



Manoj Sakale
Hidden Potential, 2018
Oil on canvas
122 x 89cm

Kundakunda, a ‘Collective Author’: Deconstruction of a Myth

Piotr Balcerowicz

Kundakunda has undisputedly shone as the brightest star on the firmament of Digambara Jainism of the South of India for a few centuries, in a way comparable to the magnitude of Śāṅkara. Despite the preeminent role he has played in shaping the practical approach to religiosity in Jainism and his dominance in the landscape of the Digambara literature, we know surprisingly little, if anything at all, about him. In this sense, when it comes to questions such as who he was, when and where he lived, and what works he composed, Kundakunda could be called a personage shrouded in complete mystery.

Kundakunda’s Location

Kundakunda is traditionally associated with the South, mainly due to Kundakunda’s alleged link to the lineage of Mūla-saṅgha or Drāviḍa-saṅgha.² Such an association is based on inscriptions, mostly found in Śravaṇabeḷagoḷa,³ all of later date and historically unreliable. The earliest of these inscriptions (no. 64) is dated 1163⁴ and already contains the now popular *myth* of the conversion of Candragupta by Bhadrabāhu and their migration to the South. As I have argued elsewhere, this story is ‘both purely of mythical nature with no substantial historical foundation’ and ‘there is no evidence that could allow one to establish any link between the founder of the Mauryan Dynasty with Jainism, and with Bhadrabāhu in particular.’⁵ This myth linking the emperor and the anchorite, and recounting their departure to the South emerged first in the tenth century in a process that served as the foundational myth for Śravaṇabeḷagoḷa as a new site of religious worship, which required such a ‘history’, a part of which

was the consecration (*pratiṣṭhā*) of the monolithic Bāhubalin of Śravaṇabeḷagoḷa, erected between 978 and 984. The ahistorical fancifulness of and confusion found in the above-mentioned inscription and in some others is additionally illustrated by the information that, for instance, Kundakunda was also called Umāsvāti-muṇīśvara etc.

Despite the unreliability of such evidence, we may nonetheless associate Kundakunda with the South – which is where his myth emerged and evolved – for other reasons. All early commentators on Kundakunda’s works, such as Amṛtacandra and Jayasena who played a pivotal role in the creation process of the Kundakunda myth, belong to the South exclusively. Further we do not find similar inscriptions referring to Kundakunda in the North, and Kundakunda does not feature in the collections of stories (*prabandha*), that are the Northern speciality, such as Nemicandra-sūri’s *Ākhyānaka-maṇi-kośa* and Āmradeva-sūri’s *Vṛtti* (1134), Prabhācandra’s *Ārādhana-kathā-prabandha*, or *Kathā-kośa* (the close of the 11th century), Merutuṅga’s *Prabandha-cintā-maṇi* (ca. 1306), Jineśvara’s *Kathā-kośa-prakaraṇa*, Rājaśekhara’s *Prabandha-kośa*, or *Catur-viṃśati-prabandha* (ca. 1348), Nemidatta’s *Ārādhana-kathā-kośa*, *Purātana-prabandha-saṅgraha* etc. Kundakunda’s impact area is restricted to the South, and it is not due to sectarian divisions but owing to the actual geographical range limits. Kundakunda must have ‘flourished’ (in the sense: Kundakunda’s tradition developed) in a Southern region with large Jaina following, but hardly palpable presence, be it of social, political, economic, or religious character, of Buddhism, inasmuch as direct reference to or influence of Buddhist ideas in Kundakunda’s core works is marginal.

Kundakunda's Works

As regards to the oeuvre of Kundakunda,⁶ he is traditionally said to have authored 84 works (frequently referred to as *pāhuḍa*; Skt. *prābhṛta*). Such a number is clearly fictitious and should be treated with utmost caution: all these works can easily be determined not to be homogeneous.⁷ Once Kundakunda came to be accepted as a preeminent thinker, many other literary compositions came to be attributed to him with great ease, similarly to the Advaita-Vedāntin Śaṅkara credited with writing hundreds of works. A close textual analysis demonstrates that some of the works attributed to Kundakunda indeed go back to a certain common source and the nucleus of each of them was expanded and elaborated in the course of time along a similar pattern. These include only three works: *The Quintessence of Sermons (Pavayaṇa-sāra*; Skt. *Pravacana-sāra*), *The Quintessence of The Main Doctrinal Point (Samaya-sāra*; SSā) and *The Compendium of the Five Extensive Entities (Paṃc'atthiya-saṃgaha*; Skt. *Pañcāstikāya-saṅgraha*, PAS). Importantly, these three core works are jointly called a *Triad of Works (Nāṭaka-traya* or *Prābhṛta-traya*)⁹ not without a reason.

