



SOAS Centre for Jaina Studies

19th Jaina Studies Workshop
Jainism and Buddhism

Book of Abstracts

18 March 2017

SOAS, University of London

Jaina and Buddhist Epistemology in Umāsvāti's Time

Lucas den Boer, Leiden University

Existing studies on the Jaina theory of knowledge recognise that the epistemological innovations in the *Tattvārthasūtra* (TS) were partly motivated by encounters with other philosophical movements. However, the precise circumstances that urged Umāsvāti to rework the Jaina epistemological account are far from clear. Although several studies have dealt with the role of the TS in the internal development of Jaina epistemology (e.g. Clavel, Balcerowicz), much remains to be done concerning the investigation of the TS in the context of its broader intellectual milieu. Given the divergent views on the date of the TS, it is still an open question as to who Umāsvāti's intellectual rivals actually were. However, it is clear that the Buddhists played an important role in the philosophical developments in the period in which the TS was written and, as Ohira has observed in *A Study of Tattvārthasūtra with Bhāṣya*, we can assume that Umāsvāti was well acquainted with Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośa*. My paper, therefore, explores whether Buddhist theories of knowledge might have influenced the epistemological account of the TS. For this purpose, I will investigate references to other philosophical movements in the epistemological parts of the TS and its *bhāṣya*. Even though these texts do only occasionally refer to other schools by name, there are several implicit references to existing debates and positions that throw some light on the intellectual surroundings of the TS. My analysis will show that the text is not so much concerned with Buddhist epistemology, but rather positions itself in relation to Nyāya thought. This outcome leads to important questions about the role of Nyāya thought and the actual encounters between Jaina, Buddhist and Nyāya intellectuals in the time of the TS and its *bhāṣya*. Further, by examining the way in which the *bhāṣya* comments on the *sūtras*, my study will contribute to a better understanding of the relation between these texts.

The Conversion of Jaina Women to the Buddhist Path According to the Pali Canon

Christopher Key Chapple, Loyola Marymount University

The *Therīgāthā*, which provides accounts of the early Buddhist nuns, includes two stories of women who had been members of Jain religious orders before converting to Buddhism. *Bhaddā Kuṇḍalakesā*, who had been born into a "financier's" family and trained as a Jaina nun, eventually became a master of debate, travelling from village to village as a religious teacher. She was convinced to follow Buddhism by *Sāriputra*. *Nanduttarā*, who had been born into a Brahmin family, similarly became skilled in debate, and became a Buddhist nun after an encounter with *Moggallāna*. This paper will speculate on how these two narratives characterize, from a Buddhist perspective, early conversations between Buddhists and Jains.

Teacher Evaluations: Jains and Their Doctrines as Portrayed in (Mūla-) Sarvāstivāda Buddhist Sūtra Literature

Charles DiSimone, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Germany

The *Gilgit Dīrghāgama* manuscript is a *Sarvāstivāda*/*Mūlasarvāstivāda* text containing a collection of ancient canonical Buddhist *sūtras*, composed in Sanskrit with some Prakrit and Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit elements and written on birch bark folios in the *Gilgit/Bamiyan Type II* script, also known as *Proto-Śāradā*. This collection had been lost for centuries and was recently rediscovered in what is thought to be the border area of Afghanistan and Pakistan in the late 20th century. Like the *Dhīganikāya* of the *Theravāda* tradition preserved in Pali and the *長阿含經* (*Cháng āhán jīng*) of the *Dharmaguptaka* tradition preserved in Chinese, the *Dīrghāgama* is rife with examples of intertextuality and its author(s) either influenced or borrowed - or most likely, both influenced and borrowed - from other Buddhist texts. While the *Dīrghāgama*, *Dhīganikāya*, and *長阿含經* (*Cháng āhán jīng*) often parallel one another, there are numerous differences and the three collections often disagree on topics and content. What does the death of *Mahāvīra* have to do with *Śāriputra* extolling *Gautama*? Upon first glance the beginnings of the *Prāsādika-* and *Prasādanīya-sūtras*, now edited and translated for the first time, appear to introduce texts with disparate themes and concerns, sharing similarity only in their titles. However, these two paired *sūtras* from the *Yuganipāta* of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda

Dīrghāgama, set near the end of the Buddha's career, are directly related in setting forth the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin positions on what makes a teacher and his doctrines successful. In the course of laying out these positions, Jains, referred to as the Nigranthas, are employed as the chief example of a group of *anya-tīrthikas* (adherents of another faith) whose positions are well-founded but ultimately do not meet the standards of perfection set forth by Gautama. This paper will examine the representations of the Jains and their views as they were interpreted - or perhaps more accurately, misinterpreted - by the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins and demonstrate how they were used as narrative foils to further the ends of the (Mūla-) Sarvāstivāda tradition as it was preserved in Central Asia in the 7th and 8th centuries of the Common Era.

