

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF *ADHYAVASĀYA* IN JAIN KARMA THEORY

Kristi L. Wiley¹

In discussions of the classical Jaina conceptions of the bondage of the soul (*jīva*) in the beginningless cycle of death and rebirth (*saṃsāra*), the centrality of *mohanīya karma*, which causes delusion or confusion regarding proper belief (*samyak-darśana*) and proper conduct (*samyak-cāritra*), has been emphasized. In the words of Paul Dundas (2002: 99), it is “the keystone of the whole structure in that its destruction paves the way for the elimination of the other varieties of *karma*.” While the influx (*āsrava*) of karmic matter is caused by activities (*yoga*) of the body, speech, and mind (TS 6.1, 6.2), its binding with the soul is caused by a deluded view of reality (*mithyā-darśana*), which is produced through the operation of *darśana-mohanīya karma*, and by non-restraint (*avirati*), carelessness or inattentiveness (*pramāda*), and passions (*kaṣāya*), all of which are produced through the operation of the conduct-deluding (*cāritra-mohanīya*) *karmas* (TS 8.1). The most important of these is the four passions, namely, anger (*krodha*), pride (*māna*), deceit (*māyā*), and greed (*lobha*). The intensity of these passions is the determining factor for two of the four aspects of karmic bondage: duration bondage (*sthiti-bandha*), the length of time that *karma* can remain bound with the soul, and intensity bondage (*rasa-*, *anubhāva-*, or *anubhāga-bandha*), the strength of the effect produced when karmic matter comes to fruition (TS 8.4 = SS 8.3).²

Karmic matter is grouped into four *rasas*, or degrees of intensity. In the case of *cāritra-mohanīya karma*, these four intensities have special names, and they correspond with the fourteen stages of spiritual purity of the soul (*guṇasthāna*).³ Passions of the strongest intensity, “pursuers from the limitless past” (*anantānubandhī kaṣāya*), are operative in the first *guṇasthāna* (*mithyātva*). A less intense degree of *kaṣāya* (*apratyākhyānāvaraṇa*) prevents a person from taking the lay vows of partial

¹ An earlier version of this essay was presented at the 13th World Sanskrit Conference in Edinburgh, July 2006.

² See S. A. Jain’s 1960: 219 translation of SS 8.3.

³ For the fourteen *guṇasthānas*, see Jaini 1979: 272f., Tatia 1951: 268–80, and Tatia 1994: 279–85.

renunciation (*aṇuvrata*), and a lesser intensity (*pratyākhyānāvaraṇa*) prevents a person from taking the mendicant vows of complete renunciation (*mahāvratā*). They are associated with non-restraint (*avirati*) and are operative until the fifth and sixth *guṇasthānas*, respectively. Passions of the least intensity, called “smouldering” (*saṃjvalana*), are associated with apathy or carelessness regarding mendicant practices (*pramāda*). They are operative until the eleventh *guṇasthāna*, in which all *mohanīya karmas* are suppressed for a short period of time, or the twelfth *guṇasthāna*, in which all *mohanīya karmas* are destroyed.⁴

The relationship between the degree of intensity of the previously bound *mohanīya karmas* that have come to fruition and the degree of intensity of new karmic matter that is being bound depends on whether the new *karma* is an auspicious variety (*puṇya-prakṛti*) or an inauspicious variety (*pāpa-prakṛti*). For inauspicious varieties, the strongest passions (*anantānubandhī kaṣāya*) cause the binding of *karma* with the most intensity (fourth *rasa*), and the weakest passions (*saṃjvalana kaṣāya*) cause the binding of *karma* with the least intensity (first *rasa*). For auspicious varieties, there is an inverse relationship: the weakest passions cause the binding of *karma* with the most intensity (fourth *rasa*) and the strongest passions cause the binding of *karma* with the least intensity (first *rasa*) (Glasenapp 1942: 24).⁵ For duration bondage, with the exception of the three varieties of life span (*āyus*) *karma* that are considered auspicious (*puṇya*),⁶ the stronger the passions, the longer the duration of its bondage with the soul. Thus, stronger passions result in longer durations of *āyus karma* for hell-beings (*nāraka-āyus*) and most animals (*tiryāṅc-āyus*) while weaker passions result in longer durations of *āyus karma* for heavenly beings (*deva-āyus*), human beings (*manuṣya-āyus*), and five-sensed rational animals (Glasenapp 1942: 23).⁷

⁴ The rise (*udaya*) of “smouldering” (*saṃjvalana*) intensities of anger (*krodha*), pride (*māna*), and deceitful manipulation (*māyā*) are either suppressed or destroyed in the ninth *guṇasthāna* and that of greed (*lobha*) in the tenth. See Glasenapp 1942: 87f.

⁵ See also Tatia 1951: 235f., where *sthānika* is the technical term used for the four main divisions of intensity.

⁶ Life spans of heavenly beings (*deva-āyus*), human beings (*manuṣya-āyus*), and five-sensed rational animals (*tiryāṅc-āyus*) are considered auspicious (*puṇya*) whereas life spans of other animals and of hell-beings (*nāraka-āyus*) are inauspicious (*pāpa*). For a discussion of the *puṇya-* and *pāpa-prakṛtis* listed at TS 8.26 (= variant at SS 8.25 and 8.26), see Tatia 1994: 203–6 and S. A. Jain 1960: 236f.

⁷ See also Glasenapp 1942: 51–61 and Jaini 1979: 107–11 for states of existence (*gati*) and classes of beings (*jāti*).

Helmuth von Glasenapp, however, mentions another term, *adhyavasāya* (Pkt. *ajjhavasāya*), in association with duration and intensity bondage. In the *Doctrine of Karman in Jaina Philosophy*, he states that “the duration and intensity of the effect of a *karman* depends upon the state of mind (*adhyavasāya*) at the moment of assimilation” (Glasenapp 1942: 3) and “the duration of the *karmans* of a *jīva* is dependent on the tenure of his mind (*adhyavasāya*), and, therefore, on the strength of the *kaṣāyas*” (Glasenapp 1942: 23). Unfortunately, although he provides a comprehensive examination of *mohanīya karma* and the four *kaṣāyas*, he does not elaborate further on these assertions nor does he cite any references.⁸ Nathmal Tatia (1951) does not mention *adhyavasāya* in his *Studies in Jaina Philosophy*, which contains one of the more detailed explanations in a western language of the mechanics of karmic bondage. Therefore, there is a need to investigate the contexts in which *adhyavasāya* and related terms such as *adhyavasāna* are used in Jain *karma* literature in order to understand its significance in karmic bondage and to determine whether its role is restricted to duration and intensity bondage or whether it is also a factor in other aspects of karmic bondage.

Definitions of *Adhyavasāya* and Related Terms

In the Sanskrit-English dictionaries of Apte and Monier-Williams, the masculine noun *adhyavasāya* is associated with the verb *adhi-ava-so*, “to determine, resolve, mean to do”; “to attempt, exert, undertake”; “to grapple with”; and “to conceive, apprehend, think.”⁹ Among the definitions given by Apte for *adhyavasāya* are “determination, resolution” and “mental effort or apprehension.”¹⁰ According to Monier-Williams, *adhyavasāya* is a philosophical term meaning “mental effort or apprehension.”¹¹ Another word derived from this verb is *adhyavasāna*, a neuter noun meaning “effort,

⁸ Glasenapp’s main source was the new (*navya*) *Karmagranthas* of Devendrasūri (thirteenth century), supplemented by the Śvetāmbara *Pañcasamgraha* of Candrarṣi (Candramahattara) and *Karmapraṅkti* of Śivaśarmasūri (both of which were known to Devendrasūri) as well as the *Tattvārtha-sūtra*.

⁹ Apte 1965: 49. Cf. Monier-Williams 1899: 23, “to undertake, attempt, accomplish” and “to determine, consider, ascertain.”

¹⁰ From Pāṇini’s *Aṣṭādhyāyī* VI.2.21.

¹¹ Monier-Williams 1899: 23. Cf. Apte 1965: 49, “determination, resolution, mental effort or apprehension.”

determination, and so forth,” which is cross-referenced with *adhyavasāya*.¹² *Adhyavasāya* is used in the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali (ca. second century B.C.E.) in the sense of “determination to begin an activity with a view to getting its fruit.”¹³ As will be seen, some of these definitions are relevant in the context of Jain *karma* theory, especially “determination, resolution,” “mental effort,” and “determination to begin an activity with a view to getting its fruit.”

