

Prakrit Text Series No. 35

# IN SEARCH OF THE ORIGINAL ARDHAMĀGADHĪ

K. R. CHANDRA

English Translation By  
N. M. KANSARA

General Editors  
Nagin J. Shah  
R. M. Shah

D. M. PRAKRIT TEXT SOCIETY  
AHMEDABAD

**Prakrit Text Series No. 35**

**IN SEARCH OF THE ORIGINAL  
ARDHAMĀGĀDHĪ**

**K. R. CHANDRA**

English Translation By  
**N. M. KANSARA**  
of The Original Hindi Book  
**Prācīna Ardhamāgadhī kī Khoj mein**

**General Editors**

**Nagin J. Shah**

**R. M. Shah**

**D. M. PRAKRIT TEXT SOCIETY  
AHMEDABAD**

**Publisher :**

**R.M.Shah**

Hon. Secretary

**D. M. Prakrit Text Society**

12, Bhagatbaug Society

Sharda Mandir Road

Ahmedabad-380 007

**Copies : 150**

**Year : 2001**

**Price : Rs. 100.00**

**Graphics :**

**Rakesh Computer Centre**

**Rakesh & Bhavana H. Shah**

**272, B. G. Tower,**

**Outside Delhi Gate,**

**Ahmedabad-380 004**

**Phone : 6303200, 7418197**

**DEDICATED**

**To**

**PT. DALSUKHBHAI MALVANIA**

**Who**

**initiated and constantly encouraged  
me in this novel field of studies**

# Contents

## Pages

Preface	
Foreword by Prof. Paul Dundas	
Author's Note	
Foreword to the Original Hindi Edition by Pt.Dalsukh Malvania	
Abbreviations & Reference Works	

## CHAPTERS

1. The State of Ardhamāgadhī in Various Editions of the Jaina Canonical (Āgamic) Texts	1 - 26
2. Archaic Linguistic Elements in the Ardhamāgadhī	27 - 46
3. The Antiquity of the Ardhamāgadhī Āgama Texts and the Place of their Composition	47 - 58
4. The Ardhamāgadhī Language of the Prakrit Grammar of Hemacandra	59 - 70
5. The Original Ardhamāgadhī Form of the Word Kṣetrajña	71 - 78
6. The Textual Reading of the Opening Sentence, the <i>Upodghāta</i> , of the Ācārāṅga	79 - 83
7. Reconstruction of the Original Ardhamāgadhī : An Endeavour	84 - 90
8. Principal Characteristics of Archaic or Original Ardhamāgadhī	91 - 95
Appendix	97 - 118
<u>Reviews And Opinions on the ĀCĀRĀṅGA</u> <u>Linguistically Re-edited</u>	

## PREFACE

The Prakrit Text Society is happy to publish the present work entitled 'In Search of the Original Ardhamāgadhī', the English rendering of Prof. K.R.Chandra's Hindi work 'Prācīna Ardhamāgadhī Kī Khoja mem'. Thus we make available to the English-speaking scholars of Prakrit and Jaina Āgamas the valuable results of Prof. Chandra's researches. It is very interesting to follow his sincere scholarly efforts in reconstructing the original Ardhamāgadhī language.

We are indeed grateful to Prof. Paul Dundas for writing appreciative foreword to the present work. Again, our sincere thanks are due to Prof. N.M.Kansara for translating the original Hindi work into English.

It is really very sad that Prof. H. C.Bhayani, the soul of Prakrit Text Society and world-renowned erudite scholar of Prakrit, passed away on 11<sup>th</sup> November, 2000 and is no more to see this publication.

It is hoped that the present work will certainly be of great use to students and scholars of Prakrit.

D.M.Prakrit Text Society  
12, Bhagatbaug Society  
Ahmedabad -380007  
March 15, 2001

Nagin J. Shah  
R.M.Shah  
General Editors

## FOREWORD

There can be very few significant literary or religious writings which have been immune from some form of scribal, editorial or interpretative alteration in the course of their transmission through history. The continuing use of texts and the mutability which they evince as a consequence are, after all, sure signs of their living significance and of the regard in which they are held amongst the various communities in which they are located. Against this background, many recent participants in philological scholarship have found the notion of a definitive version of any particular work less alluring than it may once have been, and over the last decade or so, pluralistic times indeed in the academic world, textual instability and polyvalency have been deemed particularly worthy of scholarly attention. Nonetheless, this situation, commendable though it may be in many respects, need not entail a further acquiescence to the claim that because the primal versions of ancient texts, especially those, as in early India, whose origins may lie in an oral setting, cannot possibly be retrieved authoritatively, attempts to speculate about their original configuration are therefore vain or valueless. The basic aims and obligations of philological scholarship have not altered so much in this respect.

The production of printed editions of the Śvetāmbara āgama is hardly a new phenomenon. The process started in the mid nineteenth century, although, as Ludwig Alsdorf pointed out (*Les Etudes Jaina : etat present et tâches futures*, Paris : College de France 1965, p.31), the testimony of each of these early editions had little more value than that provided by an individual manuscript. However, more recent editions, whether Indian or western, although often better organised

in terms of sources utilised, have frequently been influenced by certain flawed presuppositions about the value of the readings provided by the manuscript tradition.

Ideally, any truly critical edition of a Jaina scriptural text would be accompanied by as wide of range of readings as feasible and by all the various available layers of medieval commentary. Such an edition can in fact be found in the recent remarkable Ph.D. thesis ('The Nirayāvaliyāsuyakkhandha and its commentary by Śrīcandra: critical edition, translation and notes') submitted to The Australian National University in 2000 by Royce Wiles. However, it would have to be admitted that the work in question, the relatively short and little commented upon cluster of upāṅgas 8-12, is more amenable to this sort of presentation than the older and longer scriptures of the canon. An alternative editorial strategy might then be radically to reconsider the nature of the readings which have been bequeathed to us by the manuscripts and early commentaries connected with the old *mūla sūtras*, the most important textual witnesses for early Jainism.

It is just such a thoroughgoing reappraisal of this evidence, hitherto largely taken for granted, which has occupied the energies of Professor K.R. Chandra in recent years. Though a laborious sifting and analysis of the available printed sources (a task which, it should be said, was accomplished without any electronic assistance), Professor Chandra has been able to show how many earlier editorial procedures employed in producing 'critical' versions of the Śvetāmbara āgama were based on erroneous assumptions about the nature of the Prākṛit in which the texts were composed. Chandra's findings, which in effect represent a bold attempt to reconstruct the linguistic shape of the original Ardhamāgadhī of the canon,

## VII



were clearly and conveniently set forth in *Prācīna Ardhamāgadhī Kī Khoj Menī* of 1992, an English version of which is presented here to the scholarly world, and *Restoration of Original Language of Ardhamāgadhī Texts* of 1994. In addition, it has been possible to judge the practical value of Chandra's insights with the appearance in 1997 of his edition of the first chapter of the *Ācārāṅga Sūtra* in which his analytical methods are applied to what is perhaps the oldest Ardhamāgadhī text.

Editorial work of this sort may superficially appear excessively technical or lacking in excitement. Yet it unquestionably forms the bedrock upon which subsequent historical and literary judgements must be based. As such, Chandra's researches compel attention. What will be their longterm consequence of course remains to be seen. If very few, and certainly not among them Professor Chandra, will wish to contend that this reconstruction of the original Ardhamāgadhī can give unmediated access to the actual words of Mahāvīra, many will now wish to reflect seriously upon the implications of what is the most important development in the critical editing of the oldest Jain scriptures since the institution of the Jain Āgama Granthamālā. It will be the urgent task of competent scholars to frame responses to Chandra's work and integrate his important conclusions into the history of Middle Indo-Aryan and the Jain āgama.

**PAUL DUNDAS**

Department of Sanskrit  
School of Asian Studies  
University of Edinburgh  
Scotland, U. K.

## VIII

## Author's Note

It is a pleasure to publish this book which is English translation of the author's original Hindi book '**Prācīna Ardhamāgadhī Kī Khoj** meṁ' published by Prakrit Jain Vidya Vakas Fund, Ahmedabad, 1992. It was well received by the Prakrit scholars in India and abroad. It was suggested from the West that its English version should be published for international market. This suggestion was brought to the notice of late Pt. D. D. Malvania and Dr. H. C. Bhayani and they instantly agreed to publish the same. On our request financial aid was granted to our association P.J.V.V. Fund by the Kalikāla Sarvajña Śrī Hemacandrācārya Navama Janma Śatābdī Smṛti Saṁskāra Śikṣa Nidhi, Ahmedabad and for that we are very grateful to the Nidhi and Revd. Ācārya Śrī Śīlacandrasūriji for his liberal support to this academic cause. On our request the Hindi text was translated into English by Prof. Dr. N. M. Kansara and for that we are grateful to him.

We have made some alterations in the order of the chapters of the Hindi edition and added in the end opinions and reviews of the **Ācārāṅga**, **Prathama Śruta-Skandha**, **Prathama Adhyayana** which was linguistically re-edited by the author and published by the P.J.V.V. Fund, Ahmedabad, 1997. All this kind of work is done to restore the original form of Ardhamāgadhī which was nearer to and resembled Pāli in the phonetic nature of the medial consonants of its vocables.

We are grateful to Prof. Paul Dundas who wrote the FOREWORD to this edition. After going through my book '**Prācīna Ardhamāgadhī Kī Khoj** meṁ' he expressed the view that "only by challenging longheld presuppositions will scholarship on ancient texts be advanced" and so we thought it proper to request him to write the FOREWORD.

Now we are grateful to the Prakrit Text Society and its new office bearers Dr. N.J. Shah (President) and Dr. R.M. Shah (Hon. Secy.) for publishing this English version.

**K. R. Chandra,**  
Hon. Secy., P.J.V.V. Fund.

## IX

## Foreword to The Original Hindi Edition

### एक विशिष्ट प्रयत्न

कई विद्वानों ने जैनागम-आचारांग का समय ई.स.पूर्व ३०० के आसपास रखा है किन्तु अब तक किसी विद्वान् ने उस समय में लिखे गये अशोक के शिलालेखों की भाषा के साथ आचारांग की भाषा की तुलना नहीं की। किसी को यह विचार भी नहीं आया कि जब दोनों का लगभग एक ही समय है तब भाषा में इतना अन्तर क्यों ? दूसरी बात यह है कि भ. महावीर और भ. बुद्ध दोनों ने अपने उपदेश बिहार में दिये हैं तो उस प्रदेश की भाषा में ही दिये होंगे तब फिर जैनागम और पालि पिटक की भाषा में भी समानता क्यों नहीं ?

इन्हीं प्रश्नों को लेकर डॉ.के.ऋषभ चन्द्र ने सर्व प्रथम अशोक के लेख, पालि पिटक और जैनागम-आचारांग की भाषा का अभ्यास करने का प्रयत्न किया है। मैं साक्षी हूँ कि इसके लिए उन्होंने अपने अभ्यास की सामग्री लगभग ७५ हजार कार्डों में एकत्र की हैं। आचारांग के साथ साथ सूत्रकृतांग, ऋषिभाषित, उत्तराध्ययन, दशवैकालिक, सुत्तनिपात और अशोक के शिलालेखों के शब्दों के संस्कृत रूपान्तर के साथ कार्ड तैयार करवाये हैं। इसी सामग्री का प्रस्तुत ग्रन्थ “प्राचीन अर्धमागधी की खोज में” में उपयोग किया गया है। उन्होंने इस समस्या के समाधान के लिए जो लेख लिखे उन्हीं का संग्रह प्रस्तुत ग्रन्थ में है।

प्रस्तुत ग्रन्थ एक छोटी सी पुस्तिका ही है परन्तु उसके पीछे डॉ.चन्द्र का कई वर्षों का प्रयत्न है - यह हमें भूलना नहीं चाहिए। जैनागमों के संशोधन की प्रक्रिया शताधिक वर्षों से चल रही है किन्तु उस प्रक्रिया को एक नयी दिशा यह पुस्तिका दे रही है यह यहाँ ध्यान देने की बात है और इसके लिए विद्वज्जगत् डॉ. चन्द्र का आभारी रहेगा इसमें कोई संशय नहीं है।

विशेष रूप से भगवान् महावीर ने जिस भाषा में उपदेश दिया वह अर्धमागधी मानी जाती है तो उसका मूल स्वरूप क्या हो सकता है यह डॉ. चन्द्र के संशोधन का विषय है। इसीलिए उन्होंने प्रकाशित जैन आगमों के पाठों की परंपरा का परीक्षण किया है और दिखाने का प्रयत्न किया गया है कि भाषा के मूल स्वरूप को बिना जाने ही प्रकाशन हुआ है या किया गया है, अन्यथा एक ही पेरा में एक ही शब्द के जो विविध रूप मिलते हैं वह संभव नहीं था। उन्होंने प्रयत्न किया है कि प्राचीन अर्धमागधी का क्या और कैसा स्वरूप हो सकता है उसे प्रस्थापित किया जाय। आचार्य हेमचन्द्र के प्राकृत व्याकरण का भी नयी दृष्टि से किया गया अध्ययन प्रस्तुत ग्रन्थ में मिलेगा।

उदाहरण के तौर पर 'क्षेत्रज्ञ' शब्द के विविध प्राकृत रूपों को लेकर तथा आचारांग के उपोद्धातरूप प्रथम वाक्य को लेकर जो चर्चा भाषा की दृष्टि से की गयी है वह यह दिखाने के लिए है कि जो अभी तक मुद्रण हुआ है वह भाषा-विज्ञान की दृष्टि से कितना अधूरा है।

डॉ. चन्द्र का यह सर्व प्रथम प्रयत्न प्रशंसा के योग्य है। इतना ही नहीं किन्तु जैनागम के संपादन की प्रक्रिया को नयी दिशा का बोध देने वाला भी है और जो आगम संपादन में रस ले रहे हैं वे सभी डॉ. चन्द्र के आभारी रहेंगे।

८ ओपेरा सोसायटी  
अहमदाबाद-७  
ता. ११-१२-९१

दलसुख मालवणिया

## Abbreviations

Ācā.	:	Ācārāṅga-Sūtra
Adh.	:	Adhyāya = Chapter
Āgamo.	:	Āgamodaya Samiti, Mehsana
Āgamodaya	:	Āgamodaya Samiti, Mehsana
Alsdorf	:	Ludwig Alsdorf
Ch.	:	Chapter
Charpe.	:	Jarl Charpentier
Cū.	:	Cūrṇi
Geiger	:	W. Geiger
Isibhā.	:	Isibhāsiyāim
Jambu.	:	Muni Jambuvijayaji
JVB.	:	Jain Vishva Bharati, Ladnun
Kliene Schriften	:	Ludwig Alsdorf
Ludwig Alsdorf	:	Kleine Schriften
Mehendale	:	M.A.Mehendale
MJV.	:	Mahavir Jain Vidyalay, Bombay
No.	:	Number
p.	:	Page
PP.	:	Pages
Pischel	:	R.Pischel
PTS.	:	Prakrit Text Society, Ahmedabad
Punya.	:	Muni Puṇyavijayaji
Schub., Schubring	:	Walther Schubring
Śīlāṅka.	:	Śīlāṅkācārya
Sū.	:	Sūtra No.
Sū.Kṛ.	:	Sūtrakṛtāṅga-Sūtra
Sen.	:	Sukumar Sen
Udde.	:	Uddeśaka
Utta.	:	Uttarādhyayana.
Vivāhapa.	:	Vyākhyāprajñapti