About *Vasati* in Vyavahārabhāṣya I-II in Comparison to Buddhist Texts

Yumi Fujimoto, Japan

Vasati "a house; an abode" sometimes appears in Vyavahārabhāṣya as a dwelling place of Jain monks. Although detailed descriptions are not available, Vyavahārabhāṣya I and II has several textual parts which show characteristics of *vasati*. There are also some other words which will lead a better understanding of it (for example, *śayyātara*, *vihāra*, *abhiśayyā*, and *abhiśaisedhikī*). This paper will refer to textual parts of these words and try to explain characteristics of *vasati* based on Vyavahārabhāṣya I and II. Rules in the Buddhist order will be mentioned for comparison and consideration.

Nidāna: A Word with Different Meanings

Sin Fujinaga, Miyakonojo, Miyazaki, Japan

As a part of introductory remark of this lecture, an overview of the general meaning of the word *nidāna* in Buddhism and Jainism as well as in Hindu texts is given, and it is shown how modern scholars understand it. Mostly the word designates a cause in general and especially that of rebirth. The Jains use it in this particular context. The main part of the lecture explores Jain texts focusing on the term *nidāna*: Āyāradasāo, Vavahāra, Tattvārthasūtra, Samāiccakahā, Triṣaṣṭīśālākāpuruṣacarita, and others. Through an understanding of the uses of the word *nidāna* in various fields of Jaina literature the nature of this fundamental concept in Jainism can be grasped. In conclusion some points for further research on this term are discussed, the reason why the Jains use this word in different ways, and the necessity for further studies of Jain texts.

On Corresponding Sanskrit Words of Prakrit *posaha*: With Special Reference to Śrāvākācāra Texts and Buddhist Texts

Kazuyoshi Hotta, Otani University Kyoto, Japan

In Brahmanism the purification rite called *upavasatha* has been practiced on the day before the Vedic ritual is performed. For example, we can see the description about such purification rite in Taittirīyaśaṃhitā 1.6.7.3, Śatapathabrāhmaṇa 1.1.1.7 etc. Jainism and Buddhism have borrowed the rite in different ways and called it *posaha* or *uposatha* etc. in Prakrit and Pāli. Buddhism mainly has developed the rite as a ritual of the mendicant group. On the other hand, Jainism mainly has developed the rite as a practice of the layperson.

In this presentation, we will survey the corresponding Sanskrit words of Prakrit *posaha* and its etymological meaning seen in the Śrāvākācāra texts. In this field, the study of Robert Williams (Jaina Yoga 1963.) is the most excellent work which has to be referred to initially. However, it has been over fifty years since its publication, so it should be corrected in some respects. Firstly, we will examine his two opinions as follows. One is that there have come into existence a number of false sanskritizations *pauṣadha*, *proṣadha*, *poṣadha* for the Prakrit *posaha*. The second point is that the word form *poṣadha* seems to have attained the most general currency. On the first point, his opinion is mostly right. But we can add that the word form *upoṣadha* is seen in the printed text of Vratodyotanaśrāvākācāra as the only exception. The word form *upoṣadha* can be seen in the Buddhist texts like Divyāvadāna too. As to the second point, his assumption is not sufficient. Nevertheless, many modern scholars (for example, P. S. Jaini, Willem Bollée, Kristi Wiley etc.) seem

to consider that the word form *poṣadha* have attained the most general currency. By investigating about sixty kinds of Śrāvākācāra texts, it can be said that the word form *proṣadha* has attained the most currency. Furthermore, we can precisely point out the tendency according to the sect. That is to say, Śvetāmbara uses *poṣadha* or *pauṣadha* and Digambara uses *proṣadha*.