Adhyavasāya is used as a technical term in philosophical texts of other religious traditions. For example, in the *Nyāya Sūtra* of Gautama (third century C. E.), it is used in the sense of “ascertainment.”¹⁴ It is also a technical term in the *Sāṃkhya Kārikā* (SK) of Īśvarakṛṣṇa (550 C.E.).¹⁵ At SK 5, he says, “perception is the non-doubting awareness (*adhyavasāya*) of each [faculty’s] respective sense-content (*viśaya*) (*prativīṣayādhyavasāyo dr̥ṣṭam*)” (Clear 1990: 311). In the *Yuktidīpika*,¹⁶ *adhyavasāya* is explained as “that which follows the functioning of the sense faculties appropriating their [respective] sense-contents” (Clear, *ib.*). In the *Sāṃkhyatattvakaumudi*, Vācaspati Mīśra

¹² Apte 1965: 49. Cf. Monier-Williams 1899: 23, “attempt, effort, exertion; energy, perseverance; determining.”

¹³ Abhyankar 1986, p. 15. In VyMBh (vol. 1, p. 278, lines 1–3) Patañjali is commenting on Pāṇini 1.3.14, which deals with the term *karmanī* in the sense of *kriyā* (activity). “A man who has done a prior action of seeing ponders on some goal with his mind. When he has pondered on it, he wishes for it, and once it is wished for, he determines to do it (*adhyavasāya*). When he has determined to do it, he begins, and once he begins, he ceases. When he ceases, the fruit is obtained.”

¹⁴ NSū 2.1.1 is the first of five objections that have been raised regarding doubt (*saṃśaya*) as discussed at NSū 1.1.23. It reads “[Objection] Doubt is not on account of the ascertainment (*adhyavasāya*) of common characteristics (*samāna-dharma*) or unique characteristic (*aneka-dharma*) or the ascertainment (*adhyavasāya*) of either (*anyatara*)” (Chattopadhyaya & Gangopadhyaya 1968: 4). It is used in this same sense in the following four objections. NSū 4.2.49 (as cited in Oberhammer et al. 1991, vol. 1, p. 28f.) is about protecting right knowledge when opponents are trying to refute it with faulty reasoning. “Disputation (*jalpa*) and wrangling (*vitanda*) [are to be employed] for the purpose of protection of the ascertainment (*adhyavasāya*) of truth (*tattva*) just like fences with thorny branches [are to be employed] for the purpose of protection of the germination of seeds.” In his discussion of Nyāya epistemology, Dasgupta 1922/1975: 413 mentions *adhyavasāya*. “Knowledge was called *pramāṇa*, because it was the means by which we could form convictions (*adhyavasāya*) about the external world.”

¹⁵ Dating according to Clear 1990: 340. According to Larsen 1979: 145 little is known about the author, but the *Kārikā* and a commentary were translated into Chinese sometime between 557 and 569 C.E.

¹⁶ The author and date of this commentary are unknown. Larsen 1979: 149f. does not date it, while Clear 1990: 340 places it in the time period between 550 and 1000 C.E.

(ca. 850–950) describes *adhyavasāya* as “ascertainment or determinate knowledge as consequent upon the manifestation of the essence of the intellect, when the inertia of the intellect is overcome by the operation of the sense organs in apprehending their objects” (Sinha 1934: 121). At SK 23, *adhyavasāya* is associated with intellect (*buddhi*). According to Larsen (1979: 181), “*buddhi* [is characterized by] ascertainment or determination (*adhyavasāya*).”¹⁷ He states that “in the *Kārikā* itself, *buddhi* is characterized as being *adhyavasāya*. The term is from the root *sā* or *si*, meaning ‘to bind’ together with the prefixes *adhi* and *ava*. It can mean ‘attempt,’ ‘effort,’ ‘exertion,’ ‘perseverance,’ etc.” (ib., p. 182). Commenting on SK 23 in his *Kārikā Bhāṣya*, Gauḍapāda explains this term as “intellectual determination of the object of perception as belonging to a definite class, such as this is a jar, this is a cloth”¹⁸ (Sinha 1934: 121). *Yuktidīpikā* 92.7 states that “*adhyavasāya* is sensory cognition (*grahaṇa*) in the sense of non-doubting awareness (*niścaya*) and mental construct (*pratyaya*) that this is a cow, this is a man.”¹⁹ A variant of this word, *vyavasāya*, is found at *Bhagavad Gītā* 2.41, also with reference to *buddhi*, in the sense of one whose *buddhi* is controlled or properly directed. It is contrasted with one whose *buddhi* is *avyavasāya*, “not controlled” or “not resolute.”²⁰ Thus, *adhyavasāya* was used in a technical sense as early as the second century B. C. E. in the *Mahābhāṣya* and is found in seminal texts of other traditions, namely, the *Nyāya Sūtra* and the *Sāṃkhya Kārikā*, in the early centuries of the common era in the sense of ascertainment or determination.

In the Jain tradition, Kundakunda (ca. second–third centuries C.E.) understands the terms *vyavasāya*, *adhyavasāna*, and *buddhi* to be synonymous. “*Buddhi*

¹⁷ Cf. Sharma’s 1933: 35 explanation of *Kārikā* 23: “Determination is the definition of intellect. *Adhyavasāya* is ascertainment, and it is (present in the intellect) like the future germination of sprout in a seed. That is, it is definite cognition which arises when one determines that ‘this is a jar,’ ‘this is a cloth.’”

¹⁸ Larsen 1979: 148 states that the date of this commentary is unknown, but it was in existence by the eleventh century because Alberuni refers to it. Cf. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s definition of *adhyavasāya* in the *Sāṃkhyacandrika* (a gloss on Gauḍapāda’s work), “a modified condition of the intellect, as flame is that of a lamp; it is determination in such a form as ‘such an act is to be done by me’” (Sinha 1934: 121).

¹⁹ As cited in Oberhammer et al. 1991, vol. 1, p. 29. My translation of these technical terms follows Clear 1990: 339f. She states that *buddhi* is a synonym to *adhyavasāya*, *niścaya*, and *pratyaya* and that *niścaya* can be rendered as “belief” as in “a person has the belief *that* consciousness exists.” She defines *pratyaya* as “cognition involving mental constructs, such as concepts as opposed to purely sensory cognition (*grahaṇa*)” and that “it is sometimes equated with *niścaya* of the perceptual sort and also *adhyavasāya*.”

²⁰ “The mental attitude whose nature is resolution (*vyavasāya*) is but one in this world, son of Kuru; For many-branched and endless are the mental attitudes of the irresolute (*avyavasāya*)” (Edgerton 1972: 13).

(understanding), *vyavasāya* (resolving), *adhyavasāna* (conative activity), *mati* (thinking), *viññāna* (knowing), *citta* (consciousness), *bhāva* (conscious mode), and *pariṇāma* (conscious manifestation) all have the same meaning.”²¹ He emphasizes the role of *adhyavasāna* as a determining factor in karmic bondage by raising the question, “If *adhyavasāna* is the efficient cause (*nimitta*) through which souls, standing on the path of liberation (*mokṣa-mārga*), are bound by *karma* or are released, what can you not do?”²² Although Glasenapp (1942: 94) defines *adhyavasāya* as “the tenor of the mind, the attitude of the mind, the mood of the mind,”²³ J. L. Jaini (1918: 8f.) explicitly links it with *mohanīya karma* in his definition “impure (from the point of view of the soul’s own nature) thought activity, as love, hatred, delusion, and so forth.” This agrees with Devendrasūri’s definition in his commentary on *Karmagrantha* 4.82.²⁴ Kundakunda suggests this association by mentioning that “munis who do not have these thought activities (*adhyavasāya*) are not stained with either auspicious or inauspicious *karmas*.”²⁵ However, Kundakunda understands that *adhyavasāya* has a broader sphere of influence than on duration and intensity bondage when he states that “by its own thought activity (*adhyavasāya*), the soul creates [for itself] all [states of embodiment], animals and hell-beings, heavenly beings and human beings, as well as various types of auspiciousness and inauspiciousness. Likewise, by its thought activity, a soul identifies itself with [categories of existents] such as motion and rest (*dharma-adharma*), soul and non-soul (*jīva-ajīva*), and the unoccupied and occupied universe (*aloka-loka*).”²⁶ In these passages, Kundakunda implies that there is an association between *adhyavasāya* and type bondage

²¹ SAM, chapter 8, verse 271; translation of terms by Cakravarti.

