THE DATE OF KUNDAKUNDACĀRYA

M. A. Dhaky

Back in 1935, A. N. Upadhye fixed the date of the illustrious Ācārya Padmanandi of the anvaya or monastic order Koṇḍakunda of the Southern Nirgrantha (Digambara) Church at the beginning of the Christian Era.¹ The current Digambara Jaina scholarship by and large accepts this date, or perhaps its alternative the third century of Vikrama Era (c. A.D. 146-243) determined by Pt. Kailashchandra Shastri². This is regarded by many as definite, virtually an invariable temporal bracket for Ācārya Padmanandi, more widely known by the alias Koṇḍakundacārya (after his anvaya) and still more after the anvaya’s Sanskritised form, Kundakundacārya, since late medieval times. A few Western scholars who had an occasion to refer to him, his works, or thinking, in general seem to regard him as an early Jaina philosopher and religious teacher.³

The contemporary Śvetāmbara Jaina writers,—late Muni Kalyanvijaya,⁴ late Pt. Sukhlal Sanghvi⁵, Pt. Dalsukh Malvania⁶, and no less poignantly K. K. Dixit⁷—on the grounds of the content of his works, were not convinced of such an early date for Kundakundacārya. They felt more secure with fifth, or still better with the sixth century as the chronal zone, and preferably posterior to Umāsvāti (c. A. D. 375-400) as well as Siddhasena Divākara (c. active first half of the 5th cent. A. D.)⁸. A re-examination of the various facets of the problem in somewhat deeper depth for refixing Kundakundacārya’s date in light of the potential directions inherent (but hitherto ignored) in the available evidence is therefore in order. In the process, the premises on which the different writers earlier suggested the plausible (but differing) dates for Ācārya Kundakunda will also be reviewed and tested vis-a-vis the known evidence.

I shall begin with the review of the external evidence—direct, negative, or inferential.

1. Ācārya Padmanandi is not referred to, nor is the influence of his “original” teachings (embodied particularly in his celebrated work, the Samaya-pāhuḍa) anywhere overtly, clearly, or even indirectly implied in the writings of the pre-medieval Digambara Jaina thinkers, epistemologists, and scholiasts like Svāmi Samantabhadra (active c. A. D. 575-625)⁹, Pujyapāda Devanandi (active c. A. D. 635-685)¹⁰, and Bhaṭṭa Akalanka-deva (c. A. D. 720-780)¹¹, the trio held in the highest esteem in the Digambara Church.¹² The contemporaneous Śvetāmbara Jaina writers of equal stature, -Mallavādi kṣamāśramaṇa (c. A. D. 525-575)¹³, Jinabhadra gaṇi kṣamāśramaṇa (active c. A. D. 550-594), Śīmhasūra kṣamāśramaṇa (c. latter half of the 7th cent. A. D.), Gandhahasti Siddhasena (c. A. D. 725-770) and Yākinīśūnu Haribhadra Śūri (active c. A. D. 740-785), the latter two authors being aware of the
writings of Akalaṅkadeva—(Haribhadra Śūri even quoting Samantabhadra in the *Anekāntajayapatākā* and earlier, without naming him, in his *Nandi-vṛtti*, c. A. D. 750)—are likewise ignorant of the writings and teachings of Kundakundācārya.

2. The Digambara Jain author Indranandi in his *Śruti-vatara* (c. late 10th cent. A. D.) tells us about a commentary written by Samantabhadra on the *Tattvārthasūtra* (*Tattvārthadhigama-śāstra* of Umāsvāti),¹⁴ Pūjyapāda Devanandi, too, wrote the famous commentary, the *Sarvarthasiddhi* (c. 2nd-3rd quarter of the 7th cent. A. D.)¹⁵, on the Digambara adoption of the selfsame *Tattvārthasūtra*; and Akal īṇkaḍevā wrote his *Tattvārtha-vārtika* on the *Sarvarthasiddhi* and also a commentary *Aṣṭaśati* (c. 2nd quarter of the 8th cent. A. D.) on the *Aptamāṁśa olim Devāgama-stotra* of Samantabhadra (c. A. D. 600). Significantly, none of them chose to comment on any of the highly significant works of Kundakundācārya, for instance his famous and very important *Prabhāṣṭra-traya*—the *Samaya-pāhuḍa* (*Samaya-Prabhāṣṭra olim Samayasūtra*), *Pavayana-pāhuḍa* (*Pravacana-prabhāṣṭra olim Pravacanasūtra*) or *Paṅcāṭthikāya-saṅgha-sutta* (*Paṅcāṭṭikāya-saṅghra-sūtra olim Paṅcāṭṭikāyasūtra*),—or for that matter on the *Niyama-pāhuḍa* (*Niyama-prabhāṣṭra olim Niyamasūtra*), *Bārāsa-anuppa-khā* (*Dvādaśa-anupreksāh*), etc. The Digambara sect, since it possessed no āgamas, would have avidly sought and commented upon Kundakundācārya’s remarkable *prakaraṇas*, no less than Samantabhadra’s profound dialectical and epistemology-based works.

3. The earliest known commentaries on Kundakundācārya’s works are by Amṛta-candraśārya who seem to have flourished, on well reasoned evidence, in late ninth and early tenth century A. D.¹⁷ It seems intriguing, even inexplicable, as to why on the works of this justly celebrated and for the past thousand years the most venerated Digambara Jain philosopher-saint,—supposed by modern Digambara Jaina writers to have flourished at the beginning of the Christian (now ‘Common’) Era,—no commentaries were written for eight or nine centuries that may have followed his writings!

