

Jainism: Key Themes

Jeffery Long*

Elizabethtown College

Abstract

The Jains have constituted a small but highly culturally significant minority community in the Indian subcontinent for thousands of years. Probably best known for the profound commitment to an ethos of *ahimsa*, or nonviolence in thought, word, and deed, it is in the areas of nonviolence and ascetic practice that the Jains have had their greatest impact on the Hindu majority. Key themes and topics of ongoing scholarly debate and discussion in relation to Jainism are the question of its origins, the relationship of Jainism to Hinduism, the roles of women—especially ascetics—in the tradition, Jainism and ecology, and finally, the distinctive Jain approach to religious pluralism contained in a set of teachings called the Jain doctrines of relativity—*anekantavada*, *nayavada*, and *syadvada*.

An Overview of Jainism

Jainism shares with the other religions with which it has coexisted in India for centuries—Hinduism, Buddhism, and Sikhism—a cosmology that situates human existence in a cycle of birth, death, and rebirth. As in these other religions, this cycle is fueled by a principle of cause and effect, or *karma*—a kind of ethical law of gravitation, according to which evil deeds lead to evil results for those who commit them, and good deeds, similarly, lead to good results. Because the death of the physical body is no guarantee that one has already experienced all of the consequences of one's actions—and indeed the presence of massive injustice in the world certainly indicates that this is *not* the case—one is drawn inexorably back into the cycle of life by one's karma and is reborn in a form and at a time and place appropriate to the fruition of one's past deeds. Questions such as the rising population of the human species do not have an impact on this worldview, because it is not only human beings who have souls. The soul, or essential consciousness, of a living being can pass to a variety of forms—again, any form appropriate for bringing about the necessary results of one's past actions. In Jainism and Buddhism, this is determined in an impersonal fashion by the workings of karma. This is true of many forms of Hinduism as well, but due to its more theistic emphasis, Hinduism sometimes includes the idea of karma as being akin to divine justice. Jainism, however, like Buddhism, is a non-theistic tradition, viewing the cosmic cycle as perpetual—having no beginning and no end, and functioning through the mechanism of purely impersonal forces.

Given this cosmology, one may expect the soteriological goal of a practitioner of Jainism (or Buddhism or Hinduism) to be a good rebirth, and a major focus of religious activity to be the generation of merit or 'good karma' (*punya karma*) and the avoidance of 'bad karma' (*papa karma*). While this is certainly the case, a good rebirth is merely a penultimate goal of all of these traditions. The ultimate goal is to become free from the cycle of rebirth altogether; for even a good life will come to an end. Goods generated by

karma are always impermanent. Life in the rebirth cycle is always lived in the shadow of death. This is the inevitable suffering, or *duhkha*, emphasized in the First Noble Truth of Buddhism: the transience of existence in the material world.

How can one become free, though, from the effects of karma? For does one not inevitably engage in action? And does not all action have an inevitable effect? If karma is like gravity, how can one avoid it? How can one avoid gravity?

It is here that the traditions begin to diverge, for each has its own understanding of the process of karma and rebirth. The distinctive Jain take on karma is that it is an actual, material substance. This is in contrast with Buddhism, where karma is a kind of psychic energy with which only volitional actions are infused, or Hinduism, where it tends to be a kind of universal law of attraction. Karmic particles pervade the cosmos and are drawn to the soul, or *jiva*, of a living being by the passions that distort a soul's inherent purity as a consequence of its affective reactions to stimuli. One has an experience, either painful or pleasant, as a consequence of the fruition of previous karma, and responds to it with either aversion or attraction. This, in turn, draws karma of the appropriate kind into the soul, where it embeds itself like a seed, eventually coming to fruition and producing yet another experience. This evokes a passionate reaction, which draws more karma into the soul, and the cycle begins anew.

A major emphasis of Jainism is therefore ascetic practice that is designed to curb the reactions of attraction and aversion that we generally feel for pleasant and unpleasant experiences, as well as to purge the soul of the karmic particles already present within it. The soul in a state of calm equanimity does not attract additional karmic matter. And the unpleasant experiences associated with ascetic practice—the hunger induced by fasting, or the discomfort of meditating for long periods in uncomfortable positions—borne patiently, can accelerate the ‘burning off’ of bad karma.

