

A Note on the Heterodox Calendar and a Disputed Reading in the Kālakācāryakathā

K.R. Norman is no doubt best known among Indologists for his penetrating publications on the Pāli Canon and the Theravāda Buddhist textual tradition. It should, however, be emphasised that the particular authority of his extensive philological work, whether editorial or etymological in orientation, derives from its firm grounding upon a detailed knowledge of a wide range of Middle Indo-Aryan dialects whereby Pāli is not to be studied in exclusively Buddhological terms but rather as representing a component of a wider linguistic matrix in which the insights gained from the phonology, grammar, and lexicon of Ardhamāgadhī and other Prākṛits play a vital elucidatory role. Furthermore, the editions and metrical analyses of short Jain canonical texts and discussions of various linguistic and doctrinal parallels between early Buddhism and Jainism to be found throughout the eight volumes of his *Collected Papers* make amply clear that Mr Norman's career-long preoccupation with Pāli philology has not led to Jain studies' loss being Buddhist studies' gain.¹ In this light I trust that my former teacher will not think it inappropriate if in a congratulatory volume which contains contributions dealing almost exclusively with Buddhist matters I proceed to discuss a topic relating to Jainism which abuts on Buddhism only tangentially but nonetheless represents a matter of no little concern to the two heterodox, that is non-brahmanical, traditions, namely the configuration of the ritual calendar.

As is well known, adherents of the early *śramaṇa* orders assembled at various times of the month to preach their respective doctrines and

My thanks to John Cort for reading a draft of this paper.

¹See Norman 1990–2001. As a postgraduate Mr Norman had originally contemplated an edition of the Jain canonical text, the *Stihānāṅga Sūtra*, a project aborted because of lack of accessible early manuscripts at the time (personal communication).

perform communal rituals of purification and solidarity. This is clearly witnessed by early Buddhist and Jain sources. Thus the Mahāvagga of the Theravāda Vinaya describes this custom as taking place on the fourteenth, fifteenth, and eighth days of the half-month² and goes on to portray the Buddha as sanctioning the recitation of the Pāṭimokkha on the fifteenth day as an *uposathakamma*,³ while the Jain Sūtrakṛtāṅga Sūtra refers to the *posaha* being correctly observed on the fourteenth and eighth days, on designated dates and on full-moon days.⁴

Notwithstanding the brahmanical origins⁵ of the term used for this important day of observance,⁶ the Vedic ritual calendar proved unacceptable to renunciatory groups such as the Jains and Buddhists who wished to distance themselves from brahman customs and initially a lunar calendar seems to have been adopted by them by way of differentiation. However, the latter was in turn to be challenged by a lunisolar calendar, of Greek origin and in use by around 380 C.E., which gained ground at the expense of the former mode of reckoning through its attempt to reconcile the 354 days of the lunar calendar with the 365¼

²Vin I 101,4–6: *tena kho pana samayena aññatitthiyā paribbājakā cātuddase pannarase aṭṭhamiyā ca pakkhassa sannipatitvā dhammaṃ bhāsanti.*

³Vin I 102,22–24.

⁴Sūtrakṛtāṅga Sūtra 2.2, pp. 188–89: *cāuddasaṭṭhamuddiṭṭhapuṇṇamāsīṇīsu paḍīpuṇṇaṃ posahaṃ sammaṃ aṇupālemāṇā.* Cf. 2.7, p. 250, where Jambūvijaya reads *posadhaṃ.*

⁵The common source of the term variously rendered by the Buddhists and Jains as *uposatha*, *poṣadha*, and *posaha* (signifying both the day and the observance connected with it) is *upavasatha*, used in Vedic texts of a particular form of overnight fast associated with the full-moon sacrifice. Tieken (2000, pp. 11–13) argues for the Buddhist *uposatha* as the counterpart of the secular *akṣapaṭala* ceremony at which the king and his functionaries rendered account of activities conducted during the previous eight months.

⁶In medieval Jainism, *poṣadha* came to mean the day of the moon's periodic change and the fast carried out thereon, while today it designates a contemplative exercise structured over a half or whole day which is most generally observed at the time of Paryuṣaṇ (see below). See Cort 2001, p. 123, and Williams 1963, p. 142. This note does not deal with the Jain *poṣadha* ritual as such.

days of its solar equivalent. Adoption of one or the other of these calendars was eventually to be among the strategies involved in the formulation of sectarian identity amongst the Buddhists and so the Mūlasarvāstivādins came to organise their ritual calendar on the lunisolar model, while the Theravādins used the older lunar model.⁷ Mūlasarvāstivādin sources describe how that particular Buddhist *nikāya* customarily performed the half-monthly *poṣadha* ceremony involving the recitation of the code of monastic law on the fifteenth day of the fortnight, or, as a result of calendrical circumstances which necessitated the omission of one day, exceptionally on the fourteenth day also, thus ensuring that the observance always fell on a full-moon or new-moon day.⁸ Although the Poṣadhavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya allows for special procedures to be permitted for monks observing *poṣadha* on the fourteenth day if they were visiting a monastery where the ceremony was normally held on the fifteenth day, the Pravrajyāvastu asserts firmly that customary observance of *poṣadha* on the fourteenth day only was a practice of heretical sectarians (*tīrthya*).⁹

It is most likely that the Mūlasarvāstivādins regarded these heretics as being the members of other Buddhist *nikāyas*, but we can assume that the Jain community in the early common era was also caught up in the

⁷Vogel 1997, pp. 678, 680, and 686.