4. To add to this surprise is the complete silence on Kundakundācārya by the Digambara Ācārya Jinasena of Punnaṭa-gaṇa in his *Harivamśa-purāṇa* (A.D. 784) where he invokes and pays tribute to Samantabhadra, Siddhasena (*Dvākara*), and, apart from them, several other pre-medieval Nirgrantha (exclusively Digambara) writers of eminence. Similarly, Jinasena of Paṅcastūpāṇvaya, another preeminent Digambara Jaina writer, in the commentary *Jayadhamalā* (completed A. D. 837) on the *Kāśyapa-pāhuḍa-sutta* (*Kāśyapa-prabhāṣṭra-sūtra* : c. 2nd-3rd cent. A. D.)¹⁸ pays tribute to great Jaina writers beginning with Siddhasena and Samantabhadra but fails to allude to Padmanandi alias Kundakundācārya, True, eulogies have been continually lavished on this great thinker; and a miraculous myth of his possessing magical power of levitation (*cāraṇa-ṛddhi*) and his visiting Jina Śtmanḍhara in the Mahāvideha-kṣetra, a mythical land of Nirgrantha cosmography, is duly woven for him, indeed commensurate with his greatness as is understood in the
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sampradāya; but all of these begin to appear only from the tenth century onwards in literature, the inscriptions follow suit somewhat later. It is customary, and rather natural, that the name of a very distinguished pontiff is frequently adopted by monks of the subsequent periods, as for example Siddhasena or Prabhācandra or for that matter Māntuṅga, Akalaṅka and Haribhadra. However, in this case, the appellation “Padmanandi” is not repeated till almost a thousand years hence, if we accept first century B.C.—A.D. as his period.

In their dating, neither Upadhye nor Pt. Kailashchandra Shastri, or for that matter other prominent Jaina writers, took into account these significant omissions and their consequent implications; this fact leaves vital gaps in their otherwise detailed, if not objectively critical, examination of the problem or evidence either. To a letter sent in regard to some of the puzzling questions a propos of the sectarian relationship between Umāsvāti and Kundakundācārya by Pt. Sukhlal Sanghvi to the distinguished Digambara Jaina historian Pt. Nathuram Premi, the considered and candid reply he got also contained, by way of a bye-note, the following observation: “My own understanding is that Kundakunda was the founder of a particular ideological subsect; he sought to shape Jaina religion after the mould of the Vedāṇṭa. It appears that, till the time of Jinasena etc., his standpoint had not won universal recognition and so he was not held in regard by these authors.”

Pt. Premi’s observation represents one of the two plausible explanations of the phenomenon of “ancient omissions”. (It does not, though, clarify as to why for nine centuries his writings and thoughts, did not meet with approval or recognition. Also, why his unacceptable teachings were not refuted by any scholar; and how it came about that his works continued to be copied—even when disrecognized, for over the long centuries.) The other is that the Kundakundācārya, in reality, may not have flourished at that early date as assumed by some of the noted writers of our time, to the august list we must also include late Pt. Jugalkishor Mukhtar. It seems that, as though in unison, they all had decided not even to think about, not to say of considering and investigating this second possibility. For them the date they determined had been an unassailable truth, a fait accompli, a gospel truth, and hence a closed book. However, on prima facie grounds, the whole issue needs a probe deeper than hitherto attempted.

5. No early inscription refers to Kundakundācārya by his monastic appellation Padmanandi: He is though mentioned under his non-Sanskritized alias ‘Koṇḍakundācārya’, in one Kadamba inscription from Kuppatūr (A.D. 1075) and in two Śāntara inscriptions of A.D. 1077 from Huṅca, all from Karnātaka, these in fact are the earliest to mention him. The earliest mention of the anvaya Koṇḍakunda is encountered in three Raṣṭrakūta inscriptions, all from Gaṅgavādi in lower Karnātadeśa, dated in order in the years A.D. 797, A.D. 802, and A.D. 808. Had this anvaya been very ancient, it possibly would have figured in one or the other of the several early Kadamba and Gaṅga charters granted to the Jaina foundations;
sometimes at the instance of, sometimes to, the monks generally in pontifical and abbatial offices during the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries.

However, the Mercara copper-plate charter of the year 38825 of an unspecified Era,—taken, though wrongly, Śaka, and hence regarded as of A. D. 46726,—mentions Koṇḍakundānvaya. And this inscription had been one of the corner-stones of the edifice for an early date built for Kundakundācārya by Upadhye27 and some other Jaina writers. Unluckily, the Marcarā charter is regarded by epigraphers a forgery of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa period, even though Pt. Kailashchandra Shastri, founding his arguments perhaps on those of one other prominent Digambara Jaina scholar, Gulab Chandra Chaudhari28, is at pains to prove that the plates could represent only the re-issual (and partly a re-engravement) of the earlier charter of A.D. 467, in Rāṣṭrakūṭa times. But the Jaina temple to the pontiff of which the grant was addressed in this charter is Vijaya-Jinālaya of Mānyanagara or Mānyapura, Maṇṇe in Gaṅgavāḍi, the temple known to have been founded by Vijaya, general of Gaṅga Mārasiṃha II in the late eighth century A. D. as shown by Premi !29 The mention, in this charter, of Koṇḍakundānvaya cannot therefore push back that anvaya’s antiquity to any century prior to the eighth. Even if it were a genuine charter, the charter’s temporal position is the same, namely Rāṣṭrakūṭa, as is the case with the aforenoted three other charters. The anvaya of Koṇḍakunda may have been founded at most a century or so before, though not necessarily by, or after, the name of Padmanandi Kundakundācārya as some Jaina authors believe as proven.30

6. Jayasena (c. earlier half of the 12th cent. A. D.), the commentator next in time to Amṛtacandrācārya on the famous Prābhṛṭa-traya of Koṇḍakundācārya, has recorded two succinct but valuable historical facts concerning the author Padmanandi, the one as regards the name of his preceptor,—Kumāranandi Siddhāntadeva,—and the second about the contemporary king, Sivakumāra.