The most destructive passions, bringing the karma that entails the most unpleasant consequences for a living being, are those associated with *himsa*—the desire to bring harm to another. It is for this reason that Jainism places such a strong emphasis on nonviolence in thought, word, and deed. Ahimsa is not only the absence of violent behavior. It is the absence of even the desire to do harm.

Like the Buddhist community, the Jains are divided into ascetics and laypersons. One frequently encountered meaning of the *swastika*, a symbol deployed a great deal in Jain ritual practice, is that its four arms represent the four limbs of the Jain community: male and female ascetics and male and female laypersons. (This symbol is also said to represent the four possible incarnations of the *jiva*, or soul—*devas* or heavenly beings, hell beings, human beings, and animals—the community of all life forms.) Ascetics—monks and nuns—are understood to be closer to the goal of liberation from the cycle of rebirth, spending all of their time engaged in practices designed to lead to the purging of karma from the soul. It being practically impossible to engage in the activities of day-to-day life without at least some amount of violence—such as the killing of microscopic life forms involved in the act of cooking even vegetarian food—ascetics are forbidden to engage in them. Jain monks and nuns are therefore completely dependent upon laypersons for food, clothing, shelter, and so on. The Jain layperson, by providing these goods and supporting the ascetic quest for liberation, is acquiring religious merit—good karma—in the hope that they, too, may at some point (either in this or a future life) feel the attraction of the ascetic path and take up the life of a monk or nun. Jain laypersons also engage in ascetic practice, however, in the hope of attenuating their karma and preparing for the eventual renunciation that precedes liberation.¹

Jain History and the Question of Origins

The contemporary Jain community traces its origins to Mahavira (the 'Great Hero'), a contemporary of the Buddha who lived, according to at least one reckoning, from 499 to 427 BCE (Long 2009a). Like the Buddha, according to traditional accounts, Mahavira was a prince of a small kingdom or tribal unit in the northeastern part of India, in the 'Greater Magadha' region encompassing what are today the Indian states of Bihar and Jharkhand, as well as the eastern portion of Uttar Pradesh (Bronkhorst 2007). Like the Buddha, Mahavira is said to have taken up an ascetic quest for enlightenment around the age of thirty. He achieved liberation from the cycle of rebirth and a state of perfect knowledge (*kevala jñana*) 12 years later, as a result of his rigorous ascetic practice. For the remaining 30 years, he taught the Jain path, establishing a community of monks, nuns, laymen, and laywomen. He left his body at the age of seventy-two, never to be reborn. According to one account, the king of the region where Mahavira died ordered the lighting of lamps to commemorate the great light of Mahavira leaving the world, and thus establishing a Jain basis for the popular holiday, Diwali.²

It is, however, not correct, from a Jain perspective, to call Mahavira the founder of Jainism—even if he did establish the current *tirtha*, or fourfold Jain community. The Jain scriptures teach that Mahavira is really the twenty-fourth in a series of *Tirthankaras*, or creators of Jain communities, and re-establishers of Jainism after successive phases of decline. According to Jain tradition, the first founder of Jainism in our current cosmic epoch was Rishabha, or Adinath (literally, the 'First Lord'), a figure of ancient history who is attributed not only with establishing Jainism, but also with discovering agriculture and law and essentially inventing civilization (Dundas 2002a).

In fact, even Rishabha is the founder of Jainism only in our cosmic epoch. The universe, according to Jainism—as in Hinduism and Buddhism—undergoes vast cycles of emergence, duration, and dissolution. In each such cycle, the universe begins with a vast store of energy and possibility. For a very long time, human beings live lives of plenty, with the world yielding abundance with no effort on the part of humanity. Gradually this situation deteriorates. Effort becomes necessary in order to sustain life, and eventually, scarcity becomes a reality. Concepts such as property emerge, and conflict over property. As the cycle begins a long decline, a series of twenty-four *Tirthankaras* emerges in order to show humanity the way to freedom from suffering by escaping the cycle of rebirth. In our current period—one of massive decline, nearing the end of an epoch—the twenty-fourth *Tirthankara*, Mahavira, has already appeared. The next *Tirthankara* will not appear until the downward spiral of the next cosmic epoch has begun.