## Reference Works

1. Ācārāṅga-cūrṇi, Shri Rishabhadev Kesharimal, Ratlam, 1941 and corrected textual readings by Muni Puṇyavijayaji in the Ācā.Cūrṇi, L.D.Inst. of Indology, Ms. No. 15880.
2. Ācārātṅga Sūtra, Erster Śrutaskandha, Walther Schubring, Leipzig, 1910
3. Ācārāṅgasūtram, Nirvyukti evaṁ vṛtti, Āgamodaya Samiti, Mehsana, 1916
4. Aṅgasuttāṇī, Āgama-śabda-kośa, Part I, Jaina Vishva Bharati, Ladnun, 1980
5. Ashoka Ke Abhilekha : Dr.Rajbali Pandey, Varanasi, V.S.2020
6. Āvassayasuttam, See Dasaveyāliyasuttam.
7. Āyāraṅgasuttam, Muni Jambuvijayaji, MJV. Bombay, 1976
8. Āyāro, Muni Nathmal, Yuvācārya Mahāprajña, Jain Vishva Bharati, Ladnun, 1974
9. Cittasambhūta, vide Ludwig Alsdorf, Kleine Schriften, Wiesbaden, 1974, P.186
10. Comparative Grammar of Prakrit Languages, R. Pischel, Varanasi, 1965.
11. A Comparative Grammar of Middle Indo-Aryan, Sukumar Sen, Deccan College, Poona, 1960
12. Dasaveyāliyasuttam, Uttarajjhayanāim, Āvassaya-suttam, Muni Puṇyavijayaji, MJV. Bombay, 1977
13. Historical Grammar of Inscriptional Prakrits, M.A. Mehendale, Deccan College, Poona, 1948

14. Isibhāsiyāim, W.Schubring, L.D.Instt.of Indology, Ahmedabad, 1974
15. Itthīparinnā (Sūtrakṛtāṅga, I.4), vide Ludwig Alsdorf, Kliene Schriften, Wiesbaden, 1974
16. Kalpasūtra, Muni Puṇyavijayaji, Sarabhai Manilal Nawab (Gujarati), Ahmedabad, 1952
17. Ludwig Alsdorf, Kleine Schriften, Wiesbaden, 1974
18. Pāiya-Sadda-Mahaṇṇavo, Pt. Hargovinddas Seth, Prakrit Text Society, Varanasi, 1963
19. Pali Literature and Language, W. Geiger (English by B. Ghosh) 1968.
20. The Prakrit Grammarians, Nitti Dolchi, Motilal Banarasidas, Banaras, 1972
21. Prākṛta Vyākaraṇa, (Gujarati), Pt.Bechardas Doshi, University Grants Commission Board, Ahmedabad, 1978
22. Prākṛta Vyākaraṇam (Prakrit Grammar) Ācārya Hemacandra, ed. Prof. P.L.Vaidya, 1928
23. Sūtrakṛtāṅgasūtra, Part I, Muni Puṇyavijāyaji, PTS. Ahmedabad, 1975.
24. Suttanipāta, P.V.Bapat, Poona, 1924
25. Sūyagaḍaṅga -suttam, Muni Jambuvijay, MJV, Bombay, 1978
26. Uttarajjhayaṇāim, See Dasaveyāliya-suttam.
27. Uttarādhyayan Sūtra, J. Charpentier, New Delhi, 1980

## Publications of Prakrit Text Society

Series No.	Name of the Book	Price
१.	अंगविज्जा (Re-Print)	३५०/-
२.	प्राकृत पैगलम् भाग-१	१६/-
३.	चउपत्रमहापुरिसचरियं	२१/-
४.	प्राकृत पैगलम् भाग-२	१५/-
५.	आख्यानकमणिकोश-वृत्ति	२१/-
६.	पउमचरियं, भाग-१	२८/-
७.	पाइय-सद्-महण्णवो	५०/-
८.	पासनाहचरिउ	२५/-
९.	नन्दीसूत्र-चूर्णी	१०/-
१०.	नन्दीसूत्र-वृत्ति	१५/-
११.	प्राकृत सर्वस्व	२०/-
१२.	पउमचरियं, भाग-२	३२/-
१३.	कथाकोश	३०/-
१४.	वज्जालगं	२१/-
१५.	मूलशुद्धि	२०/-
१६.	पुहईचंदचरियं	३०/-
१७.	दशकालियचूर्णी-प्रताकार	३०/-
१७.	दशकालियचूर्णी-पुस्तकाकार	४५/-
१८.	गउडवहो	२५/-
१९.	सूत्रकृतांग-चूर्णि-प्रताकार	२५/-
१९.	सूत्रकृतांग-चूर्णि-पुस्तकाकार	३०/-
२०.	सेतुबन्धम्	४०/-
२१.	गाहाकोस	३५/-
२२.	प्राकृताध्याय	५/-
२३.	अपभ्रंश व्याकरण	८/-
२४.	तारायण (तारागण)	२०/-
२५.	हरिवंशपुराण भाग-२	५०/-
२६.	समकितविचार	३०/-



२७.	हरिवंशपुराण भाग-१	४०/-
२८.	A Study of Bhagavatī - Sūtra	१३०/-
२९.	महानिसीह सुयक्खंध	१००/-
३०.	खिण्णेमिचरिउ (हरिवंशपुराण प्रकाश्यमान) भाग-३(१)	१५०/-
३१.	खिण्णेमिचरिउ (हरिवंशपुराण प्रकाश्यमान) भाग-३(२)	२००/-
३२.	दोहा गीती कोश	९०/-
३३.	इसिभासियाई का प्राकृत-संस्कृत शब्द-कोश	६०/-
३४.	जिनागमों की भूल भाषा	१२०/-
३५.	IN SEARCH OF THE ORIGINAL ARDHAMĀGADHĪ -	१००/-
३६.	संदेश-रसक भाग -१	६५/-
	संदेश-रसक भाग -२	६५/-
३७	खिण्णेमिचरियउ Pt. IV(1)	७५/-
३८.	प्रवचनसार की अशेष प्राकृत - संस्कृत शब्दानुक्रमणिका	६०/-
३९	सिरिभयण सुंदरी कहा (कथाखंड)	२५०/-
४०.	प्राकृत भाषाओं का तुलनात्मक व्याकरण	४०/-

## 1. THE STATE OF ARDHAMĀGADHĪ IN VARIOUS EDITIONS OF THE JAINA CANONICAL (ĀGAMIC) TEXTS

We do not find uniformity (particularly pertaining to the phonetic changes) in the various editions of the Ardhamāgadhī Jaina Canonical (*Āgama*) texts. Due to change in places and circumstances, and passing of time, linguistic changes have taken place in textual readings; even then we do find some archaic variants of textual readings preserved to some extent. In some book or some edition some readings which are of very old stage in some places, are found along with some other of later period in the same edition. These points are here highlighted with due illustrations, with the hope that on the basis of the available data itself we may be able to preserve the archaic form of the language of the Jaina *Āgamas* to whatever extent, by re-editing them.

### (A) Changes In The Textual Readings Of The Ardhamāgadhī *Āgama* Texts

From the point of view of the linguistic changes in the textual readings of the Jaina *Āgamic* texts, the remarks made by the very serious researcher, Āgama Prabhākara Muni Śrī Puṇyavijayajī in the Introduction to his edition of the *Kalpasūtra*<sup>1</sup> are very important. The gist of his opinion in this matter is as follows :-

- (1) There is much variation in all the manuscripts from linguistic point of view.
- (2) We do not have for our reference the ancient manuscripts on the basis of which the authors of the *Cūrṇis* and the commentators adopted their readings or their norms.
- (3) It is necessary to seriously think afresh about original textual readings.
- (4) The readings adopted by the authors of the *Cūrṇis* are not found in any of the manuscripts.

- (5) As to the general loss of medial unaspirate consonants and the change of medial aspirate consonants to 'h', this rule had not been much prevalent.
- (6) The later *Ācāryas* have deliberately introduced changes in readings, or they have done so due to lack of understanding of ancient usages on their part. Inspite of all this, some original readings have survived in many places.
- (7) During later period the Prakrit language got mixed up, like hotch-potch, in all regions, and consequently the language of the Jaina *Āgama* texts too has got mixed up likewise.<sup>2</sup>
- (8) Due to all these reasons it has become very difficult to find out the state of the original language of the Jaina Ardhamāgadhī *Āgamas*. These changes have occurred in every text of the *Āgamas*, the *Bhāṣyas* and the *Cūrṇis*.
- (9) The Prakrit Grammar of Hemacandra is not an adequate means for the purpose of critical research.

Out of the points, enumerated above by Muni Śrī Puṇyavijayajī, Nos. 3, 5, 6 and 9 are highly important. In the course of our studies and researches, the present author too has been convinced that the Jaina *Āgamas* call for a re-editing from the linguistic point of view.

### (B) Some Examples Of The Changes That Have Occurred In The Ancient Language In The Course Of Time

The process by which the changes have occurred in the original ancient language of the Jaina *Āgamas* can be illustrated by means of some usages :

- (1) The word '*JĪVITA*'
  - (a) '*sabbesaṃ jīvitaṃ piyaṃ*' - Dhammapada, 130
  - (b) '*savvesiṃ jīvitaṃ piyaṃ*' - Ācā., 78. (MJV.)

The word '*jīvita*' is found to be identical in both the

**Dhammapada** and the **Ācārāṅga**, since Buddha and Mahāvīra were contemporaries; this should be born in mind. The change that occurred in the case of this word can be clearly seen in the edition of the latter work by Prof. Walther Schübring. The reading in his edition is as follows :

(c) 'savvesim̐ jīviyaṁ piyaṁ' - Ācā. p.8, l.25. Here, the influence of the Prakrit Grammarians' rule pertaining to phonetic change can be clearly seen in the case of the reading 'jīviyaṁ'.

### (2) The word 'KṢETRAJÑA'

Various variants of the word, 'kṣetrajñā' are found in the Ācā., Sū.Kṛ. (MJV.) as preserved in the manuscripts of these works, such as, *khettanna*, *khetanna*, *khedanna*, *kheyanna*, *kheanna*, *khettanṇa*, *khetanṇa*, *khedanṇa*, *kheyanṇa*, *kheanṇa*.<sup>3</sup>

The question here arises is : Were all these different forms of this word prevalent in usage contemporaneously, i.e., at the same period of time and in the same region ? It is quite clear that the above list of the variant forms contains the usages of the Māgadhī Prakrit (eastern region), the Śaurasenī Prakrit (northern region) and the Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit (western region) of India. The last five forms are clearly due to the influence of Prakrit grammarians, and they have been introduced in the later period.

### (3) The word 'ĀTMAN'

In the Ācā. all the three forms of this word, viz., *attā*, *ātā* and *āyā* are used. Here the usage 'āyā' is clearly a later usage; is it not ? The form has been derived by the elision of the medial 't' and the influence of the Prakrit grammarians is obvious therein.

In the *Itthīparinnā* (Sū. Kṛ. 1.4.2.22) Alsdorf<sup>4</sup> has adopted the usage 'ajjhatta' for the word 'adhyātma', as in 'ajjhatta visuddhe', while in other editions of the work the form is 'ajjhattha', as found in 'ajjhattha visuddhe'; it is ob-

viously a later usage.

(4) The word '*MOKṢA*' (Uttarā., Ch. 4.3.)

(a) *mokkhu* (Pun̄yavijayaḡ, MJV.); variants *mukkhu*, *mukkha*.

(b) *mukkha* (Charpentier's Edn.).

The change of the vowel 'O' to 'u' before a conjunct consonant, in the above illustration, is due to the influence of the later linguistic usage.

(5) The use of the consonant 'L' =  $\overline{\omega}$  (Vedic)

The Prakrit grammarians hold that the use of 'l' was confined to Pāli and Paīśācī only. But, its usage in some or other way has been found to have survived in the Ācārāṅga Sūtra and the Sūtrakṛtāṅga, as for instance :

*leḡu* and *leḡum̄si* (Ācā. vide Pischel, 379) ;

*leḡunā* (Ācā. vide Pischel, 304, 379)

In the modern editions we find 'l' in the place of 'l'. This is a fine illustration of the way in which the old usage disappeared.

(6) The following variants clearly show the peculiarities of the later linguistic usages :

MJV. Edn. of the  
Ācārāṅga

*aṇitiyaṁ*

*sahasammuiyā*<sup>5</sup>

*aṇupuvvīya*

*pamajjiyā*

*gacche*

*samabhijāṇiyā*

Variants in MSS. and  
other Edns. of the Ācā.

*aṇiccam̄* (1.1.5.45)

*sahasammuiē* (1.1.1.2)

*aṇupuvvīē* (1.8.8.230)

*pamajjiḡjā* (1.9.1.273)

*gacche(jḡjā)* (2.15.786)

*samabhijāṇijḡjā* (1.6.3.187 ;  
8.4.214)

The above variants have been adopted as the original readings in some or other of the editions of the Ācārāṅgasūtra.

(7) About the Prakrit reading for the expression  
'*ŚRUTAM ME BHAGAVATĀ*'

- (a) The **Ācā.** (MJV.) has the following reading in the very beginning : *suyam me āusam teṇam bhagavayā evamakkhāyam* (1.1.1.1).
- (b) The **Vijayodayā-ṭīkā**<sup>6</sup> on the **Mūlārāadhanā** reads as follows :  
*sudam me āussamto bhagavadā evamakkhādām*
- (c) At one place the **Sū. Kr.** (2.2.694) reads as follows :  
*sutam me āusamteṇa bhagavatā evamakkhātām* (MJV.)
- (d) In the beginning of each of the *Adhyayanās* of the **Isibhāsiyāim**, there is the following reading : *arahatā . . . . . buitām*, wherein the consonant 't' has been preserved, while in the other readings mentioned above, in one case the 't' has changed to 'd', and in the other one 't' has been replaced by 'y'.
- (8) Illustrations of recurring usages of later period in the Manuscripts due to phonetic change :

(a) (Published text-reading) <sup>7</sup>	(Variants in the Mss.)	(Sūtra No.)
<i>picchāe</i>	<i>pimchāe</i>	Ācā. 52
<i>pucchāe</i>	<i>pumchāe</i>	" "
<i>mattā</i> <sup>8</sup>	<i>maṃtā</i>	Ācā. (Schü. edn.)p.4.15
<i>egadā</i>	<i>egatā</i>	Ācā. 79
<i>ṇassati</i>	<i>ṇāsati</i>	" "
<i>etaṃ</i>	<i>eyam</i>	" "
<i>paveditaṃ</i>	<i>pavetiyaṃ</i>	" "
<i>adhe</i>	<i>ahe</i>	" 1
<i>thībhi</i>	<i>thīhi</i>	" 84
<i>abhikkamtaṃ</i>	<i>ahikamtaṃ</i>	1.2.1.5.
		(JVB. Edn.)
<i>vipariyāsam</i>	<i>vivajjāsam</i>	Sū. Kr. .
	<i>vivariyam</i>	1.1.4.9

(b) The Readings in the Mss. of *Ācārāṅga-Cūrṇī* :

For	<i>mattā</i>	<i>maṁtā</i>	Ācā.	40
"	<i>logaṁ</i>	<i>loyaṁ</i>	"	20
"	<i>kūrāṇi</i>	<i>kurāim</i>	"	82
"	<i>kammāṇi</i>	<i>kammāim</i>	"	"
"	<i>parivaṁdaṇa</i>	<i>pariyamdaṇa</i>	"	7
"	<i>atithibale</i>	<i>atidhibale</i>	"	79

(9) Similar instances of readings with phonetic changes in the *Suttanipāta* in Pāli are notable :

Thus, we find *pahaṁsamāṇo* for *pahassamāṇo* (50.10) and *vītaraṁsī* for *vītaraṁsī* (55.41)

It is clear how linguistic changes go on creeping into the archaic form of the language, with passing time.