As for Kumāranandi, Upadhye made a good search through inscriptive as well as literary sources and noticed three pontiffs bearing the selfsame appellation, but all belonging to different ages and differing gaṇas (monastic clans). Kumāranandi of Mathurā inscription of the year K.S. 87 (c. A.D. 165, or A.D. 192. or A.D. 215, or A.D. 230)31 belongs to the Uccairnāgara-śākhā of Nōthern (afterwards emerging as Śvetāmbara) tradition; hence he is out of question. The next available Kumāranandi, whom Upadhye, notices, figures as a grand-preceptor of the recipient of a copper-plate charter dated Ś. 698/A.D. 776 issued by the chieftain Jasaḥitadeva of Nirgund dynasty in Karnāṭa. But this Kumāranandi belonged to the Pulikalbagcha of Eregittūr-gaṇa inside Śrīmūla-Mūla-gaṇa of the Nandi Saṅgha (Yāpanṭya), and not to the Digambara Church! (Also, from Upadhye’s standpoint he is a much younger pontiff than what his own perception of Kundakundācārya’s and hence his preceptor’s date would warrant.) The third Kumāranandi spotted by Upadhye figures in the Patraparīkṣā of Vidyānanda (c. first half of the 9th cent. A. D.)32. Vidyānanda, reports Upadhye, quotes some three verses of Kumāranandi Bhaṭṭāraka;
but Vidyānanda says nothing about Kumāranandi’s _anvaya_ or _gaṇa_, though he might have been the one we are looking for, but cannot immediately be sure about since no other evidentiary details are there to go by. What we need is a Kumāranandi who must belong to the _anvaya_ Koṇḍakunda. Luckily, _there was_ one such Kumāranandi. However, Upadhye, even in his _Pravacanasāra_’s revised edition of 1964, misses him, just as did Pt. Kailashchandra Shastri in his publication of 1974. This Kumāranandi of Koṇḍakundānvaya figures in a charter granted by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa governor of Gaṅgavādi, Prince Raṇāvaloka Kambhārāja, in Ś. 730/A.D. 808 from Badanaguppe, the charter noticed as far back as 1927.\textsuperscript{33} In that charter, for Vardhamānaguru, who received the bequest of the village Badanaguppe, the following preceptorial lineage is given:

Kumāranandi Siddhāntadeva

\_\_\_

Elavācārya

\_\_\_

Vardhamāna-guru (A. D. 808)

The _gaṇa_ to which these pontiffs belonged is mentioned as “Śirmulage-guru”, a denomination perhaps taken after an earlier pontiff of this line within the Koṇḍakundānvaya.\textsuperscript{34} (It is likely, as hinted in earlier context, that the Kumāranandi with the title “Bhaṭṭāraka” mentioned in the inscription is identical with his namesake (bearing the same hierarchical status) whose verses were cited by Vidyānanda.)

Kumāranandi thus located within the Koṇḍakundānvaya, the next question relates to finding his disciple Padmanandi. What we find in the charter of A. D. 808, however, is the appellation “Elavācārya”, seemingly a Kannada (local dialectical?) variant of Elācārya. “Elācārya” is a status-cognomen in the hierarchy of the Digambara Jaina Church for a pontiff of the highest learning and for a qualified teacher of Jaina doctrines, a position more or less equivalent of _vācaka_, _vācanacārya_, or _kṣamāṣramana_ or _mahattara_ in the ancient Northern Nirgrantha of which Śvetāmbara Jaina Church is the off-shoot. Once a pontiff received the ecclesiastical title _elācārya_ his original monastic appellation apparently went into the background. For example, Śvāmi Virasena in the encomium of his monumental commentary, the _Dhavalā_ (completed A. D. 816), on the _Ṣaṭkhandāgama_ of Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali (c. late 5th - early 6th cent. A. D.)\textsuperscript{35}, refers to his teacher Elācārya of Citrakūṭa but does not mention his personal monastic name. Likewise, the Kuḍalūr grant of Gaṅga Mārasimha II, dated Ś. 884/A. D. 962, mentions the grantee as Elācārya of Surasta-gaṇa without mentioning his original monastic appellation.\textsuperscript{36} But is there any evidence that Padmanandi had an _elācārya_ status? Considering his attainment of an unequalled spiritual plane within the fold of Nirgrantha way of life, his prestige as a mystic and a saint, and his competence in the highly original exposition and interpretation of some of the Nirgrantha doctrines, not to say of his profound conversance with the traditional Jaina dogmas despite
of his orientations to mysticism, small wonder if his contemporaries in his spiritual lineage elevated him to the most honorable position, of "Elācārya", in the ecclesiastical hierarchy of the Digambara Church. In point of fact, the Vijayanagar lamp-pillar inscription of Ś. 1307/A. D. 1386, which enumerates five distinct appellations for our Padmanandi, includes both Kundakunda and Elācārya. The Nandi Saṅgha gurvāvalī (c. A. D. 14th cent.) likewise mentions the elācārya status-cognomen of Kundakunda-cārya. True, these latter two sources are rather late; but they possibly were so recording on the basis of the then current written or oral tradition.

Because Cakravarti nayanar (earlier in his introduction to the Pañcāstikāya of Kundakundacārya) had taken Kundakundacārya as a pontiff of the 1st cent. B. C./A. D., (and also had equated him with the particular ancient "Elācārya" who is traditionally held as the author of the ancient Tamil classic Tirukkural), he was looked upon as an early pontiff of the Southern Church. Indeed, considerable discussion ensued on this point which led to no conclusion since the foundational premise was per se wrong; it only served to confuse the issue! While conceding with Upadhye and other Jain writers that the two other epithets mentioned in the aforementioned Vijayanagar inscription, namely Vakragṛiva-cārya and Grđdhapichācārya, did not in fact apply to Kundakundacārya. there is nothing against taking Elācārya as his genuine epithet and thus equating him with the Elavacārya the disciple of Kumāranandi Siddhāntadeva of the anvaya Koṇḍakunda.

This point cleared, the next point having a bearing on the issue is the search for the king "Śivakumāra" for whom Ācārya Padmanandi, according to Jayasena, is said to have written the Pravacana-sagara. Earlier, K. B. Pathak had suggested that this king could be the Kadamba monarch Śivamgeśavarmā; and, for Cakravati nayanar, he was the early Pallava king Śivaskandavāmi (Skandavarmā I) since both authors had assumed Kundakundacārya as a very early writer and hence both, in pursuance of their own line of thinking, were looking for him in the early centuries in South India, indeed a wrong temporal area! In any case, Upadhye had not rejected the possibility of Kundakundacārya being contemporary to Śivaskandavarmā, without however, proceeding to investigate the date of that monarch. This, as shown by T. V. Mahalingam, is c. A. D. 345-355 and not c. first century B. C.-A. C. which is envisaged by Upadhye for Kundakundacārya who is supposed to be contemporary of Śivaskandavarmā! The foregoing discussion rather compels us to expect the king in question somewhere in the later part of the eighth century A. D. within the geographical, political and cultural ambit of Karṇāṭaka proper.