Does this traditional Jain conception of the cosmic history have any bearing on a scholarly picture of ancient India, and the origins of this distinctive tradition? Or is it just a mythic conception, without empirical foundation? This is not only an academic issue, but one with political ramifications as well. It has become something of a truism in the Hindu community that Hinduism is the oldest of the world's religions, in relationship to which Buddhism and Jainism are seen as offshoots or reform movements. But with their conception of Jainism as a primordial tradition with roots in the distant past, Jains tend to argue that it is the other way around: that Jainism is the older of the two traditions, with roots in India stretching back long before the Vedic tradition is said by scholars to have emerged—around 1500 BCE—on the basis of a culture brought to the subcontinent by a group of nomadic immigrants speaking an Indo-European language and deploying horses and chariots (Long 2009a).

With the discovery of the Indus Valley Civilization, which was at the height of its technological development from roughly 2600 to 1900 BCE—declining due to the drying up of the Sarasvati river and changes in the course of the Indus—Jain scholars have sought to tie Jainism to the culture of the Indus peoples (see, for example, Parikh 2002). As with similar Hindu attempts to see proto-Hinduism, or even Vedic culture, in this civilization, the Jain interpretation of the data from the Indus valley relies to a great extent on resemblances between figurines who appear to be engaged in meditation and other yogic practices and later art work depicting analogous Jain practices (such as the distinctive *kayotsarga* meditation, a Jain practice that utilizes a standing posture, with the arms slightly extended and held to the sides).

A major problem, of course, with both of these attempts—Hindu and Jain—to claim the Indus culture (and therefore the title of the truly oldest, indigenous Indic tradition) is that the writing system of this culture remains undeciphered. All claims about the beliefs of the Indus peoples therefore remain highly speculative. But this has not prevented some Jain intellectuals from postulating that the Jainism of Mahavira represents a re-assertion of a pre-Vedic tradition indigenous to the subcontinent. This account of Jain origins in terms of an indigenous tradition is in contrast with the standard ‘Protestant Reformation’ model, according to which Mahavira—much like his contemporary, the Buddha—was a reformer who was offering an essentially internal critique to the Brahmanical Vedic tradition of his time. The indigenous reaction or assertion model, in other words, is an alternative to the idea that Jainism and Buddhism are offshoots of what is now called Hinduism.

A third possibility, with strong evidence in its favor has been proposed by Johannes Bronkhorst. According to Bronkhorst’s model, the *shramana* culture, of which both the Jain and Buddhist traditions are examples, is neither a remnant of the indigenous culture represented by the Indus valley civilization, nor an offshoot of Vedic culture, but a non-Vedic Indo-European culture that entered the subcontinent prior to and penetrated further east than the Punjab-based Vedic traditions (Bronkhorst 2007). One of the virtues of Bronkhorst’s thesis—in addition to the fact that it remains neutral in the Jain vs. Hindu ‘Whose tradition is older?’ debate and does not involve tendentious speculations about the Indus valley culture—is that it is able to explain the evidence proffered in favor of both of its rivals—the ‘Indigenous Reaction’ theory and the ‘Protestant Reformation’ theory. The distinctive, shared traits of the *shramana* traditions, which mark them off from Vedic traditions—such as the use of burial mounds, or *stupas*—are explained by the fact that this is a distinct culture from that of Brahmanism, as the Indigenous Reaction theory says. At the same time, the numerous continuities between these cultures and that of Brahmanism, such as shared deities like Indra and Brahma, are also explained by the fact that both of these cultures are Indo-European. Rather one being an offshoot from the other, both have a common source.

A final note on the historical reliability of the Jain tradition of there having been a series of twenty-four Tirthankaras is that independent evidence does exist for the life of the twenty-third Tirthankara—Mahavira’s immediate predecessor, Parshvanath. Probably living between 850 and 750 BCE, Parshvanath established a tradition with resemblances to Jainism that was still practiced in Mahavira’s time. Indeed, according to Jain scripture, Mahavira’s parents were practitioners in this tradition. So unlike the Buddha, who is said to have achieved awakening purely through his own efforts, without the aid of an existing tradition or teacher, the continuity of Mahavira with Parshvanath’s tradition is asserted (Long 2009a).

The Relationship of Jainism to Hinduism

Related to the question of Jain origins, and whether it was Jainism or Hinduism that came first, is the issue of the boundaries between these two traditions. Is there a sense in which it would be correct to see Jainism as a type—a variant or branch—of Hinduism? Clearly, if one defines Hinduism as the family traditions that hold the Vedic literature to be sacred, and Jainism as the teaching of the Tirthankaras, these two are quite distinct. On the other hand, if one defines Hinduism as Hindu nationalist groups and, on occasion, the Supreme Court of India tends to do—as the family of religious traditions indigenous to the Indian subcontinent—then not only Jains, but also Buddhists and Sikhs, become Hindus just by definitional fiat.