These three texts have more than one element in common: only these three were commented on by Amṛtacandra-sūri (900–950),¹⁰ the very first of Kundakunda's commentator, and by Jayasena (ca. 1150–1200).¹¹ They share a particular manuscript tradition in the sense that none of them exists in a form independent from their commentaries: all three have been transmitted only as integral parts of Amṛtacandra's and Jayasena's works, and their independent, un-commented versions preserved in manuscript form appear to be relatively recent extracts copied from the commentaries. Further, Jayasena's commentaries on these three works consistently add several *gāthās* unknown to or un-commented by Amṛtacandra, whereas Jayasena comments on all the verses which Amṛtacandra had incorporated in his commentarial works. This feature alone attests both to a noticeable development of the core texts ascribed to Kundakunda and to the fundamental role of the commentators in moulding Kundakunda's tradition.

Another work ascribed by the Jaina tradition to Kundakunda may *perhaps* be related loosely to the core texts, namely the *Quintessence of Constraint (Niyama-sāra*; Skt. *Niyama-sāra*). *The Eight Discourses (Aṭṭha-pāhuḍa*; Skt. *Aṣṭa-prābhṛta*)¹² as well as a number of other works, likewise called discourses (*pāhuḍa*, Skt. *prābhṛta*), are a clear reference to the semi-canonical work *A Discourse on Passions (Kaṣāya-pāhuḍa*; *Kaṣāya-prābhṛta*) by the author-compiler Guṇadhara, dating back to ca. third century CE or even much younger. Judging on inter-textual criteria, marked differences in style, compositional structure, language (later Prakrits and traces of Apabhraṃśa), intellectual framework and character, it is highly improbable that these *pāhuḍas* as well as *The Quintessence of [the Three] Gems (Rayaṇa-sāra*; Skt. *Ratna-sāra*) and *Twelve Reflections (Bārahānuvekkhā*; Skt. *Dvādaśānuprekṣā*) could go back to the same intellectual milieu that is covered by the name of 'Kundakunda' associated with the *Triad of Works*. Kundakunda is also accredited with composing a twelve-thousand-verses large Parikarma, a commentary on the first three chapters of the *Canon in Six Parts (Cha-kkhaṃḍāgame*, Skt. *Ṣaṭ-khaṇḍāgame*): this rather confused tradition goes back to Indranandin's *Śrūtāvātāra* (ca. 950–1000?), verses 160–161, which mention a certain Padmanandin who composed such a commentary in Kuṇḍakundapura. No vestiges of such a commentary can be traced anywhere, and Kundakunda's authorship of *Parikarma* should therefore be rejected. Also, a tiny work *Daśa-bhakti*¹³ is ascribed to Kundakunda which links him with an emerging *bhakti* tradition in Jainism.

Kundakunda's Date

Various dates have been proposed for Kundakunda¹⁴ spanning a range of almost a millennium, starting from the first century BCE (8 BCE)¹⁵ and first century CE (92 CE),¹⁶ through 2nd–3rd century¹⁷ till 'early fifth century or later',¹⁸ 'second half of 8th century'.¹⁹ As we can see, the dating of Kundakunda is extremely confused, inaccurate, and undecided for several reasons. On the one hand, the research resorts to the 'tangible' material such as inscriptions, pontifical lists (*paṭṭāvalī*) and enumerations of *guru* lineages as reliable historical evidence. All these sources are however very late, mostly post-eleventh century, disorderly and self-contradictory; they confuse persons, names, and facts, which indicates that their authors themselves did not really know the actual state of affairs. On the other hand, certain textual layers within Kundakunda's core works are discovered to be capable of some dating in their own right, as undoubtedly reflecting certain theoretical and philosophical developments of other philosophical schools, such as Vaiśeṣika or Vedānta, which contradicts the 'tangible' evidence.

Sometimes it is brought up that the consistency of the Prakrit found in Kundakunda's works can be used as an evidence both for singular authorship and for the particular dating proposed.²⁰ Unfortunately, the main works ascribed to Kundakunda are extremely varied in terms of terminology and particular Prakrits used, and various Prakrit layers are intermixed, for instance the Prakrit forms for *ātman* – *attā* (Śaurasenī, Māgadhi), *appā* (Māgadhi, Ardha-māgadhi, Mahārāṣṭrī, Jaina Śaurasenī), and *ādā* (Jaina Śaurasenī) – are used interchangeably. As we shall see, several verses are unknown to the very first commentator on Kundakunda, Amṛtacandra, whereas they are already incorporated into the main works and commented by Jayasena two and a half centuries later, which can imply that the *gāthās* were composed after Amṛtacandra. These additional verses do not particularly stand out from earlier *gāthās* either in terms of Prakrit variety or style. Most importantly, the style of the majority of Kundakunda's verses is rather unspecific, lacking any idiosyncratic features or individual peculiarities that could allow us to associate them with a particular author.