²² SAM, chapter 8, verse 267.

²³ Cf. N. L. Jain 1995, no page, “mental effort.”

²⁴ “*adhyavasāya-sthānāni kaṣāyodaya-rūpāni adhyavasāya-sabdena.*”

²⁵ SAM chapter 8, verse 270. They would experience only instantaneous bondage (*īryāpathika-bandha*) in which one variety of *karma*, *sātā-vedanīya*, which causes pleasant feelings, is bound in one instant and experienced in the next, not duration bondage (*sāmparāyika-bandha*) associated with mundane souls, which is the cause of rebirth. The only time that *yoga* alone is the cause of *prakṛti-bandha* is when the soul has attained the states of purity associated with the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth *guṇasthānas*. Here, where there are no passions because all *mohanīya karma* has been either suppressed or destroyed, *yoga* alone causes instantaneous bondage of *sātā-vedanīya karma*.

²⁶ SAM chapter 8, verse 270.

(*prakṛti-bandha*) because different sub-varieties of *karma* are responsible for rebirth and embodiment in the four states of existence, as well as auspiciousness or inauspiciousness in each life as characterized by factors such as attractive or unattractive bodies (sub-varieties of *śarīra-nāma karma*), high or low status (sub-varieties of *gotra karma*), and so forth.²⁷ On the other hand, confusion regarding the nature of the soul and its identification with existents that are non-soul are caused by *darśana-mohanīya karma*. This broader sphere of influence is supported by passages in Jain *karma* literature.

***Adhyavasāya* and Type Bondage**

It is said in the *Tattvārtha-sūtra* of Umāsvāti/Umāsvāmī (ca. fourth–fifth centuries C.E.) that type bondage (*prakṛti-bandha*) and quantity bondage (*pradeśa-bandha*) are caused by activity (*yoga*) and duration bondage (*sthiti-bandha*) and intensity bondage (*anubhāga-bandha*) by passions (*kaṣāya*) (TS 8.4 = SS 8.3; KG 5.96). However, as Nathmal Tatia (1951: 238) has pointed out, the varieties of karmic matter that are bound are determined by the nature of the activity, which, in turn, is determined by the various passions.²⁸

An association between *adhyavasāya* and both activity (*yoga*) and type bondage (*prakṛti-bandha*) is found in Maladhārī Hemacandra’s commentary on the *Gaṇadharavāda* of Ācārya Jinabhadra entitled in Solomon’s (1966) translation “Acalabhrātā Regarding the Reality of *Puṇya-Pāpa* (Good-Evil).”²⁹ Here a question is

²⁷ For details regarding the four *aghātiyā karmas* (*āyus, nāma, gotra, and vedanīya*), see Wiley 2000a. For different views regarding *gotra karma*, see Wiley 1999.

²⁸ For a listing of the 120 varieties of *karma* that can be bound, see Glasenapp 1942: 5–20. For more details on the most important varieties, see Jaini 1979: 115–33. Quantity bondage will not be discussed here because it is dependent on the degree of activity alone and is not associated with *adhyavasāya*. See Glasenapp 1942: 24–27.

²⁹ The GV is a section of the *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya*; however, it has been published as an independent manuscript. The text of the GV edited by Dalsukh Malvania for his Gujarati translation has been reproduced in Solomon’s translation, and the numbering of the verses here follows this edition. Her translation incorporates Maladhārī Hemacandrasūri’s commentary, although the text has not been included here. Maladhārī Hemacandrasūri (twelfth century) was a disciple of Abhayadevasūri. According to Kapadia 1941: 198, he was a senior contemporary of Hemacandrasūri (1089–1172). The latter, who was a disciple of Devacandrasūri, has been given the epithet Kalikālasarvajña. He was the author of a number of works, including the *Triṣaṣṭīśalākāpuruṣacaritra*. Acalabhrātā is the ninth Gaṇadhara of Mahāvīra.

raised regarding the coexistence of good and evil. In denying this possibility, there is a discussion about whether *karma* can be a mixture of good and bad:

“*Karma* cannot be of a mixed nature as there is no cause of such a *karma*. *Yoga* (activity) is the cause of *karma*. *Yoga* can be either good or bad at one time, but not of a mixed good-cum-bad nature; its effect too should be good, viz. *puṇya* or bad, viz. *pāpa*, but not of a mixed form, *puṇya-cum-pāpa*. Perverted attitude, non-abstinence, spiritual inertia, passion, and activity (*yoga*) are the causes of bondage; of these *yoga* alone is such that it is invariably connected with *karma*-bondage; that is to say, *karma*-bondage is not possible without *yoga*. Hence, *yoga* alone of all the causes has been mentioned here. *Yoga* is three-fold according as it [*sic*] pertains to mind, speech, or body.”³⁰

In further clarifying the nature of *yoga*, it is stated:

“[*Y*]*yoga* is two-fold, *dravya* (physical) and *bhāva* (psychical). The material substances inspiring the activities of the minds, etc., are *dravya-yoga* and so also all the vibrations of the mind, etc. *Adhyavasāya* (determination, motive, intention) is the cause of both these kinds of *dravya-yoga*. *Dravya-yoga* may be of a mixed nature both good and bad. But the cause of it viz. *adhyavasāya* can be at a time either good or bad, but can never be of a mixed nature. *Dravya-yoga* too is said to be of a mixed nature only from the *vyavahāra-naya*, i.e. the empirical point of view; but from the ultimate point of view (*niścaya-naya*), it can be only good or bad at a time. . . . In the case of *bhāva-yoga*, the mixed state is not possible from any point of view. *Adhyavasāya* can be either good or bad; in no scripture do we find a reference to a third type of *adhyavasāya* of a mixed nature good-cum-bad. When the *adhyavasāya* is good, there is the binding of *puṇya karma*, and when the *adhyavasāya* is bad, there is the binding of *pāpa karma*, but there being no *adhyavasāya* of a mixed nature, good-cum-bad, there can never be any *karma* which is of a mixed nature, *puṇya-cum-pāpa*. Hence, *puṇya* and *pāpa* should be regarded as independent and not of a mixed nature.”³¹

³⁰ Solomon 1966: 187 (translation of GV 1934–1935).

In Maladhārī Hemacandra’s commentary on this same section of the *Gaṇadharavāda*, *adhyavasāya* is also mentioned in the context of transforming generic karmic matter into auspicious or inauspicious sub-varieties:

“As long as *karma-pudgala* is not bound by the *jīva*, it is neither auspicious nor inauspicious, but as soon as *jīva* binds it, it transforms it into auspicious or inauspicious by virtue of the peculiarity of the transformation in the form of *adhyavasāya* (determination) and also of the support, as in the case of food. That is to say, the *jīva* while binding *karman* produces in it auspiciousness or inauspiciousness in accordance with the transformation of the *jīva* into auspicious or inauspicious *adhyavasāya*; again, the *jīva*, which is the support of *karman*, has such a peculiar nature on account of which it can transform *karma* even while binding it; the *karma* too has such a nature that it is thus transformed even while being bound by the *jīva* with auspicious or inauspicious *adhyavasāya*.”³²

The passage continues with the analogy of *karma* with food. “Even if a cow and a serpent are given the same food, the cow’s food turns into milk and that of the serpent into poison.” This is attributed to the particular nature of food as well as to the particular nature of the receptacle of that food, i.e., the body that has consumed it:

“*Karma*, similarly, has the energy or capacity to undergo an auspicious or inauspicious transformation on resorting to a *jīva* with an auspicious or inauspicious *adhyavasāya* (resolution); and the supporting *jīva*, too, has the capacity to bind *karman* and to transform it into auspicious or inauspicious, i.e., into *puṇya* (merit) or *pāpa* (sin).”³³

Modern commentators also associate *adhyavasāya* with the binding of different varieties of karmic matter. In his commentary on *Tattvārtha-sūtra* 8.5, which lists the eight main varieties (*mūla-prakṛti*) of *karma*, Pandit Sukhlāl Saṅghvī (1952: 274) states

³¹ Solomon 1966: 188 (translation of GV 1936).