Verily, there is no king with the name Śivakumāra known to have flourished at that time. However, I seem to perceive that there could be a slight error, scribal or a deliberate emendation done at some later point, in the orthography of the name as it has come down to us through Jayasena's notice. For exactly at that time we meet the Gaṅga ruler Śivamāra II (c. last quarter of the 8th cent. A. D.) in Gaṅgavāḍi, a part of south-eastern Karṇāṭaka. It is for him, the luckless monarch who had to spend several years in Rāṣṭrakaṭa prison, that Kundakundacārya may have written
his Pravacana-prābhṛta! Kundakundacārya’s writings, on this showing, seem to belong to the last quarter of the eighth century A.D. though the third quarter of the selfsame century he may have spent in studies and preparation. Upadhye, as did other serious writers, had accepted the testimony of Jayasena—which arguably is more trustworthy than the medieval inscriptions or the hagiological lists of the Digambara Church, all of which are of much later date and, like the Śvetāmbara medieval lists of succession, undependable when they talk about pontiffs that flourished earlier than the founders of the sub-orders to which they primarily pertained.44

Once we accept these equations, we concede to the clarification they provide on the principal puzzling point, the date for Kundakundacārya—it can only be latter half of the 8th cent. A.D.—the other enigmas are, by the logic of this new dating, resolved. This is why we find for long no influence or impact of Kundakunda’s new doctrines and his fresh interpretations of ancient doctrines and their terminology and, as a result, of the earlier Jaina positions; which is also why no earlier commentaries on, or genuine and undoubted quotations from this celebrated saint’s great works are available. For these just could not have existed since he is not a very ancient sage and hence his works could not have been known at least till some time after Akalaṅkadeva.45

7. P. B. Desai identifies the place “Konḍakunda” with Konakoṇḍala (Konḍakunde in a medieval inscription) situated in Sindavādi a territorial division of ancient upper Kānaṭadeśa but presently within the Anantapur District of Andhra Pradesh. The site, according to Desai, is located four miles south of Guntakal.46

Desai cites some Jaina sculptures and epigraphs at that site in support of his identification. For example, on the hillock Rasasiddhula-guṭṭa, which stands about two furlongs to the village, there exists an image, carved on the rock-face, of a Jina standing on a lotus. (He does not mention the plausible date of the sculpture.) Also, in a nearby structural shrine, are two images of standing Jina with triple umbrellas (dateable to c. 13th cent. A.D.), today worshipped by local populace as “Rasasiddhas”. There is also a fragmentary inscription (possibly commemorative) in the 7th century characters referring to some Jaina saint “... adored by Singhahanandi”.47 A tenth century inscription here refers to a nisidhi (memorial column) of Nāgasenacārya. An inscription on the nearby Kailāsappagutṭa hillock refers to Cāṭṭa-Jinālayana founded by lady Nākabbe “in Konḍakundeyatīrtha” to which a grant was made by Mahāmaṇḍalesvara Joyimayyarasa, governor of Sindavādi, in A.D. 1081, in the reign of the Cāḷukya sovereign Vikramāditya VI. In a damaged inscription in the village, c. early 12th century and of the time of Vikramāditya VI, the name of Padmanandi Bhaṭṭāraka is said to figure twice. There is also a reference in that inscription to the cārṇas (sages Indued with power of levitation) and also, according to Desai, to the Konḍakundānvaya. The inscription pertains to Nayakṛṣṭideva Saiddhāntika-cakravarti. However, a recent re-examination of the selfsame inscrip-
tion by A. V. Narasimhamurti has revealed that "it does not contain even the word Kundakunda." Desai erroneously had thought that Padmanandi here referred is the illustrious Kundakundačārya of Konḍakundānvaya. This Padmanandi may have been a medieval preceptor, either a direct guru or the one who flourished at most a couple of generations before Nayakīrti. The appellation Padmanandi is not uncommon in the medieval Digambara Church and Konḍakundānvaya by then was claimed by the Mūla Saṁgha as well as the Deśiya-gaṇa also. Moreover, the term cāraṇa in the inscription figures in plural and hence cannot "singly" pertain to Padmanandi (in whom too the legend invests the power of levitation). The inscription simply purports to say that this Konḍakundeya-tīrtha was visited by the (mythical) cāraṇā-sages. For instance the hill at Ellorā, where the Jaina caves were excavated in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa period (9th cent. A. D.), was known as 'Cāraṇādrī', meaning thereby that the cāraṇas frequented that sacred hill. The only fact which is certain from this inscription is that the hills nearby the village formed the "Konḍakundeya-tīrtha" in the medieval period. (And it might just be a 'sthāpanā-tīrtha' or 'avatāra-tīrtha' established after the original sacred hill.)

Recently, P. N. Narasimha Murthy has suggested on an inscriptionsal basis and on account of the presence of Jaina sculptures and rock-cut caves in the surroundings, that Kundādri (=Konḍakunda, Dravidian koṇḍa being Sanskrit adri, hill) in Tulunāḍu (Kanara District, Karnātaka) could be the original Konḍakunda. A third possibility, which I presently would suggest, is the Gopinātha hill near Nandi in southern Karnātaka, whence a fragmentary commemorative inscription engraved on the rock of which only the opening part in Sanskrit remaining and dateable to c. mid eighth century, refers to the existence, on the site, of the temple of Jina Pārśvanātha and calls the hill "Kunda ..." (probably Kunda-giri, Kundaparvata or Kundādri). In view of the fact that this "Kunda" hill (Konnda-Kunda) is situated in Gaṅgavādi, and all the earliest inscriptions pertaining Konḍakundānvaya also hail from Gaṅgavādi, relating as they do to Mānyapura (Maṇe), Talavanapura (Talakād), Vadanoguppe (Badanaguppe),—towns all within the territory of Gaṅgavādi—it is more likely that this Gopinātha hill—ancient Kunda (parvata, Konnda-Kunda)—probably was the place after which the anvaya Konnda-Kunda took its denomination.

However, what is at issue is not the identity of the site, but its antiquity. If Padmanandi-Konḍakundācārya flourished in the early centuries of Christian Era, Konḍakunda—be it in Sindavādi or be it in Tulunāḍu or in Gaṅgavādi—must reveal early archaeological associations with the site. In point of fact, and so far, no Jaina antiquities (nor even early literary or epigraphical notices) of consequence which can unequivocally be dated (or related to an age) prior to the latter half of the fourth century A.D., have been noticed within the territorial boundaries of the entire ancient Karnātaka! I doubt whether any one of the three Konḍakundas could historically be earlier than the seventh or at most sixth century A. D. At
least nothing so far has been reported for these sites which can confidently be placed before the second half of the first millennium. Projected against this perspective of historical reality, Kṣṇaṇḍakundānvaya cannot be anterior to the pre-medieval times.