In most attempts to date Kundakunda we may discover a vicious circle: even if researchers are inclined to assign much of these texts to a later date, they override such intuitions with the 'between-first-to-third-century' time anchor accepted in advance, arrived at on the basis of inscriptions and *guru* lists, regarded as the 'tangible' historical evidence. This combined methodology has led researchers practically to no definite conclusion and therefore has to be substantially revised. In any future research on Kundakunda it is required that we clearly discriminate at least between (1) a person or a group of persons named Kundakunda, and (2) the author of the three core texts: an occurrence of the name Kundakunda in an inscription or a *paṭṭāvalī* does not necessarily mean that that person is the author of the three core texts.

Against the view of Upadhye (1964: 1) that 'the compilatory character of Kundakunda's works nullifies the criterion whether a *gāthā* fits a particular context or not', an opinion supported by Johnson (1995: 96), I claim that a deconstruction of the core texts into various historical layers is possible. In my monograph on Kundakunda (under preparation),²¹ I propose to begin in a reverse order, with the texts themselves first: to apply a complex methodology which combines philological analysis of the text and a number of inter-textual analysis criteria – in particular the examination of stylistic measures and terminology, internal consistency of the text, dissonance or sense of discontinuity,

sudden terminological shifts, sensitivity to possible insertions and mental leaps or jumps and breaks, jarring or glitches in the narration, concepts and terminology— with historical-philosophical approach, in particular an analysis of the background of philosophical ideas and models as well as the tracing of the reflection of Jaina-internal and Jaina-external philosophical concepts and ideas in Kundakunda's work. With 'Jaina-internal', I mean the presence of historically different strata of Jaina dogmatics which developed over centuries and was over time incorporated into various textual strata and later assimilated into Kundakunda's work. With 'Jaina-external', I refer to the influence of similarly historically divergent strata of other, non-Jaina philosophical-religious systems of India which are recorded in Kundakunda's work. Such dating strategy comprises another methodology that is based on an wider analysis of Jaina ontological models intended to explain the complexity of the world, as they developed over centuries, each of the models marked by its own particular terminology.²² The models, as I argue elsewhere,²³ group a range of well-known categories, beside the *jīva-ajīva* dualism, and usually comprise the principle of motion (*dhamma, dharma*), the principle of rest (*ahamma, adharmā*), space (*āgāsa, ākāśa*) and matter (*poggala, pudgala*), occasionally extended to embrace also time (*kāla*) in a later period. Altogether five such models, with two additional variants, can be specified and assigned to various historical periods that span 1st–3rd century and 400–450, and they group either selected or all of the categories under various headings, such as soteriological categories (*tathya/tattva*; Model 2: 1st–2nd centuries CE), extensive entities (*asti-kāya*; Model 3: 4th century CE); world components (Model 4: ca. 400 CE) and substances (*dravya*; Model 5: ca. 400–450 CE). A historically interesting feature of these models is that each subsequent one elaborates upon the previous, replacing it with some crucial terms that can be treated as historical markers. For instance, finding Model 3 in a particular text, with no evidence of later models, can be treated as evidence that the text in all probability belongs to the 4th century or early 5th century, when the subsequent models did not take over yet.

Under examination are the core texts of the *Triad of Works*: *Pravacana-sāra*, *Samaya-sāra* and *Pañcāstikāya-saṅgraha*, with the emphasis on the two latter, which like none other are associated with Kundakunda and raise no serious doubt. Once the historical stratification is settled, we may try to see whether the alleged 'tangible' material could fit into this picture and provide us with additional clues.

The research reveals altogether seven different layers of the *Pañcāstikāya-saṅgraha* that fall into the periods of between 350–400; ca. 450; ca. 500, between 550–600; between ca. 600–?; ?–925 (pre-Amṛtacandra and Amṛtacandra) and 950–1150 (pre-Jayasena and Jayasena). The original, earliest layer belonging to 350–400 was a succinct work in approximately 16 verses on the five extensive entities (*pañcāsti-kāya*) that fits the ontological Model 3. An anonymous author augmented the text with significant additions. A large part of Chapter 1 belongs to the period of ca. 500, and this is the core of the whole work, incorporating several earlier verses, mostly of 350–400. This core was redacted and largely expanded in the period of 550–600, when the *maṅgala* to Chapter 1 and most of Chapter two, including its separate *maṅgala*, were added as well as the second, final colophon. In the period between 600 and the life of Amṛtacandra, the work was largely re-redacted with additional insertions, and final touches were put by Jayasena, who added several new verses, either independent or composed by himself. The case of the *Samaya-sāra* is likewise complex, with