The issue is complicated by the fact that Jains and Hindus share many practices, ideas, deities, and holidays. In some parts of India, Jains, and Vaishnava Hindus quite frequently intermarry. Indeed, Mahatma Gandhi's family had strong Jain connections, and his guru, Rajachandra Mehta, was a prominent Jain layman. Jains, like Hindus, also organize themselves into castes—or endogamous, birth-based occupational groups—though unlike the Brahmanical tradition of Hinduism, Jainism does not sacralize the practice of caste or give it any particular religious significance. The response that one often receives when one asks the question of the relationship of Jainism to the larger complex of Indian religious thought and practice is that Jains practice a unique and distinct religion but that they are 'culturally Hindu' (Long 2009a). One Jain layperson compares the relationship of Jainism to Hinduism, for Jains, to the relationship between Buddhism and Shinto for Japanese Buddhists. The former is one's soteriological path, showing the way to liberation from the rebirth cycle and providing answers to the major philosophical questions. But it need not be in conflict with participating in the larger national religious culture, which is usually oriented toward maintaining good relations with the spirit world and achieving this-worldly goods such as long life and prosperity (Long 2009a).

The Roles of Jain Women

Another issue connected with Jainism is with regard to the roles of both lay and ascetic women in the tradition.

Regarding nuns, or *sadhvis*—female ascetics—the main sectarian division within the Jain community is directly connected with the question of the ability of women to attain liberation from the rebirth cycle within this lifetime—the ultimate goal of all Jain ascetic practice. Around the beginning of the Common Era, the community divided itself into two distinct groups—the Shvetambaras, or 'white clad', whose male and female ascetics wear simple white robes as a marker of their role as ascetics, and the Digambaras, or 'sky clad', whose monks practice ascetic nudity, wearing nothing at all, but whose nuns, like Shvetambara nuns, wear simple white robes. Seeing ascetic nudity as necessary for the attainment of liberation, the Digambaras teach that a Digambara woman must be reborn as a male in order to become free from the cycle of rebirth.

The Digambara practice of ascetic nudity is regarded in this tradition as a logical extension of the practice of *aparigraha*, or non-ownership, which all Jain ascetics have to practice (and which is even practiced by Jain laypersons as non-attachment, or cultivation of an unworldly, non-materialistic attitude toward physical objects and comforts). In the Digambara tradition, however, the understanding of *aparigraha* is that its perfect practice requires one to physically renounce ownership of all possessions, including clothing. The practice of wearing clothing is identified in this tradition with a residual sense of

shame and identification with the body that must be overcome in order for perfect enlightenment and liberation to occur.

Women, however, are barred from the practice of ascetic nudity, on the rationale that nude female ascetics would be vulnerable to sexual assault. Such worries are taken not to apply to nude male ascetics, though concerns about harassment (not necessarily of a sexual nature) have led to Digambara monks becoming gradually more reclusive over the centuries, tending to reside in monasteries and having few direct relations with the lay community.³ Because women cannot engage in a practice that is held to be essential to the attainment of liberation, rebirth as a woman is held to be unfortunate. Even a devout and rigorously practicing Digambara nun must be reborn as a man in order to be liberated from the rebirth cycle.

The Shvetambara tradition regards the Digambaras as being unduly attached to an outward practice, arguing that the inner *attitude* of aparigraha is what is really essential to the attainment of liberation. Even a nude Digambara monk might still harbor feelings of attachment and possessiveness, even while practicing total detachment, while a nun may be perfectly detached, even while wearing clothing in order to protect not so much her own modesty as that of the rest of the community. Shvetambara Jains therefore hold that it is possible for a woman to attain liberation during her incarnation as a woman—in this lifetime—without having to wait for rebirth as a man in order to practice ascetic nudity. In fact, according to the Shvetambara tradition, the nineteenth Tirthankara, Mallinath, was a woman.⁴

Interestingly, women have traditionally played a prominent role in the practice of Jainism. According to the earliest extant Jain texts, nuns outnumbered monks from the start of the tradition, during the life of Mahavira himself. Jain female ascetics today play a major role in teaching and perpetuating the tradition and embodying its values (Vallely 2002). Jain lay women, who engage in a good deal of devotional practice, have also become a major topic of scholarly investigation, given that devotion has tended to be downplayed in the dominant representations of Jainism in academic scholarship, which has tended to place its emphasis on the ascetic activities of monks—a trend which recent scholarship seeks to correct (Kelting 2005).