⁸“[A lunar] year is made up of twelve synodic months of about 29½ days each, this being the interval between two successive full (or new) moons styled a lunation. If the Poṣadha ceremony had been celebrated on the fifteenth throughout, after two months already it would have taken place one day later than [the] full moon, which would surely have been noticed by the monks. It is for this reason that one day was dropped, and the function was held on the fourteenth instead of the fifteenth every other month. Hence Poṣadha always fell on [the] full-moon or new-moon day” (Vogel 1997, p. 678). For a Jain awareness of this situation, cf. the fourteenth-century Gurutattvapradīpa (see note 36) 4.17. At an early date a rule was formulated by the Buddhist community to allow for three *poṣadha* days for the laity every fortnight, namely the eighth, fourteenth, and fifteenth. See Dietz 1997, p. 63, and cf. Hu-von Hinüber 1994, p. 21, and Hureau 2006, p. 102.

⁹Vogel 1997, p. 678.

difficulties contingent upon calendrical innovation, even if detailed contemporary evidence equivalent to that provided by the Buddhists is lacking from this source. It is against this background that we can proceed to discuss the main change in the dating system of the Jains, introduced according to tradition by the teacher Kālaka in 466 C.E. whose career is described in the cycle of hagiographies which can be collectively and individually entitled the Kālakācāryakathā, and the possible implications of this for disciplinary observance held on the fourteenth day of the month.¹⁰

The earliest account of Kālaka's redating of Saṃvatsarī, the day communally devoted to *pratikramaṇa*, the general repentance of transgressions (in this case, those committed in the previous year) which is the culmination of the festival of Paryuṣaṇ, occurs during the tenth *uddeśaka* of the Niśītha Cūrṇi by Jinadāsa (c. seventh century).¹¹ Kālaka is portrayed there as authorising while in Pratiṣṭhāna the shift of the date of Saṃvatsarī from its traditional location on the fifth day of the month of Bhādrapada to the fourth day at the behest of King Śātavāhana in order to avoid a clash with a Hindu festival. The portion of the Niśītha Cūrṇi version of the story most relevant to the present discussion can be rendered as follows: "So Paryuṣaṇ (i.e. the Saṃvatsarī *pratikramaṇa* ceremony) must be performed on the fourth

¹⁰See Brown 1933. This Kālaka is no doubt not identical to the teacher of the same name who according to the Kālakācāryakathā invited the Śakas into western India to revenge an insult to his sister. However, this is not relevant to the present paper. The story of Kālaka became associated with the Kalpa Sūtra, the central text of the Śvetāmbara Jain festival of Paryuṣaṇ. The Gurutattvapradīpa 4.22 autocomentary states that there existed no early (*ādya*) manuscript of the Kalpa Sūtra which did not contain the story of Kālaka and that the latter must have been included when the former was first written down as an individual text (*prthaglikhita*). Both the Kalpa Sūtra and the Kālakācāryakathā thus have equal antiquity and authority. The Gurutattvapradīpa also suggests (4.24 autocomentary) that the story of Kālaka originated about two and a half centuries after its hero's life.

¹¹Niśītha Cūrṇi on *bhāṣya* verse 3153, p. 131. For *pratikramaṇa* in general, see Cort 2001, pp. 123–24.

day [of Bhādrapada]. In this way the mighty teacher of this epoch (Kālaka) caused the fourth day to be introduced [as the day for the observance of Saṃvatsarī] since there was an appropriate motive for this. That same date was approved by all the monks.”¹² Later writers (see below) also refer to the Paryuṣaṇākālpa Cūrṇi, possibly approximately contemporary with the Niśītha Cūrṇi, which gives as the equivalent of its version, “[The Saṃvatsarī day of] Paryuṣaṇ was performed on the fourth day of the month; in this way the fourth day became [a festival] inspired by an [appropriate] motive.”¹³ In other words, the Niśītha Cūrṇi and Paryuṣaṇākālpa Cūrṇi record the fact that a significant modification in the ritual calendar entered the realm of Śvetāmbara Jain customary practice for a practical reason and with general approval.

Versions of the story of Kālaka found in Śvetāmbara Jain narrative collections in the later centuries of the first millennium C.E. such as Jayasimhasūri’s Dharmopadeśamālāvivaraṇa do not appear to concern themselves with the finer issues of the account of the redating of Saṃvatsarī. However, versions of the story produced at the beginning of the second millennium introduce a statement describing the possible implications of Kālaka’s redating which was to prove highly controversial.¹⁴ An early example occurs in the Kālakācāryakathānaka found in the commentary of 1089–90 C.E. by Devacandrasūri (the teacher of the celebrated Hemacandra) on Pradyumnasūri’s Mūlaśuddhiprakaraṇa.¹⁵ After providing an approximate reproduction of the

¹²*tāhe cauthīe pajjosaviyaṃ. evaṃ jugappahāṇehi cauthī kārāṇe pavattitā. sa ccevāṇumatā savvasāhūṇaṃ*

¹³*cauthīe katā pajjosavaṇā, evaṃ cauthī vi jāyā kārāṇiyā.* See Kulamaṇḍana-sūri (1353–99), *Vicārāmṛtasārasaṃgraha*, p. 34, and *Gurutattvapradīpa*, p. 66. I have not had access to a published version of the Paryuṣaṇākālpa Cūrṇi and am not confident that one exists.