altogether four distinguishable layers that belong to the periods 550–600; 600–?; ?–925 (pre-Amṛtacandra and Amṛtacandra) and 950–1150 (pre-Jayasena and Jayasena). Of note is that the earliest layer is not earlier than 550–600, and this is the core text, including the *maṅgala* and subsequent five verses. In the extant form the *Samaya-sāra* presents a clear three-stranded braid-like structure plaited out of strata the latest of which is that dating back to Amṛtacandra himself, who was the second and the most important redactor of the (still anonymous) work. Jayasena added yet another layer to the complexly structured text and finalized the redaction process of the work. None of the works, now known under the titles *Pañcāstikāya-saṅgraha* and *Samaya-sāra*, originated before the sixth century, even though they do contain some earlier material that was incorporated from various anonymous sources: such *gāthās* were apparently inserted into both texts in order to provide some additional illustration of a particular content. Both texts assumed their more or less final form at the time when Amṛtacandra flourished, still before the concluding review was carried out by Jayasena.

Under such circumstances, it would mean that the lifespan of the celebrated Jaina thinker and the author of these texts known as 'Kundakunda' would extend over four centuries. Instead, I would argue that we should rather speak of a 'collective author' or 'collective thinker' known as 'Kundakunda'. We may, of course apply the conventional authorship of 'Kundakunda' to a nucleus of writings that bears certain features that allow us to attribute them to a particular philosophical Digambara tradition of the period between the sixth and early tenth centuries, albeit there is no particular historical person named 'Kundakunda' identifiable as their author: the historical person Kundakunda may have been an author of one of the historical layers, but we may not even know of which of them.

Creators of Kundakunda's Myth

The core works, now associated with Kundakunda, had remained anonymous compilations for centuries. Even Amṛtacandra in his commentaries on Kundakunda's three core works is silent as regards the actual name of the author. The first explicit identification of the author of one these texts as Kundakunda is done by Jayasena in his introductory lines to the commentary on the *Pañcāstikāya*.²⁴

It appears to be Jayasena who played a pivotal role in elevating Kundakunda to the status of the visionary thinker, in establishing the cult of Simandhara-svāmin, associated with Kundakunda, and in promoting the *bhakti* cult, to which also the *Daśa-bhakti* is linked. To provide the collection of verses of the *Pañcāstikāya* with a true sense of direct revelation gained from a Tīrthakara, Jayasena – as the first writer – opens his commentary with a 'well-known narrative' (*prasiddha-kathā*) of Kundakunda, a disciple of a certain Kumāranandin Siddhāntadeva, otherwise completely unknown from other sources.²⁵ Kundakunda is recounted to have visited the distant continent of Eastern Videha in order to see the omniscient Tīrthakara Simandara-svāmin²⁶ (*śic*; lit. 'the one who breaks the limits') residing there. There, Kundakunda grasps the true essence of the Pure Soul (*śuddhātma-tattva*) conveyed to him directly by means of the divine speech (*divya-vāṇī*) emanating from Simandara's mouth. Thereafter, he returns and recites the Discourse on the Five Extensive Entities (*Pañcāstikāya-prābhṛta*) to teach inner and outer truths and to succinctly enlighten the Mahārāja Śivakumāra and disciples.²⁷ This particular story finds its earliest forerunner in the narrative of Saṅghadāsa-gaṇin's *Roamings of Vāsudeva* (*Vasudeva-hiṅḍi*; c. 600?),²⁸

one of numerous cases of Jaina appropriation of Hindu motifs and celebrities. Saṅghadāsa describes, at the behest of Kṛṣṇa, the visit of Nārada (replaced with Kundakunda by Jayasena) within an instant in order to receive a direct teaching from Sīmandhara (*sic*) Tirthakara who resides 'in another Videha',²⁹ however with no mention of Kundakunda. This story re-emerged significantly influencing modern Jaina religiosity within the tradition of Kāñjī Svāmī (1889–1980) and was popularised through Kāñjī Svāmī's follower Campāben (1918–1993).

Kundakunda is said by Jayasena to be known altogether under five names, including that of Padmanandin; from other sources, such as a Vijayanagara inscription dated 1386 and fifteenth-century pontifical lists (*paṭṭāvalī*), we learn that these are: Padmanandin, Kundakunda, Vakragrīva, Elācārya and Ḡṛdhrapiccha (or -piñcha). Despite the unreliability of these accounts, we may suggest that these names perhaps preserve five different authors of various historical layers that were incorporated into the core works ascribed later to one of them, Kundakunda. Occasionally, researchers identify Padmanandin with Kundakunda on the basis of a village Kuṇḍakunda to which Padmanandin is said to be related; also two appellations found in Śravaṇabeḷagoḷa inscriptions, viz. 'Kuṇḍakunda' or 'Koṇḍakunda', meaning 'jasmine flower of the spring well', are treated – which is of course incorrect – as equivalent of the proper name 'Kundakunda' and treated as historical evidence for Kundakunda.