The verdict of the external evidence is clear enough. It does not favour a date anterior to the latter half of the eighth century for Padmanandi-Kundakundācārya. The position as regards the internal evidence may now be examined and assessed. To begin with, Kundakundācārya gives no information either about himself, his spiritual lineage, or the date of composition of any of his works: And among the works attributed to him, only in two cases is there some evidence as to the authorship. Even if this evidence is not very direct, it is sufficiently indicative and dependable. His general style (barring the more ancient verse-quotations which he assuredly incorporates in his writings, and the plausible as well as probable interpolated verses) and his thought patterns are sufficiently distinguished, even singular, to stipulate his authorship of all those works. The evidence, then, from the content of his undoubted works (there is some doubt about his authorship for the Āṣṭa-prābhṛtas) can also be significant on the main problem of date.

1. In the Liṅga-pāhuḍa (Liṅga-prābhṛta),—one from among the Āṣṭa-prābhṛtas traditionally ascribed to Kundakundācārya—the author thunders against the laxities that had crept in the (Southern) Jaina Church. Among the deeds or doings which violently go against the Jaina monastic code is the one relating to practicing agriculture by monks or friars. There apparently is no evidence of the Nirgrantha monks resorting to agriculture, indeed anywhere in India, until after some point within the sixth century A.D. And this was in Kāraṇṭaka to be precise. All earliest royal charters granted to the Jaina Fraternity relate to “Saṁgha” and “Jinālaya”, the pontiffs and monks are not in the picture excepting that their consent in the matter was sometimes sought or obtained. The situation next had changed and it is the abbots (both of the Yāpanīya as well as of the Digambara Church) who now had started receiving land-grants directly from the ruling royalty and provincial military governors—which henceforth will become a regular feature. The situation of the Śvetāmbara Church in the North was no better, though there is as yet no evidence that the grants were issued in abbot’s name even until the medieval times. The decadence of Jaina monastic order was universal, the contemporaneous caityavāsa Śvetāmbara was not exception! The combined archaeological and literary testimony for this practice in Kāraṇṭaka unambiguously would point to a date anytime after the sixth century for Kundakundācārya if the Liṅga-prābhṛta is his work.

2. Indranandi credits Padmanandi-Koṅḍakundācārya to have written a commentary—Parikarma—on the Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama of Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali. As I elsewhere have demonstrated, the Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama cannot be dated between A.D. 87 and 126 as late Pt. Hiralal Jain, its distinguished editor, had claimed. The plausible date for that work is c. early sixth or at most late fifth century A.D. even when its small part—some gāthās and phrases etc., seemingly are of a somewhat
remoter antiquity, say second or third century A. D. in terms of language, style, mannerism and content. This period-position for the Šatkhanda-gama would entail Kundakundacārya to be posterior to early sixth century A. D., providing he really wrote such a commentary.

3. The compilation Mūlācāra of Vaṭṭakera, a Yāpanīya work wrongly ascribed to Kundakundacārya by some recent Jaina writers on account of some late and misleading colophons, seemingly was known to Kundakundacārya. Because the Mūlācāra embodies about four gāthās from the Sammati-prakaraṇa of Siddhasena Divākara (t. 5th cent. A. D.) as also several which are paralleled in the Āvaśyaka-niryaṅkuti and some noticeable in the Ācāraṅga-niryaṅkuti, the Ogha-niryaṅkuti, and in the Pinda-niryaṅkuti as well,—these four being the Śvetāmbara āgamic glosses of the early sixth century A. D., the Mūlācāra at the earliest can be dated only to the sixth century. The Mūlācāra has one of its verses regarding the sāmāyika, pratikramaṇa, and cognate self-purification rites, which eulogise these as “āmṛta-kumbha” (nectar-jar). Kundakundacārya, from his sophistic standpoint, creates a counter verse calling the above-noted rites as viṣa-kumbha (poison pitcher) So Kundakundacārya is posterior to Vaṭṭakera’s Mūlācāra and hence flourished any time posterior to the middle of the sixth century A. D. Indeed, Kundakundacārya is not, as some Digambara Jaina writers earlier and on a different basis had argued, the author of the Mūlācāra, although a few verses do commonly figure inside his works and particularly the Samayasārādhikāra of the Mūlācāra, the latter reasonably could have been interpolated after the work was admitted in the Digambara scriptural fold.