Jainism and Ecology

In recent years, many Jain intellectuals have expressed the view that Jainism, because of its very strong emphasis on nonviolence toward all living beings, could form the basis for a global ecological ethos, thus adding a Jain voice to the growing number of calls for the protection of the environment.

Some scholars of Jainism, however, have called this view into question, arguing on the basis of Jain textual traditions that Jainism generally expresses a world-denying ethos of extreme asceticism that, far from positively valuing the world, sees the world as an obstacle to be overcome. A re-envisioning of Jainism as a 'green' tradition, according to this argument, involves a massive distortion and basic misunderstanding of Jainism. In the words of Paul Dundas,

...[T]o detach Jain teachings from their overall historical, practical, and mythical context in the cause of rendering them into a quasi-scientific ahistorical philosophy palatable to the modern world is completely at variance with the trajectory of informed scholarship on Asian religious traditions...Very often, what emerges from this is little more than a trivialization of Jainism into strings of platitudes (Dundas 2002b).

John Cort similarly observes that, “The Jain soteriology, with its devaluation of the material world in the pursuit of pure spirituality, is in many ways not conducive to the development of an environmental ethic.” ‘But’, he adds,

the Jains also have a rich history of daily practices and attitudes that foster a much more positive engagement with the material world. Such habitual activities in relationship to the environment oftentimes underlie and inform an environmental ethic, more so than abstract moral rules and injunctions (Cort 2002).

By contrasting soteriology at a formal, textual level with concrete social practice, Cort points to one of the deep paradoxes of Jainism. Although it radically devalues the material world as that which is to be renounced, it involves the practice of profound respect for life, including non-human life. Its non-anthropocentric view of the soul, or *jiva*, as not a distinctively human quality, but as dwelling in all beings (even plants, fire, water, stones, and air), produces a deep reverence for all living things, which are viewed as repositories of potential divinity, rather than as raw material to be exploited for human ends. Although its philosophy may be world negating, the *practice* of this philosophy issues in a negation of this negation that takes the form of profound mindfulness of one’s environmental impact in everyday life (Long 2009a,b).

The Jain Doctrines of Relativity

Finally, another Jain theme that has received a good deal of scholarly attention is a set of teachings referred to as the Jain doctrines of relativity: *anekantavada*, the Jaina doctrine of the complexity of existence, *nayavada*, the doctrine of perspectives, and *syadvada*, the ‘maybe doctrine’, or doctrine of conditional predication. To characterize these teachings as doctrines of relativity is potentially controversial, because they do not constitute a form of *relativism*, as this is generally understood—the view either that there is no such thing as absolute truth, or if there is absolute truth, it is unknowable. But these doctrines do teach that, for non-omniscient, non-enlightened beings, the truth is always perceived in only an incomplete fashion, and that one must therefore always be open to perceptions of truth different from one’s own. Omniscient, enlightened beings, like the Tirthankaras, perceive the absolute truth and teach it. But this teaching occurs in a way that takes into account the many dimensions or aspects of reality under consideration, and not in a one-sided fashion.

Rooted in classical Indian philosophical debates about the nature of being, these doctrines provide an excellent metaphysical foundation for religious pluralism, defined as the idea that there is at least some kernel of truth in the worldviews of many religions and philosophies.

The principle of religious pluralism is an important intellectual tool in developing a sustainable worldview that can accommodate difference and cultivate mutual respect among humanity’s many systems of belief and practice. It is not the case that agreement on all issues is necessary in order for communities with differing worldviews to coexist peacefully. But it is certainly the case that finding common ground—being able to see and appreciate the truth in the view of another—is conducive to such peaceful coexistence. It also opens up the possibility that one might learn from and be transformed by the view of another. For if the worldview of the other shares common insights with one’s own, it is at least possible that the worldview of the other contains distinctive truths heretofore not known in one’s own tradition: different from, but not necessarily incompatible with, the beliefs that one already holds, and therefore capable of incorporation

into one's own view without logical contradiction. The understanding of truth operating here is of a vast field of possibility that unfolds and is revealed to one gradually, through a process of dialogue and study of multiple worldviews and perspectives.