³² Solomon 1966: 191 (translation of GV 1943).

³³ Solomon 1966: 193 (translation of GV 1944).

that when the bundle of karmic matter (*karma-pudgala-rāśi*) is being grasped as a unit at one time by a soul with a particular mental determination (*adhyavasāya-viśeṣa*), changes of various types (*svabhāva*) take place that are in conformity with the particular type of mental power (*adhyavasāya śakti*) present at this time.

Adhyavasāya and the Binding of Āyus Karma

In his commentary on the *Pañṇavaṇā (Prajñāpanā)* in which he discusses the parameters regarding the binding of life span (*āyus karma*), Malayagiri (twelfth century) states that *adhyavasāya* determines the manner in which this *karma* is bound. Unlike the other seven main varieties (*mūla-prakṛti*), *āyus karma* is bound only once in each life. It remains inactive until the moment of death, when *āyus karma* for the present life has been exhausted. At this time, *āyus karma* for the next life begins its operation, determining the soul's state of embodiment as well as its life span, or length of time in that embodiment.³⁴

The binding of *āyus karma* does not take place in an instant (*samaya*), as is the case with most other varieties, but may continue for an *antarmuhūrta* (forty-eight minutes). Malayagiri does not explain the reason for this, but he states that during the *antarmuhūrta* in which *āyus karma* is being bound, there can be multiple attractions (*ākaraṣa*), with the binding stopping and starting again for a total of eight times. Using the analogy of a cow drinking, he states:

“For example, some cows finish taking a drink of water in only one gulp; some, on account of fear, having repeatedly stopped, drink water in two, three or four, or seven or eight gulps. In this way, some souls with strong [mental] effort or will (*adhyavasāya*) grasp in only one slow attraction the *pudgalas* of *āyus*. . . . For others, with two or three attractions, there is a slower attraction; and with six, seven, or eight, an extremely slow attraction.”³⁵

³⁴ Four sub-varieties of *āyus karma* determine whether the soul will be embodied as a heavenly being (*deva*), a hell-being (*nāraki*), a human being (*manuṣya*), or an animal or plant (*tīryaṅc*). The latter category also includes insects and one-sensed life-forms embodied in the elements of earth, water, fire, and air, as well as the most basic life-form, *nigodas*. For details regarding the binding of *āyus karma*, see Wiley 2003.

³⁵ Malayagiri's commentary on PrSū 6, *sūtra* 145 (folio 216: 145f.). See also Jināgama Granthamālā edition, p. 494.

He also mentions that the fewest number of souls bind *āyus* with a maximum of eight *ākarṣas* and the largest number bind with one *ākarṣa*.³⁶

Adhyavasāya is also mentioned in association with the binding of *āyus karma* by some editors and translators of printed editions of *karma* texts. For example, in discussing the *karmas* that are operative in the third *guṇasthāna*, Muni Miśrīmal states that *ānupūrvī nāma karma*, which functions during transmigration of the soul from the place of death to its place of rebirth, does not come into rise here because death cannot occur due to the fact that *āyus karma* cannot be bound “because the *adhyavasāya* of that sort does not exist.”³⁷ Perhaps Glasenapp also may have been thinking of *adhyavasāya* in the association with the third *guṇasthāna*, although he does not use this term here. He states that while the soul is in the third *guṇasthāna*, which is characterized by indifference, “the two still remaining *āyus* [*deva* and *manuṣya*] cannot be bound, because the *jīva* cannot die on this stage, and because, also, a clear ‘tendency of will [*adhyavasāya*?],’ which could be decisive for the binding of a certain *āyus*, is not existing” (Glasenapp 1942: 79). *Āyus karma* also cannot be bound in the *guṇasthānas* above the seventh, namely, those attained by the soul as it ascends either the ladder of suppression (*upaśamika śreṇi*), culminating in the eleventh *guṇasthāna*, or the ladder of destruction (*kṣāyika śreṇi*), culminating in the state of the omniscient *kevalin* (thirteenth and fourteenth *guṇasthānas*). Here, *adhyavasāya* may be a factor as well because in his comments on the *Karmagranthas* of Devendrasūri, Muni Miśrīmal states that beginning in the ninth *guṇasthāna*, the purity of the various *adhyavasāyas* keeps on increasing.³⁸

Mendicant-scholars and *paṇḍits* with whom I have discussed the binding of *āyus karma* were familiar with this term. Some thought that *adhyavasāya* was the reason that binding stopped and then started again. However, some Śvetāmbara scholars used this term in association with other aspects of its binding. One mentioned that *adhyavasāya*, or “mental attitude,” determines the specific sub-variety (*uttara-prakṛti*) of *āyus* that is bound, which is supported by its association with type bondage, as discussed above.

³⁶ PrSū, Jināgama Granthamālā edition, verses 690–91 (p. 492).

³⁷ Muni Miśrīmal 1974 (vol. 2): 88, discussing KG 2.15–17.

³⁸ Muni Miśrīmal 1974 (vol. 2): 103, on KG 2.18–19. For the *karmas* that are bound in the eighth, ninth, and tenth *guṇasthānas*, see Glasenapp 1942: 84–88. In the *guṇasthānas* above the tenth, in the absence of passions caused by *mohanīya karma*, there is only instantaneous bondage of *sātā-vedanīya karma*, which is caused by *yoga*. See note 25 above.

Another stated that when *adhyavasāya* is very intense or very weak (the worst *adhyavasāya* or the best *adhyavasāya*), *āyus karma* does not bind.

Adhyavasāya and Leśyā

The term *adhyavasāya* is also mentioned in conjunction with *leśyā* (Pkt. *lessā*), or “karmic stain of the soul.” The concept that mental activities produce colours (*leśyā*) associated with either the mind or the soul itself is found at an early date in other religious traditions of South Asia, and scholars have speculated that this idea may have originated with the Ājīvikas or was shared knowledge within mendicant communities. The question of what causes *leśyā* has been a subject of considerable debate among Jain commentators.³⁹ In his commentary on the *Uttarajjhayaṇa* (*Uttarādhyayana*), chapter 34, verse 1, Lakṣmīvallabhagaṇi (eighteenth century) states that “*leśyās* are specific types of mental effort (*adhyavasāya-viśeṣāḥ*), and the *leśyās* of *karma* are six.”⁴⁰ For this same verse in the Jināgama Granthamālā edition of the *Uttarādhyayana*, Muni Rājendra Śāstrī states in his Hindi explanation that *leśyā* is a transformation of the soul, a type of mental effort (*adhyavasāya-viśeṣa*). In support of this, he provides a note in Sanskrit: “*adhyavasāye, ātmanaḥ pariṇāmaviśeṣe, antaḥkaraṇavr̥tti*”.⁴¹ From his citation for this quotation, it would appear that these terms are found as a unit in the *Āyārāṅga* (*Ācārāṅga*). However, apparently he is providing a listing of three separate meanings for the word *leśyā*, one of which is *adhyavasāya*.⁴² The association of *adhyavasāya* with *leśyā* here is based on Śīlāṅka’s (ninth century) commentary on AS 1.6.5.5. The *sūtra*, which lists various characteristics of a great muni (*mahā-muni*), includes the term *abahillese* (Skt. *abahir-leśyā*). Śīlāṅka glosses *leśyā* with *adhyavasāya*, but does not

³⁹ For a discussion of views of various commentators on *leśyā*, see Wiley 2000b.

⁴⁰ UttSū 1984a: 248.

⁴¹ UttSū, 1984b: 610, note 1.