(C) Peculiarities Of The Two Editions (Schū. and Jambū.)  
Of The *Ācārāṅga*

Schübring<sup>9</sup> has adopted the readings with the elision of medial unaspirate consonants and with the change of the aspirate consonants to 'h', thus he has literally followed the rules of the Prakrit grammarians. On the other hand Muniśrī Jambūvijayaṇī<sup>10</sup> has retained the medial consonant in its original form in his edition. Schübring has adopted the readings with the complete elision of the medial 'r', and 'tā', 'ti', 'tu', 'tum', 'to', of the terminations of cases, tenses and those of the participles, etc., while actually we find, in the very ancient Palmleaf Ms. (A) utilised by him, the occurrence of the termination 'ti', of the present tense to the extent of 50 per cent; we do not find 'i', in the place of 'ti', everywhere<sup>11</sup> in the Ms. The elision of the medial 'r', is comparatively very less in the edition of Muniśrī Jambūvijayaṇī. In Schübring's edition the elision of the medial consonants exceeds 50%, while in that of Muniśrī Jambūvijayaṇī it is 25% only.<sup>12</sup>

In Schübring's edition the initial dental 'n', the dental 'n' of the indeclinable, the medial and initial 'ny' as 'nn',

the medial 'nn', the change of the initial and medial 'jñ', to only 'n' and 'nn' are found, while in the editions of Muniśrī Jambūvijayajī we find 'n', and 'nn', in all these cases. From the point of view of the gradual evolution of the Prakrit (i.e. MIA.) languages, Jambūvijayajī has adopted the peculiarities of the Prakrit of later period, while Schübring has adopted here those of the Prakrit of the ancient period.<sup>13</sup>

The guttural and the palatal nasals 'ñ' and 'ñ̃' occurring in the conjunct consonants of the same class, are found retained in Schübring's edition, while in the editions of Muniśrī Jambūvijayajī these nasals have been changed to the nasal dot (*anusvāra*). This practice is the one of modernizing in a way those of the ancient times.<sup>14</sup>

Thus, it is proved that different editors have adopted different norms in editing ancient texts, and have not given importance to ancient usages in view of the antiquity of those texts.

#### (D) The Words And Terminations with Various Phonetic Changes in Different Editions.

##### (1) The Readings of the Ācārāṅga :

Schü.	Āgamo.	JVB.	MJV.	Sūtra No.
(a) Phonetic change :				
<i>k = k, g, y</i>				
<i>logāvāī</i>	<i>loyāvādī</i>	<i>logāvāī</i>	<i>logāvādī</i>	1.1.1.3
<i>logaṁ</i>	<i>loyaṁ</i>	<i>logaṁ</i>	<i>logaṁ</i>	1.1.3.22
<i>logaṁsi</i>	<i>logaṁsi</i>	<i>logaṁsi</i>	<i>logaṁsi</i>	1.1.1.9
<i>mahova-</i>	<i>mahova-</i>	<i>mahova-</i>	<i>mahova-</i>	
<i>garaṇaṁ</i>	<i>garaṇaṁ</i>	<i>garaṇaṁ</i>	<i>karaṇaṁ</i>	1.2.4.82
<i>bahugā</i>	<i>bahugā</i>	<i>bahugā</i>	<i>bahuyā</i>	1.2.4.82
<i>j = j, y</i>				
<i>viyahittu</i>	<i>viyahittā</i>	<i>vijahittu</i>	<i>vijahittā</i>	1.1.3.20
<i>t = t, a, y</i>				
<i>bhagavayā</i>	<i>bhagavatā</i>	<i>bhagavayā</i>	<i>bhagavatā</i>	1.1.1.7
<i>paveiyā</i>	<i>paveiā</i>	<i>paveiyā</i>	<i>paveditā</i>	1.1.1.7
<i>paveiyā</i>	<i>paveditā</i>	<i>paveditā</i>	<i>paveditā</i>	1.1.1.24



Schü.	Āgamo.	JVB.	MJV.	Sūtra No.
<i>annayariō</i>	<i>aṇṇayariō</i>	<i>aṇṇayariō</i>	<i>annatarīto</i>	1.1.1.1
"	"	"	<i>annatarīo</i>	1.1.1.2
<i>ahiyāe</i>	<i>aḥiāe</i>	<i>ahiyāe</i>	<i>ahitāe</i>	1.1.2.1
<i>bhavai</i>	<i>bhavai</i>	<i>bhavai</i>	<i>bhavati</i>	1.1.1.1 (twice)
d = d, y				
<i>kammāvāi</i>	<i>kammāvādī</i>	<i>kammāvāi</i>	<i>kammāvādī</i>	1.1.1.3
<i>paḍisaṃ- veei</i>	<i>paḍisaṃ- vedei</i>	<i>paḍisaṃ- vedei</i>	<i>paḍisaṃ- vedayati</i>	1.1.1.6
<i>uyarami</i>	<i>udarami</i>	<i>uyarami</i>	<i>udarami</i>	1.1.2.15
<i>udaya-</i>	<i>udaya-</i>	<i>udaya-</i>	<i>udaya-</i>	1.1.3.26
dh = dh, h				
<i>ahedisāo</i>	<i>ahodisāo</i>	<i>ahedisāo</i>	<i>adhedisāto</i>	1.1.1.1
n = n, ṇ				
<i>no</i>	<i>ṇo</i>	<i>ṇo</i>	<i>ṇo</i>	1.1.1.1
<i>natthi</i>	<i>natthi</i>	<i>ṇatthi</i>	<i>ṇatthi</i>	1.1.1.1
jñ = n-, ṇ-, nn-, ṇṇ-				
<i>nāyam</i>	<i>ṇāyam</i>	<i>ṇātām</i>	<i>ṇātām</i>	1.1.1.1
<i>samaṇunne</i>	<i>samaṇunne</i>	<i>samaṇuṇṇe</i>	<i>samaṇuṇṇe</i>	1.1.1.4
nn = nn, ṇṇ				
<i>ainnāyā- ṇam</i>	<i>adinnādā- ṇam</i>	<i>adinnādā- ṇam</i>	<i>adinnādā- ṇam</i>	1.1.3.26
<i>chinnam</i>	<i>chiṇṇam</i>	<i>chinnam</i>	<i>chiṇṇam</i>	1.1.5.45
ny = nn, ṇṇ				
<i>annayariō</i>	<i>aṇṇayariō</i>	<i>aṇṇayariō</i>	<i>annatarīto</i>	1.1.1.1
<i>annesim</i>	<i>aṇṇesim</i>	<i>aṇṇesim</i>	<i>aṇṇesim</i>	1.1.1.2
(b) Nominal Suffixes :				
<i>cuo</i>	<i>cue</i>	<i>cuo</i>	<i>cute</i>	1.1.1.1
<i>aṇegā</i>	<i>aṇege</i>	<i>aṇegā</i>	<i>aṇegā</i>	1.1.3.26
<i>annayara- mmi</i>	<i>aṇṇayara- ṇṇmi</i>	<i>aṇṇayara- ṇṇsi</i>	<i>aṇṇayara- ṇṇmi</i>	1.2.6.96

Schü.	Āgamo.	JVB.	MJV.	Sūtra No.
(c) Verbal forms :				
<i>addakkhū</i>	<i>addakkhū</i>	<i>adakkhū</i>	<i>adakkhū</i>	1.9.1.27
<i>sahae</i>	<i>sahaī</i>	<i>sahate</i>	<i>sahatī</i>	1.2.6.98
<i>paḍisaṇi-veei</i>	<i>paḍisaṇi-vedei</i>	<i>paḍisaṇi-vedei</i>	<i>paḍisaṇi-dayati</i>	1.1.1.6
<i>aṇupāliya</i>	<i>aṇupālijjā</i>	<i>aṇupāliya</i>	<i>aṇupāliya</i>	1.1.3.20

(d) Participle :

<i>vijahittu</i>	<i>vijahittā</i>	<i>vijahittu</i>	<i>vijahittā</i>	1.1.3.20
------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	----------

(2) Readings of the Itthīparinnā (Sū. Kṛ. 1.4) :

Alsdorf	MJV.	JVB.	Puṇya.	Udde.& Sū.
---------	------	------	--------	------------

(a) Phonetic changes :

*k* = *k*, *g*, *y*

<i>egayā</i>	<i>egatā</i>	<i>ekadā</i>	<i>ekadā</i>	1. 14
<i>sāviyā</i>	<i>sāviyā</i>	<i>sāvikā</i>	<i>sāviyā</i>	1. 26
<i>uvakasanti</i>	<i>uvakasanti</i>	<i>uvakasanti</i>	—	1. 20
<i>uvagasitt-</i>	<i>uvagasitt-</i>	<i>uvagasitt</i>	-	-
<i>āṇaṇi</i>	<i>āṇaṇi</i>	<i>āṇaṇi</i>		1. 7
<i>-jāiyā</i>	<i>-jātikā</i>	<i>-jātikā</i>	<i>-jāiyā</i>	2. 19
<i>-pāgāe</i>	<i>-pāgāe</i>	<i>-pāgāe</i>	<i>-pāyāya</i>	2. 5

*g* = *g*, *a*

<i>bhoga-</i>	<i>bhoga-</i>	<i>bhoga-</i>	<i>bhoga-</i>	2. 1
<i>mie</i>	<i>mie</i>	<i>mie</i>	<i>mie</i>	1. 9
(= <i>mrgaḥ</i> )				

*j* = *j*, *a*

<i>œ</i>	<i>oje</i>	<i>œ</i>	<i>œ</i>	2. 1
<i>teyasā</i>	<i>teyasā</i>	<i>teyasā</i>	<i>teyasā</i>	1. 21
<i>t</i> = <i>t</i> , <i>d</i> , <i>y</i>				
<i>-jāiyā</i>	<i>-jātikā</i>	<i>-jātikā</i>	<i>-jāiyā</i>	2. 19
<i>sarapāda-</i>	<i>sarapāda-</i>	<i>sarapāya-</i>	<i>sarapāda-</i>	
<i>gaṇi</i>	<i>gaṇi</i>	<i>gaṇi</i>	<i>gaṇi</i>	2. 13

THE STATE OF ARDHAMĀGADHĪ IN VARIOUS EDITIONS OF THE JAINA  
CANONICAL (ĀGAMIC) TEXTS

Alsdorf	MJV.	JVB.	Puṇya. Udde.& Sū.
<i>th = dh, h</i>			
<i>gorahagaṃ</i>	<i>gorahagaṃ</i>	<i>gorahagaṃ</i>	<i>goradhagaṃ</i> 2. 13
<i>aha</i>	<i>aha</i>	<i>aha</i>	<i>adha</i> 1.18 ; 2.2
<i>d = d, y, t</i>			
<i>egayā</i>	<i>egatā</i>	<i>egayā</i>	<i>egatā</i> 1. 4
"	"	<i>ekadā</i>	<i>ekadā</i> 1. 14
<i>ādaṃsagaṃ</i>	<i>ādaṃsagaṃ</i>	<i>āyaṃsagaṃ</i>	<i>ātaṃsagaṃ</i> 2. 11
<i>dh = dh, h</i>			
<i>ahe</i>	<i>ahe</i>	<i>ahe</i>	<i>adhe</i> 1. 3

(b) Nominal forms, Verbal forms and Participles :

<i>āiṭṭho</i>	<i>āiṭṭho</i>	<i>āiṭṭho</i>	<i>āiṭṭhe</i> 1. 19
<i>-pāgāe</i>	<i>-pāgāe</i>	<i>-pāgāe</i>	<i>-pāyāya</i> 2. 5
"	"	"	<i>-pātāe</i> 2. 10
<i>āghāe</i>	<i>āghāti</i>	<i>āghāe</i>	<i>āghāti</i> 1. 11
<i>saṃṭhavantī</i>	<i>saṃṭhavaṃti</i>	<i>saṃṭhavaṃti</i>	— 2. 17
<i>pavesāhi</i>	<i>pavesehi</i>	<i>pavesehi</i>	<i>pavesehi</i> 2. 11
<i>ādāya</i>	<i>āyāe</i>	<i>āyāe</i>	— 1. 10

(c) Some more examples from the Itthīparinnā (Sū. Kṛ. 1.4) :

(Sutra No.)	(Sanskrit)	(Prakrit)	(Editions)
1.4.1.25	<i>rukṣam</i>	<i>lūham</i> (other Edns.)	<i>rukṣham</i> (JVB.)
1.4.1.17	<i>grhāṇi</i>	<i>gihāṇi</i> (Puṇya.)	<i>gihāṃ</i> (other Edns.)
1.4.1.2	<i>sūkṣmeṇa</i>	<i>suhumena</i> (Alsdorf)	<i>suhumeṇa</i> (other Edns.)
1.4.1.24	<i>vācā</i>	<i>vāyā</i> (Alsdorf)	<i>vāyāi, vāyāe</i> (other Edns.)
1.4.1.16	<i>ātmahitāya</i>	<i>ātahitāya</i> (MJV.)	<i>āyahiyāe</i> (other Edns.)
1.4.1.15	<i>bhavanti</i>	<i>bhavaṃti</i> (Puṇya.)	<i>horṃti</i> (other Edns.)

(Sutra No.)	(Sanskrit)	(Prakrit)	(Editions)
1.4.1.9	<i>mucyate</i>	<i>muccae</i> (Alsdorf)	<i>muccatī</i> , <i>muccai</i> (other Edns.)
1.4.1.31	<i>icchet</i>	<i>icche</i> (other Edns.)	<i>icchejja</i> (Puṇya.)
1.4.1.12	<i>viharet</i>	<i>vihare</i> ( “ )	<i>viharejja</i> (Alsdorf)

## (3) Sūtrakṛtāṅga 1.6 :

(MJV.)	(JVB.)	(Ch. Sūtra No.)
<i>pannasā</i>	<i>paṇṇayā</i>	1. 6. 8
<i>mahīya</i>	<i>mahīe</i>	1. 6. 13

This presents a clear picture as to how the scribes and editors are influenced by the words and forms of later period, as also the fact that ancient usage of words and forms too have survived.