Kundakunda's Thought

Under such circumstances, it is virtually impossible to expect a homogenous 'philosophy of Kundakunda', inasmuch as various historical strands incorporated into the three core works reflect quite different, often incompatible philosophical ideas. There is nothing resembling a unified philosophical system represented in Kundakunda's works, which as such cannot be treated as original and premier formulations of certain ideas. On the contrary, they are mostly compilatory and secondary in character, and only some of these ideas gained prominence since mediaeval times. Mostly, we find both standard and non-standard depictions of Jaina ontology and epistemology, with no attempt to reconcile such divergencies.

The compilations ascribed to Kundakunda reflect a range of ideas of other philosophical systems. In his core works we find a strong influence of Vaiśeṣika ontology, including the ideas of ontological categories (*padārtha*), of existentiality (*astitva*) and existence (*sattā*), of dimensions ranging from atomic (*aṇu*) to macroscopic size (*mahant*), the models of substance (*dravya*) and quality (*guṇa*), expanded with modes (*pariyāya*), and of property-possessor (*dharmin*) and property (*dharma*). Some influence of Buddhist concepts is also palpable, mostly associated with the

Higher Doctrine (Abhidharma) tradition, well known for instance from Vasubandhu's *Treasury of the Higher Doctrine* (*Abhidharma-kośa*), but also a stray use of *reductio ad absurdum* (*prasaṅga*), well-attested in the post-Nāgārjuna Madhyamaka tradition. Kundakunda's theory of two varieties of time is proposed as a solution of the problem of momentariness introduced by Buddhism. Here and there, we come across some traces of Sāṃkhya-Yoga, as well.

However, a most decisive impact came from early (and even later) Advaita-Vedānta, primarily the ideas traceable to such works as *Gauḍapāda's Verses* (*Gauḍapāda-kārikā*; c. 500 CE), Ādiśeṣa's *Quintessence of the Ultimate Reality* (*Paramārtha-sāra*; early sixth century). This is where we should look for the inspiration in the case of the new idea of the pure, inactive, intrinsically *karman*-free, disengaged self (*ātman*), the uncontaminated soul in its own nature, essentially dissociated from the workings of *karman* and the material world. The idea is also reminiscent of certain formulations found in the *Bhāgavad-gītā* that emphasizes the intrinsic detachment of the self (*ātman*) which never acts, never commits evil and is never attached to anything. The pure soul is eventually called the Paramount Self (*paramātman*) in the latest historical strata that go back to Amṛtacandra and Jayasena. Such a pure soul is distinguished from the empirical living being (*jīva*), the actual agent embedded in the mundane world of *saṃsāra*. This theory assumes different shades in Kundakunda's core works. On the one hand, it is the presence of the self (*ātman*), intrinsically pure, that turns the world of *karman* on, itself being essentially dissociated from it, comparable to the *puruṣa* in the Sāṃkhya and Vedānta model. On the other hand, karmic states (*bhāva*) are made by *karman*, the actual 'agent', not by the pure self (*ātman*), and the experiencing subject (*bhoktṛ*) of the workings of *karman* is the living being (*jīva*).

Such a distinction is naturally and logically correlated with the two-truth theory, which has become the hallmark of 'Kundakunda', or two perspectives on the soul and the world via the determinate, or the absolute certainty viewpoint (*niścayānaya*), known also as the pure viewpoint (*suddha-naya*), and the empirical viewpoint (*vyavahāra-naya*). These two perspectives are occasionally compared to the Buddhist Madhyamaka two-truth theory featuring the ultimate truth (*paramārtha-sat*) juxtaposed with the conventionally, empirical truth (*samvṛti-sat*). However, they are much closer in nature to Vedāntic differentiation between two realities, especially to Śaṅkara's ultimate reality (*paramārtha*) and worldly empirical practice (*loka-vyavahāra*).

There is no tangible evidence that the two-fold distinction existed prior to Akalaṅka (c. 720–780). Rather, it is Akalaṅka who seems to have introduced a nucleus of the distinction – now associated with Kundakunda – of the two correlated viewpoints in their nascent form: the empirical viewpoint (*vyavahāra-naya*)