⁴² Muni Rājendra Śāstrī uses an abbreviation indicating the *Ācārāṅga* but does not provide a listing of his sources. For this citation, he may have been quoting from the *Leśyā Kośa* because these three terms are found under the heading at LK 1966: 3, entry 3 “meaning of the word *leśyā*,” as three separate items. Item 1, *ātmanaḥ pariṇāmaviśeṣe* (transformation of the soul), references a definition of *leśyā* at ARK, *lessā* (vol. 6, p. 675, col. 1). Item 3, *adhyavasāya*, references AS 1.6.5.5. Item 4, *antaḥkaraṇavr̥tti* (state or condition of the mind), references AS 1.8.5. Items 1 and 4 are not relevant to our discussion because *adhyavasāya* is not mentioned in these citations.

provide a definition for *adhyavasāya*. He defines the term *abahir* with its opposite, *bahir*, as “one who has departed from (*nirgata*) restraint (*saṃyama*)” and says that a *mahā-muni* is one who does not have this; he is one whose has a mental effort (*leśyā*) that is characterized by restraint (*abahir-leśyā*).⁴³ Śīlāṅka also mentions *adhyavasāya* along with *leśyā* elsewhere when he talks about very pure mental effort (*ativiśuddhādhyavasāya*) and mental effort associated with anger and so forth (*krodhādyadhyavasāya*).⁴⁴

This definition, however, is not reflected in other sources. The term *adhyavasāya* is not mentioned in association with *leśyā* in Malayagiri’s commentary on the *Prajñāpanā* or Abhayadevasūri’s (eleventh century) commentaries on the *Viyāhapannatti* (*Vyākhyāprajñapti = Bhagavatī*) or the *Ṭhāṇaṅga* (*Sthānāṅga*).⁴⁵ Nor is it used by Muni Miśrīmal or Pandit Sukhlāl Saṅghvī in their discussions of *leśyā* in the fourth *Karmagrantha*. I have not found *adhyavasāya* mentioned in Digambara commentaries in passages on *leśyā* in *Gommaṣasāra*, in Vīrasena’s commentary on the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, nor in any of the passages for *leśyā* in *Jainendra Siddhānta Kośa* or *Jaina Lakṣaṇāvalī*. No mendicant-scholar or *paṇḍit* with whom I discussed this topic equated *adhyavasāya* with *leśyā*. Instead, all maintained that in the absence of the rise of *mohanīya karma*, there is no *adhyavasāya*, but there is still *leśyā* as long as there is activity of the body, speech, or mind. Thus, there is *leśyā* in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth *guṇasthānas* whereas *adhyavasāya* does not exist beyond the tenth *guṇasthāna*.

***Adhyavasāya* and Transformation of Karmic Matter (*Samkramaṇa*)**

For a soul to attain final liberation from the cycle of death and rebirth, it must be devoid of all karmic matter. However, this does not mean that *karma* is always experienced in

⁴³ In the Āgamodaya Samiti Edition, *sūtra* 195. The term *abahir-leśyā* is discussed on p. 172, line 16ff. Initially, I thought that the terms *bahirlabahir leśyā* might be the equivalent of *dravya* and *bhāva leśyā*, but this made little sense here. Then I thought that perhaps *abahir* (“not outside”) might mean one whose *leśyā* does go outside of, or does not deviate from, the auspicious *leśyās* that a mendicant in the sixth *guṇasthāna* would have. If so, it is not reflected in Prakrit dictionaries, where this term is defined as “one absorbed in self-restraint” (Ratnacandra 1923, vol. 1, p. 332), or “one who is restrained (*saṃyama*), and “one whose mind does not wander outside” (Sheth 1963: 59, col. 1). This term is also found at ARK, vol. 1, col. 1, where *bahir* is glossed as *avidhyamāna*, which I would interpret as “not being present,” in the sense that one’s mental efforts are not properly attentive or focused. *Adhyavasāya* is not found in any of these citations.

⁴⁴ AS 1.8.6.6 (p. 190, line 9ff.).

⁴⁵ It also is not found in the notes to the Jināgama Granthamālā edition of these texts.

the same form in which it was bound. Sometimes it is possible for the soul to decrease or increase the intensity with which specific *karmas* produce their effects or to increase or decrease the length of time that it remains bound. It is also possible to transform certain sub-varieties (*uttara-prakṛti*) of karmic matter bound at an earlier time into a corresponding sub-variety that is in the process of being bound. For example, it is possible to transform the *karma* that causes unpleasant feelings (*asātā-vedanīya*) into the variety that causes pleasant feelings (*sātā-vedanīya*) and vice-versa.⁴⁶

One of the varieties of *karma* that may be transformed is *mithyātva-darśana-mohanīya*, the *karma* that causes a deluded view of reality. Under certain circumstances, it may be transformed into a less virulent variety called “mixed” *darśana-mohanīya karma*. In support of the statement in Maladhārī Hemacandra’s commentary on the *Gaṇadhara-vāda* section of the *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya* that it is impossible for *karma* to be of a mixed nature, this transformation has been examined:

“[T]his previously bound *karma prakṛti* [*mithyātva-darśana-mohanīya*] can be turned by the force of *adhyavasāya* (determination) from good into bad and from bad into good. The formerly bound *aśubha karman* of the nature of perverted attitude can be transformed into the nature of right attitude by purifying it by good *adhyavasāya* (determination). Similarly bad or impure *adhyavasāya* can transform the good *pudgalas* of (*karma* of) right attitude into the nature of perverted attitude, and some *karma-pudgalas* of perverted attitude can be half-purified. Thus, from the point of view of the existing *karman* (persisting after being bound), mixed [*miśra*] *mohanīya karma* is possible; but at the time of binding, there is never the binding of mixed *mohanīya karma*.”⁴⁷

⁴⁶ For parameters associated with the various processes of energy (*karaṇa*), including *saṃkramaṇa*, see Tatia 1951: 254–60.

⁴⁷ Solomon 1966: 189 (translation of GV 1938). According to Glasenapp 1942: 8, *miśra-darśana-mohanīya karma*, which is also called *samyagmithyātva-darśana-mohanīya karma*, produces “a mixed belief, i.e., if it operates, the soul waxes and wanes betwixt true and false; it is indifferent to the religion of the Jina and has no predilection for, nor hatred against it.” When this variety of *karma* produces its effects, the soul is in the third *guṇasthāna* (ib., p. 78f.). In contrast, *mithyātva-darśana-mohanīya karma* causes “complete unbelief or heterodoxy. If it realizes itself, the *jīva* does not believe in the truths as proclaimed by Mahāvīra; he believes false prophets to be saints and enjoins false doctrines (ib., p. 8). Thus, a soul affected by this variety of *karma* is in the first *guṇasthāna*. A third variety, *samyaktva-darśana-mohanīya karma*, is associated with correct belief. As Glasenapp points out, “this *samyaktva* is, however, not the correct faith in its completeness but only in a preliminary degree; it is a so-called *mithyātva*, from which the

Pandit Sukhlāl Saṅghvī also mentions *adhyavasāya* in the context of karmic transformation:

“There is a rule regarding the fruition of *karma* that it must give its effect only in accordance with its inherent nature in its own *mūla-prakṛtis* (main varieties), but not in the same *uttara-prakṛtis* (sub-varieties). This is because later on, it is possible for one *uttara-prakṛti* of a certain *karma* to be changed into the form of another *uttara-prakṛti* by the force of *adhyavasāya*, and it gives its fruits, mild or strong, in accordance with the inherent nature of the *uttara-prakṛti* into which it was transformed rather than its previous form.”⁴⁸

***Adhyavasāya* and Duration and Intensity Bondage**

From the passages discussed above, we know that *adhyavasāya* is a determining factor in which sub-varieties of karmic matter are bound (auspicious or inauspicious) and in the transformation of karmic matter from one sub-variety into another. It also plays a role in the binding of *āyus karma*, and several commentators have associated it with *leśyā*. However, these sources do not shed any light on Glasenapp’s assertion that the duration (*sthiti*) and intensity (*anubhāga*) of *karmas* depend upon the state of mind (*adhyavasāya*) at the moment of assimilation and, therefore, on the strength of the *kaṣāyas*. However, there are instances in the *karma* literature where the term *adhyavasāya* is used in a technical sense in terminology used to describe the mechanics of karmic bondage. These

mithyātva-quality has been abstracted, a *mithyātva* free from poison” (ib.). This variety of *karma* is associated with a state of the soul called *kṣāyopaśamika samyaktva* (or *kṣāyopaśamika samyagdr̥ṣṭi*), which may be present in a soul in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh *guṇasthānas*. Alternatively, a soul in these four *guṇasthānas* may have attained the state of *kṣāyika samyaktva* in which all *darśana-mohanīya karma* has been destroyed. “The true belief in its perfection is only obtained when the atoms of the *samyaktva-mohanīya karmas* have disappeared” (ib.). It is not possible for such a soul to ever fall below the fourth *guṇasthāna* because a total of seven *mohanīya karmas* have been destroyed: all three varieties of *darśana-mohanīya karma* and the four varieties of *anantānubandhī-cāritra-mohanīya karma* that also were eliminated in the process of attaining *kṣāyika samyaktva*. See J. L. Jaini’s 1918: 61 definitions of *kṣāyika samyaktva* and *kṣāyopaśamika samyaktva*. The point here is that a soul binds only one variety, namely, *mithyātva-darśana-mohanīya karma*, and that the other two varieties are generated by its transformation. For the attainment of *samyaktva* and the mechanical processes involved, see Jaini 1979: 138–56 and Tatia 1951: 268–76.