¹⁴Brown (1933, p. 2) suggests that the Kālakācāryakathā cycle may have emerged in the twelfth century.

¹⁵Mūlaśuddhiprakaraṇa, p. 130.

statement in the Niśītha Cūrṇi given above¹⁶ and an epitomising verse delineating the overall context of the redating as being prompted by King Śātavāhana,¹⁷ Devacandrasūri continues: “And because of that (*tavvaseṇa*) (i.e. the redating), the [regular] fortnightly observances [of *pratikramaṇa*] (*pakkhiyāim*) were performed on the fourteenth day of the month, which had otherwise been described in scriptural tradition [as to be performed] on the full-moon day (i.e. the fifteenth day).”¹⁸ That is to say, Kālaka’s redating of Saṃvatsari is held to be responsible for the relocation of another important observance, the fortnightly act of repentance, which had previously (that is, back to the time of Mahāvīra) been practised on the full-moon day,¹⁹ to the fourteenth day of the month.²⁰ The *tavvaseṇa* statement also occurs in the first serious

¹⁶*evaṃ ca kāraṇeṇa Kālagāyariēhiṃ cauthīe pajjosavaṇaṃ pavattiyāṃ samatthasaṃghēṇa ya aṇumaṇṇiyāṃ.*

¹⁷*kāraṇiyā ya cauthī ceiyajaisāhuvāsaṇanimittam\uddisiya Śātavāhana pāyaṭṭiyā Kāliya ’jjeṇa.*

¹⁸*tavvaseṇa ya pakkhiyāiṇi vi cauddasī āyariyāṇi, aṇṇahā āgamottāṇi puṇṇimāe.* This will be designated hereafter as the “*tavvaseṇa* statement”. The spelling *puṇṇimāe/puṇṇimāe* alternates in the various sources.

¹⁹See Renou and Filliozat 1953, p. 734, for the bright half (*śuklapakṣa*) of the fifteenth day also being called *pūrṇimā* (or some derivative of it).

²⁰In his defence of the impossibility of any scriptural warranty for the fortnightly *pratikramaṇa* being observed on the full-moon day, the fourteenth-century Kulamaṇḍanasūri, Vicārāṃṭasārasaṃgraha, p. 24, specifically connects the *tavvaseṇa* statement with Devacandrasūri, albeit locating it in his commentary on the Sthānāṅga Sūtra, a work which seems to have been lost, rather than his commentary on the Mūlasuddhiprakaraṇa. However, Kulamaṇḍanasūri further points out that in that same work there also occurs confirmation of the general authority for the fortnightly observance taking place on the fourteenth day, that is without any reference to a supposedly scripturally sanctioned full-moon day observance, and he ascribes these two differing judgements apparently made by Devacandrasūri to the influence of the current time of decline (*janānāṃ kāladoṣaviśeṣeṇa*). For a reference to the Sthānāṅga Sūtra commentary in conjunction with a version of the Kālaka-ācāryakathā which possibly relates to the topic under discussion in this study, see Catalogue 2006: No. 668 (entry for Nānāvicāra-ratna-saṃgraha), p. 472: *iti śrī-Devacandrasūri-kṛtāyāṃ Thānā-vṛttau, tathā kasyāmeit Kālaka-cārya-*

modern edition of the Kālaka story, that of Jacobi, which was based on a manuscript dating from 1428²¹ and was to be drawn on by Brown in his study of 1933 for an edition of what has come to represent the best-known telling of the story, the so-called “Long Anonymous Version”.²²

On the face of it, the assertion of the *tavvaseṇa* statement that the fortnightly *pratīkramaṇa* must be performed on the fourteenth day of the month, when in fact scripture had originally stipulated that it should take place on the full-moon day, might seem to represent a simple acknowledgement of the necessity for a further adjustment of the ritual calendar as a knock-on effect in the wake of the redating of Saṃvatsarī to one day earlier than had been the ancient practice. However, the authoritative ninth-century commentator Śīlāṅka, elucidating Sūtra-kṛtāṅga Sūtra 2.7.3 (~2.2.76) which describes the various days on which *poṣadha* could be celebrated (see above), connects only the three four-monthly (*caturmāsaka*) *pratīkramaṇa* observances, in which repentance is offered for transgressions in the previous four months, with full-moon days, not the fortnightly *pratīkramaṇa*,²³ and by the eleventh century (that is, at the approximate time when developed versions of the Kālākācāryakathā were starting to appear) there can be found increasing evidence that a connection of the fortnightly *pratīkramaṇa* with the supposedly scripturally sanctioned full-moon day was difficult, or indeed impossible, for elements of the Śvetāmbara Jain community to accept. This situation is signalled by Bhojak, the editor of Deva-

kathāyām api. Kulamaṇḍanasūri, Vicārāmṛtasārasaṃgraha, p. 26, describes Devacandrasūri, the commentator on the Sthānāṅga Sūtra, as being a contemporary of King Jayasiṃha Siddharāja and thus clearly the same teacher as Hemacandra’s guru.