## (4) Isibhāsiyāim :

(Schübring)	(MJV.)	(Chapter)
<i>cauttham</i>	<i>catuttham</i>	1
<i>uvahāṇavam</i>	<i>uvadhāṇavam</i>	1
<i>āyāti</i>	<i>āyāi</i>	2
<i>bhavidavvam</i>	<i>bhavitavvam</i>	3
<i>koham</i>	<i>kodham</i>	“
<i>jadhā</i>	<i>jahā</i>	“
<i>parinnātā</i>	<i>pariṇṇātā</i>	“
<i>vedaṇā</i>	<i>veyaṇā</i>	11
<i>ghaṭṭati</i>	<i>ghaṭṭai</i>	“

## (5) Uttarādhyayana :

(a) (Charpentier)	(Alsdorf, p. 150)	(Ch. Sūtra)
<i>sambhūya</i>	<i>sambhūta</i>	13. 11

(b) (MJV.) <sup>15</sup>	(JVB.)	(Ch. SŪtra)
<i>kāmabhoe</i>	<i>kāmabhoge</i>	13. 34
<i>bhogāim</i>	<i>bhogāini</i>	13. 20
(c) (Charpe.)	(JVB.)	(MJV.)
<i>niyānapayaḍā</i>	<i>niyānappagaḍā</i>	<i>nidānapagaḍā</i> 13. 8
<i>uccoyae</i>	<i>uccoyae</i>	<i>uccodae</i> 13. 13
<i>kammāim</i>	<i>kammāini</i>	<i>kammāni</i> 13. 26
<i>mahālayāim</i>	<i>mahālayāini</i>	<i>mahālayāni</i> 13. 26
<i>sesāni</i>	<i>sesāni</i>	<i>sesāim</i> 26. 28
<i>cautthii</i>	<i>cautthie</i>	<i>cautthii</i> 26. 12

(6) Ācārāṅga-niryukti, Adhyāya 1 (Āgamodaya Samiti)

(Niryukti)	(GāthāNo.)	(Consonant)	(Gāthā quoted)	(Page No.)
<i>ekkā</i>	19	(k)	<i>egā</i>	4
<i>solasagam</i>	20	"	<i>solasayam</i>	5
<i>saṃjoge</i>	20	(g)	<i>saṃjoe</i>	5
<i>pagai</i>	29	(t)	<i>payati</i>	5
<i>gaimāhāro</i>	30	"	<i>gati-āhāre</i>	6
<i>payasahassio</i>	30	(d)	<i>padasahasio</i>	
<i>aṭṭhapaeso</i>	42	"	<i>aṭṭhapadeso</i>	10
<i>nissamgayā</i>	34	(n)	<i>ṇissamgayā</i>	7
<i>saṇṇā</i>	63	(jñ)	<i>sannā</i>	12

Nominal and Verbal forms

<i>ācālo</i>	7	<i>ācāle</i>	2
<i>gaimāhāro</i>	30	<i>gati āhāre</i>	6
<i>jāṇijjā</i>	4	<i>jaṇejjā</i>	4

(7) The Readings of Ācārāṅga quoted in other work :

Ācārāṅga (MJV.)	Vijayodayā Tīkā <sup>16</sup> of the Mūlārādhana	Sūtra No.
<i>uvātikkamte</i>	<i>upātikkamte</i>	214
<i>ahā</i>	<i>athā</i>	(yathā)
<i>-pāyam</i>	<i>-pattam</i>	588

Ācārāṅga (MJV.)	Vijayodayā Ṭikā	Sūtra
<i>maṭṭiyā-tahappagāraṃ</i>	<i>maṭṭiga-tathāppakāraṃ</i>	

(E) The Word-Readings Of Different Periods In The Same Edition :

(1) The Word-readings according to the Word Index given at the end of Schübring's Edition of the Ācārāṅga :

- (a) *vijñā* = *viññū*, *vinñū* ; *ārya* = *āriya*, *ajja* ;  
*artha* = *attha*, *aṭṭha* ; *ātman* = *atta*, *appa*,  
*āyā* ; *arhat* = *arahanta*, *arihā* ; *adhas* = *aha*,  
*ahe*, *aho* ; *āveśa* = *āvesa*, *āesa* ; etc.
- (b) *k* = *g*, *y*  
 (i) *āgara*, *āgāsa*, *aladdhaga*, *appaga*, *āhāraga*.  
 (ii) *ahiya*, *abhiseya*, *ālaiya*, (= *ālayika*),  
*ānugāmiya*.
- (c) *j* = *j*, *y*  
*ajiṇa*, *avijāṇao*.  
*viyahittu* (variant - *vijahittā*).
- (d) *d* = *d*, *y*  
*udaya-nissiyā*, *ainnāyāṇam*(= *adattādānam*).

(2) The Readings of the Ācārāṅga of the Āgamodaya Samiti (Sūtra No.) :

*t* = *t*, *y*

- (a) *iccete* (2, 5, 6, 7) *iccee* (3)
- (b) *pariññātā* . . . . . *pariññāta-kamme* (17)  
*pariññāyā* . . . . . *pariññāta-kamme* (30)  
*pariññāyā* . . . . . *pariññāya-kamme* (13)

(3) The Readings of the Ācārāṅga of Jaina Viśvabhāratī Edition (Sūtra No.) :

- (a) *t* = *t*, *y*  
*bhavai* (1, 4, 134), *bhavati* (2, 25, 48)  
*pariññāyā bhavaṃti* (12), *pariññātā*

- bhavaṃti* (34)  
*jāī-maraṇa-moyaṇāe* (10), *jāī-maraṇa-moyaṇāe* (103)  
*nātaṃ* (2, 4, 25), *nāyaṃ* (4, 134)
- (b) *n* = *n*, *ṇ*  
*no saṇṇā* (1), *no nātaṃ* (2)
- (c) *ny* = *ṇṇ*, *nn*  
*nevaṇṇehiṃ* (33, 88), *nevannēhiṃ* (64)
- (4) The Readings of the Ācārāṅga of MJV. Edition (Sūtra No.) :
- (a) *t* = *t*, *y*  
*jīviyassa* (7), *jīvitassa* (24) ;  
*pariṇṇāyā* (9), *pariṇṇātā* (39) ;  
*dukkhapaḍighātaheṭuṃ* (7),  
*dukkhapaḍighātaheṭuṃ* (13)  
*dukkhapaḍighāyahetuṃ* (51);  
*annatarīto disāto* (1), *annatarīo disāo* (2)
- (b) *d* = *d*, *y*  
*pavayamāṇā* (23), *pavadamāṇā* (42)
- (c) *dh* = *dh*, *h*  
*adhe disāto* (1), *ahāo vā* (2)
- (d) *kṣ* = *kkh*, *h*  
*dakkhiṇāo vā* (1), *dāhiṇāo vā* (2)

**(F) Different Readings In The Same Edition :**

- (1) Sometimes Archaic and Sometimes Younger Reading :
- (a) Ācārāṅga, First Śrutaskandha (Sūtra No.)
- (i) *khettaṇṇa* (MJV. 32, 79, 104, 176, 210)  
*khettaṇṇa* (MJV. 109, 132, 209)  
*kheyaṇṇa* (MJV. 88, 109)
- (ii) *anitiyaṃ* (Schübring, p. 22. 7)  
*aniccayaṃ* (Schübring, p. 4. 30)
- (iii) *adhe* (MJV. 174)  
*ahē* (MJV. 1)

(iv) *tividheṇa* . . . *bahugā* (MJV. 79)

*tiviheṇa* . . . *bahuyā* (MJV. 82)

(v) *egadā* (MJV. 79)

*egayā* (MJV. 66)

(b) **Itthīparinnā** (Sūtrakṛtāṅga, 1.4)

Alsdorf has sometimes adopted archaic readings and sometimes younger readings in the re-editing of this chapter :

(1)	$d = d$	$d = y, a$
	<i>vadittāṇaṃ</i> (1.23)	<i>channapaṇa</i> (1.2)
	<i>itthīveda</i> (1.23)	<i>veya</i> (1.20)
	<i>pādachejjāim</i> (1.21)	<i>nisiyaṃti</i> (1.3)
	$p = p$	$p = v$
	<i>upakasanti</i> (1.20)	<i>virūva-rūvāṇi</i> (1.6)
	$n = n$	$n = ṇ$
	<i>suhumenā</i> (1.2)	<i>channapaṇa</i> (1.2)
	$jñ = nn$	$jñ = ṇṇ$
	<i>khedanna</i> (1.20)	<i>paṇṇā</i> (1.20)
	$ay = e$	$ay = a$
	<i>nimanteti</i> (1.4,6)	<i>daṃsaṃti</i> (1.3)

(2) Sometimes readings of three different strata are found in the same sentence :

**Ācārāṅga** (MJV.)

(a) *vitahaṃ pappa khettaṇṇe tammi thāṇammi ciṭṭhati* (1.2.3.79)

(First Stratum)

*pappa*  
*ciṭṭhati*

(Second Stratum)

*khettaṇṇe*  
*vitahaṃ*

(Third Stratum)

*tammi*  
*thāṇammi*

(b) *vadheṃti*

*vahemti*

*vahimti*  
(1.1.6.52)

(c) *sadā*

*satā*

(1.1.4.33)

*egadā*

*egayā*

(1.1.1.67)



- (3) Conviction of their belonging to the earlier or later period due to the introduction of the phonetic change in the similar words of different works :

From the two works, *Ācārāṅga* and *Āvaśyakasūtra* published by MJV., Mumbai, a few usages<sup>17</sup> are given below, which clearly show that while there are archaic usages in the *Ācārāṅga*, whereas there is a marked influence of the phonetic change of the later period in the medial consonants in the same words in the *Āvaśyakasūtra* :

(Ācārāṅga)	(Sanskrit)	(Āvaśyakasūtra)
<i>agaṇi</i>	( <i>agni</i> )	<i>aggi</i>
<i>anidāṇa</i>	( <i>anidāna</i> )	<i>aniyāṇa</i>
<i>atithi</i>	( <i>atithi</i> )	<i>atihi</i>
<i>atta</i>	( <i>ātman</i> )	—
<i>appa</i>	“	<i>appa</i>
<i>ātā</i>	“	—
<i>āyā</i>	“	<i>āyā</i>
<i>abodhi</i>	( <i>abodhi</i> )	—
<i>abohi</i>	”	<i>abohi</i>
<i>ādāṇa</i>	( <i>ādāna</i> )	—
<i>ātāṇa</i>	“	<i>āyāṇa</i>
<i>āriya</i>	( <i>ārya</i> )	—
<i>ajja</i>	“	<i>ajja</i>
<i>uvatṭhita</i>	( <i>upasthita</i> )	<i>uvatṭhiya</i>
<i>jāti</i>	( <i>jāti</i> )	<i>jāi</i>

- (G) Difference In The Readings Of Two Most Ancient *Āgama* Works, Of Almost The Same Period, Edited By Schübring :

(Ācārāṅga)	(Isibhāsiyāim) <sup>17</sup>	(Ācā.)	(Isibhā.)
(r)			(d)
<i>bhagavayā</i>	<i>arahatā</i>	<i>āyāe</i>	<i>ādāya</i>
<i>taiya</i>	<i>tatiya</i>	<i>āyāṇa</i>	<i>ādāṇa</i>
<i>bhavai</i>	<i>bhavati</i>	<i>vāyam</i>	<i>vādam</i>
<i>virai</i>	<i>virati</i>		
<i>savvao</i>	<i>savvato</i>	<i>paveiyam</i>	<i>vedemti</i>
<i>sevae</i>	<i>sevate</i>		
(p)			(tr)
<i>aivāya</i>	<i>atipāta</i>	<i>kheyanna</i>	<i>khittato</i>

### (H) Different Systems (Of Editing) Adopted By Different Editors:

(Sūtrakṛtāṅga–Alsdorf)	Conso- nants	(Ācārāṅga–Schübring)
<i>ādāya</i> (1.4.1.10)	(d)	<i>ainnāyāṇam</i> (adattādānam)
<i>vijānehi</i> (1.4.2.10)	(j)	p.3.21 <i>vijahittu</i> ( <i>vijahāya</i> ), p. 3.10

### (I) About The Medial *t* :

#### (1) Isibhāsiyāim<sup>17</sup>

In the edition of Schübring, sometimes *t* is elided and sometimes it is retained :

(Printed)	(Variant)
[elision]	[retained]
<i>lippae</i> (Ch. 3)	<i>lippate</i>
<i>asieṇa</i> (Ch. 3)	<i>asiteṇa</i>
[retained]	[elision]
<i>āyāti</i> (Ch. 1)	<i>āyāi</i>
<i>āgacchati</i> (Ch. 1)	<i>āgacchai</i>

#### (2) The position of the medial *t* in the Ācārāṅga and Isibhāsiyāim (Schübring's Editions of both the works)

Although the medial '*t*' was found in some in-

stances in the manuscripts of the **Ācārāṅga** (1st Śruta-Skandha) used by Schübring but he has scrupulously picked out in some instances the medial 'r' (in words, case-suffix or terminations), as one would do with a fly fallen in butter, but in the edition of the **Isibhāsiyāim** he has not done so; the retention of 'r' in it as analysed in some chapters is as follows :

(Chapter No.)	(Retained) <i>r</i>	(Sonant) <i>d</i>	(Elision) <i>y</i>	(Percentage of Elision)
1	21	0	10	32
2	19	0	0	0
29	15	0	14	50
31	45	0	12	21

- (3) For the **Ācārāṅga**, Schübring seems to have taken for granted that wherever the medial 'r' is found, it is '-r-' variant (śruti) and hence to be thrown out, but he did not adopt this same rule for the **Isibhāsiyāim**. The elision of the other medial consonants, as in the case of -r- has not been adopted; sometimes 'd' = 'r' is also found. This process of making them unvoiced is the stage that preceded that of elision. In the **Isibhāsiyāim** 'd' = 'r' has been preserved (*yadi* = *jati* 3.2), but in the **Ācārāṅga** such readings have not been adopted, although they were found in the manuscripts.