⁴⁸ Saṅghvī 1952: 294f. on TS 8.22–24.

terms are found in what I understand to be “expansion passages” because they expand upon, or flesh-out, the basic form of *karma* theory, with its one hundred twenty varieties and four degrees of intensity.⁴⁹ In doing so, *karma* theory is transformed from a set of concepts that, with a little effort, can be comprehended, into a complex system of operations that is much more difficult to understand. Such expansion passages are found in a number of texts, including the Śvetāmbara *Karmagranthas* and *Karmaprakṛti* and the Digambara *Gommaṭasāra* and *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, as well as commentaries on the *Tattvārtha-sūtra*.

In the *Rājavārtika* of Akalaṅka (eighth century), a Digambara commentary on the *Tattvārtha-sūtra*, there is an expansion passage following *sūtras* 8.4 and 8.5 (= SS 8.3, 8.4), where the four aspects of karmic bondage, namely, type (*prakṛti*), duration (*sthiti*), intensity (*anubhāva*), and quantity (*pradeśa*), are mentioned and the eight main varieties (*mūla-prakṛti*) of karmic matter are listed. Here the question is raised, “is this the extent of karmic bondage or are there more types (*vikalpa*)?” Akalaṅka uses the technical term *adhyavasāya-sthāna* in his discussion of the complexities of karmic bondage. He explains that there are, in fact, many different types, from one to numerable (*saṃkheya*). For example, there are two types from the perspective of the differentiation of auspicious (*puṇya*) and inauspicious (*pāpa*), three in accordance with beginningless/ending, beginningless/ending; and with a beginning and ending; four from the perspective of type (*prakṛti*), duration (*sthiti*), intensity (*anubhāva*), and quantity (*pradeśa*), and so on. After stating that there are eight types from the perspective of different varieties, beginning with knowledge-obscuring (*jñānāvaraṇa*) *karma*, he concludes that *karma* is numerable with respect to words (*śabda*) such as these. However, the types are uncountable (*asaṃkheya*) from the perspective of the types of mental states (*adhyavasāya-sthāna*). And there are infinite (*ananta*) types in accordance with the rules regarding the transformation of infinite times infinite (*ananta-ananta*) molecules (*pradeśa*) of matter. It is also infinite from the perspective of the degrees of indivisible units that are a measure of intensity (*avibhāga-praticcheda*) of knowledge-obscuring (*jñānāvaraṇa*) *karma*, and so forth.⁵⁰

Similar passages are found elsewhere in the *karma* literature. For example, at the end of the section on bondage in *Gommaṭasāra Karmakāṇḍa* of Nemicandra (tenth

⁴⁹ See Glasenapp 1942: 19 for different ways of counting the number of varieties of *karma*.

⁵⁰ Another technical term for an indivisible unit of force is *rasabhāga* (Tatia 1951: 236). For a translation of the entire passage, see N. L. Jain 1998: 65f.

century), prior to introducing the subject of fruition bondage, *gāthā* 257 summarizes the main concepts of karmic bondage presented thus far, namely, that *prakṛti*- and *pradeśa-bandha* are caused by *yoga*, and *sthiti*- and *anubhāga-bandha* by *kaṣāyas*; and although there is quantity bondage (*pradeśa-bandha*), there is no cause for duration bondage (*sthiti-bandha*) in the eleventh *guṇasthāna* and above. *Gāthās* 258, 259, and 260 are expansion passages that, in essence, answer four questions: (1) How many different degrees of vibratory activity (*yoga*) and varieties of karmic matter are there? “All vibratory divisions (*yoga-sthāna*) are an uncountable or innumerable (*asaṃkhyāta*) part of the base line of the universe (*śreṇi*), and the collection (*saṃgraha*) of varieties (*prakṛti*) is innumerable times (*asaṃkheya-guṇa*) these” [258] (J. L. Jaini 1927: 149). (2) How many different degrees of duration are there? “The different varieties of duration (*sthiti-viśeṣa*) are an uncountable part of these (ultimate *prakṛtis*). And the (different) degrees or states of thought activity that are the cause of, or are associated with, duration bondage (*sthiti-bandha-adhyavasāya-sthāna*) are innumerable times these” [259].⁵¹ (3) How many different degrees of intensity are there? “And this number [*sthiti-bandha-adhyavasāya-sthāna*] multiplied by innumerable times the spatial units of the universe is the number of divisions of thought activity that is the cause of fruition bondage (*anubhāga-bandha-adhyavasāya-sthāna*)” [260].⁵² (4) How many molecules of *karma* are there? “And one should know that the number of *karma pradeśas* is infinite times this number” [260]. Here, one should keep in mind, as J. L. Jaini (1927: 147) has noted, that in these passages “innumerable” are not the same, because there are different degrees of innumerable, just as there are different degrees of infinite.⁵³ Thus, from these passages, one can ascertain that there is not a one-to-one correspondence of a degree of mental activity (*sthiti-bandha-adhyavasāya-sthāna*) and a specific degree of duration

⁵¹ First sentence, my translation; second sentence, J. L. Jaini’s. See also J. L. Jaini 1918: 58, where the term *kaṣāyādhyavasāya-sthāna* is defined as the “degree of passion which determines duration of bondage.” This term is found in the commentary on GKK 259 (p. 406ff.).

⁵² In ARK, vol. 1, p. 399, col. 2, *anubhāga-bandha-adhyavasāya-sthāna* is defined as “rises accompanied by *kaṣāya*, types of modification of *leśyā*, *kṛṣṇa* and so forth, that are the causes of intensity-bondage.” The term *sthiti-bandha-adhyavasāya-sthāna* is not found here, but under *sthiti-bandha* (= *thiibandha*) (vol. 4, p. 1731, col. 1) *adhyavasāya* is mentioned but *leśyā* is not.

⁵³ For a discussion of classifications of numbers, measurements of time, and measurements of space in Jainism, see Tatia 1994: 265–77. As would be expected, similar passages to these and to those cited below at the end of GKK are found in ŚKhĀ and Vīrasena’s commentary (*Dhavalā*). For example, see vol. 6, p. 199; vol. 11, p. 308ff.; vol. 11, p. 346ff.; and vol. 12, p. 202ff.

bondage because the number of different degrees of mental activities exceeds those of duration bondage.

Further details regarding the technical aspects of *adhyavasāya* are found at the end of the *Karmakāṇḍa*, where the method of calculating the incremental increase of the degrees of thought activity associated with duration bondage is described. “The degree of thought activity that causes the minimum duration bondage (*avara-sthiti-bandha-adhyavasāya-sthāna*) are innumerable times (the space-points of) the universe. As a rule, (they are) gradually increasing . . . until the passionate-thought-activity place causing maximum duration is reached.”⁵⁴ At GKK 947 and 948, *adhyavasāya* is subdivided in accordance with the specific durations (*sthiti*) associated with each main variety (*mūla-prakṛti*) of karmic matter and their relative frequency is calculated. As one could surmise from the fact that *āyus karma* is bound only once in each life, that *adhyavasāya* which is associated with the duration of *āyus karma* is the least, while those that cause the durations of feeling (*vedanīya*), deluding (*mohanīya*), and obstructing (*āvaraṇa*) *karmas* are the greatest. Combining these two parameters are *gāthās* that describe the incremental increase in degrees of the thought activity that causes the binding of the minimum duration of *āyus* to that which causes the greatest duration (953) and also the method of calculating the incremental increase in other *adhyavasāyas* associated with duration of the other seven varieties.⁵⁵

Since Glasenapp based his study of *karma* theory on Śvetāmbara sources, primarily the *Karmagranthas*, it is likely that his statements about *adhyavasāya* are based on two similar expansion passages at the end of the sections on duration bondage (5.55) and type bondage (5.95), and perhaps on a *gāthā* (4.82) regarding countable, uncountable, and infinite numbers (*saṃkhya*, *asaṃkhya*, and *ananta*).⁵⁶ In his explanation of KG 5.55, Pandit Kailāśacandra Siddhāntaśāstrī (1942: 147) states:

⁵⁴ GKK 949. Details regarding these calculations are provided at GKK 950–955.