4. Upadhye, after the linguistic analysis of Kundakundacārya’s available works (with a strong focus on the Pravacanasāra), has concluded that the language employed by the author is Ardhamāgadhī (of the Śvetāmbara āgamas) and Jaina Śauraseni. Now, Śauraseni is the language of the Yāpanīya āgamas as well as of the “secondary”, “substitute”, “surrogate” or “isonāgamic” texts of the Digambara Church—which in point of fact is the mainstay of Kundakundacārya’s Prabhṛta-traya. Also the influence of Jaina Mahārāṣṭrī (the language to some extent employed in the Śvetāmbara niryaṅkuts, bhāṣyas, and prakaranas) and even Apabhramsha (raccet found only in the Aṣṭa-prabhṛtas) is in evidence in his writings. What conclusion can be drawn from this miscellany? How do we explain this phenomenon? First of all, before beginning his linguistic analysis, Upadhye did not isolate the “quotes” of earlier āgamic works of the Ardhamāgadhī canon (acknowledged by Śvetāmbara and Yāpanīya) from the author’s own verses, although he is aware that such are certainly there. Most of such “quoted” verses are paralleled in the Śvetāmbara prakṛṇakas, a few in the niryaṅkuts (and in the bhāṣyas as well), and some decidedly from works now lost, the earliest of which are dateable to a period between the 4th and the 6th century A. D. Pt. Malvania, for instance, has shown that a verse in Jaina Mahārāṣṭrī from the Mahāpratyākhyāna which occurs also in the Devendrasāva,—both being the prakṛṇaka works (c. 3rd 4th cent. A. D.) of
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the Śvetāmbara canon,—and a parallel verse in the Pañmacariya of Vimala Śūri of Nāgendra kula (c. A. D. 478) also figures in Kundakundācārya’s Pravacanasūtra. The Śvetāmbara āgamas and āgamic works are of course completely ignorant of Kundakundācārya’s works; it is then clear that Kundakundācārya borrowed the self-same verse and several others either through some Yāpanīya intermediary or perhaps in a few cases directly. (Unfortunately, nobody has attempted to pursue the line of research Pt. Malvania had opened). Therefore, the results of the linguistic analysis without the proper sifting of data in Kundakundācārya’s works, can be misleading and now so proven, possesses little determinative value for the pontiff’s date. At any rate, a few relatively early-seeming (quoted) verses in Kundakundācārya’s works at best compare with the third period (approximately late Kuśāna and post-Kuśāna). Śvetāmbara āgamas and āgamic works. From the standpoint of language, even when some earlier word-forms and phraseology occasionally are discernible in Kundakundācārya’s works, this factor has to be thoroughly tested against other evidence. My own experience is that the later talented Jaina writers sometimes emulated (or unconsciously picked up) relatively earlier Prākṛta of the canonical brand, since they were well-versed and much too familiar with that kind of traditional writing. For instance, some of Haribhadra Śūri’s works, or parts thereof, from language standpoint, do possess an early look, as to some extent also does the imposter Mahāniṣṭhasūtra (c. 8th cent. A. D.). Where Kundakundācārya’s real period revealed is the later Prākṛta Āryās which he consistently uses, often the more modern style in composition he adopts, and the typical formal cadence he builds. Also the inaugural maṅgala verses of his famous works are in a form, style, phraseology, predilections met with and mood noticeable only from the seventh century onward. These factors, viewed alongside his highly advanced thought-constructs, fresh concepts, new epistemological positions, novel approaches to and new interpretations, as well as fresh application of old knowledge, and the concomitant or relevant terminological jargon (which often is far ahead of the canonical literature), clearly indicate that he cannot be an early author, as has been persistently, even obstinately, claimed to be.

5. Keeping those latter facts and criteria (mentioned in Haribhadra Śūri’s case) in view in the analysis of Kundakundācārya’s works, the period-perspective that takes shape considerably differs from what Upadhye and other proponents taking his line and following his intent had conjunctured, even conjured up.

Kundakundācārya’s style of writing, excepting where he adopts the traditional mould or has Ardhamāgadhī (and Śaurasenī) quotes, is in effect far advanced compared to any exhibited in the available early nirgrantha writings in Ardhamāgadhī and other Prākṛtas. His own verses in his works show powerful articulations and strong directness and acuity combined with subtleties, precision and mystical power but reflect no archaisms nor is there any resort to cleverness, puns, deliberate
obscurities, varbal conceits or virtuosity. The style, though dry, is dynamic, direct and lucid. Some of these qualities are already in evidence in the Sammati-prakarana of Siddhasena (c. 5th cent. A.D.) as well as in the Mūlācāra of Vaṭṭakera (c. late 6th cent. A. D.). In fact, strong conceptual (sometimes even verbal) parallelisms between Kundakundācārya’s Samaya-prābhṛta on the one hand and Siddhasena’s Sammati-prakarana on the other, do exist as has been demonstrated by Pt. Sukhlal Sanghvi.

6. This is further supported by several elements present in his thinking. However, this being a sizeable subject in itself, I am discussing it in a separate follow up paper. A few salient points to which I would here succinctly hint, but without citing references and without entering into detailed discussion, are as follows: a) Kundakundācārya had massively leaned toward the niścaya-naya or absolutistic standpoint in his Samaya-prābhṛta. This naya, but not its profound implications, was known before, but on its application was not done to the scale and extent by Siddhasena Divākara or even Mallavādi. (b) On the basis of the niścaya-naya, Kundakundācārya, in theory, views ātman or Self as separate from and independent of the association of pudgala or matter as was done in the Sāmkhyā and the Vedānta systems with the difference that ātman is not looked upon as totally inactive; Self does possess the faculty of knowing, intellecting and creating as well as feeling emotive impuleses within. Self is thus not a doer of deeds (karta) and enjoyer of fruits (bhokta), although, from the standpoint of external and practical relatings (vyavāra-naya), he may be regarded as a doer and enjoyer because of his emotional involvement which leads to, or colours, his conscious thinking that way, this in fact being his habit to so orient since countless ages and for endless births. Now, the ancient Jain doctrine of ātman as the karta and bhokta has never been interpreted or understood that way by any Jain scholiast till the pre-medieval times, and that too not before the Kundakundācārya’s doctrine was widely known.

The unliberated Self, in Kundakundācārya’s concept, thus is always pure and not contaminated by karma-rajā as was otherwise believed till late, even in the Digambara sect. The apparent contamination with karma, and its consequent and subsequent fruition are due to the bhāva or inner consciously felt or willed emotional directives of the Self. It is thus illusory. The Self goes on wandering from birth to birth because he has not known what it really is and this is what keeps it in apparent bondage.

The new Vedānta doctrine about ātman was already known at least 50 years before Śaṅkarācārya (c. A.D. 780-812), through the kārikās of his grand preceptor Gaudapāda. May be, Kundakundācārya has seen these and adopted the Vedāntic way of looking at Self, but in a modified way. c) As its corollary as though, Kundakundā-
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Kundakundācārya completely redefines the terms *svasamaya* and *parasamaya*, the terms which for long had been understood as the ‘doctrine of one’s own sect’ and ‘the doctrine of the other’s sect’. According to Kundakundācārya, *svasamaya* is the one which relates to ātman, the *parasamaya* meant anything outside ātman including one’s body. This is an absolutely different way of looking at the connotation of the terms, indeed not referred to by even Southern Jaina writers. (d) Between the two categories of *śubha* (auspicious and desirable) and *aśubha* (inauspicious and undesirable), he creates a third category, *śuddha* (pure) which really is the true and intrinsic disposition of the ātman or Self. This conceptual improvement is earlier unknown. (e) Kundakundācārya is fully aware of the terms *syādvāda* and *saptabhaṅgi* both of which are unknown in the works of Umasvāti as well as of Siddhasena, but known to Samantabhadra (c. A.D. 550-625). It was Samantabhadra who for the first time uses these terms and formulates a doctrine based on them. (f) Likewise, the original Upaniṣadic classification of *antarātma* (inner Self), *bāhya* or *bahirātma* (outer self; outer body) and *paramātma* (Absolute Self) is mentioned by Kundakundācārya with some difference in detail and hence of implications. Already, Pujayapāda Devanandi (c. A.D. 635-680) had adopted these terms, though before him it is totally unknown in Jaina writings. Kundakundācārya possibly took these terms and their conceptuality from Devanandi.