It seems from these facts that at the time of editing the **Ācārāṅga** he was under the influence of the rules of the Prakrit grammarians as stated in their works with reference to the later Prakrit, but at the time of editing the **Isibhāsiyāim** he did not stick to those rules and followed the proper system of adopting the oldest readings. (See the **Ācārāṅga**, I, ed. H. Jacobi, 1882)

- (4) Other editors have also adopted the readings with elided medial -r- as for instance :

	(Uttarādhyayana - Charpe. Edn.)	(Variants in the manuscripts)
(a)	<i>jāī</i> (13. 18) <i>harai</i> (13. 26) <i>nābhisamei</i> (13. 30)	<i>jāti</i> <i>harati</i> <i>nābhisameti</i>
(b)	<i>saṁbhūya</i> (13. 11)	<i>saṁbhūta</i> <sup>18</sup>

(J) Some Editors Have Adopted ‘*n*’ And Some Others  
‘*ṇ*’ For The Initial Dental ‘*n*’ And ‘*jñ*’ :

Illustrations from the Word-Index of the MJV. Editions :

<i>n = n, ṇ</i>				
Editor	Jambūvijayaṇī	Editor Puṇyavijayaṇī		
Ācārāṅga	Sūtrakṛtāṅga	Uttarādh- yayana	Daśavai- kālika	Āvaśyaka Sū. <sup>19</sup>
<i>ṇagīṇa</i>	-	<i>nagga</i>	-	-
<i>ṇatta</i>	-	<i>naṭṭa</i>	-	-
<i>ṇara</i>	<i>ṇara, nara</i>	<i>nara</i>	<i>nara</i>	<i>nara</i>
<i>ṇaraga</i>	<i>ṇaraga</i>	<i>naraga</i>	-	-
<i>ṇāma</i>	<i>ṇāma, nāma</i>	<i>nāma</i>	-	<i>nāma</i>
<i>ṇikāya</i>	-	-	-	<i>nīkāya</i>
<i>ṇikkhamṇa</i>	<i>nikkhamṇa</i>	<i>nikkhamṇa</i>	-	-
<i>ṇiggaṇṇa</i>	<i>ṇiggaṇṇa, niggamṇa</i>	<i>niggaṇṇa</i>	<i>niggaṇṇa</i>	<i>niggaṇṇa</i>
<i>ṇiyama</i>	-	-	<i>niyama</i>	-
<i>ṇiyāga</i>	-	<i>niyāga</i>	-	-
<i>ṇivvāṇa</i>	<i>nivvāṇa</i>	<i>nivvāṇa</i>	-	<i>nivvāṇa</i>
<i>ṇivvuḍa</i>	-	-	<i>nivvuḍa</i>	-
<i>ṇisīeja</i>	-	<i>nisīeja</i>	-	-
<i>ṇīla</i>	-	<i>nīla</i>	-	-
<i>ṇo</i>	-	-	<i>no</i>	-
<i>jñ = n, ṇ</i>				
<i>ṇāṇa</i>	<i>ṇāṇa</i>	-	<i>nāṇa</i>	<i>nāṇa</i>
<i>ṇāta</i>	-	<i>nāya</i>	-	-
<i>ṇṇ = nn, ṇṇ</i>				
<i>ṇisaṇṇa</i>	-	-	<i>nisanna</i>	-

**(K) Archaic Word-Forms Not Adopted:**

- (1) Alsdorf considers 13.10 of the *Uttarādhyayana* (*Cittasam-bhūta*) as an 'archaic' verse. In the MJV. Edition, the reading adopted is 'āyā' (13.10) for the word 'ātmā', while the *Cūrṇī* adopts the variant 'attā'. In such a situation, why should the archaic reading 'attā' have not been adopted ?

- (2) Ācārāṅga (JVB. Edn.) (Archaic Variants)  
*pahū ejassa* (Ācā. 1.1.7.145) *pabhū ...*

- (3) Itthīparinnā (Edited by Alsdorf)<sup>20</sup>

Sometimes the archaic readings and sometimes the younger readings.

- |     |  |   |
|-----|--|---|
| (a) | (Archaic readings accepted)              | (Younger readings as variants)            |
|     | <i>itthīvede</i> (1.23)                  | -   |
|     | <i>vidū vi</i> (1.26)                    | <i>viū vi</i>                             |
|     | <i>vadittāṇaṃ</i> (1.23)                 | <i>vaittāṇaṃ</i>                          |
|     | <i>lūhaṃ</i> (from <i>Cūrṇī</i> ) (1.25) | <i>rukkhaṃ</i>                            |
| (b) | (Younger readings accepted)              | (Archaic readings as variants)            |
|     | <i>veyāṇuvī</i> (1.19)                   | <i>vedānuvīyī</i> ( <i>Cūrṇī</i> reading) |
|     | <i>pavāṇaṃ</i> (1.26)                    | <i>pavāḍaṇa</i> ( " " )                   |
|     | <i>muccae</i> (1.9)                      | <i>muccatī</i> (Oldest Palmleaf Ms.)      |
|     | <i>gihāim</i> <sup>21</sup> (1.17)       | <i>gihāṇi</i> (variant)                   |

- (4) Archaic word-forms in the variants :

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| (A) Ācārāṅga : (a) Schübring's Edition |   |
| (Adopted Readings)                     | (Variants)  |
| <i>kheyanna</i> (16 times)             | <i>khettanna</i> (3 times in <i>Cūrṇī</i> and 5 times in G Ms.) |

<i>khedanna</i> (p. 17.21)	<i>khettanna</i> (Cūrṇī and G Ms.)
<i>aniccayan</i> (p. 4.30)	<i>anitiyaṇ</i> (Cūrṇī)
<i>cuo</i> (p. 1.7)	<i>cue</i> (Cūrṇī)
<i>jīvā aṇegā</i> (p. 3.18)	<i>jīvā aṇege</i> (A Ms.)
<i>āraṇbhamāṇā</i> (p. 6.1)	<i>āraṇbhamāṇā</i> <sup>22</sup> (Cūrṇī)
<i>aṇāiyamāṇe</i> (p. 12.25)	<i>aṇāiyamāṇe</i> (A Ms.)
<i>annayarammi</i> (p. 11.29)	<i>annayaramsi</i> (A, D, G. Mss. and Cūrṇī)

## (b) JVB. Edition

<i>paḍisaṇvedei</i> (1.1.1.8)	<i>paḍisaṇvedayai</i> (Gh. Ms.)
<i>cuo</i> (1.1.1.2)	<i>cute</i> (Gh Ms.)

## (c) MJV. Edition

<i>rogasamuppāyā</i> (1.2.2.67)	<i>rogasamuppātā</i> (Saṁ., Kham. Mss.)
<i>egayā</i> (1.2.1.64)	<i>egatā</i> (He.1.2.3, Lā., 1. Mss.)
<i>saṇṇihisaṇṇicayo</i> (1.2.5.87)	<i>saṇṇidhisamṇicayo</i> (Cūrṇī)
<i>abhikaṇṭaṇ</i> (1.2.1.64)	<i>abhikkamṭaṇ</i> (Schüb., He. 2, 3, Lā., 1. Mss.)
<i>pavvahie</i> (1.2.4.84)	<i>pavvadhie</i> (=pravyathitaḥ) (Khe. Ms.)
<i>iha, jahā, tahā</i>	<i>idha, jadhā, tadhā</i> (Cūrṇī and Old Palmleaf Mss. of MJV. Edn., refer Prastāvanā, p. 44)
<i>se taṇ saṇbujjhamāṇe</i> (1.1.2.14)	<i>se ttaṇ</i> (Śīlāṅka, Cūrṇī and Schü.)
<i>kūrāṇi kammāṇi</i> (1.2.4.82)	<i>kūrāṇi kammāṇi</i> (Saṁ., Śāṁ., Kham., Khe. Mss.)
<i>aṇṇayarammi</i> (1.2.6.96)	<i>aṇṇayaramsi</i> (He. 1,2,3; Lā. Mss.)
<i>aṇupuvvīe</i> (1.8.8.230)	<i>aṇupuvvīya</i> (except Kham Ms.; and Cūrṇī)
<i>sahatī</i> (1.2.6.98)	<i>sahate</i> (He. 1,2,3 ; Lā. Mss.) <i>sahae</i> (Schü.) <i>sahate</i> (JVB.)
<i>kappai</i> (1.1.3.27)	<i>kappati</i> (Saṁ., Śāṁ., Kham., Khe. Mss. and Cūrṇī)

(B) **Sūtrakṛtāṅga :**

(a) JVB. Edition

(Variants)

*mahīe majjhammi* (1.6.13)

*mahiya majjhammi* (Kh. Ms.  
and *Cūrṇī*)

*visohaittā* (1.6.17)

*visodhaittā* (*Cūrṇī*)

(b) MJV. Edition

*sambohī* (1.2.1.1)

*sambodhī* (*Cūrṇī*)

*aha* (1.4.2.16)

*adha* (*Cūrṇī*)

*kayapuvvaṃ* (1.4.2.18)

*kaḍapuvvaṃ* (*Cūrṇī*)

*gihāim* (1.4.1.17)

*gihāṇi* (*Cūrṇī*)

*eyāim bhayāim* (1.2.1.3)

*etāṇi bhayāṇi* (*Cūrṇī*)

*āiṭṭho* (1.4.1.19)

*aiṭṭhe* (Pu. Ms.)

*kaḍehim gāhatī* (1.2.1.4)

*kaḍebhi*<sup>23</sup> *gāhae* (*Cūrṇī*)

(C) **Uttarādhyayana :**

MJV. Edition

*āyā* (13. 10)

*attā* (*Cūrṇī*)

(5) **Presentation of the way of Rejecting Archaic Word-forms,  
in another manner :**

(a) Rejected Archaic Readings occurring in younger Mss.<sup>24</sup>

*pavvahie* (MJV., Ācā.

*pavvathie* (I. Ms.)

1.1.2.10)

*kūrāim kammāim* (Schü,  
Ācā.p.9.8)

*kūrāṇi kammāṇi* B., B<sup>1</sup>.,  
B<sup>2</sup>. Mss.)

*ihamegesim* (MJV., Ācā.

*idhamekesim* (Kham., Ms.)

1.2.1.64)

*ihamegesim* (JVB., Ācā.

*idhamekesim* (Ca. Ms.)

1.2.1.4)

(b) Younger Reading in the Original, but Archaic Reading  
in the Vṛtti :

*viyahittā* (Ācā. Āgamo. Edn. *viyahittā* (Vṛtti reading  
sūtra 19) p.43b)

(c) From Mss. also adopted by editors sometimes Archaic  
and sometimes Younger Readings

(1) *cuo* (JVB., Ācā. 1.1.1.2) *cute* (Ca. Ms.)

(2) *nātaṃ* (JVB., Ācā.1.1.1.4) *nāyaṃ* (Ca. Ms.)

(d) Rejection of the **Contemporary Popular Forms** :(Pre. Par. - *māṇa*)(- *mīṇa* - Popular)<sup>25</sup>*ghāyamāṇe* (MJV., 1.6.4.192) *ghāyamīṇe* (Schü., p. 31.3)*samaṇujāṇamāṇa* (JVB. 1.6.4.91) *samaṇujāṇamīṇa* (Schü., Ācā., p. 31.4; 33.9)(L) Rejection By Later Editors Of Archaic Word-Forms  
Of The Preceding Editions :(1) *Ācārāṅga* :

(Later Edition)

(Preceding Edition)

*avijāṇao* (MJV. 1.1.6.49,  
and JVB.)*avijāṇao* (Schü.)*ṇīie* (JVB. 1.4.1.2)*nitie* (Schü.)*bahuyā* (MJV. 1.2.4.82)*bahugā* (Schü., and Āgamo., and  
JVB.)*adakkhu* (MJV. 1.2.5.88,  
1.9.2.70 and JVB.)*addakkhu* (Schü.; Āgamo.)*kūrāṇiṃ kammāṇiṃ* (MJV.  
1.2.4.82 and JVB.)*kūrāṇi kammāṇi* (Āgamo.)(2) *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* :*vivegamāyāe* (MJV. 1.4.1.10) *vivegamādāya* (Ālsdorf)(M) Language Of The Original Preacher Looking As That  
Belonging To The Later Period While That Of The  
Compiler As Of Ancient Period(1) *Ācārāṅga* (MJV.)

(a) Compiler's language

*tattha khalu bhagavatā pariṇṇā paveditā*  
(Sūtra 7)*soccā bhagavato aṇagārāṇaṃ ihamegesim nātaṃ*  
*bhavati*, Sūtra 14 ; (See also Sūtras 24, 25, 35,  
36, 43, 44, 51, 52 as also 58 and 59)(b) In the above examples there is no elision  
of the medial 'r', 'd' etc., while the elision is found  
in the following illustrations from the original  
discourse :



- (i) *kappai na kappai* (Sūtra 27), *saṃpayamṭi* (Sūtra 37), *etthovarae* (Sūtra 40); (Elision of *-t*).
  - (ii) *pavayamāṇā* (Sūtra 12,13), *hiyayamabbhe* (Sūtra 15); (Elision of *-d*).
- (2) Isibhāsiyāim :
- (a) Compiler's language  
*arahatā isinā buitam* (Every chapter begins with this reading; the *-t* has been preserved here.)
  - (b) The original language of the discourse  
*samāhie* (*samāhitah*), *lubbhai* (*lubhyate*), *jāgarao* (*jāgrtah*) - (Adhyāya - 38)  
*bhāvao*, *kammao*, *ajjhavasāyao* (there is *-o* for *-to*, Adhyāya - 39)

Similar instances of the elision or retention of medial *-t* from each chapter can be quoted profusely.

## CONCLUSION

It is clear from this sort of linguistic analysis that in the task of editing of the Ardhamāgadhī *Āgama* texts, the method adopted by the editors has not remained consistently uniform; the medial consonants are sometimes retained, and sometimes changed into voiced and mostly elided (with changing the aspirates to *h*). The terminations of cases and tenses are sometimes archaic and sometimes younger, i.e. of the later period. The problem is this : Ardhamāgadhī is an archaic language which is very old as compared to the Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit. The Ardhamāgadhī *Āgama* literature originated in the Eastern region of India, and the period of the First Redaction of the ancient *Āgamas* (i.e. the *Gaṇi-piṭaka* of the Twelve *Aṅgas* (i.e. *duvālasaṅga-gaṇipīḍaga*) is anterior to that of the Ashokan Edicts. In view of these points, one has to accept that the Original Ardhamāgadhī

language of the First Redaction (*prathama vācanā*) of the Jaina *Āgamas* has suffered Mahrāṣṭriisation; there can be no doubt about this. But, even then one finds archaic readings, old in view of the evolution of the language, and therefore, why should they not be accepted ? Archaic readings are found in the manuscripts of the *Āgama* texts and the *Cūrṇis*. Hence, for the purpose of preserving the archaic form of the original language, it is but proper to adopt the archaic readings. This is the main purport of the present study.