⁵⁵ These mathematical calculations regarding the incremental increase in degrees of duration are also mentioned in discussions of one of the five cycles of wandering (*parivartana*) of mundane souls, namely *bhāva-parivartana*, or “thought cycle.” See a summary of the commentary on GJK 560 (J. L. Jaini 1927: 282) and S. A. Jain’s 1960: 58–60 translation of SS 2.10.

⁵⁶ KG 5.55 is similar to the passages at the end of GKK discussed above regarding the incremental increase in the *sthiti* of *āyus* and the other seven *prakṛtis*. It is also similar to KP, *bandhanakarana*, *gāthā* 87. KG 5.95 is similar to GKK 257–260.

“[I]n the previous *gāthās* the various degrees (*sthāna*) of duration were explained. Here it is explained that there are innumerable degrees of *adhyavasāya* that are the cause of individual degrees of duration. *Adhyavasāya-sthāna* means a certain type of rise, strong, stronger, strongest, or mild, milder, mildest, of *kaṣāya*. In other words, a transformation of the *ātman* that is produced or caused by *kaṣāyas* that is the cause of duration bondage is called *adhyavasāya*. Thus, there is not one specific degree of *adhyavasāya* that is the cause of one specific degree of duration bondage, but various (different) *adhyavasāya-sthānas*, and from different *adhyavasāya-sthānas* one duration may be bound. For example, if ten humans bind *deva-āyus* of two *sāgar* [*opama*] in length, then it is not necessarily the case that the transformation [in the souls] of these ten humans is exactly the same. *Adhyavasāya-sthānas*, which are the extent of an uncountable *loka*, may be the cause of just one individual *sthiti*.”

The Significance of *Adhyavasāya*

Based on these representative samples from Jain *karma* literature, it is evident that *adhyavasāya* is used in both a general and a technical sense. However, two fundamental questions remain unanswered. First, why is *kaṣāya* not sufficient to explain karmic bondage? It is insufficient, I believe, because it does not adequately explain how a single main variety of karmic matter, namely *mohanīya karma*, which generates one of the four passions in a specific degree of intensity when coming to fruition, ultimately results in modifications to generic karmic matter that is in the process of being bound and being transformed into the numerous sub-varieties, infusing it with different durations and different degrees of intensity, each of which is appropriate for each individual sub-variety of karmic matter. In other words, the rise of one type of *karma*, namely, one of the sub-varieties of *cāritra-mohanīya karma*, which contains within it a specific degree of intensity, is capable of generating a type of mental resolve or determination (*adhyavasāya*), which is the efficient cause (*nimitta*) for modifications in the inherent nature of the soul. These modifications, in turn, are capable of causing multiple transformations in generic karmic matter while it is being bound, infusing each individual

molecule (*pradeśa*) with a specific duration (*sthiti*) and intensity (*anubhāga*) that is appropriate for each variety.⁵⁷

A second question should be addressed as well. Why is this level of detail regarding duration and intensity necessary? Here one should consider how karmic matter is arranged at the time of bondage. When we think of karmic bondage, we usually understand that a mass of karmic matter is bound, which, following a period of quiescence (*abādhā-kāla*), rises, producing its effect and detaching from the soul. However, this entire mass of *karma* does not come to fruition at precisely the same time. Instead, there is a range of time over which it rises. This is best illustrated by *āyus karma*, which is bound only once in each life but produces its effects over an entire life span. In order for there to be an uninterrupted rise over this range, at the time that *karma* is being bound, it is grouped into bundles of karmic particles that have the same duration. Furthermore, these bundles are arranged so that those particles of karmic matter that have been infused with the least duration are first in line to come to fruition, to be followed by those with a duration of one moment more, and so forth.⁵⁸ Therefore, it is possible that this level of detail is necessary because of the intricate nature of the physical mechanics of karmic bondage.

Adhyavasāya thus plays a role in several aspects of karmic bondage. It is a determining factor in the way in which *āyus karma* is bound, and it informs the actions associated with the binding of either auspicious or inauspicious varieties of *karma*. It is directly responsible for the intensities and durations of each individual sub-variety (*uttara-prakṛti*) of karmic matter, and it is necessary for the transformation of karmic matter from one sub-variety into another (*saṃkramaṇa*). In this role, it probably has its greatest impact on karmic bondage, for without this process of energy (*karāṇa*), it would be impossible to transform *mohanīya karma* into less virulent varieties, thereby enabling the soul to progress on the path of purification and ultimately attain liberation (*mokṣa*) from the cycle of death and rebirth.

⁵⁷ For a listing of the minimum and maximum *sthitis* of different varieties of *karma*, see Glasenapp 1942: 20–23; for intensities, see Glasenapp 1942: 24.

⁵⁸ Details regarding this are found in some of the *karma* texts, for example, GKK 919–951 (Prasād 1937: 399–418). The technical term for this bundle is *niṣeka*. It is the number of karmic particles that operate together as a unit and are shed in one instant. *Karmas* are arranged in such a manner that the greatest number of karmic particles are in the bundle that comes to fruition first, followed by a progressive decrease in the particles in the successive bundles (ib., p. 401).

Perhaps *adhyavasāya* is not commonly mentioned in discussions of *karma* theory because, as is the case with *leśyā*, it is possible to adequately explain the basic concepts of bondage, which constitute the surface structure of *karma* theory, without it. However, as illustrated in the “expansion passages” mentioned above, *adhyavasāya* is a vital part of the deep structure of *karma* theory in which the mechanics associated with its binding, arrangement, and realization are described in minute detail. There are, of course, a number of other technical terms that are found at these deeper levels of *karma* theory. However, one seldom becomes aware of them because the same term is not used in a non-technical sense in the surface structure of *karma* theory, as is the case with *adhyavasāya*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- ARK *Abhidhānarājendrakōṣa* (7 Vols.). Compiled by Vijayarājendrasūri. Delhi: B. R. Publishing Corp., 1910–1925/1985.
- AS *Ācārāṅgasūtram* and *Sūtrakṛtāṅgasūtram*, with the *Niryukti* of Ācārya Bhadrabāhu and the Commentary of Śīlāṅkācārya. Ed. Muni Jambūvijayajī (Re-edition of Āgamodaya Samiti Edition). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1978.
- BG *The Bhagavad Gītā*. English Translation by Frankin Edgerton. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- GJK *Gommatsara Jiva-Kanda* of Nemicandra. English Translation by J. L. Jaini. The Sacred Books of the Jainas, Vol. 5. New Delhi: Today & Tomorrow’s Printers & Publishers, 1927/1990.
- GKK *Gommaṣasāra Karmakāṇḍa* of Nemicandra, with *Karnāṭa-vṛtti*, *Sanskrit-ṭīkā Jīvatattvapradīpikā*, Hindi Translation and Introduction (2 Vols.). Eds. A. N. Upadhye & Pandit Kailāśacandra Śāstrī. Fourth Edition. Delhi: Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha, 2003. (First Edition 1980–1981)