The paper will also investigate the etymological interpretations of the respective word forms seen in Śrāvākācāra texts, especially focusing on texts which Robert Williams did not deal with. In Jainism, the original word form *upavasatha* has been re-sanskritized via the Prakrit form *posaha*, so they have lost the sight of the preverb *upa* and assumed that $\sqrt{pu\text{ṣ}}$ etc. are the etymological origin. Here, we examine the etymological meaning included in the respective word forms, comparing it with the etymological interpretation seen in Brahmanical texts and Buddhist texts.

***Ekapoṣadha* and *ekamaṇḍalī*: Some Comparative Notes of Jaina and Buddhist Monastic Rules**

Haiyan Hu-von Hinüber, Freiburg, Germany

Both post-vedic religions of Jainism and Buddhism show analogies in many aspects. In a book published in 2016 (*Sambhoga. The Affiliation with a Religious Order in Early Jainism and Buddhism*), I investigated the essential term *sambhoga* which is largely used with the same meaning (“alms district”) by Jainas and Buddhists. The present paper aims to analyze some further similarities concerning the monastic rules of both religions, with focus on two technical terms: *eka-poṣadha* of the Buddhists and *eka-maṇḍalī* of the Jainas.

The Buddhist *uposatha/poṣadha* ceremony had been presumably carried out by the historical Buddha himself, along with the fortnightly recitation of the old part of the Pātimokkha. The earliest reference is attested in three versions of Aśoka’s so-called “Schism-Edict” found in Kauśāmbī, Sāñci and Sārnāth. According to some early Buddhist sources such as the Aṅguttara Nikāya, the Vinayapiṭaka of the Mahāsāṃghika and the Mūlasarvāstivāda school, it is evident that the Buddhists actually adopted the *poṣadha* ritual from “ascetics of different faith” (*anyatīrthikaparivrājaka*), among those the *nigaṇṭhūposatha* is explicitly referred to.

Comparing the above mentioned Buddhist texts with some early sources of the Jaina canon (*Viyāhapannati*, *Uvāsagadasāo* etc.), my paper intends to discuss the usage of certain technical terms in both monastic systems and their relationship to each other. For instance, both religions differentiate between the *pauṣadha/poṣadha* ceremony for the members of a religious order and those determined for the laity.

The Jaina boundary *eka-maṇḍalī* (“in one district only”) ensures the common supplies (*sambhoga*) for the clerics as well as their ritual immaculateness, because all monks or nuns who are staying within this *maṇḍalī* have to confess their possible offences before taking the meal jointly. Analogically, the Buddhist Vinaya prescribes (*saṃgho etehi nimittehi sīmaṃ sammannati samānasamvāsam ekuposatham*) that only one *uposatha/poṣadha* ceremony is allowed to be held in one residence of monks in order to guarantee the purity of the Saṃgha. The district of a Buddhist order is defined by a *sīmā* (boundary) which corresponds to the Jaina term *maṇḍalī*.

Examination of the Buddhists in Amitagati's *Dharmaparīkṣā*: A Reflective Look on Jaina Criticism

Heleen De Jonckheere, Ghent University

The *Dharmaparīkṣā* by the Digambara monk Amitagati, written at the beginning of the eleventh century, is a satirical text that mainly criticizes the Brahmanic tradition through narrative. Although this work emphasizes the faults and flaws of the Purāṇic tradition, some space is also reserved for the Buddhists. I will discuss what is said about the Buddhists in this text and why it is so important to mention them. I will show that by opposing the Buddhists Amitagati puts them within the philosophically relevant world for the Digambara Jain community, and that by characterizing them he is actually also revealing something about his own community.