### Foot-Notes

1. *Kalpasūtra*, Muni Śrī Puṇyavijayajī, Sarabhai Manilal Nawab, *Prastāvanā*, pp.3-7 and 14-15 (Original in Gujarati), 1952 A.D.
2. Is it for this reason that any originality of the Ardhamāgadhī is not been found clearly in the Prakrit Grammar of Hemacandra ?
3. See '*Restoraion of the Original Language of the Ardhamāgadhī Texts*' by the same author, published by P.J.V.V. Fund, 1994, pp.20-21, and see '*Kṣetrajñā śabda ke vividh prākṛita rūpoṃ kī kathā aur uskā Ardhamāgadhī rūpāntara*, vide ŚRAMAṆA, P.V.R. Inst., Vārāṇasī, Oct.-Dec., 1990, Year 41, Aṅka 10-12, pp. 49-56.
4. Lüdwig Alsdorf, p.200.
5. This reading is correct as per other evidences. Two case - suffixes 'ya' and 'e' are appended in the printed reading '*sahasammuiyāe*'. See, '*Sahasammuiyāe Pātha Par Kucha Carcā* (Hindi), A.I.O.C. Proceedings, Calcutta, 1986.
6. *Ācārāṅga*, *Prastāvanā*, p.36 (MJV. Edn.).
7. MJV. Edn.
8. Additionally note down that the readings, '*jahā*' and '*tahā*' have been adopted in the places of '*jadhā*' and '*tadhā*', respectively. See Variants, Sūtra 92, p.27, .fn.7, *Ācā.* (MJV.), and its *Prastāvanā*, p.44. para 1.
9. *Ācārāṅgasūtra*, Erster Śrutaskandha (Leipzig), 1910.
10. *Ācārāṅga* (MJV.), 1977.
11. The position of the medial -t- is found preserved to the extent

- of 50 to 100% in different *Adhyayanas* of the *Isibhāsiyāim* edited by him; this is a matter of surprise. (Cf. supra, pp.17-18).
12. The elision of the medial consonants is found to be sometimes 10%, sometimes 25%, sometimes 35%, and on an average 25% only in the *Isibhāsiyāim* edited by Schübring.
  13. See, my article, 'Prācīna Prākṛta Bhāṣā meṁ Ādya Nakāra yā Nakāra', 'PRĀKṚTA VIDYĀ', Udaipur, July-Sept., 1989.
  14. See, my article, 'Prācīna Prākṛta meṁ 'ña' aur 'ñā' ke Parivartan kī Samīkṣā', 'PRĀKṚTA VIDYĀ', Udaipur, July-December, 1990.
  15. The medial -g- is preserved in the MJV. Edn. of the *Sāmāyārī*, 26th *Adhyayana*, seven times, while in those of Charpentier and JVB. editions it is generally found elided.
  16. *Ācārāṅga*, (MJV.), *Prastāvanā*, pp.36-37.
  17. Quoted from the Index, given at the end of the relevant editions of the works and the *Isibhāsiyāim* Kā Prākṛit-Sanskrit Śabda-kośa, K.R. Chandra, 1998.
  18. Alsdorf has here adopted the reading '*saṁbhūta*'; see, *Kleine Schriften*, p.190.
  19. Although the period of the composition of the *Āvaśyaka-niryukti* is later, the dental 'n' is generally found retained in the Edn. of the work published by the *Āgamodaya Samiti*, e.g. (i) *natthi*, *nāṇāviha*, *niṇṇa*, *nijjutti*, *niddosa*; (ii) *nāṇa*, *nāyavva*, *sannā*; (iii) *uvavanna*; (iv) *anna* (*anya*).
  20. See, *Kleine Schriften*, pp.197-198.
  21. But, in 1.25 the reading is *cittalaṁkārāgāṇi* (i.e. the reading with the suffix -āṇi).
  22. The suffix -*mīna*, in the place of -*māna* of the Present Participle is found in the *Ashokan inscriptions*.
  23. It is proper to mention here the usage of the word '*thībhi*' (*strībhiḥ*), found in all the Edns. of the *Ācārāṅga* (1.2.5.84). It is surprising how this usage has been preserved. It is proper to accept the reading '*kaḍebhi*'.
  24. See, the *Prastāvanā* of the relevant edition of the work with regard to the antiquity or modernity of the manuscripts.
  25. See, *Infra*, foot-note 22.

## 2. ARCHAIC LINGUISTIC ELEMENTS IN THE ARDHAMĀGADHĪ

We find, in the senior works of the Jaina **Ardhamāgadhi** *Āgama* literature', some of the linguistic usages which have escaped the influence of the Prakrit languages that evolved in later period; they have preserved their archaic forms in tact. If these forms<sup>2</sup> are compared with those of the usages of the Prakrits of the later period, it will clearly reveal that these escaped archaic usages prove the antiquity of the *Ardhamāgadhi* (in contrast to the later Prakrits, like the Śaurasenī, the Mahārāṣṭrī, etc.) and at times one cannot but avoid feeling that they are similar to the forms of Pāli usages, thus, vindicating the fact of their antiquity in support of which the following usages should be noted.

### (A) Additional matter Post-Hindi Edition :

- (i) Traces of the usage of Vedic 'ḷ' (𑀭) mostly in the Āgamic Texts.

*Ācā.-dāḷima, āṇiḷiya, pariṇiḷiya, Sū.Kṛ.-, leḷuṇa*, vide Pischel 240, 304, 379, 592. This consonant is preserved in Pāli and has been inherited in some cases by other MIA. dialects and by some NIA. languages also. Modern Indian Editions have replaced 'ḷ' by 'l' or 'd'.

This is a specific and crystal clear example of how a language undergoes transformation at the hands of editors of later period and of different regions. In the **Sattasaī** (Śaptaśatī) of Hāla which is edited by a Marāṭhī editor the 'ḷ' is available in a number of words because the editor is a Marāṭhī and in that language the syllable 'ḷ' is a part of its usage, whereas the same text edited by Hindi speaking editors does not have 'ḷ' and it is replaced by 'l' or 'd'.

(ii) Medial -dh- retained.

*asādhū* Sū.Kṛ. 2.2. 713, p.176;

*samādhīya* Sū.Kṛ. 1.10.6, p. 85,

f.n. 26 (v.1. from Cūrṇi)

**(B) Voicing of the Medial Consonants, Instead of Elision :**

Numerous usages with voicing of medial 'k' are surely available in the Ardhmāgadhī. Along with them, sometimes we find that the usages with 'd' and 'dh' in place of 't' and 'th' respectively (i.e. voiced medials too) are preserved in Ardhmāgadhī, as for instance :

- (1) *pāda* for *pāta* ← *pātra* (4 times in the Ācā. (MJV.) 2.6.1.592; *sarapādagam* (*śarapātakam*) - Sū. Kṛ., 1.4.2.13 (Alsdorf)';
- (2) *bhavidavvam* (*bhavitavyam*) - Isibhā., 3.1 (Schübring) and also (additional matter post-Hindi Edition) the instances from the *Sū.kṛ.* (MJV. Edn.) *sikkhadī* (v.1. khaṁ 2) 1.5.1.303, *adīte*=*atīte* (v.1. khaṁ 2, Pu. 1) 1.6.356), *ativādāya* = *atipātāya* (v.1. khaṁ 2, Pu. 1, Lā) 1.8.414, *adivādejjā* for *atipātejjā* (v.1. khaṁ 1) 1.8.429, *uppādāhi* for *uppātāhi* (v.1. four times from the Cūrṇi) 2.1.643
- (3) *tadhā*, *radha*, *jadhā*, *kadham*, *savvadhā* (for *tathā*, *ratha*, *yathā*, *katham*, *sarvathā*) see, Isibhā., 3.7.8; 24.3., 25.14; 35.12; 38.29; 40.10; 45.25. *jadhā* (*yathā*), Ācā., 2.5.555; Sū. Kṛ. (MJV) *jadhā* 1.1.2.45, *annadhā*, variant, 1.7.384, (khaṁ 2, Pu. 1, Lā.).
- (4) *adha* (*atha*) - Itthīparinnā, Sū. Kṛ., 1.4.1.23 (Punya. Edn.)
- (5) The forms with 'āgha' for the root 'ākhyā', such as, *āgham*, *āghavaṇā*, *āghavijjanti*,

*āghavittae*, *āghaviya*, *āghavemāṇa*, etc., which are found in the Ardhamāgadhī works, are also the evidences of the voicing of 'kh' to 'gh' (See, Pischel.202, 551; 85, 88; 350, 382, etc.)

- (6) Similarly, among the illustrations given by Hemacandra, of course excepting 'k' = 'g', we find 'c' = 'j' (8.1.177) as in *pisājī* (*piśācī*), 'th' = 'dh' (8.1.186), as in *pidham*, *pudham* (*pṛthak*), and 'ph' = 'bh' (8.1.236) as in *rebha* (*repha*), they seem to be the usages of the archaic Prakrit language.
- (7) The period of the Ardhamāgadhī is older than other Prakrits. Hence, it is not improper from the point of view of linguistic evolution, if we find 't' = 'd' and 'th' = 'dh'. In this context, it is but highly proper when Nitti Dolchi' remarks that when Hemacandra' prohibited the change of 't' to 'd' in common Prakrit, all such usages were automatically removed from the manuscripts of the period subsequent to him. A clear example of this modified process is the edition of the Ācārāṅga published by the Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya. The editor, Muniśrī Jambūvijayajī, has clarified in his *Prastāvanā* (p.44) that he has adopted the forms '*jahā*' and '*tahā*' ( for '*yathā*' and '*tathā*', respectively) in the place of '*jadhā*' and '*tadhā*' in accordance with the tradition of the commentators.

(C) **Anaptyxix (*svarabhakti*) Instead of Simplification of Conjunct Consonants :**

The process of anaptyxix, through which conjunct consonants are separated is believed to have been

anterior to that of assimilation. According to Pischel (132, 133), the anaptyxix in the case of some of the conjunct consonants is found more in the *Ardhamāgadhī*. Some of the examples are as follows :

(words used in *Ācārāṅga*<sup>6</sup> :

*agni* = *agaṇi* Sū. (34,37,39,211,212)

*uṣṇa* = *usiṇa* (Sū. 107)

*tūṣṇika* = *tusiṇia* (Sū. 288)

*paṇyaśālā* = *paṇiyasālā* (Sū. 278)

*vaiyāvṛtya* = *veyāvaḍiya* (Sū. 199, 207, 219, 227)

Some other examples given by Pischel (133) are :

*kaṣiṇa* (*kṛtsṇa* or *kṛṣṇa*), *paṣiṇa* (*praśna*), *nigīṇa* (*nagna*), *dīhara*, (*dīghara-dīrgha*), etc. We may add the following to this list :

From the *Isibhā*. *nitya* = *nītiya*, *ārya* = *āriya*, *paryāya* = *pariyāya*, *kāryam* = *kāriyam* (Ch. 11.3), *agnikāyaḥ* = *agaṇikāe* (ch.10, p. 23.3)

#### (D) The usage of 'attā' for the word 'ātman' :

Four alternative usages, viz., *attā*, *ātā*, *āyā* and *appā* are found in the place of the word *ātman*. Out of these, only *attā* form occurs in the Ashokan Inscriptions.<sup>7</sup> Hence, this form is the oldest. In the Ashokan Inscriptions of the Western India we find the usage *atpā* instead of *attā*; and this *atpā* has later on changed to *appā* and has then been more prevalent. From *attā* developed *ātā*, and from the latter developed the word *āyā* gradually; these are thus later usages, from the chronological view-point.

In the first Śrutaskandha of the *Ācārāṅga*, which is the oldest Prakrit work, *attā* is found in greater proportion than the *ātā*, which is compara-

tively in less proportion; in the second Śrutaskandha, however, we find *appā* frequently, while *atta*, *ātā* and *āyā* are rather rare; Examples,

Ācā.I-attāṇaṃ, attasamāhite, attattāe, ātato, ātavaṃ, ātāvādī; Ācā.II-appaṇo, appāṇaṃ, appaṇā, appāṇeṇaṃ

(E) Usages of Conjunct Consonants with Dental Nasal 'n' :

*vahni* (*vahni-mārūya-samyogā*) - Isibhāsiyāim, 9.24 (Schübring). In the later period this same word has been used in the form of *vaṇhi*. Other examples are :

*annatarī* (*anyatarī*) - Ācā. 1.1.1.1.

*anna* (*anya*), *annāya* (*anyāya*), *channa*, *chinna*, *pannaga*, *manne* (*manye*) - Sū. Kṛ. We find in these usages 'nn'(dental), instead of 'ṇṇ' (cerebral). This indicates that they are archaic usages.

(F) The form 'vayaṃ', the Nominative plural of the Pronoun 'asmad' :

The popular form of the nominative plural of 'asmad' is 'amhe' in Prakrits. But, the form *vayaṃ* has been preserved in the older portions of Ardhamāgadhi, in place of *amhe*, as for instance :

*vayaṃ puṇa evamācikkhāmo* (Ācā. 1.4.2.138)

*tesim pi vayaṃ lajjāmo* (Ācā. 1.8.8.203) *vayaṃ* (Ācā 2.5.1, 561-563; Sū. Kṛ. , 1.1.2.47, 1.3.2.187, 189; 2.1.647, 2.6.838)

*jahim vayaṃ savvajanassa vessā* (Uttarā., 13.18, *Cittasambhūta*) Pischel. (419) has mentioned the usage of 'vayaṃ' as found seven times from the Ācārāṅga, six times from the Sūtrakṛtāṅga, three times from the Uttarādhyayana, as also from the Bhagavatīsūtra and the Daśavaikālika.



**(G) (Additional matter post-Hindi Edition):**

A number of archaic forms with the *-āṇi* suffix for the Acc. Plu. of the Neuter gender are available in the Senior Canonical Works, e.g.

*Ācā, kūrāṇi kammāṇi* 1.148, *duccaragāṇi* 1.298, *maṇṣūṇi* 1.303

*Ācā* 2.11 - *muṅgasaddāṇi*, etc. 669, *vīṇāsaddāṇi* etc. 670, *tālasaddāṇi*, etc., 671, *saṁkhasaddāṇi*, etc. 672, *vappāṇi*, etc. 673 and so on.

*Ācā* 2.12- *gaṁthimāṇi*,..... *pothakammāṇi*, *cittakammāṇi*, ..., *vivihāṇi*, 689 (and so on totalling 11 in number. In these Sūtras there are nominal forms with the usage of *-āim* suffix also, e.g. *virūvarūvāim*, *saddāim*, *egatīyāim*, etc.

**Uttarā.** - *niratthaṇi* 1.8, *khettāṇi* 9.36, *bhīmāṇi* 19.47, *taṇāṇi* 23.17, etc.

**Daśavai.** - *uvvattaṇāṇi* 3.5, *āsaṇāṇi* 9.2.17, *savvāṇi* 10.19

**Isibhā.** - *kammāṇi* 2.5. *dukkhāṇi* 15.1, *imḍiyāṇi* 16.3, etc.

**(H) Some Archaic Usages of the Instrumental Singular of Words Ending in Consonants :**

Pischel (364, 396, 407, 411, 413) has mentioned numerous old usages from the *Ardhamāgadhī*; they are -

*vāyā* = *vācā* (*Uttarā.*; *Daśavai.*) *kāyaggirā* (*Daśavai.*); we find *vāyā* in the *Sū.Kṛ.* (1.4.1.24) also.

Other examples are : *viūsā*, *teyasā*, *ceyasā*, *jasasā*, *sirasā* (also *kāyasā*, *jogasā*, *niyamasā*, *payogasā*, *balasā*, *bhayasā*, etc.) and *matimayā*, *mahayā*, *jāṇayā*, etc. These usages have been quoted from the *Ācārāṅga*, the *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*, the *Uttarādhyayana*, the *Daśavaikālika*, the *Sthānāṅga*, the *Bhagavatīsūtra*

and the *Aupapātikasūtra*. We may add to these from the *Sū. Kr.* the usage 'āyasā' (for 'ātmanā', 1.4.1.6 Alsdorf) and 'ātasā' (MJV.) 'paññasā' (1.6.8; 1.13.13,14) and from the *Isibhā.* 'cakkhusā' (35.23), 'cetasā' (27.2), 'tejasā' (37, p.83.24), etc.