There are, in point of fact, several other major and minor points of significance which would not have been in the writings of Kundakundācārya if he were to flourish in the 1st century B.C.—A.D. His style of writing and phraseology then would have been archaic, the jargon as well as the concepts and their presentation would have been far less advanced than is apparent in his writings.

NOTES AND REFERENCES


largely of the cursory observations made by pioneering German writers on Jainā canonical literature. In the “Chronology” section placed at the end of his booklet, *The Religion of the Jainas* (English version of the original by A. Sena, Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series No. LII, Studies No. 31, Calcutta 1966, p. 36), he placed Kundakunda in the 2nd-3rd cent. A D. Had Schubring investigated the problem in depth, his conclusion would have been very, very different.


6. My personal discussions with him. Also his long and penetrating discussion in his introduction (Hindi) to the *Nyāyāvatāravārtika-vṛtti*, Singhi Jain Series, Vol. 20, Bombay 1949, pp. 117-141. Therein he has demonstrated that the context of Kundakunda’s works, when compared to Umāsvāti’s is more advanced in terms of concepts as well as exposition. Upadhye, significantly, ignores these findings and in his own write up avoids all such engaging discussions, dismissing them all as cross-currents of thoughts of little chronological value (cf. his p. 122). Upadhye gives neither real reasons nor cites valid examples which would allow such a dismissal. Content is an important category of evidence.

7. *Jaina Ontology*, Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Series No. 31, Ahmedabad 1971, pp. 89, 95-97, & 132-135. Diksit was not only a very perceptive, but also an articulate among the Indian authors who discussed Jaina philosophy, ontology and metaphysics.

8. The lower limit for the date of Siddhasena Divākara depends on the date of Umāsvāti who apparently had flourished in the latter half of the fourth century A.D.

9. I have discussed and fixed the date of Samantabhadra in detail. The paper in Gujarātī will shortly appear in a separate congratulatory volume for Pt. Malvania containing all articles in Gujarati and to appear from Ahmedabad.


12. This is supported not only by literary traditions but also by an inscription from Bandalike date S. 996/A.D. 1074. (cf. *Epigraphia Carnatica*, Vol. VIII, Sorab tl., no. 262. The initial invocatory verse mentions Samantabhadra, Devanandi and Akalankaideva, but not Kundakundacarya).

13. Pt. Sukhlal Sanghvi, Muni Jambūvijaya and some other Śvetāmbara Jaina scholars place him to the fourth century A.D. However, the citations in the Mallavādi's original text, of Āryās from the two niruyiktis...the Āvaśyaka and the Bṛhatkalpa (c. A.D. 525)... and the author refuting Diśnāga (c. A.D. 480–560), among other evidence, go against an early date.

14. Currently unavailable, if at all it ever was written,

15. It was definitely written fairly later than the Bhāṣya or the auto-Commentary (c. A.D. 375-400) on the Original version of the mūlasūtra of Umāsvāti; Pūjyapāda's commentary reveals considerable advance in style, form, grammatical improvements in the original text, as well as developed content. He likewise had attempted to modify it at places to suit the Digambara dogmas, though some sūtras still remained which go against the Digambara beliefs.


Pt. Kailashchandra Shastri has given much thought to Amṛṭacandrācārya’s date and he places him after Akalankaideva and before Devasena (first half of the 10th cent. A. D.: Vide his detailed discussion, pp. 178-186. The mean plausible date of Amṛṭacandrācārya’s commentary, as judged by its style and content, could be C. A. D. 900–925, though this date partly depends on Devasena’s. If the date of Devasena’s Darśanaśāra was in reality expressed in Śaka Era (although labelled as Vikrama, particularly because he says he wrote it in Dhārā), the upper limit of Amṛṭacandrācārya will have to be shifted upward.

18. The Kasāya-pāhuḍa-sutta represents the scholiastic formulations on the karma-siddhānta, the divisions (uttara-bhedas), sub-divisions (upabhedas) and still further divisions (prabhedas) of karmas (particularly of the Mohanīya), their mode of operation and their consequencing power, their relationship with the psychic planes (gunaṭhānas) at which different souls stand (jīvasthānas), and related
matters. The original teachings embodied in this work are ascribed to Guṇadhara from whom (or from whose tradition) Ārya Nāgahasti and Ārya Maṅkṣu (Ārya Maṅgu or Maṅghahasti) . . . teachers in the 2nd cent. A. D. . . . of the Northern Nirgrantha tradition got them and the unknown Yāpanīya scholiast with the epithet Yati Vṛṣabha (between c. 4th-6th cent. A. D.) wrote the first available cūrṇi-commentary on it. Guṇadhara might be the Guṇandhara alias Guṇasundara or Guṇākara, preceptor of Ārya Śyāma II (c. 2nd-3rd cent. A. D.) as recorded later in the medieval Śvetāmbara Kālaka-katha lore. For linguistically and by content the text proper (vērsified) cannot go to the period before the Christian Era; it rather seems comfortable in the Kuśāṇa period-perspective. The Śvetāmbara sect has for long lost it. The first available Digambara Jaina commentary (Jayadvahalā) on this work is by Śvāmī Vīrasena, the commentary completed after his death by his worthy disciple Jinasena in A. D. 837.


21. For Kuppāṭur inscription, see Jaina Śīlālekha Saṅgraha, pt. 2. Ed. Pt. Vijayamurti, Bombay V. S. 2009/A. D. 1953. Ins. No. p. 269. For Humca inscriptions, ibid., No. 212, p. 294, and No. 214, p. 303. These two latter inscriptions place Kundakundācārya after Gaṇadhara Gautama and before Bhadrabāhu. In other words, Kundakundācārya, in the perception of the authors of these two inscriptions, flourished before B. C. 325. Upadhye misses these important inscriptions. They are indeed so helpful in placing Kundakundācārya even 300 years prior to the date he proposes.