²¹Jacobi 1880, p.271.

²²Brown 1933, pp. 36–52; for the *tavvaseṇa* statement, see p. 47.

²³Śīlāṅka, commentary on Sūtrakṛtāṅga Sūtra, p. 272c: *tathā caturdaśy-aṣṭamyādiṣu tithiṣūpadiṣṭāsu mahākalyāṇakasambandhitayā puṇyatithitvena prakhyātāsu tathā paurṇamāsīṣu ca tiṣṭṣv api caturmāsakatithiṣv ity arthaḥ, evaṃbhūteṣu dharmadivaseṣu*. This passage is referred to by the sixteenth-century Dharmasāgara (see below), Pravacanaparīkṣā 3.59.

candrasūri's Mūlasuddhiprakaraṇa, who notes that the *tavvaseṇa* statement is not found in two of the six manuscripts utilised by him.²⁴ Another version of the Kālaka story approximately contemporary with that of Devacandrasūri, that found in the Kahāvalī of Bhadreśvara,²⁵ does not contain the *tavvaseṇa* statement at all, although the fourteenth century Kulamaṇḍanasūri does in fact associate this version of the story, albeit without quoting it directly, with the claim that the fortnightly *pratikramaṇa* was held on the full-moon day.²⁶ Furthermore, two of the manuscripts utilised by Brown for his edition of the Long Anonymous Version of the Kālakācāryakathā, dated respectively 1279 and 1287, read *ya caumāsāni/caumāsayaṇi* for *pakkhiyāṇi* (the equivalent of *pakkhiyāṇi* in other versions), that is to say enjoining that the four-monthly *pratikramaṇa* observance be performed on the fourteenth day of the month rather than the fortnightly observance.²⁷ A version of the

²⁴Bhojak also notes that the epitomising verse referred to above is only found in two manuscripts.

²⁵Although this significant Prākṛit narrative collective has unfortunately remained in manuscript form to this day, Brown (1933, pp. 102–106) provided an edition and summary of its version of the Kālaka story. Malvania (1983, p. 81) argues that Bhadreśvara most likely flourished in the twelfth century. For Kulamaṇḍanasūri, Vicārāmṛtasārasaṃgraha, p. 26, the author of the Kahāvalī was already of uncertain date (*anirṇītasambhavakāla*).

²⁶Vicārāmṛtasārasaṃgraha, p. 26. The Kahāvalī describes King Śātavāhana's wives being instructed by their lord to fast on *amāvāsya* (the dark half of the fifteenth day) for the sake of *pratikramaṇa* and then to feed monks on the *pratipad*, the first day of the fortnight. See Brown 1933, p. 104. The phrase *parikkhiya-paḍikkamaṇ'atthaṃ* of Brown's edition, while possibly meaning something like "for the sake of repentance of faults which have been examined", is nonetheless odd, and we may conjecture that Kulamaṇḍanasūri was referring to a manuscript of the Kahāvalī which had a reading corresponding to *pakkhiya/pakkhiyāṇi*. This is indeed the reading found in the quotation of this passage at Gurutattvapradīpa 4.36 autocommentary p. 80.

²⁷ Kulamaṇḍanasūri, Vicārāmṛtasārasaṃgraha, pp. 29–30, quotes the Niśītha Cūrṇi and other sources for the original observance of the four-monthly *pratikramaṇa* on the full-moon day, pointing out that the fact that it had come to be prescribed for the fourteenth day had been brought about by practice initiated in ancient times (*ya ca caturdaśyāṃ vidhīyate tatra pūrvappravṛttācaraṇā*

tavvaseṇa statement contained in a *Kālakācāryakathā* edited by Leumann in 1883 also contains the reading *caumāsiyaṃ*, although the verse in which it occurs appears to have been added as a supplementary amplification to the manuscript utilised by the Swiss scholar.²⁸

There was a perfectly understandable calendrical rationale for the redating of the four-monthly *pratīkramaṇa* to the fourteenth day. It derived from the fact that the Kalpa Sūtra, which in the form it exists today most likely dates from around the fifth century C.E., states (p. 296) that Mahāvīra had commenced the Paryuṣaṇ festival in which Saṃvatsarī occurs after a month and twenty days of the rainy season retreat had elapsed. As the rainy season for the Jains customarily started on a full-moon day which was also an obvious date for one of the three purificatory four-monthly *pratīkramaṇas*, a forward adjustment of Saṃvatsarī necessarily entailed a commensurate forward adjustment to the fourteenth day for that particular *caturmāsika* observance and by extension for the other two also.²⁹ However, it seems clear that the story of Kālakā's redating of Saṃvatsarī and the possible consequences of it, involving as they did matters of authority and consensus as well as the relocation of an ancient festival, was to become a highly charged issue in the Śvetāmbara Jain community by around 1000–1100 C.E. and we

