2, 6.
31. *Ibid.*, 2, 24-25.
32. *Nis.* 16, 16-24.
33. *Nis. Cun.* 11, pp. 717ff.
34. *Bṛh. Kalp. bhā.* Vol. V, 5172-89.
35. Vol. III, 3005ff.
36. Vol. I, 373-75.
37. *Bṛh. Kalp. bhā.* II, 1272-73.
38. *I.A.*, 39, p. 267, f.n. 45.
39. *Bṛh. Kalp. bhā.* IV, 3304.
40. *Jit. bhā.* 2280-87; *Vim.* 16, 13.
41. *Jit. bhā.* 2288-2300; *Vim.* 16, 14.
42. Vol. V, 4971-84; *Jit. bhā.* 2463ff.
43. 2578ff.
44. Vol. V, 5032ff.
45. *Bṛh. Kalp. bhā.* Vol. II, 886-888.
46. *Ibid.*
47. *Ibid.*, Vol. I, 607-31.
48. *Ibid.*, 758.
49. *Ibid.*, 471-529.
50. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, 906.
51. *Vav.* 7, 15-16.
52. 3, 12.