and the determinate viewpoint (*niścaya-naya*), and to have coined the term 'the pure viewpoint' (*śuddha-naya*). These ideas became later – at the time of Amṛtacandra or just before – an entirely independent descriptive framework, unrelated to the theory of the seven viewpoints (*naya-vāda*). We may observe a gradual development of terminology and ideas from Akalaṅka's earlier *Royal Commentary* (*Rāja-vārttika*) on Umāsvāmin's *Treatise on Reality* (*Tattvārtha-sūtra*) to his later work, *The Elementary Trilogy* (*Laghīyas-traya*). Interestingly, both ideas – the distinction between the pure self (*ātman*) and mundane living being (*jīva*) as well as the two-truth theory – emerge jointly in the same historical layer of the core works, prior to or at the time of Amṛtacandra. It is of note that Amṛtacandra develops these ideas in his own works, starting from his earliest work, *The Quintessence of Reality* (*Tattvārtha-sāra*), as well as in *On the Means of the Attainment of the Human Goals* (*Puruṣārtha-siddhy-upāya*), and *Revelation of Truth in an Accessible Manner* (*Laghu-tattva-sphoṭa*). The two latter texts function as an exposition of one of these two viewpoints, the empirical viewpoint (*vyavahāra-naya*) and the determinate viewpoint (*niścaya-naya*, or *śuddha-naya*), respectively. His glosses on Kundakunda's verses also provide original terminology with completely new meanings on par with the two-truth theory.

The mystic insight into the nature of the self opens completely new dimensions of Jaina religiosity and becomes a new path accessible to all, not only to mendicants, but – mainly – to lay people. Its prime drive is thought to be the novel spiritual perspective enabled by the pure viewpoint: 'The one who knows – through the pure viewpoint (*śuddha-naya*) – the self as unbound and untouched by karmic matter, non-different and with no distinction, also knows the core of the *sūtras* of the instruction that makes the complete teaching of the Victor' (SSā 15). 'Kundakunda' denounces as useless philosophical knowledge of categories, the study of scriptures as well as the importance of asceticism when he says that 'emancipation is difficult (i.e., impossible) to attain to the one whose mind understands the idea of the ford-maker alongside the categories (*padārtha*), who is fond of scriptures, who performs practices of restraint and asceticism' (PAS 170). Instead, he emphasises the role of the pure viewpoint, which accelerates one's progress on the path to final emancipation, with no rigid asceticism or monkish garb required, as well as unconditional belief (*śraddhāna*), and a religious cult centred on material representation (e.g., a *mūrti*) and devotion (*bhakti*). In this way Jainism may now respond to the needs of lay believers more flexibly and efficiently and adapt to the changing social and political environment, both in the times of the mediaeval rapid spread of new forms of devotional Hinduism (*bhakti*) and Vedānta philosophy, during the political domination of Islam, in the colonial era, and in modernity.

References

Texts and translations

- DS *Darśanasāra* of Devasena. Ed. by A.N. Upadhye. 'Darśanasāra of Devasena: Critical Text.' *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Institute* 15 (1935) 198–206.
- PAS *Pañc'atthiya-saṅgaha* [Pañcāstikāya-saṅgraha] of Kundakunda. *Śrīmat-Kundakunda-svāmi-viracitaḥ Pañcāsti-kāyaḥ Tattva-pradīpikā-Tātparya-vṛtti-Bālāvabodhaka-bhāṣēti tīkā-trayōpetah*. Ed. Manoharlāl, Hindi Tr. Pannālāl Bākalīvāl. 3rd ed. Śrī Paramaśruta-Prabhāvaka-Manḍala. Agās: Śrīmad Rājacandra Āśrama, 1970 [1st ed.: 1904].
- PA-TVṛ *Pañcāstikāya-tātparya-vṛtti* of Jayasena. *Śrīmat-Kundakunda-svāmi-viracitaḥ Pañcāsti-kāyaḥ Tattva-pradīpikā-Tātparya-vṛtti-Bālāvabodhaka-bhāṣēti tīkā-trayōpetah*. Ed. Manoharlāl, Hindi Tr. Pannālāl Bākalīvāl. 3rd ed. Śrī Paramaśruta-Prabhāvaka-Manḍala. Agās: Śrīmad Rājacandra Āśrama, 1970 [1st ed.: 1904].
- SSā1 *Samaya-sāra* of Kundakunda. *Ācārya Kundakunda mūla racayyāt Samaya-sāra, saṁskṛta-Ātma-khyāti (Śrī Āmṛtacandrācārya) saṁskṛta-tīkā-tātparyavṛtti (Jayasenācārya), hindī-tīkā (pañc. Jayacanda Jī)*. Ed. and Eng. Trans. Rājākṛṣṇa Jaina, Manohar Varṇī, A.N. Upādhye. Dillī: Ahimsā-Mandira-Prakaśana, 1992 [1st ed.: 1959].
- SSā2 *Samaya-sāra* of Kundakunda. *Samayasara (The Soul-Essence) by Śhri Kunda Kunda Acharya. The Original Text in Prakrit, with its Sanskrit Renderings, and a Translation*. Ed. and Tr. Rai Bahadur J.L. Jaini. Sacred Books of the Jains 8. Lucknow: The Central Jaina Publishing House, 1930.
- SSā3 *Samaya-sāra* of Kundakunda. *Samayasara or The Nature of The Self by Sri Kunda Kunda with an English Translation and Commentary based upon Amritachandra's Atmakyati- together with English introduction By A. Chakravarti*. Banaras: Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha Prakāśana, 1950.
- TṢSPC *Tri-ṣaṣṭi-śālākā-puruṣa-carita* of Hemacandra. *Kali-kāla-sarva-jña-śrī-Hemacandrācārya-viracitaṁ Tri-ṣaṣṭi-śālākā-puruṣa-carita-mahā-vākyam*. Eds. Caraṇavijaya, Puṇyavijaya, Ramaṇīkavijaya. 5 vols. Ahmadāvd: Kalikāla-sarvajña Śrī-Hemacandrācārya Navama Janma-śātābdī Smṛti, 1990, 2001, 2006, 2012.
- VH *Vasudeva-hinḍi* of Saṅghadāsa-gaṇin. *Pūjya-śrī-Saṅghadāsa-gaṇi-vācaka-vinirmitaṁ Vasudeva-hinḍi-pratama-khaṇḍam*. Eds. Caturvijaya and Puṇyavijaya. 2 Parts. Bhāvanagara: Śrī-Jaina-Ātmānanda-sabhā, 1930–1931.