karāṇam) i.e. not recently. Muniandrasūri (see below), Pākṣikasaptati, v. 66, gives a negative and a positive justification for the four-monthly *pratīkramaṇa* taking place one day earlier on the fourteenth day of the month: firstly (here I follow the commentator Maheśvara), because in the current debased time men are generally incapable of enacting the appropriate disciplinary behaviour associated with the observance, in this case a structure of austerity which would have otherwise required a six-meal fast concluding on the full-moon day (*sāmpratamanuṣyāṇām bāhulyena ṣaṣṭhatapasah karāṇe śakter abhāvād iti*), and secondly, because it represents the customary behaviour of upright Jains. For the first reason, cf. Gurutattvapradīpa 4.34.

²⁸See Leumann 1998, p. 21 (III vv. 82–83): *evaṃ ceva cauthīe kayam Kālagasūriṇā | pajjosavaṇa-pavvaṃ, to savva-sangheṇa manniyaṃ. tav-vaseṇa mun'-indehiṃ āṇiyaṃ caumāsiyaṃ | āyaraṇā coddasī annahā puna punnīmā*. With reference to v. 83, Leumann notes, "Dieser Śloka ist im Texte selbst vergessen, aber am Rande nachgetragen."

²⁹See Vaidya 1977, p. 271 and the helpful explanation in Cort n.d.

may regard the increasing production of extended versions of the Kālakācāryakathā as partly indicative of this. Furthermore, the emergence of one particular disciplinary order, the Paurṇamīyaka Gaccha, at the beginning of the twelfth century, reveals how this issue exposed what must have appeared to some possible inconsistencies in Śvetāmbara Jain customary practice.

The Paurṇamīyakas, or “Adherents of the Full-Moon Day”, are credited with inspecting the logic of Kālaka’s redating and consequently interpreting an ancient, that is to say pre-Kālaka, Saṃvatsarī observed on the fifth day of Bhādrapada as necessarily requiring the restoration of the observance of the fortnightly *pratikramaṇa* on the full-moon day (the fifteenth) rather than the fourteenth, and they accordingly defended the validity of this dating in what was among the first of many attempts in Śvetāmbara tradition in the second millennium C.E. to reactivate the context of the ancient scriptures, the word of the Jinas.³⁰ Unfortunately, no significant Paurṇamīyaka writings defending this position seem to have survived, and their arguments have to be reconstructed from the accounts of their opponents. So the twelfth-century Pākṣikasaptati, “Seventy Verses on the Fortnightly Pratikramaṇa” (also known as the Āvaśyakasaptati, “Seventy Verses on the Obligatory Practices”) of Municandrasūri of the Bṛhad Gaccha, with its commentary by Maheśvara, prepares the ground for later polemicists in presenting the Paurṇamīyakas as attempting to overthrow the consensual basis of Kālaka’s redating. In this work Municandrasūri affirms the impossibility of the fortnightly *pratikramaṇa* taking place on the full-moon day³¹ on the grounds of general usage, textual authority, albeit

³⁰The Paurṇamīyaka Gaccha seems to have ceased to exist as a significant institutional component of Śvetāmbara Jainism in the eighteenth century. However, vestigial traces of its continuity into more recent times can be found. See Cort 2001, p. 45.

³¹See Municandrasūri, Pākṣikasaptati, v. 40, for the terms *caturdaśī*, “fourteenth day”, and *pākṣika*, “fortnightly”, being identical in significance, a point reiterated by all later anti-Paurṇamīyaka writers against the supposed claim

deriving from works apparently not predating the sixth century,³² and customary behaviour since Kālaka's time.³³

The status of the readings *pakkhiyāṇi* and *cāummāsiyāṇi* (or some close approximation to them) in the *tavvasena* statement was a topic not dealt with in detail by Muncandrasūri, but their implications became increasingly discussed from the thirteenth century by anti-Paurṇamīyaka polemicists belonging to the Tapā Gaccha disciplinary order who refused to accept that the fourteenth-day *pratikramaṇa* observance was originally observed on the full-moon day and subsequently conditioned by Kālaka's redating of Saṃvatsarī. So Kulamaṇḍanasūri claims in his *Vicārāmṅtasārasaṃgraha* that there can be no reason to associate a change to the fourteenth day with Kālaka, since no authoritative text refers to this.³⁴ He also asserts that there can be found no reference to any teacher such as Kālaka performing the fortnightly observance on the fourteenth day for the very first time, thereby confirming its

that the fortnightly observance could in fact overlap with the first part of the fifteenth day of the month and thus coincide with the new moon.

³²Muncandrasūri, *Pākṣikasaptati*, v. 12, with commentary (pp. 13–17) which refers to *cūrṇis*, the *Mahāniśītha Sūtra* and the *Samarāiccakahā*.