Studies of the Jain doctrines of relativity have argued that these doctrines are able to successfully steer a course between the extremes of absolutism and relativism to which conversations about religious pluralism are prone. Absolutism—the attitude that one's own worldview alone is fully true and the standard by which all truth-claims are to be measured—is conducive to the dehumanization of those whose views differ from one's own, and thus to inter-religious violence. Relativism—the idea that it is really impossible to determine the truth, all perspectives having *equal* value—is a tempting antidote to absolutism. But relativism undermines any serious attempt to understand the world either intellectually or through a life of spiritual practice aimed at illumination. If absolutism produces the extremes of dogmatism, fundamentalism, and fanaticism, relativism leads to a superficial and ultimately nihilistic view of the world as devoid of meaning or purpose.

Anekantavada, however—as deployed in its original setting, as part of the larger worldview of Jainism—balances an absolutist understanding of reality as having a definite character, as revealed in the teachings of the Jinās, with a relativistic understanding that a being who has not reached the state of omniscience necessarily perceives only a portion of the totality of being. The various, at first glance incompatible worldviews advanced in the world's religions and philosophies need not be seen as mutually contradictory, but as reflecting complementary insights into the nature of being: as having aspects that are both temporal and non-temporal, personal and impersonal, permanent and impermanent, and so on. Most philosophies typically grasp one of these insights and portray its opposite as an illusion or a reflection of false consciousness. But using anekantavada, one is able to analyze and then synthesize diverse worldviews.

Due to its potential uses as a philosophy of religious pluralism, some Jain thinkers have argued that this way of thinking is a form of 'intellectual ahimsa', or nonviolence in the realm of intellectual discussion. More critical scholars of Jainism, however, have also shown that, in its original context, the doctrines of relativity were deployed to show the superiority of Jainism over other views, as a more encompassing view able to incorporate the one-sided perspectives of its rivals. Exceptions, however, who saw anekantavada as a philosophy of tolerance and acceptance of other views, also existed in pre-modern times, and included such prominent Shvetāmbara Jain philosophers as Haribhadrasuri (c. 700–800 CE) and Yasovijaya (1624–1688).

As with Jainism and ecology, religious pluralism is an area in which advocates of the tradition see profound relevance for a Jain perspective, while scholars of the tradition caution against the risk of simplistic applications of Jain concepts that are unmindful of countervailing tendencies in the tradition in the original historical contexts in which these concepts emerged.⁵

Conclusion

Though historically a numerically small community, Jains have had an enormous impact on the intellectual and cultural life of India. As the examples given here have shown, this community continues to advocate for the relevance of its teachings to pressing issues like the environmental crisis and inter-religious conflict. Sometimes these efforts can appear to be in tension with scholarship—such as when attention is drawn to the world-denying ethos of Jainism in the context of the environmental conversation, or when attention is drawn to the polemical uses of the doctrines of relativity in the context of the discussion

of religious pluralism. But both communities—those of the scholar and the practitioner—can find their respective discourses mutually enriched by the insights of the other, as their dialogue continues into the future.

Short Biography

Jeffery D. Long is Associate Professor and Chair of Religious Studies and Co-Director of Asian Studies at Elizabethtown College in Elizabethtown, Pennsylvania. He is the author of *A Vision for Hinduism: Beyond Hindu Nationalism*, *Jainism: An Introduction*, and the forthcoming *Historical Dictionary of Hinduism*. Long is currently co-chair of the North American Hinduism unit of the American Academy of Religion and former chair of the Steering Committee of the Dharma Academy of North America (DANAM). He received his PhD from the Divinity School at the University of Chicago in the year 2000.

Notes

* Correspondence address: Jeffery Long, One Alpha Drive, Elizabethtown, PA 17022, USA. E-mail: longjd@etown.edu

¹ For more information about the overall worldview and practice of Jainism, see Dundas 2002a; Jaini 1979; Long 2009a.

² *Kalpa Sutra*, Jacobi trans (Jacobi 1884).

³ One practice arising from this trend—a practice that has led to further division internal to the Digambara Jain community—has been the institution of the *bhattaraka*, or head of a Digambara monastery who wears orange robes and is charged with administrative duties that involve interaction with the lay community. The Bisapanthi Digambaras utilize the services of *bhattarakas*, but Terapanthi Digambaras do not.