Haribhadrasūri on the Property Ownership by the Buddhist Mendicants

Yutaka Kawasaki, The University of Tokyo

Past studies have revealed that the eminent Śvetāmbara monk Haribhadrasūri (8th century) had a good knowledge about various kinds of the Buddhist philosophical and epistemological concepts, and that he inveighed against such as the theory of momentariness, the concept of consciousness-only (*vijñaptimātratā*), Dharmakīrti's epistemology, and so on. Besides, it is also well known that Haribhadrasūri was a bitter critic on the daily practices of Buddhist mendicants in their monastic life. We can find one such criticism in his treatise written in Prakrit, the *Dhammasaṅgahaṇi*. According to *Dhammasaṅgahaṇi* verse 986, an opponent is said to assert that the Buddhist mendicants can possess various types of property in the villages because their owning of such property leads to the growth of "the three jewels (*buddha*, *dharma*, and *sangha*)," that is, Buddhism. After this assertion, Haribhadrasūri starts disputing with his opponent over the legitimacy of the property ownership by the Buddhist mendicants till verse 1015. This paper, after briefly touching upon the concept of 'non-possession (*aparigraha*)' in Jainism, will explore how Haribhadrasūri criticizes his opponent's claims and how his opponent argues back against Haribhadrasūri in order to legitimate the property ownership by the Buddhist mendicants. Through a careful reading of this dispute which probably reflects some historical facts, this paper will reveal the different understandings on the concept of 'possession (*parigraha*)' between Jainism and Buddhism. It will also shed new light on the actual conditions of the management of Buddhist monastery in the medieval period.

The Making of the Cult Image: New Aspects of Interaction of Buddhism and Jainism in Ancient Indian Art

Patrick Krüger, Ruhr-University Bochum, Germany

It is well-known that Jain religion as well as Buddhism arose from an ascetic movement, whose members refused any worldly possessions. For this reason it seems remarkable, that especially from Jainism an image tradition originated, which was probably adopted by the Buddhists a little later. Previous research has explained the creation of early images of the Jina and the Buddha from the art historical perspective, where images are mostly perceived as depictions based on a literary tradition. From a media perspective, however, making objects means to visualize religious themes and beliefs and in a sense the image changed and formed the religion. The paper will present new perspectives of the origin and meaning of the early Jina image and the religious culture of the Jains in Mathura.

Identity Issues of Buddhist Monks in the *Ṛṣibhāṣitāni*

Samaṇī Kusum Prajñā, Jaina Vishva Bharati Institute Ladnun, India

The *Ṛṣibhāṣitāni* is the only Indian ancient work which contains the traditional and practiced knowledge contributed by the three renowned religious streams viz. Jaina, Buddha and Vedic. This text researched by Schubring, Pandit Dalsukhbhai Malavaniya, Sagarmal Jaina and other scholars will be debated from different perspectives. The text serving as an excellent example of liberal thinking and religious tolerance, raises more questions than answers, for its status in Jaina canon is disputed, its author unknown and furthermore the saints in the text reveal disputed identity. This paper will deal with this Identity Issue of Buddhist Monks.

This work contains the preaching of all the four types of saints - Royal saint (*rājarṣi*), Divine saint (*brahmarṣi*), Godly saint (*devarṣi*) and Supreme saint (*paramarṣi*). Probability of these twelve saints belonging to different traditions is nirgrantha (Jaina) tradition, five from Buddhist tradition, and seventeen from Vedic tradition. Different factors create dispute and question this probability. Further, there are some more saints explained here but the tradition they belong to not recognized. In the paper I focus on the monks found in the chapters 2nd Vrajikaputra, 9th Mahākaśyapa, 26th Mātāṅga, 38th Sāciputra, and 41st Indranāga, as these saints seem to be 'related with' Buddhist tradition. The reasoning behind delegating them as merely related to Buddhism rather than making a factual claim of being Buddhist saints will be investigated.

The reasoning behind delegating them as merely 'related to' Buddhism rather than making a factual claim of being Buddhist saints will be investigated. My research will undertake a philological and

philosophical analysis of the text itself, investigate the commentary of unknown author and revisit the research of scholars such as Schubring and others. For example, the unknown commentator on the text, Dr. Schubring, and Sagarmal Jain consider the saint Sāiputta to be Buddhist, yet each of them employ different rationale behind the argument in their pursuit of philological investigation. Debate gets intensified when different scholars designate Sāiputta as Buddhist but identify them as different Buddhist saints.