³³Maheśvara, commenting on *Pākṣikasaptati*, v. 67, p. 53, reiterates the reading of the *Niśītha Cūrṇi*, adding to it *Kālagajjehiṃ*. Muncandrasūri, *Pākṣikasaptati*, v. 59, addresses the argument that there can be found authoritative textual evidence for lay people fasting on the fifteenth day. The example cited occurs in the *Kālakācāryakathā* when King Śātavāhana informs his wives that they must fast on the *amāvāsyā*, that is to say the fifteenth day when the new moon rises. See *Niśītha Cūrṇi*, *uddeśaka* 10, p. 131, and note 26. This is interpreted as a special case by reference to a permissible act of worship on this particular day of depictions of the temple on the uninhabited continent of *Nandīśvara*. Cf. *Pākṣikasaptati*, vv. 60–62, which discusses the mention of occasional cases of lay observance on the fifteenth day, stating that they do not undermine the general authority of practice on the fourteenth day, and *Pākṣikasaptati*, v. 65, which rejects endorsement of any popular leaning towards the fifteenth day.

³⁴Kulamaṇḍanasūri is here opposing the Paurṇamīyaka claim that the fourteenth day *pratikramaṇa* observance is purely conventional.

antiquity.³⁵ On this basis and also on the authority of a central canonical text like the *Sūtrakṛtāṅga Sūtra*, the fourteenth-day observance must be regarded as having been promulgated by none other than the Jinas at the beginning of each successive *tīrtha*. It is therefore the Jain teacher lineage as represented in Kulamaṇḍanasūri's time by the leaders of the Tapā Gaccha and those who have preceded them as far back as Mahāvīra who guarantee the genuineness of this dating and the fact that a challenge to its validity was not articulated in the Jain community prior to the emergence of the Paurṇamīyaka Gaccha.³⁶

The Gurutattvapradīpa, a polemical text written by a monk of the Bṛhatpośālīka sublineage of the Tapā Gaccha some time in the fourteenth century and approximately contemporary with Kulamaṇḍanasūri, discusses the matter equally explicitly in its fourth chapter which is directed against the Paurṇamīyaka Gaccha.³⁷ It confirms that no compelling textual connection can be established between Kālaka and the institution of the fourteenth-day *pratīkramaṇa* observance. Detailed mention in the Paryuṣaṇākālpa Cūrṇi and what the Gurutattvapradīpa styles the “short” (*laghu*) version of the Kālākācāryakathā of a matter not immediately relevant to the celebration of Paryuṣaṇ and the dating of Saṃvatsarī would, it is claimed, be improbable because of the brevity of these texts.³⁸ Injunctions relating to both the fourth and fourteenth days of the month are no doubt found in the “long” version of the story, but even there no description is given of what observance is to be

³⁵Kulamaṇḍanasūri, *Vicārāmṛtasārasaṃgraha*, p. 28, points out that even the Śatapadī, the foundational text describing the customary practice of the Añcala Gaccha, an order which emerged from the Paurṇamīyaka Gaccha and still observes Saṃvatsarī on the fifth day of Bhādrapada (see Balbir 2003, p. 59), admits that Kālaka was not responsible for initiating the observance of the fortnightly *pratīkramaṇa* on the fourteenth day.

³⁶Kulamaṇḍanasūri, *Vicārāmṛtasārasaṃgraha*, pp. 26–28.

³⁷For the background to this text, see Catalogue 2006, p. 463 (entry no. 662), and Dundas 2007, chapter four.

³⁸Gurutattvapradīpa 4.20–21 with autocommentary.

carried out (*caritānuvāda*).³⁹ In other words, the fourteenth-day *pratikramaṇa* observance has its own authority without reference to the Kālakācāryakathā. The Gurutattvapradīpa further states that in the old manuscripts of the Kālakācāryakathā the reading in the *tavvasena* statement is regularly *tavvasena ya caummāsīāṇi vi cauddasī āyariyāṇi* and it attributes the existence of erroneous references to the fortnightly observance found in other versions of the statement to an interpolation by an ill-informed member of another sect (*siddhāntānābhijñā matāntariya*), who can no doubt be judged to be Candraprabhasūri, the founder of the Paurṇamīyaka Gaccha, or one of his followers.⁴⁰

The question of the correct reading in the *tavvasena* statement remained an issue as late as the second half of the sixteenth century. The Tapā Gaccha polemicist Dharmasāgara claims that it was a member of the Paurṇamīyaka Gaccha (*rākārakta*) who had altered the old and genuine reading (*jīrṇapāṭha*) *caummāsīāṇi* to *pakkhiāṇi* in the portion of Devacandrasūri's commentary on the Sthānāṅga Sūtra referred to by Kulamaṇḍanasūri, supposedly thus giving a meaning making as much sense as the phrase "water it with fire". Dharmasāgara refers to the reading *cāummāsīāṇi* being found in many of the old palm-leaf manuscripts in the famous libraries in Pāṭaṇ and also to the absence of the reading *pakkhiyāṇi* in old manuscripts in general, suggesting that the presence of the phrase *annaha āgamuttāṇi puṇṇimāe* is itself indicative of this change of reading, since it could only convey meaning

³⁹Gurutattvapradīpa 4. 22 autocommentary, p. 70.