Secondary sources

- Balcerowicz, Piotr. 'Beginnings of Jaina Ontology and its Models.' 49,4 (2021) 657–697.
- Balcerowicz, Piotr. 'Royal Patronage of Jainism. The Myth of Candragupta Maurya and Bhadrabahu.' *The Gift of Knowledge. Patterns of Patronage of Jainism. Essays in Honour of Professor Hampa Nagarajiah's Promotion of Jain Studies*. Ed. Christine Chojnacki & Basile Leclère, 33–66. Bengaluru: Sapna Book House, 2018.
- Bhatt, Bansidhar. 'Vyavahāra-naya and Nīścaya-naya in Kundakunda's Works.' *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 28, Supplement II: XVIII. *Deutscher Orientalistentag* (1972) (1974) 279–291.
- Chakravartinayanar, A. 'The Historical Introduction: The Age of Kundakunda or Elacharya.' *The Building of the Cosmos or Pañcāstikāyasāra (the Five Cosmic Constituents) by Svami Sri Kundakundacharya*. Sacred Books of the Jains 3, i–xvi. Arrah: The Central Jaina Publishing House, 1920.
- Dhaky, M.A. 'The Date of Kundakundācārya.' *Aspects of Jainology, Vol. III: Pt Dalsukhbhai Malvania Felicitation Volume I*. Ed. M.A. Dhaky & Sagarmal Jain, 187–206. Vārāṇasī: P.V. Research Institute, 1991.
- Dundas, Paul. 'The Laicisation of the Bondless Doctrine: A New Study of the Development of Jainism', *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 25 (1997) 495–516.
- Dundas, Paul. *The Jains*. 2nd Revised Edition. Routledge, London–New York, 2002.
- Hoernle, August Friedrich Rudolph. 'Three further pattavalis of the Digambaras.' *Indian Antiquary* 21 (1892) 57–84.
- Jain, Kailash Chandra. *Kunda-kunda Prābhṛta Saṅgraha Compiled from Kundakunda's Works*. Sholapur: Jain Sanskrit Sanrakshaka Sangh, 1960.
- Johnson, William J. *Harmless Souls. Karmic Bondage and Religious Change in Early Jainism with Special Reference to Umāsvāti and Kundakunda*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1995.
- Malvania, Dalsukh & Soni, Jayendra (eds.): *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, Vol. 10: Jaina Philosophy, Part I*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2007.
- Narasimhachar, R. *Epigraphia Carnatica. Vol. II: Inscriptions at Sravana Belgola*. Revised Edition, Mysore Archaeological Series. Bangalore: Mysore Government Central Press, 1923.
- Petit, Jérôme. *De la convention à la conviction: Banārasīdās dans l'histoire de la pensée digambarasur l'absolu*. PhD Dissertation, Université Paris 3 Sorbonne Nouvelle, 2013.
- Potter, Karl & Balcerowicz, Piotr (eds.). *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, Vol. 14: Jaina Philosophy, Part II*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2013.
- Schubring, Walter: *The Religion of the Jains*. Calcutta, 1966 (Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series 52).
- Schubring, Walther. 'Kundakunda echt und unecht.' *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 107 (1957) 557–574 [reprint: Kleine Schriften. Ed. Klaus Bruhn, 344–361. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1977].
- Soni, Jayendra. 'Kundakunda and Umāsvāti on Anekānta-vāda.' *Essays in Jaina Philosophy and Religion [Proceedings of the International Seminar on Jainism 'Aspects of Jainism']*. Warsaw University 8th–9th September, 2000. Ed. Piotr Balcerowicz, 25–35. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2003.
- Upadhye, Adinath Neminath. 'Introduction', *Śrī Kundakundācārya's Pravacanasāra (Pavayaṇasāra): A Pro-Canonical Text of the Jains*. Ed. A.N. Upadhye, 1–126. Agas: Shri Raojibhai Chhaganbhai Desai, Shrimad Rajachandra Ashrama, 1964.