- GKK *Gommatsara Karma-Kanda* (Part 1). English Translation by J. L. Jaini. The Sacred Books of the Jainas, Vol. 6. New Delhi: Today & Tomorrow's Printers & Publishers, 1927/1990.
- GKK *Gommatsara Karma-Kanda* (Part 2). English Translation by Sītal Prasād. The Sacred Books of the Jainas, Vol. 10. New Delhi: Today & Tomorrow's Printers & Publishers, 1937/1990.
- GV *Gaṇadharavāda*. English Translation by Esther A. Solomon. Ahmedabad: Gujarat Vidya Sabha, 1966.
- JL *Jaina Lakṣaṇāvalī* (3 Vols.). Compiled by Bālchandra Siddhāntaśāstrī. Vir Sewa Mandir Series, No. 15. Delhi: Vir Sewa Mandir, 1972–1979.
- JSK *Jainendra Siddhānta Kośa* (4 Vols.). Compiled by Jinendra Varṇī. Delhi: Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha, 1970–1973.
- KG *Karmagrantha* of Devendrasūri. *Catvāraḥ Karmagranthāḥ* with *Svopajña-vṛtti*. Bhavnagar: Jaina Ātmānanda Sabhā, 1934.
- KG *Karmagrantha* of Devendrasūri (Vol. 4). Hindi Translation and Annotation by Pandit Sukhlālji [Saṅghvī]. Agra: Ātmananda Jaina Pustaka Pracāraka Maṇḍal, 1922.
- KG *Karmagrantha* of Devendrasūri (Vol. 5). Hindi Translation and Annotation by Kailāśacandra Siddhāntaśāstrī. Agra: Ātmananda Jaina Pustaka Pracāraka Maṇḍal, 1942.
- KG *Karmagrantha* of Devendrasūri (6 Vols.). Hindi Translation and Annotation by Muni Śrī Miśrīmal Mahārāj. Beawar: Marūdharakesarī Sāhitya Prakāśana Samiti, 1974–1976.
- KP *Karmaprakṛti* of Śivaśarmasūri, with the *Cūrṇi* and the Commentaries of Malayagiri and Yaśovijaya. Dabhoi: Khubchand Panacand, 1937.

- LK *Leśyā-Kośa*. Compiled by Mohanlāl Bāṅṭhiyā and Śrīcandra Coraḍiyā. Calcutta: Mohanlāl Bāṅṭhiyā, 1966.
- NSū *Nyāya-sūtra* of Gautama (Vol. 2). English Translation by Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya and Mrinalkanti Gangopadhyaya as *Nyāya Philosophy*. Calcutta: Indian Studies, Past & Present, 1968.
- PrSū *Prajñāpanā-sūtra*, with the Commentary of Malayagiri. Ed. Muni Ajita Śekhharvijaya (Re-edition of Āgamodaya Samiti Edition). Bangalore: Ādināth Jain Temple Trust, 1988.
- PrSū *Prajñāpanā-sūtra* (3 Vols.). Hindi Translation and Annotation by Jñāna Muni. Jināgama Granthamālā, Nos. 16, 20, and 27. Beawar: Āgama Prakāśan Samiti, 1983–1986.
- SAM *Samayasāra* of Kundakunda. English Translation by A. Cakravarti. Delhi: Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha, 1971.
- SK *The Sāṃkhya Kārikā* of Īśvara Kṛṣṇa, with the Commentary of Gauḍapāda. English Translation by Har Dutt Sharma. Poona: Oriental Book Agency, 1933.
- ṢKhĀ *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* of Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali, with the *Dhavalā-tīkā* of Vīrasena (16 Vols.). Prakrit and Sanskrit Texts with Hindi Translation by Hiralal Jain. Amaravati: Jaina Sāhityoddhāraka Fund, 1939–1959. Revised Edition. Solapur: Jaina Saṃskṛti Saṃrakṣaka Saṅgha, 1985.
- SS *Sarvārthasiddhi* of Pūjyapāda. Sanskrit Text with Hindi Translation by Phoolchandra Siddhāntaśāstri. Eighth Edition. Delhi: Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha, 1998. (Second Edition 1971)
- SS *Sarvārthasiddhi* of Pūjyapāda. English Translation by S. A. Jain as *Reality*. Calcutta: Vira Sasana Sangha, 1960.
- TS *Tattvārtha-sūtra* of Umāsvāti. Hindi Translation and Commentary by Sukhlālji Saṅghvī. Banaras: Jaina Saṃskṛti Saṃśodhana Maṇḍal, 1952.

TS *Tattvārtha-sūtra* of Umāsvāti. English Translation by Nathmal Tatia as *Tattvārtha Sūtra: That Which Is*. London: Harper Collins, 1994.

TSRV *Tattvārthavārtika (Rājavārtikam)* of Akalaṅkadeva (2 Vols.). Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Jaina Granthamālā, Sanskrit Grantha, Nos. 10 and 20. Delhi: Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha, 1953–1957/1982. (See also N. L. Jain, trans.)

UttSū *Uttarādhyayana-sūtra* with the *Ṭīkā* of Lakṣmīvallabhagaṇi (2 Vols.). Ahmedabad: Śāradā Prakāśana Kendra, 1984a.

UttSū *Uttarādhyayana-sūtra*. Hindi Translation and Annotation by Rājendra Muni Śāstrī. Jināgama Granthamālā, No. 19. Beawar: Āgama Prakāśan Samiti, 1984b.

VyMBh *Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali* (Vol. 1). Ed. F. Kielhorn. Third Edition, Revised by K. V. Abhyankar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1962.

Secondary Sources

Abhyankar, Kashinath Vasudev. *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar*. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1986.

Apte, V. S. *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Fourth Revised and Enlarged Edition. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1965.

Clear, Edeltraud Harzer. “Īśvarakṛṣṇa’s Two-Level-Perception: Propositional and Non-Propositional.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 18 (1990) 305–340.

Dasgupta, Surendranath. *A History of Indian Philosophy* (Vol. 1). Cambridge, 1922 (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1975/1992).

Dundas, Paul. *The Jains*. Second Revised Edition. London: Routledge, 2002. (First Edition 1992)

Glaserapp, Helmuth von. *The Doctrine of Karman in Jain Philosophy*. Translation of *Die Lehre vom Karma in der Philosophie der Jainas* (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz 1915) by G. Barry Gifford, Revised by the Author, and Edited by Hiralal R. Kapadia. Bombay: Bai Vijibhai Jivanlal Panalal Charity Fund, 1942.

Jain, Nandalal (ed.). *Glossary of Jaina Terms*. Ahmedabad: Jain International, 1995.

Jain, Nandalal (trans.). *Jaina Karmology: English Translation with Notes on Chapter Eight of Tattvārtha-Rāja-Vārtika of Akalaṅka*. Varanasi: Pārśvanātha Vidyāpītha, 1998.

Jaini, J. L. *Jaina Gem Dictionary*. Arrah: Central Jain Publishing House, 1918.

Jaini, Padmanabh S. *The Jaina Path of Purification*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.

Kapadia, Hiralal Rasikdas. *A History of the Canonical Literature of the Jainas*. Surat: the Author, 1941.

Krishna, Jadunath. *Indian Psychology* (Vol. 1). London: Routledge, 1934.

Larsen, Gerald. *Classical Sāṃkhya*. Second Revised Edition. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1979. (First Edition 1969)

Monier-Williams, Monier. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1899/1992.

Oberhammer, Gerhard, et al. (3 Vols.). *Terminologie der frühen Philosophischen Scholastik in Indien*. Vol. 1. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1991.

Ratnacandrajī, Muni. *Sacitra Ardhamāgadhī Koṣa (An Illustrated Ardha-Magadhi Dictionary)*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1923/1988.

Sheth, Hargovind Das. *Pāia-Sadda-Mahaṅṅavo: A Comprehensive Prakrit-Hindi Dictionary*. Second Edition. Reprint Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1928/1963/1986.

Sinha, Jadunath. *Indian Psychology* (Vol. 1). London: Routledge, 1934/2000.

Tatia, Nathmal. *Studies in Jaina Philosophy*. Varanasi: Jaina Cultural Research Society, 1951.

Wiley, Kristi L. "Gotra Karma: A Contrast in Views." *Approaches to Jaina Studies: Philosophy, Logic, Rituals and Symbols*. Ed. N. K. Wagle & Olle Qvarnström, 113–130. Toronto: University of Toronto, Centre for South Asian Studies, 1999.

Wiley, Kristi L. *Aghātiyā Karmas: Agents of Embodiment in Jainism*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 2000a.

Wiley, Kristi L. "Colors of the Soul: By-Products of Activity or Passions?" *Philosophy East & West* 50, 3 (2000b) 348–366.

Wiley, Kristi L. "The Story of King Śreṇika: Binding and Modification of Āyu Karma." *Jainism and Early Buddhism: Essays in Honor of Padmanabh S. Jaini*. Ed. Olle Qvarnström, 337–358. Fremont, California: Asian Humanities Press, 2003.