⁴⁰Gurutattvapradīpa 4.36 autocommentary. Cf. Gurutattvapradīpa 4.22 autocommentary, pp. 70–71, where those responsible for the change of reading in the *tavvasena* statement are said to be recent (*vākyataḥ pāścātyānām apy ādeśo 'bhavat*). Gurutattvapradīpa 4.36 autocommentary also refers to the episode in the Kālaka story given in the Kahāvalī (see note 32) in which King Śātavāhana instructs his wives to perform a fast on *amāvāsyā*, ascribing this assertion either to the carelessness (*anābhoga*) of the author Bhadreśvara or an interpolation by a recent monk under the influence of the Paryuṣaṇākālpa Cūrṇi which describes a fast observed on this day.

in respect of the four-monthly observances.⁴¹ As Dharmasāgara emphasises, since the fourteenth-day observance must be regarded as dating from the very founding of the Jain community by each Jina, it is thus eternal; historical agency in promoting it, as in the possible case of Kālaka, has played no role.⁴² The immemorial (*anādisiddha*) nature of the fortnightly observance and the heretical status of the Paurṇamīyaka Gaccha are both confirmed by Dharmasāgara by reference to the description in Haribhadra's commentary (c. sixth century C.E.) on Āvaśyaka Niryukti, v. 468, of Jinadāsa, a lay follower of Pārśva, the twenty-third Jina, fasting on the eighth and fourteenth days of the month.⁴³

Although what was perceived by later polemicists to be the original legitimation for change in the calendar and the prime exemplification of the introduction of customary practice by senior monks, namely Kālaka's redating of Saṃvatsarī from the fifth to the fourth day of Bhādrapada, had supposedly taken place in the fifth century C.E., it was not until the beginning of the second millennium C.E. that disputes about calendrical issues gained identifiable momentum in Jainism.⁴⁴ It can be seen from the foregoing that the version of the Kālakācāryakathā best known to western scholars, that edited by Jacobi and Brown, enshrines a reading relating to the ritual calendar which became markedly controversial within Śvetāmbara Jain tradition at that particular time, and we can confidently assert on this basis that at least one portion of the Kālakācāryakathā was not an uncontested text but subject to regular sectarian pressures.

Further conclusions are necessarily conjectural but worthy of more detailed exploration. So it seems possible that the Kālaka story may not

⁴¹Pravacanaparīkṣā 3.59 autocommentary, p. 176, and 3.63 autocommentary, p. 181. Cf. 5.36 autocommentary. For Dharmasāgara, see Dundas 2007.

⁴²Paryuṣaṇādaśasāta, v. 107 (*evaṃ cāuddasiyaṃ tithaṃ tithhappavaṛṇāṇāṃ*), with autocommentary.

⁴³Sūtravyākhyānavidhiśāta, v. 31, with autocommentary.

⁴⁴Cf. Cort 1999, p.42.

in fact record a genuine historical event but may rather represent a later narrative attempt to rationalise a period of calendrical complexity for the Jain community as the implications of the novel style of lunisolar reckoning became increasingly appreciated. Furthermore, the insistence by anti-Paurṇamīyaka polemicists on the immemorial location of the central disciplinary observance of the fortnightly *pratikramaṇa* on the fourteenth day of the month may reflect the fact that this date had been in actuality influenced by wider calendrical conditions and possibly maintained as a means of sectarian differentiation in the context of the increasing prestige of the new lunisolar calendar.

As we saw at the beginning of this note, the Mūlasarvāstivādins viewed observance of *poṣadha* on the fourteenth day as exceptional, with the full-moon day being regarded as normative for this ceremony. In legislating for potentially difficult situations arising from these datings, Buddhist sources from the beginning of the first millennium appear in general to have been much more articulate about the issues involved in the various forms of calendrical reckoning in circulation in north India at that time than their Jain counterparts. In that case, it seems clear that if the later Jain controversy described in this note concerning whether the fortnightly *pratikramaṇa* be observed on the fourteenth day or the full-moon day does actually bear witness to the long-range influence of changes in calendrical systems introduced in the opening centuries of the first millennium C.E., particularly in relation to use of the lunar and lunisolar modes of reckoning, then the evidence of Buddhist texts must be a necessary resource for students of Jainism wishing to contextualise fully the early historical situation.

