

The Date of Kasāyapāhuḍa

K. R. Chandra

The available canonical or *āgama* literature inherited by the Śvetāmbara sect originally was composed in Ardhamāgadhī; whereas that of the Bṛhika/Kṣapaṇaka of northern Indian and its derivative the Yāpanīya of Southern India had inherited the *āgamas* which were composed in Śauraseni. The surrogate or iso-*āgamic* works of the Digambara Church, too, had employed Śauraseni Prakrit. The earliest works of this pro-canonical literature are the *Kasāyapāhuḍa*, the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, and the works of Kundakundācārya. There is a general trend among the contemporary Digambara authors to place Guṇadhara-cārya, the author of the *Kasāyapāhuḍa*, earlier than Kundakundācārya, the author of the *Samayasāra*, the *Pravacanasāra*, the *Pañcāstikāya*, and a number of other works.

In this article, the language of the *Kasāyapāhuḍa* and of the *Pavayaṇa-pāhuḍa olim Pravacanasāra* is analysed with the view to finding out which work can be assigned an earlier date on the basis of the main linguistic characteristics.

Linguistic Data

I Phonological Changes

<i>Kasāyapāhuḍa</i> (=KP)		<i>Pavayaṇasāra</i> (=PS)	
Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
(i) medial -t-			
(including -to, -tā, -ti, -te, -tu)			
=-t-	0	0	5
=-d-	413	84.8	560
=-y- or -a-	74	15.2	29

(ii) medial -d-				
=-d-	136	92.6	143	98.0
=-y- or -a-	11	7.4	3	2.0
(iii) medial -th-				
=-th-	1	1.5	0	0
(e.g. atha, verse No.128)				
=-dh-	13	20	24	54.5
=-h-	51	78.5	20	45.5
(iv) medial -dh-				
=-dh-	21	31.3	26	57.8
=-h-	46	68.7	19	42.2

II Morphology

<i>Kasāyapāhuḍa (=KP)</i>		<i>Pavayanāsāra (=PS)</i>	
Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
A. Declensional Suffixes			
(i) Neuter gender : Nom. & Accu. Plural			
Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
-ṇi	50	27	100
-im	2	0	0
(ii) Locative Singular			
-mhi	35	21	68
-mmi	19	10	32
B. Verbal Terminations			
3rd person sg. termination of Present tense			
-di,-de	95	216	100
-i, -e	35	0	0

C. Three Prakrit forms of verbal root $\sqrt{\text{bhū}}$					
=bhava	4	5	7	9	
=hava	2	2.5	45	61	
=ho	76	92.5	22	30	
D. Participle : Affixes of Absolutive					
1. Sanskrit Forms (tatsama)					
	0	0	2	5(-)	
2. Sanskrit forms with phonological changes					
	0	0	25	59(+)	
3. Prakrit Forms					
	3	100	15	36(-)	
Various Affixes of Absolutive (see D Participle; as above)					
1. Sanskrit					
-ya	0	0	2	5(-) ādāya 3.7 abhibhūya 2.45	
<i>Kasāyapāhuda (=KP)</i>			<i>Pavayaṇasāra (=PS)</i>		
Number		Percentage		Number Percentage	
2. (Sanskrit forms with phonological changes)					
(i) -iya (-ya)	0	0	7	16.5(+) paṇamiya 3.1, pappā 1.65, 2.77, etc.]	
(ii) -ttā (-rvā)	0	0	6	14(+) [cattā 2.98, diṭṭhā 3.52, etc.]	

(iii) -ccā (-tvā)	0	0	3	7(+) [kiccā 1.4, soccā 3.7, etc.]
(iv) -cca (-tya)	0	0	2	5(-) [paḍucca 1.50, 2.44]
(v) -jja (-dya)	0	0	5	12(-) [āsejja 2.91, samāsejja 1.5, etc.]
(vi) -ccha (-chya)	0	0	1	2.5 [āpiccha 3.2]
(vii) -bbha (-bhya)	0	0	1	2.5 [uvālabbha 1.88]
Total	0	0	25	59

3. Prakrit forms

(i) -dūṇa	1	33.3	1	2.5(-)
(ii) -tūṇam	2	66.7	0	0
(i) e.g. ovattēdūṇa	94			e.g. sunidūṇa 1.62
(ii) e.g. mottūṇam	27,28			
(iii) -ittā	0	0	8	19(+)
(iv) -īya	0	0	6	14(+)

Examples from *Pavayaṇasāra*

(iii) jāṇittā 2.102, ṇirumbhittā 2.104, peccittā 3.35, etc.

(iv) bhaviya 1.17, khaviya 2.103, etc.

E. Affix of Future			
-hi-	hohimti 68	-ssa-	bhavissadi 2.20, jivassadi 2.95

Analysis

The above tabular analysis of the data culled from the above-noted two works of Ācārya Guṇadhara and Kundakunda reveals that the *Kasāyapāhuḍa* and the *Pavayaṇapāhuḍa* (the *Kaṣāyaprabhṛta* and the *Pravacanaprabhṛta*) respectively have their comparative position of the peculiarity of language as follows :-

- (i) The PS retains medial -t- approximately at the rate of 1%, changes (voices) it to -d- at 95% and drops at that of 5% whereas the KP at 0%, 85% and 15% respectively.
- (ii) As regards medial -d- the former retains it at the rate of 98% and drops it at that of 2% whereas the later retains at 93% and drops it at 7%.
- (iii) The medial -th- is voiced in the former work at the rate of 54.5% and changed to -h- at 45.5% whereas in the later work it is voiced at the rate of 20% and changed to -h- at the rate of 78.5%.
- (iv) The medial -dh- is retained at 58% and changed to -h- at 42% in the former work but in the later work the rate is 31% and 69% respectively.