⁴ For a detailed account of the Digambara–Shvetambara debates on this issue, see Jaini 1992.

⁵ For more information on the Jain doctrines of relativity, see Long 2009a, 2000; Ganeri 2009; Matilal 1981; Mookerjee 1978; Padmarajah 1963; Dundas 2002a,b; Cort 2000.

Works Cited

- Bronkhorst, Johannes (2007). *Greater Magadha: Studies in the Culture of Early India*. Leiden: Brill.
- Cort, John (2000). Intellectual *Ahimsa* Revisited: Jain Tolerance and Intolerance of Other. *Philosophy East and West*, 50, pp. 324–47 (No. 3, July 2000).
- . (2002). Green Jainism? Notes and Queries toward a Possible Jain Environmental Ethic. In: Christopher Key Chapple (ed.), *Jainism and Ecology: Nonviolence in the Web of Life*, pp. 63–94. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Dundas, Paul (2002a). *The Jains*. London: Routledge.
- . (2002b). The Limits of a Jain Environmental Ethic. In: Christopher Key Chapple (ed.), *Jainism and Ecology: Nonviolence in the Web of Life*, pp. 95–118. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ganeri, Jonardon (2009). *Philosophy in Classical India: The Proper Work of Reason*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Jacobi, Hermann (1884). *The Kalpa Sutra of Bhadrabahu (Sacred Books of the East Vol. 22, F Müller, ed.)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jaini, Padmanabh S. (1979). *The Jaina Path of Purification*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- . (1992). *Gender and Salvation: Jaina Debates on the Spiritual Liberation of Women*. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Kelting, Whitney M. (2005). *Singing to the Jinas: Jain Laywomen, Mandal Singing, and the Negotiations of Jain Devotion*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Long, Jeffery D. (2000). *Plurality and relativity: whitehead, Jainism, and the reconstruction of religious pluralism*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Chicago.
- . (2009a). *Jainism: An Introduction*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- . (2009b). The Paradoxes of Radical Asceticism: Jainism as a Therapeutic Paradigm. In: Michel Weber (ed.), *The Roar of Awakening: A Whiteheadian Dialogue Between Western Psychotherapies and Eastern Worldviews*, pp. 71–84. Frankfurt: Ontos Verlag.
- Matilal, Bimal Krishna (1981). *The Central Philosophy of Jainism: Anekantavada*. Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology.

- Mookerjee, Satkari (1978). *The Jaina Philosophy of Non-Absolutism: A Critical Study of Anekantavada*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Padmarajiah, Y. J. (1963). *A Comparative Study of the Jaina Theories of Reality and Knowledge*. Bombay: Jain Sahitya Vikas Mandal.
- Parikh, Vastupal (2002). *Jainism and the New Spirituality*. Toronto: Peace Publications.
- Vallely, Anne (2002). *Guardians of the Transcendent: An Ethnography of a Jain Ascetic Community*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Further Reading

- Chapple, Christopher Key (1993). *Nonviolence to Animals, Earth, and Self in Asian Traditions*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- . (ed.) (2002). *Jainism and Ecology: Nonviolence in the Web of Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . (2003). *Reconciling Yogas: Haribhadra's Collection of Views on Yoga*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Cort, John (ed.) (1998). *Open Boundaries: Jain Communities and Cultures in Indian History*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- . (2001). *Jains in the World: Religious Values and Ideology in India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dundas, Paul (2004). Beyond Anekantavada: A Jain Approach to Religious Tolerance. In: Tara Sethia (ed.), *Ahimsa, Anekanta and Jainism*, pp. 123–36. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Jaini, Padmanabh S. (2000). *Collected Papers on Jaina Studies*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Rankin, Aidan (2010). *Many-Sided Wisdom: A New Politics of the Spirit*. Oakland, CA: O Books.
- Shanta, N. (1997). *The Unknown Pilgrims—The Voice of the Sadhis: The History, Spirituality, and Life of the Jaina Women Ascetics*. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.
- Tatia, Nathmal (1951). *Studies in Jaina Philosophy*. Banaras: Jain Cultural Research Society.
- . (trans.). (1994). *That Which Is: Tattvartha Sutra of Umasvati*. San Francisco: Harper Collins.
- Tobias, Michael (1991). *Life Force: The World of Jainism*. Fremont, CA: Jain Publishing Company.