Paul Dundas

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Devacandrasūri, Kālakācāryakathānaka, in Pradyumnasūri, Mūlasuddhiprakaraṇa with the commentary of Devacandrasūri, ed. A.M. Bhojak, Ahmedabad: Prakrit Text Society, 1971, story 22, pp. 123–34
- Dharmasāgara, Paryuṣaṇādaśasāta, Surat: Ṛṣabhdev Keśarmalji Śvetāmbara Saṁsthā, 1936
- Dharmasāgara, Pravacanaparīkṣā, Surat: Ṛṣabhdev Keśarmalji Śvetāmbara Saṁsthā Surat, 1937
- Dharmasāgara, Sūtravyākhyānavidhiśataka, ed. Muni Lābhasāgara, Kapaḍvaṁj: Āgamodhāraka Granthamālā, 1961
- Gurutattvapradīpa ed. Muni Lābhasāgara, Kapaḍvaṁj: Mīthābhāi Kalyāṇcaṁḍ Peḍhī, 1962
- Jayasīṃhasūri, Dharmopadeśamālāvivarāṇa, ed. L.Bh. Gāndhī. Bombay: Singhi Jain Series, 1949
- Jinadāsa, Niśītha Cūrṇi, in Niśītha-Sūtram, *tṛtīyo vibhāgaḥ, uddeśakāḥ* 10–15, ed. Amaramuni and Muni Kanhaiyālāl, Āgrā/Rājagṛha: Sanmati Jñān Pīṭh, 1982
- Kalpa Sūtra, translated by Hermann Jacobi, in *Jaina Sutras Part 1*, New York: Dover, 1968 (reprint)
- Kulamaṇḍanasūri, Vicārāmṛtasārasaṁgraha, Surat: Ṛṣabhdevjī Keśarmalji Śvetāmbara Saṁsthā, 1936
- Mahāvagga, The Vinaya Piṭakam, Vol 1. The Mahāvagga, ed. H. Oldenberg, London: Williams and Norgate, 1879
- Municandrasūri, Pākṣikasaptati, ed. Muni Lābhasāgara, Kapaḍvaṁj: Āgamodhāraka Granthamālā, 1971
- Śīlāṅka, commentary on Sūtrakṛtāṅga Sūtra, ed. Muni Jambūvijaya, in Ācārāṅgasūtram Sūtrakṛtāṅgasūtram ca, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1978
- Sūtrakṛtāṅga Sūtra. Sūyagaḍaṁgasuttam, ed. Muni Jambūvijaya, Bombay: Śrī Mahāvīra Jain Vidyālaya, 1978

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Balbir, Nalini, 2003. “The A(ñ)cala Gaccha Viewed from Inside and from Outside”. In *Jainism and Early Buddhism: Essays in Honor of Padmanabh S. Jaini*. Edited by Olle Qvarnström, Fremont: Asian Humanities Press, pp. 47–77
- Brown, W. Norman, 1933. *The Story of Kālaka: Texts, History, Legends, and Miniature Painting of the Śvetāmbara Jain Hagiographical Work the Kālakācāryakathā*, Washington: Smithsonian Institution

- Catalogue 2006. *Catalogue of the Jain Manuscripts of the British Library, Including the Holdings of the British Library and the Victoria & Albert Museum*, Vol. 2. Edited by Nalini Balbir, Kanhaiyalal V. Sheth, Kalpana K. Sheth, and Candrabhal Bh. Tripathi, London: The British Library and the Institute of Jainology
- Cort, John E., 1999. "Fistfights in the Monastery: Calendars, Conflict and Karma among the Jains". In *Approaches to Jaina Studies: Philosophy, Logic, Rituals and Symbols*. Edited by N. Wagle and O. Qvarnström, University of Toronto: Centre for South Asian Studies
- 2001. *Jains in the World: Religious Values and Ideology in India*, New York: Oxford University Press
- n.d. John E. Cort, "Fistfights in the Monastery. Respect and Authority in the Jain Tradition: Calendars, Karma, and Kriyā", unpublished manuscript
- Dietz, Siglinde, 1997. "Anmerkungen zum buddhistischen Fastentag". In *Bauddhavidyāsudhākara: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, edited by Petra Kiefer-Pülz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Swisttal-Oderndorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, pp. 63–70
- Dundas, Paul, 2007. *History, Scripture and Controversy in a Medieval Jain Sect*, London: Routledge
- Hu-von Hinüber, Haiyan, 1994. *Das Poṣadhavastu: Vorschriften für die buddhistische Beichtfeier im Vinaya der Mēlasarvāstivādins*, Reinbek: Dr Inge Wezler
- Hureau, Sylvie, 2006. "Preaching and Translating *poṣadha* Days: Kumārajīva's Role in Adapting an Indian Ceremony to China", *Journal of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies* 10, pp. 87–119
- Leumann, Ernst, 1998. *Kleine Schriften*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner
- Jacobi, Hermann H., 1880. "Das Kālakācārya-Kathānakam", *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 34, pp. 247–318
- Malvania, Dalsukh D., 1983. "On Bhadreśvara's *Kahāvalī*", *Indologica Taurinensia* 11, pp. 77–95
- Norman, K.R., 1990–2007. *Collected Papers*, Volumes I–VIII, Oxford: Pali Text Society
- Renou, Louis, and Jean Filliozat, 1953. *L'Inde classique: manuel des études indiennes*, Volume 2, Hanoi: École française d'Extrême-Orient
- Tieken, Herman, 2000. "Aśoka and the Buddhist *Samgha*: A Study of Aśoka's Schism Edict and Minor Rock Edict 1", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 63, pp. 1–30
- Vaidya, F.L., 1977. *Jain Dṛṣṭie Tithidin ane Parvārāadhan*. Mumbāi: Śrī Jain Pravacan Pracārak Ṭraṣṭ

- Vogel, Claus, 1997. "On the Date of the Poṣadha Ceremony as Taught by the Mūlasarvāstivādins" In *Bauddhavidyāsudhākara: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Edited by Petra Kiefer-Pülz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Swisttal-Oderndorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, pp. 673–88
- Williams, R.W., 1963. *Jaina Yoga: A Survey of the Medieval Śrāvakācāras*, London: Oxford University Press