Notes

- 1 Acknowledgements: This article has been supported by the National Science Centre of Poland (Research Project: 'History of Classical Indian Philosophy: Buddhism, Scepticism and Materialism', 2016/23/B/HS1/00536).
- 2 E.g. Upadhye 1964: 9–10, 23.
- 3 Inscriptions 69, 73, 125, 140, 240, 254, 269, 327, 331, 339, 345, 380, 397, 495 in: Narasimhachar 1923.
- 4 All dates in the article are of the Common Era (CE).
- 5 Balcerowicz 2018.
- 6 Kundakunda's literary output has been comprehensively described by Upadhye 1964.
- 7 See: Schubring 1957 and Bhatt 1974: 280.
- 8 Sometimes the title is also translated as: 'The Soul-Essence', see: Rai Bahadur J.L. Jaini: *Samayasara (The Soul-Essence) by Śhri Kunda Kunda Acharya. The Original Text in Prakrit, with its Samskrit Renderings, and a Translation* (Sacred Books of the Jains 8, Lucknow 1930); as 'The Nature of the Self', see: A. Chakravarti: *Samayasara or The Nature of The Self* (Bhāratiya Jñānapīṭha Prakāśana, Banaras 1950); as 'Quintessence du soi', see: Jérôme Petit: *De la convention à la conviction: Banārasīdās dans l'histoire de la pensée digambarasur l'absolu* (Université Paris 3 Sorbonne Nouvelle, Thèse de doctorat, 2013).
- 9 Upadhye 1946: 1, 46.
- 10 Upadhye 1964: 93–96: 'Somewhere about the close of the 10th century A.D.'; or 925, according to: Malvania–Soni 2007: 483.
- 11 Upadhye 1964: 97–99; or ca. 1160, according to: Potter–Balcerowicz (2013: 366–367).
- 12 Schubring (1957) analyses the *Aṭṭha-pāhuḍa* in comparison with the character, style, and language of some of the core texts, esp. *Samaya-sāra* and *Pravacana-sāra*, to the conclusion that the former is very distinct and much later from the core texts and cannot even belong to the same social/monastic group.
- 13 Jain (1960: 154–176).
- 14 A comprehensive overview of all possible dating possibilities was done by Upadhye (1964), with notable new critical review offered by Johnson (1995: 91–97).
- 15 Date of accession as pontiff acc. to the *paṭṭāvalī* of Sārasvatī Gaccha of the Digambaras, see: Hoernle (1892: 74).
- 16 Date of accession as pontiff according to the *Vaṃsāvalī* of the Gurus of the Digambaras, see: Hoernle (1892: 81). Also A.N. Upadhye (1964: 5–21).
- 17 Schubring (1957), Schubring (1966: 36), Johnson (1995: 91–97) and Soni (2003).
- 18 Johnson (1995: 95).
- 19 Dhaky (1991: 193), and Dundas (1997: 507 ff.), Dundas (2002: 107).
- 20 E.g. Upadhye (1964: 22).
- 21 Some material was already presented as at the 20th Anniversary Jaina Studies Workshop: History and Current State of Jaina Studies, SOAS, London, on 24 March 2018.
- 22 Balcerowicz (2021).
- 23 Balcerowicz (2021).
- 24 PA-TVṛ1,2 p. 1.13–17. Cf. Upadhye (1964: 2), Johnson (1995: 94).
- 25 Dundas (2002: 269) reports that 'the tenth-century Digambara Devasena was the first writer to mention how Kundakunda had gained his knowledge directly from Sīmandhara'. However, the person in Devasena's account (DS 43) is Padmanandin, and Padmanandin's identification, or mergence, with Kundakunda occurred much later, perhaps around Jayasena's time. Perhaps this is the same literary personage *Kumāra-samaṇa* known from the *Vasudeva-hiṇḍī* narrative (a source for Jayasena's account), mentioned in a very similar context, see VH, p. 84.10.
- 26 PA-TVṛ1,2 p. 1.14: Śrīmandhara-svāmin. Altogether, we find three different version of the name: Sīmandhara, Sīmandara or Śrīmandara.
- 27 PA-TVṛ1,2 p. 1.13–17.
- 28 See a note on early references to Sīmandhara in Dundas (2002: 305, n. 75–76).
- 29 VH, p. 84.9 ff. This version is repeated also by Hemacandra in *The Story of 63 Illustrious Persons* (TṢSPC 8.6.146 ff., vol. 4, p. 91), again with no mention of Kundakunda.