(I) The Forms with Case Suffix '-bhi' of  
Instrumental Plural :

Some residual usages of this case termination found in the *Ardhamāgadhī* are as follows :

*thībhi* (= *strībhiḥ*) - Ācā 1.2.4.84; *pasubhi* (= *paśubhiḥ*) - Uttarā 9.49 *saṃjhamebhi* - *Isibhā.*, p.128.2, 9 (Schübring); *kaḍebhi* (?) (*Sū. Kr. Cūrṇi* usage). (cf. infra, p. 26 f.n. 23)

(J) Some Usages with the form having the Case  
Ending '-āya' of the Dative Singular :

(i) *Isibhā.* - *nevvānāya* (27.2), *vāhikkhayāya* and *mohakkhayāya* (38.7), *jhānāya* (38.15), *kammādānāya* (38.16) *mokkhāya* (24.38), *nevvānāya* (27.2)

(ii) *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* - *ātahitāya* (MJV, 1.4.1.16) *aṇṇapāyāya* (*annapākāya*) - Variant of *Cūrṇi* quoted on p.50 of the MJV Edition. (Normally, we find the forms with the suffix -āe in such cases).

(K) Old Usages of Ablative Singular as Adverb :

*padiso* (*tasamti pānā padiso disāsu ya* - Ācā. 1.1.6.49). Pischel (413) has quoted the following instances :

*diso disam* (Ācā. 2.16.6) MJV; p. 278 variants : *disodisim*, *disodisi*.

*disodisim* (*Praśnavyākaraṇa*, *Uttarādhyayana*, *Nāyādhammakahāo*).

We may add the following examples :

*paogaso* (Isibhā 24.37),  
*bahuso* (Ācā. 1.9.4.17)  
*savvaso* (Ācā. 1.9.1.12, 16, 18)

Similar usages are found in the Pāli Suttanipāta also, e.g.,

*puthuso* (50.14,15), *sabbaso* (53.6,16)

(L) Forms of Genitive Singular :

(1) Present Participle –

*karao* (*kurvataḥ*) Ācā. 1.1.1.4, *aviyāṇao* (variant *avijāṇato* = *avijānataḥ*, Ācā. 1.1.6.49; also see Sūtra Nos. 144, 148, 149, 154). Forms quoted by Pischel (396) are : *viharao*, *akuvvao*, *haṇao*, *kittayao*; *vippavahato* can be quoted from the Isibhā. 16, p. 33.20

(2) Forms of Words Ending in Consonants  
 (Gen. Sing.) :

*dhīmato* (*dhīmataḥ*) Isibhā 9.15

*dhiīmao*, *mahao* (*mahataḥ*), *bhagavao* (*bhagavataḥ*) (Pischel, 396) *jasassiṇo* (Pischel, 405)

(M) The Older Nominal suffix ‘-*mhim*’ and ‘-*mhi*’  
 of Locative Singular :

(1) The evolution of the case-suffixes ‘-*mhim*’ and ‘-*mhi*’ has been from Sanskrit case-suffix ‘-*smin*’. The termination ‘-*mhi*’ is found in the Western Ashokan Inscriptions. Later on ‘-*mmi*’ termination has evolved from this ‘-*mhi*’. The Locative singular suffixes in Pāli are ‘-*smim*’ and ‘-*mhi*’, which should be noted in this context.

The Preserved Usages of ‘-*mhi*’ and ‘-*mhim*’  
 in the Ardhamāgadhī Works :

*imamhi* (Vyavahārasūtra, 7.22, 23)

*kamhim* (Uttarādhyayana, 15.2 Alsdorf)\*

## (2) The Older Nominal suffix ‘-ssim’ of the Locative Singular :

The popular suffix of the Loc. Sing. in the Ardhamāgadhī is ‘-am̐si’, as for instance, *logam̐si*, *nayaram̐si*, *aggim̐si*, *vāum̐si*. But, the suffix ‘-ssim’ is rarely found but in a few places. In fact ‘-ssim’ is the suffix anterior to the ‘-am̐si’, and the ‘-ssim’ has evolved from ‘-smin’. In the Ashokan Inscriptions we find the written form ‘-sim’ for this ‘-ssim’. Prakrit grammarians have prescribed ‘-ssim’ case suffix for pronouns, but it has not been mentioned with reference to the nouns. This case suffix must have been prevalent in the archaic forms of nouns, too. But, later on the case suffix ‘-am̐si’ became popular everywhere. The ancient usages with the suffix ‘-ssim’ have been only rarely preserved. One such instance is found in one of the manuscripts of the Ācārāṅga, and it is consigned to the variants in the foot-notes in the printed edition of the work; thus, *logassim* (Ācā. 1. 1.1.9, a Variant in MJV. Edn.)

It seems the usages with this suffix ‘-ssim’ have disappeared from literature since the Prakrit grammarians too have not mentioned it with reference to the nouns.

## (3) The form ‘rāo’ (rātrau) of the Locative Singular of rātrī :

The popular Loc. Sing. form of the word *rātrī* in Prakrit is ‘*rattīe*’ but the ancient forms ‘*rāto*’ and ‘*rāo*’ too are found to have survived<sup>10</sup>.

*diyā ya rāto ya* (Ācā. Sū. 189, 190 MJV.)

*aho ya rāo ya* (Ācā. Sū. 63, 73)

Over and above these see the Ācā. Sūtra Nos. 133, 282, 291, etc. Pischel (386) has quoted similar instances from the *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*, *Uttarādhyayana*, *Daśavaikālika*, etc.

(N) Some More Archaic Forms :

- (i) *vedavī* (*vedavit*) Nom. Sing. (Ācā. Sūtra 145, 163, 174, 196) *kālaveyavī* (Isibhā., 22.12)
- (ii) *jantavo*, *sāhavo*, (Nom. Plu.; Ācā., Sū. Kṛ., Uttarā., Pischel, 380)
- (iii) *dummaṇā*, *sumaṇā* (Nom. Sing.; Sū. Kṛ. Pischel, 408)
- (iv) *ativijjam* (*atividvān*) (Ācā. Sū. 112, 115; Sū. Kṛ. Pischel, 299)
- (v) *hrīmato* (Sū. Kṛ. 1.2.2.18; variant *hīmato*)
- (vi) *tamasi* (Loc. Sing.; Pischel, 408)
- (vii) *nīpatanti* (Isibhā. 10, p. 23.9); the prevalent form would be *nī(ni)vaḍamti*, ('ta' = 'ḍa'); we find *nīvatimsu* (Sū. 295, 297) and *nīvatita* (Sū. 148, 316), in the Ācā.
- (viii) *vidhīyate* (Isibhā., 22.14)
- (ix) *dhīt* (Isibhā., 22.1)
- (x) *dittatejasam* (Acc. Sing., Isibhā., 39.1)

(O) The nominal suffixes 'ya' and 'yā' Similar to Pāli, and 'ye' Similar to Ashokan Inscriptions :

The Prakrit grammarians have not mentioned the 'ya' and 'yā' as the oblique case suffixes of feminine sing., as a result of which even though there might have been the usage of these suffixes in ancient Prakrit literature, such suffixes must have automatically been discarded. In fact these suffixes are older and are found in both Pāli and Ashokan inscriptions. It does not seem proper to say that there could not have been such suffixes in prevalence, because the period and the region of the origination of the original **Ardhamāgadhī** and **Pāli** literature has been the same. If some usages of such suffixes have survived in the **Ardhamāgadhī**, they indicate an archaic trait, For instance,

*anupuvvīya* (Ācā., 1.8.8.230, Inst. Sing.)

*mucchāya* (Isibhā., 3.2 Gen., Sing.), *araṇīya* (=araṇyām) Isibhā., 22, p.43, 9), *puḍhaviya* (=prṭhivyām) Isibhā., 22.p.43.8).

Similarly, the usage '*sahasammuiyāe*' (v.1. -tiyāe, -diyāe) of the Ācā.; must have actually been '*sahasammuiyā*' or *sahasammutiya* or (-*diyā*) (cf. H. Jacobi) as is found in the *Uttarādhyayana* (*sahasammuiyāsava-samvare*) (28.17), the Ācā. Niryukti Gāthā 65 and 67, and the Ācā. *Cūrṇi*, p.12. The form '*sahasammuiē*' too of this word is found. In the *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*, we find the usages '*mahīya majjhammi*' (1.6.13), '*cariyāya apamatto*' (a variant, 1.9.30), '*samāhīya rate*' (1.10.6, '*samādhīya*' in *Cūrṇi*), *bhāsāya dose, guṇe ya bhāsāya Sū. Kṛ. 2.6.791*.

The usages with the nominal suffix '-ye' as found in the *Isibhāsiyāim* are as follows :

*subhāsiyāe bhāsāye* (Isibhā 33.4). Here there is the use of the Inst. Sing. suffix '-ye' instead of 'e', which is similar to that found in the Ashokan inscriptions.

*pāduppabhāyāe rayanīye* (Isibhā 37, p.83. 23, Loc. Sing.)

In the *Ācārāṅga Cūrṇi*, too, we find the usage '*gāhāye ceva bhaṇṇati amḍayādi*' (p.35.11, Loc. Sing.).

#### (P) Usages with Archaic Terminations of the Past Tense :

Various older terminations for the past tense are found in the *Ardhamāgadhī*, that have disappeared from the later literature; they are of the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular and plural and some times used for other persons and numbers also. For the terminations '*-si*', '*-sī*', '*-im*', '*-ī*', '*tthā*', '*-itthā*', '*-u*', '*-ū*', '*-ssam*', '*-amsu*' and '*-imsu*' see Pischel, (515-518). The antiquity of these terminations is proved

on the basis of those in usage in the Pāli literature and Ashokan inscriptions.

Examples from the Ardhamāgadhī literature :

- (1) *akāsī* (Ācā. 1.9.4.314), *rikkāsī* (Ācā. 1.9.1.257), *ahesi* (Ācā. 1.9.1.298): *pakāsī*, *ṇāsī* (Isibhā., 31, p.69. 10,18).
- (2) *acārī* (Ācā. 1.9.3.294); *bhuvim* (Isibhā., 31, p.69.18). Cf. *abhīramim* (Pāli Suttanipāta, 63.2), etc.
- (3) *kuvvitthā* (Ācā. 1.9.4.321), *esitthā* (Ācā. 1.9.4.318).
- (4) *āhu* (= *āhuh*) (Ācā. Sū.140, Sū kr., 1.2.17,20); *abhū* (= *abhūt*) (Uttarā., Pischel 516), *adakkhu*, *adakkhū*, *addakkhu*, *addakkhū* (Ācā. Sū. 88, 151, 152).
- (5) *akarissam* (Ācā. Sū.,4; Pischel 516), *pucchissa'ham* (Sū. Kr. 1.5.1).
- (6) *āhamṣu* (Ācā. Sū. 1.4.1.28 *abhaviṃsu*. (Sū. Kr. 1.15.25), *himsiṃsu* (Ācā. Sū. 52,256,295), *lusiṃsu*, *nivatiṃsu*, *viharimṣu* (Ācā. Sū.295,297).

(Q) Usages with archaic terminations of Optative Mood :

The common terminations of the Optative Mood in Prakrit are ‘*-jja*’, ‘*-jjā*’, ‘*-ijja*’, ‘*-ijjā*’; and ‘*-ejja*’, ‘*-ejjā*’ but, in the older portions of the Ardhamāgadhī texts, archaic usages with older terminations have survived, which may be illustrated as follows :

- (1) The termination ‘*-e*’ :

*gijjhe* (*gr̥dhyet*), *harise* (*har̥set*), *kujjhe* (*krudhyet*), *kaṇḍūyae* (*kaṇḍūyayet*), *kiṇe* (*kṛ̇net*), *care* (*caret*) - Ācārāṅga; *labhe* (*labhet*), *ciṭṭhe* (*tiṣṭhet*), *uvaciṭṭhe* (*upatiṣṭhet*) - Uttarādhayayana (See, Pischel, 462); *acche* (*ācchindyāt*), *abbhe* (*ābhindyāt*) - Ācārāṅga,

Sū. 1.1.2.15; Pischel, 466; *gacche* - Ācā. 2.1.2. 338 (four times)., 2.15.786. They are corroborated by similar archaic usages that are found in the **Suttanipāta** (Pāli) also, as for instance,

*icche* (47.1), *sikkhe* (52.19), *tiṭṭhe*, *gacche* (54.14), *abhinande* (54.18)

- (2) The termination ‘-yā’ (See, Pischel, 462, 464, 465):

*siyā* (*syāt*), *asiyā* (*asyāt*), *būyā* (*brūyāt*), *haṇiyā* (*hanyāt*), *sakkā* (*śakyāt*), *cakkiyā* (*\*cakyāt*), *labbhā* (*\*labhyāt*), etc.; Ācā. - *pamajjiyā* (*pramārjayet*) 1.9.1.273; *samabhijāṇiyā* 1.187, 214; *siyā* (*syāt*) - *Isibhā.*, 39.3.4; *kujjā* (*kuryāt*) - *Isibhā.*, 39.1,3; Ācā. 2.1.2.338 (seven times) 2.15.786.

- (3) The termination ‘-eya’:

*vatteya* (*varteta*) - *Isibhā.*, 24.11. (In this matter Pischel, 459, says that no such archaic termination was ever prevalent. But, the once or twice occurrence of this in the **Isibhāsiyāim** proves that such usages must have been prevalent in the older manuscripts, and that in the absence of the knowledge of antiquity of the language, they might have been removed by the scribes and replaced by the younger terminations.

## (R) Archaic forms of Gerund of Absolutive or Indeclinable.

(1) For Gerunds, the forms of archaic usages can be shown thus, without applying the Prakrit terminations to the original roots, but only by phonetic changes in the original Sanskrit Gerunds:

*abhikaṁkha* (*abhikāṅkṣya*), *nikkhamma* (*niṣkramya*), *pakkhippa* (*prakṣipyā*), *pavissa* (*praviśya*), *uvalabbha* (*upalabhya*), *pariccajja* (*parityajya*)-See Pischel, 590.



In the younger Prakrit literature, the forms of the Absolutive Gerund that occur are those with the terminations ‘-ia’, and the currency of the archaic Sanskrit-like forms ceases, as for instance, *laṁbhia*, *pavisia*, *pariccaia*, etc. (Pischel, 590).

Similar archaic usages occur in the **Suttanipāta**, too, such as, *ārabha* (54.18), *parakkamma* (54.12). Some more usages, according to Geiger, are *āpuccha*, *nikkhamma*, *pariccajja*, etc. Some more can still be added to these archaic usages of the **Ardhamāgadhī**, such as,

*pappa* (*prāpya*) Ācā. 1.2.3.79, *Isibhā.*, ch. 31 and 45;

*kiccā* (*kṛtvā*) *Isibhā.*, 31; *jittā* (*jītvā*) *Isibhā.* 29, etc.

The later forms for the above two usages are *pāviya*, *pāviūṇa*, *karia*, *karettā*, etc. and *jīṇiya*, *jīṇiūṇa*. can also be added to them.

(2) The absolutive Gerund suffixes ‘-ttāṇam’, ‘-ccā’, ‘-ccāṇam’, ‘-yāṇa’, and ‘-yāṇam’ are believed to have been of very old age; they occur in the sūtra-works, like the *Ācārāṅga*, *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*, *Uttarādhyayana*, *Daśavaikālika*, etc. (See, Pischel, 583, 587 end 592). Some of the examples from the *Isibhāsiyāim* are *kiccā* (35.1; 39.2.; 41.1), *āṇaccā* (*ājñāya*) (11, p.23.20), *nirākiccā* (11.5), *ṇaccā* (11, p.23.20; 30.8), *sāhaittāṇam*, (*sādhayitvā*) (11.4), *jīṇittāṇam* (29.16) *kasittāṇam*, (32.4), etc.