Thus, in the evolutionary stage of MIA. the dialect of the KP reflects a stage later than that of the PS.

Morphological study of these two works reveals that

- (i) the PS has not a single suffix of Nom. and Accu. plural of Neuter in -im̐ whereas in the KP it is available at 4% :
- (ii) As far as the suffixes of loc. sg. are concerned, there is no considerable difference worth distinction between -mhi and -mmi.
- (iii) The termination of present tense III person singular is -di or -de available at the rate of 100% in the PS whereas in the KP it is at the rate of 73% and the other termination -i or -e at the rate of 27%. This shows

that the language of KP is highly influenced by the Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit in this respect.

- (iv) The verbal root √bhū is employed as bhav-, hav- and ho- at the rate of 9, 61 and 30 percent in the PS while in the KP their rate is 5, 2.5, and 92.5 percent respectively. The Prakrit form ho- is rather a later development whereas bhav- and hav- belong to the earlier strata of the MIA. dialects.
- (v) The number of absolutive participles in the KP is not so numerous as to compare their variety for deciding the time of its composition but it is evident that the PS employs older affixes (Sanskrit and Sanskrit-like) in greater number whereas the KP uses purely Prakrit affixes like -dūṇa and -tūṇaṁ. This trait proves that the date of KP is later than that of the PS.
- (vi) The affix of the future tense is -ssa- in the PS whereas -hi- in the KP and this goes against its being an earlier work than the PS.

Thus, the study of the linguistic data proves that the *Kasāyapāhuḍa* is a work composed later than the *Pavayaṇapāhuḍa*. In this context it is not convincing to accept the opinion of those scholars who assign it a date earlier than that to the *Pravacanasāra* of Kundakunda.

Annotations :

PS = *Pavayaṇasāra* or *Pavayaṇapāhuḍa*, KP = *Kasāyapāhuḍa*

1. Date of Kundakundācārya

- A. According to A. N. Upadhye, “the age of Kundakunda should be limited in the light of the circumstantial evidences noted above to the first two centuries of the Christian era.” He further notes “I am inclined to believe, after this long survey of the available material, that Kundakunda’s age lies at the beginning of the Christian era.”

See his *Pravacanasāra*, “Introduction”, Agasa 1964, p. 21.

- B. N. C. Shastri is of the same opinion as given by A. N. Upadhye : See his *प्राकृत भाषा और साहित्य का आलोचनात्मक इतिहास*, वाराणसी १९६६, पृ० २२५.
- C. J. C. Jain is of the opinion that Ācārya Kundakunda seems to have flourished in the third or fourth century A. D. *Vide प्राकृत साहित्य का इतिहास*, वाराणसी १९६१, पृ० २९७.
- D. H. L. Jain thinks it worthwhile to place Kundakunda in the beginning of the fifth century A. D. or a little earlier than that : See his *भारतीय संस्कृति में जैन धर्म का योगदान*, भोपाल १९६२, पृ० ८३.

2. Date of Guṇadharācārya

- A. J. C. Jain is of the opinion that Guṇadharācārya belongs to the 2nd-3rd Century A. D. *Vide* प्राकृत साहित्य का., पृ० २९१.
- B. H. L. Jain is not sure about the date of Guṇadharācārya. He is unable to say definitely whether Dharasenācārya connected with the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* was earlier or posterior to Guṇadharācārya. He assigns 2nd cent. A. D. to the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*. Accordingly, the date of Guṇadharācārya would fall either in the 1st or the 3rd cent. A. D. *See* his भारतीय संस्कृति में., पृ० ८२.
- C. Shastri feels that the *Kasāyapāhuḍa* is a work of earlier date than the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* as well as the works of Kundakunda and, therefore, according to him, Guṇadharācārya should be assigned the 1st cent. A. D. *Vide* प्राकृत भाषा और साहित्य का., पृ० २१३.

Thus we find that the opinions of the above-cited scholars differ on the date of Guṇadharācārya. None is positive regarding his date which ranges between the 1st to the 3rd century A. D. and the date of Kundakunda also differs according to different scholars. His date fluctuates between the 1st and the 8th century A. D.

One fact is clear that all these scholars place Guṇadharācārya anterior to Kundakundācārya but the features of the language of PS and KP clearly demonstrate that the *Pavayaṇasāra* is a composition datable earlier than the *Kasāyapāhuḍa*.

In conclusion, it is to be surmised that, if the editions of the texts studied herewith have been edited, linguistically, faithfully by their learned editors and there is no doubt about the authorship of these two works, then it may seem positive that Guṇadharācārya is an author dated later than Kundakundācārya.

(As for the date of Kundakundācārya, the linguistic analysis can be more trustworthily applied in date-determination after isolating on the one hand the earlier *āryās / gāthās* etc. (most of these arguably incorporated by the author himself) and on the other hand by removing the later interpolations. The available historical evidence as well as the textual studies combined with style and content do not warrant anteriority of Kundakundācārya to either the *Kasāyapāhuḍa* or the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*. Formally, and linguistically, too, there are several detectable/obvious modernisms, highly advanced ideas (totally unknown to the Jaina authors till the medieval times), as also the presence several uncharacteristic Prakrit words artificially created from Sanskrit. —Editors)