22. Ibid., Ins. No. 122 from Maṅñe.

23. Ibid., Ins. No. 123, also from Maṅñe.


26. Ibid.

27. Cf. his "Intro." Pravacanasāra, pp. 18-19.


29. I lately realized it was not Premi but some other author whose work is currently not handy.
30. It is a belief partly grown out of the profound reverence and a very false notion as regards the antiquity of Kundakundacarya.

31. During my discussions with Prof. A. K. Narain and subsequently with Dr. T. P. Verma, I was told that an year c. A.D. 105 for the beginning of the Kuśāna Era seems closer to the truth. Incidentally, Jayasenaçarya mentions “Kumāranandi Siddhāntadeva” as the preceptor of Padmanandi-Kundakundacarya in his commentary on the Pañcāstikāya-sūtra.

32. Upadhye, “Intro.,” p. 9. The date of Vidyānanda, suggested here follows the generally accepted date by the Jaina and non-Jaina writers. However, in my recent researches I found that he apparently belonged to the first half of the 10th century. My paper “The Date of Vidyānanda and Epigraphical Evidence” is currently in press.

33. For details, cf. here f.n.no. 20.

34. The two Rāṣṭakūṭa inscriptions from Manče (for the sources of publication here cf. f.n. 18-19), lay bear the existence of a parallel branch of the pontiffs of the Kōṇḍakundānvaya, though the gana is not mentioned:

   Toraṇācarya of Śalamali-grāma
   Puṣpanandi
   Prabhacandra (A.D. 797; A.D. 802)


37. Upadhye “Intro.” pp. 1-24 where he mentions the sources. (The two sources in question are of course late medieval.

38. Cf. Upadhye, “Intro.,” p. 12 and infra. The author seems to be Chakravartinayanar and it was his work which Upadhye may have in mind.

39. This is reported by Jayasenaçarya in his commentary on the Pravacanasūra. For details, cf. Upadhye, “Intro.” Pravacanasūra. pp. 18-19.


42. At least the available inscriptions do not seem to suggest one.

43. The data presented by Jayasenācārya are fairly pin-pointed unlike the later sources.

44. Pt. Nathuram Premi as well as Muni Kalyanvijaya is of this view.

45. About the so-called, though very small, parlelism between Akalaṅka-deva’s writing and of Kundakundācārya, in one case, I shall review it in a future paper. (Also a quotation commonly figuring in Pūjayapāda Devanandi’s Kundakundācārya I shall discuss in a subsequent paper.)


47. Ibid., p. 184.


50. Desai, p. 90.

51. I noticed this reference in his Ph.D. dissertation entitled “Jainism on the Kanara Coast”, which was submitted to Mysore University, 1983. My grateful thanks are due to Shri Narasimha Murthy.

52. EC, X, Chika-ballapur l., no. 29.

53. The sites in question must be thoroughly surveyed by the State Department of Archaeology and the different university departments dealing with ancient Indian history and related subjects in Karnataka State, for estimating their antiquity.

54. The paper is entitled “The Date of Śatkhanaḍāgama” and is shortly going to the press. I, therefore, will discuss no evidence in this paper on the late date for that work.


56. These may have come from the floating sangrahanī collections. Some of these, with small variations in readings and sequence also figure inside the Prajñā-panā-sūtra of Ārya Śyāma (II) (c. 3rd cent. A.D.)

57. Upadhye earlier had doubted it. Pt. Kailashchandra Shastri, however, concedes to this as possible. Pt. Hiralal Jain found a few parallelisms between the Niyamaśūra attributed to Kundakundācārya and the quotations of the Parikarma
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found in the Dhavalā commentary of Vīrasena. (Cf. Upadhye, “Post Script”, p. 121,)


59. This is the considered opinion of late Muni Punyavijayaji. Pt. Dalsukh Malvania, the present author, and several other scholars agree to that date for the nirvyuktis. (I have of course evidence other than already stated and known.)

60. The Mūlācāra, being a compilation, later had received additions. Once it passed in the hands of the Digambara sect, at some stage, verses typical of the new doctrines or those that signified new interpretations from Kundakundācārya’s works seemingly were also added to it. (They look quite incongruent with and offer sharp contrast in terms of style and content.)

61. These verses figure in the Samaya-prābhṛta.

62. The main Prākṛta adopted in Kundakundācārya’s work is for certain the Jaina Śaurasenī. The meters preferred are the late Ārṣya of the classical and post-classical period and, to a small extent Anuṣṭubh.

63. Upadhye, however, ascribes this to the period when the āgamas were the common property of the Śvetāmbaras as well as the Digambaras. I must confess I cannot agree with this suggestion. The separation, without declaration between, and without even the knowledge of the Northern and the Southern Nirgranthā (Digambara) had occurred long before Kundakundācārya and on account more of geographical distance and factors of history than due to any conscious and overt disagreements in the earlier stages. There is no evidence at all inside the genuine Digambara works on the rejection of the āgamas shaped by the Northern Nirgranthas in Pāṭaliputra (c. B. C. 300). (That is a deliberately concocted and propagated modern Digambara Jaina myth to which many trusting minds, including some German Jainologists, succumbed.) The Digambara had lost the āgamas (and these must be their very early version and in terms of number they must be very restricted at that early date, showing undeveloped doctrines, dogmas and philosophy; and this happened due entirely to their remote surroundings, their location in extreme south. It seems more correct to think that Kundakundācārya got some of the agamic verses possibly from the Yāpanīya and plausibly a few directly from the Śvetāmbara sources. And this could be only after the Yāpanīyas were well settled in Kāṇṭa, that is to say, in or after the 5th-6th century A. D. In point of fact, some of the Kundakundācārya’s verses which are traced in the nirvyuktis, prakīrṇakas and similar sources are indeed not very ancient and could by style and content only be dated to the late Kuṣāna, Gupta and post-Gupta periods. (There are small variations in readings between these and Kundakundācārya’s versions.)

64. The Śvetāmbara cūrṇi commentaries (7th cent. A. D.) often cite from agamic works now not traceable.

66. Ibid. Pt. Malvania, however, draws no definite conclusion on the relative positions of the four works.

67. Yāpanṭyas had lived alongside the Digambaras at many centers in ancient and medieval Karnāṭaka. See here also the f. n. 63.

68. I have carefully compared these maṅgalaś with what figure in the 7th and 8th century Śvetāmbara works. Both the groups are fairly close in style, sometimes even in phrāsṇology.

69: I am discussing his views with full quotations in the follow up paper.