Just to analyse Sāiputta, unknown commentator analysis the word '*bhikṣu*' used with Sāiputta as tagged with Buddhist tradition. While Dr. Schubring translates Sāiputta in Sanskrit as Svātiputra. Dr. Sagarmal Jaina has acknowledged Sāiputra as the main disciple of Saint Buddha by translating Sāiputta as Sāriputra but, the Sanskrit meaning of Sāiputta should be Sāciputra, which is one of the names of Lord Buddha. The name of Lord Buddha's mother was Māyā. According to Sanskrit dictionaries Sāci is the synonym of Māyā. Therefore, Sāciputra (the son of Sāci) like Māyāsuta (the son of Māyā) should also have been used for Lord Buddha. Another main reason behind considering Sāiputta as Buddha is that out of the mentioned 44 saints, Lord Buddha's name is not among them (if Sāiputta is excluded). It seems inappropriate to include the names of disciples ignoring the name of the Guru. Therefore, it can be said that Sāiputta must have been used for Lord Buddha. Overall the disputed journey of investigating the original tradition will be presented in the paper. Difficulties to discern the original tradition, gets intensified for the discourse of these saints does not fit to one specific tradition. Such and other issues will be dealt exploring why few are 'related to' Buddhist tradition rather than being Buddhist.

This identity issue of Buddhist monks will quintessentially also unveil the identity problem of saints in general in the text, question of conversion and question the notion of 'standardised philosophy' in three traditions.

The Digambara Vidyānandin's discussion with the Buddhist on *svasaṃvedana*, *pratyakṣa* and *pramāṇa*

Jay Soni, University of Innsbruck, Austria

Two of the terms in the title are from Vidyānandin's Tattvārtha-śloka-vārttika (Tśv, 1, 6, 11), which is his commentary on Umāsvāti's Tattvārtha-sūtra (TS). Sūtra 6 of the TS is: *pramāṇa-nayair adhigamaḥ* ('Knowledge - of the seven categories - is attained by the instruments of knowledge and the standpoints'). Vidyānandin's commentary on this sūtra 6 entails a total of 56 ślokas, with his own prose *vārttika* on each of them in varying lengths. Tśv 1, 6, 1-8 deal with particulars and universals, for which he uses the synonymous pairs *aṃśa/aṃśin* and *avayava/avayavin*. That he is attacking the Buddhist position regarding this age old theme in Indian philosophy, is evident also in that he quotes Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇa-vārttika. By the time he comes to his Tśv 1, 6, 6, he establishes that an object as a whole is open to perception and that the Buddhist also accepts perception as a valid means of knowledge, but does not accept the perception of an object as a whole.

From Tśv 1, 6, 11 onwards Vidyānandin continues with the same theme, elaborating his attack of the Buddhist view even further, in terms of *svasaṃvedana*, *pratyakṣa* and *pramāṇa* (self-awareness, perception and valid means of knowledge). The presentation will attempt to deal with these concepts in order to see how Vidyānandin vindicates the Jaina position vi-à-vis the Buddhist one. This presentation will continue from my previous study of Vidyānandin's Tśv 1, 6, 1-10.

The Buddhist Salvation of Ajātaśatru and the Jaina Non-Salvation of Kūṇika

Juan Wu, Leiden University / Tsinghua University

Buddhism and Jainism, as cousin traditions, not only show remarkable similarities in beliefs and customs, but also share a good number of common narrative characters. One example of such a shared character is King Ajātaśatru/Kūṇika of Magadha, who is widely featured in both Buddhist and Jaina literature. In comparing Buddhist and Jaina sources, previous studies have mostly focused on the parallelism between Buddhist and Śvetāmbara Jaina descriptions of how Ajātaśatru/Kūṇika imprisons his own father and causes his death. Rather less attention has been devoted to exploring how or why Buddhist and Jaina narrative traditions of this character differ.

This paper will demonstrate a stark contrast between Buddhist and Jaina attitudes toward the salvation of Ajātaśatru/Kūṇika. While a number of Buddhist texts predict that Ajātaśatru, after his next birth in hell, will be released from there and finally become a pratyekabuddha or a buddha, the Jainas only told us that Kūṇika is killed by a cave deity and falls into hell, without saying when he will be released from hell, or whether he will ultimately attain liberation. Moreover, while the Buddhists offered various solutions to Ajātaśatru's sinful condition, the Jainas proposed no remedy for Kūṇika's bad *karma*. The Buddhist prophecies of Ajātaśatru's liberation indicate that some Buddhists in ancient India were particularly concerned with the salvation of morally corrupted or karmically trapped ones such as the patricide Ajātaśatru. The Jaina silence on Kūṇika's future destiny after his life in hell indicates that the Jainas in general had little interest in bringing him to liberation, and deemed him to be one who is never able to overcome his *mithyātvā* ("false view") due to his strong passions.