For the corresponding Pāli usages with the forms having the suffix ‘-tvāna’ such as *ñatvāna*, *katvāna*, *chetvāna*, and for those with the suffix ‘-yāna’ and ‘-yāṇam’, see Geiger 209, 214; And for the usages with the suffixes ‘-cca’ and ‘-cya’ used in the Ashokan inscriptions, such as, *āgacca*, (*āgatya*), *adhigicya* (*adhikṛtya*), etc., see Mehendale, p.45.

(3) The Archaic Prakrit Usages of the absolutive form *ḍṣṭvā*:

*dissa* (Isibhā., 28.22); *dissā* (Sū. Kr., Vivāhapa., *padissā* (Vivāhapa.), *dissam* (Uttarā.), etc., (Pischel, 334); they correspond to *disvā*, etc., of Pāli.

**(S) Ancient Usages of Present Participles :**

(1) Usages with the suffix ‘-am’ (= ‘-an’) :

*akuvvam* (*akurvan*) Ācā. 1.9.1.271; *jānam* (*jānan*) - Isibhā., 41.8 Similar usages are found in the *Suttanipāta*, too, as for instance, *akubbam* (47.10; 51.18), *passam*, (51.15).

(2) Usages with the suffix ‘-āṇa’ :

*buyābuyānā* (= *bruvantaḥ*) - Sū. Kr., 1.7.390. According to Pischel (562), such usages are very rare. Corresponding usages occurring in the *Suttanipāta* are *vaḍānam* (42.2), *vaḍāno* (50.11), *paḍānam*, (54.9), *paribbasānā* (51.1), etc.

**(T) The Archaic suffix ‘-ttae’ (-ittae) of the Infinitive Gerund :** This suffix is confined to the Ardhamāgadhī literature only. It is the phonetic modification of the Vedic terminations ‘-tave, tavai’ (See, Pischel 578).

The forms with this same suffix ‘-tave’ are found in Pāli and Ashokan inscriptions. (See, Geiger, 204.1); Mehendale, p.45. Examples from the Ācārāṅga, according to Pischel are :

*tarittae*, *gamittae* (1.2.3.6), *ṭhāittae* (2.8.1), *kahaittae*, *pūraittae* (1.3.2.2.), *dhārittae* (1.7.7.1). According to Pischel (577), this suffix ‘-ttae’ is very popular in the Ardhamāgadhī. Pischel (578) has compared some of such forms with the Vedic usages, as for instance, *pāyae* = (*Vedic pātave*), *vatthae* Ācā. 2.2.2.10 (= *Vedic vastave*); and also *bhottae*, *pātae*, Ācā. 2.1.1. 324.

**(U) A Vedic Adverb :**

*aṇuvīyi, aṇuviyi, aṇuvīi* (See, Ācā. Sū. 26, 140, 196, 197). According to Pischel (593) all these are the Prakrit modified forms of the original Vedic word '*anuvīti*', which is used as an adverbial usage, rather than a gerund. It should be interpreted carefully in the same sense as is found in the Vedic usage.

**(V) Usages of Archaic Forms of Some Roots :**

(1) '*bhū*' = *bhava, bho, hava, ho, hu*

In the senior Ardhamāgadhi works<sup>12</sup> like the Ācārāṅga and the Sūtrakṛtāṅga, the use of the roots '*bhava*' and '*bho*' of the Sanskrit root '*bhū*' are found in a greater proportion than those of its forms like '*hava*', '*ho*', and '*hu*', which are very rare. The use of the root '*bhava*' gradually tends to be scantier in the later Prakrit works, while that of the Prakritized roots like '*hava*', '*ho*' and '*hu*' go on becoming more popular.

The usages of Prakrit roots '*bhū*', '*bhava*' and '*bho*' are found nine times in the Aṭṭhakavagga of the ancient Pāli work like the Suttanipāta, while those of '*ho*' and '*hu*' are found in twenty-two cases. In the Ashokan inscriptions, too, the usages '*bhū*', '*bho*' and '*bhava*' are found to the extent of 25%, while those of '*hu*', '*ho*' and '*hava*' are found to that of 75%. This kind of disparity between Amg. on the one hand and Pāli and Ashokan language on the other hand is worth notable for the antiquity of Amg.

Thus, as compared to the other ancient classical literatures and inscriptions, the usages with the archaic forms of '*bhū*' and '*bhava*' are found to a greater extent in the Ācārāṅga. In view of this evidence, one can have an idea of the antiquity

of the above work which forms the basis of this research.

(2) The Usages of the Root 'brū' :

The forms of the root 'brū' are found only in senior Amg. works, and not in works of later period. For instance<sup>13</sup>, *bemi*, *būyā*, *būhi*, *beṃti*, *buiya*, *bavīti*, *buita*, *buitāo*, *buyābuyāṇā*, etc. (See Pischel 464, 466, 494, etc.).

'*tti bemi*' and '*arahatā isiṇā buitam*' are used in each chapter of the *Isibhāsiyāim*.

(3) The Archaic Forms<sup>14</sup> of the Root 'prāp' (according to Pischel 504) are :

- (a) *pappoi*, *pappoti*, *papputi* (= *prāpnoti*) - Uttarā and (pappati 15.21, pappāti 4.19, *Isibhā.*).
- (b) *pāuṇai*, (*\*pāpuṇāti*, *\*pāpuṇati*) - *Vyākhyāprajñapti*, *Aupapātikasūtra* and *Prajñāpanāsūtra*.
- (c) *pāuṇati* - *Isibhāsiyāim*. 33.8; Sū. Kṛ. 714. *pāuṇamti* - Sū. Kṛ. Sūtra 517.
- (d) *pāuṇissāmi* - Ācā. Sū., 187.
- (e) *pappa* (= *prāpya*) - Ācā. Sūtra, 79; *Isibhā.*, Ch. 31.67.20 *pappā* 33.14.
- (f) *pāuṇejjā* - Ācā., 2. 473.
- (g) *pāuṇittae* - Ācā. 2.490.

(4) Archaic Forms of the Root 'Kṛ'<sup>15</sup> :

(i) (a) *kurute* - *Isibhā.*, 29.17. (*\* kurvate* - active voice usage). This usage has not been noticed in the *Prakrit Grammar* of Pischel. In the *Pāli Suttanipāta*, however, such usages are found, as in 43.1, 4,56; 49.6 etc. See, Geiger 149.

(b) *kajjate*,<sup>16</sup> *kajjati*, *kajjamti*,

- (i) *kajjate* (\**karyate*, a passive voice usage - Isibhā. 34.3).
  - (ii) *kajjati* - Ācā. 67,73; Sū. Kr. 747 (MJV.). Pischel has quoted the form *kajjaī*.
  - (iii) *kajjamti* is its plural form (= *kriyante*) traced in the Ācā. 87, the Sū. Kr. 714, etc.
- (c) *kajjamāṇa* - Sū. Kr., 431.

- (ii) The Usage of the Forms of the Root 'kuvva'

*kuvvati* (Sū. Kr., 376, 417), *kuvvamti* (Sū. Kr., 262, 418); *kuvvamāṇa* (Ācā., 19), *kuvvam*, (Ācā., 13; Sū. Kr. 753); *kuvvitthā* (Ācā., 321), *kuvvaha* (Ācā., 117)", *kuvveja* (Isibhā., 33.7, 17), etc.

Such usages are found in the Pāli Suttanipāta also, as for instance, *kubbatī*, *kubbanti*, *pakubbamāṇo*, *kubbetha*, *kubbaye*, etc. (see W. Geiger). The above archaic usages prove the antiquity of the Ardhamāgadhī, in comparison with other literary Prakrits, e.g. Māgadhī Śaurasenī and Mahārāṣṭrī and at times helps one to realize that it is similar to Pāli. Originally the first redaction of the Ardhamāgadhī canons (i.e. the *duvālasamga gaṇipīḍaga* = 12 *Aṃga* (texts) was done a few centuries before (i.e. circa 4<sup>th</sup> Cent. B.C.) the Christian Era". Hence, similar and other usages, comparable with those in the Pāli are found in this literature. This language is definitely senior and elder than (anterior to) the Mahārāṣṭrī and Śaurasenī Prakrits, and there is no doubt that the phonetic changes (such as, the elision of the medial consonants, etc.) as are found in the usages of words, have all crept in during the subsequent period."

## : Foot-Notes :

1. In the absence of the mention of any other edition, the examples are quoted from the editions of the Āgama texts as published by the Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, Bombay.
2. Some of the archaic usages (with suffixes and terminations of Cases of Nouns and Verbs) gradually go on dwindling and at times go out of use, and new forms replace them, in the Prakrit literature of the later period.
3. Kleine Schriften : Lüdwig Alsdorf, Wiesbaden, 1974, p.200.
4. The Prakrit Grammarians (1972), p.159, f.n.4.
5. Prākṛta Vyākaraṇam, 8.1.209.
6. MJV. 4th Edn.
7. *ata-* (*ātmā-*), *atana*, *atanā* (*ātmanā*), *atane* (*ātmanah*), *atānam* (*ātmānam*).
8. Kleine Schriften (1974), p.232.
9. There is no mention of the case-suffix '*anisi*' in the Prakrit Grammar (8.3.11; 8.3.59) of Hemacandra. Over and above this, a number of archaic usages of the Ardhamāgadhī language are not at all mentioned by him. The opinion of Pt. Bechardasaji Doshi, that the Grammar of Hemacandra cannot explain all the usages of the Ardhamāgadhī, since he has never taken note of all the usages of the Āgamas, seems to be totally justified. Cf. 'Prākṛta Mārgopadeśikā', (4th Edn.), 1947, p.31.
10. An archaic usage, viz., 'tebbho' (tebhyaḥ, Ablative Plural) has survived in the Sūtrakṛtāṅga (1.1.1.8).
11. The Prakrit Grammarians have mentioned the nominal suffixes 'a', 'ā' and 'ī' in the place of these ones. In fact these suffixes have evolved from the '-ya' and '-yā'. The syllables '-ya' and '-yā' must have changed to 'a' and 'ā' by the

time these grammars were composed, and hence they might have not been mentioned. As a result, all those usages that possessed ‘-ya’ and ‘-yā’ in the senior works must have been changed to those with ‘-a’ and ‘-ā’.

12. See, the Indices to the MJV. Editions.
13. See. The Indices to the MJV. Edns. of the Ācārāṅga and the Sūtrakṛtāṅga.
14. The Examples given in the sections 3 and 4 are from the Comparative Grammar of the Prakrit Languages by R. Pischel.
15. Cf. S.M.Katre, ‘Prakrit Languages and their Contribution to Indian Culture, (1945), p.60.
16. Cf. Pischel (508 and 517) for these usages.
17. ibid.
18. This is the date of the First Redaction at the Pāṭaliputra Council which is believed to be held in the second decade of the fourth century B.C. See, *Jaina Sāhitya Kā Bṛhad Itihāsa*, vol. I (Vārāṇasi, 1966), *Prastāvanā*, p.51 by Pt. D. D. Malvania.
19. Āgamaprabhākara Muni Śri Puṇyavijayaji clearly held that the general elision of the medial unaspirate consonant and change of the aspirate one to ‘h’ was not so much prevalent in the comparatively Senior Texts of the Ardhamāgadhī. This has already been mentioned by us in the initial chapter of this work. And, Pt. Bechardas Doshi, too, held that the original Ardhamāgadhī language gave prominence to the consonants, but in the course of time the (medial) consonants disappeared (or were elided). Cf. ‘Prākṛta Mārgopadeśikā’ (4<sup>th</sup> Edn. 1947), p.29.

### 3 THE ANTIQUITY OF THE ARDHAMĀGADHĪ ĀGAMA TEXTS AND THE PLACE OF THEIR COMPOSITION

The nature of the Ardhamāgadhī language of the Jaina Āgama texts is not uniform. This is known to all scholars. And, it is also wellknown that with the passage of time and due to migrations, changes occurred in the original Ardhamāgadhī language. In spite of this situation, even now there are such linguistic evidences in these Āgama texts, on the basis of which it can be determined that the composition of the Ardhamāgadhī Āgama texts took place in Eastern India, and that even now one finds therein numerous elements of the language of the Ashokan period, which have survived somehow in their unmodified form.

#### (1) The Characteristics of the Ashokan Language in the Ardhamāgadhī :

(A) Use of 'ahā' for 'yathā', and of 'āva' for 'yāvat' :

Generally, the initial 'y' changes to 'j' in the Prakrits, but the usages with *ahā* and *āva* for *yathā* and *yāvat*, respectively, are often found in the Ardhamāgadhī, as for instance:

*āhattahīyam* (*yāthātathyam*) or *āhāttahīyam* (*\*yāthātathīyam*), which is the title of the 13<sup>th</sup> *Adhyayana* of the *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*. If this title was to be in Prakrit, it would have been *jahātaccham* (see, Pischel, 335); *ahāsutam* (*yathāśrutam*) - Ācārāṅga 1.9.1.254; *ahākaḍāim* (*yathākṛtāni*) - *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* 2.5.761.

Such usages are often found in the Ardhamāgadhī Āgama works. Pischel has quoted twenty such examples from the Āgama works in his Prakrit Grammar. The works from which he has quoted, and the examples of 'ahā' and 'āva' he has given are as follows :

Ācārāṅga - (a) *ahākappaṃ*, *ahānupuvvīe*, *ahārihaṃ*, *ahāsuhumaṃ*, *ahāsuyam*, *ahātiritta*, *ahākaḍam*, *ahāsaccam*, *ahāpariḷḷa*; (b) *āvakahaṃ*, *āvakahāe*, *āvantī*, etc.;

*Sūtrakṛtāṅga* - *ahākammāṇi*, *ahākaḍam*; *āvakahā*, etc.;



Additional (post Hindi Edition) forms from the Ācā. and the Sū.kṛ. (MJV. Edns.) are as follows :

Ācā. ahāpariṇṇātaṃ, ahālaṃdaṃ 2.7.1.621; Sū,Kṛ. ahāvakāseṇaṃ 2.3.732, ahāvagāseṇaṃ 2.3.723, ahāpariṇṇā 2.3.722 ahābīeṇaṃ 2.3.732, 733; ahāvaram 2.3.733.

*Sthānāṅga* - *ahārāṇiyāe*; *āvakahāe*, etc.;

*Vyākhyāprajñapti* - *ahāmaggaṃ*, *ahāsuttaṃ*, etc.;

*Jñātādharmakathā*, *Upāsakadaśā* and *Kalpasūtra-ahākappaṃ*, *ahāmaggaṃ*, *ahāsuttaṃ* ;

*Aupapātikasūtra* - *ahāṇupuvvīe*;

*Uttarādhyayanasūtra* - *ahākammehim*.

As regards the change of the initial 'y' into 'a', Prof. Mehendale (p.274) says that this was the practice with the Ashokan inscriptions of the Eastern region, and it is found in other regions, too, due to the influence of this region. This practice dwindles after Ashok, but some such usages are found in the Eastern region upto the second century B.C. (Mehendale, p.13).

**Inscriptional examples :**

*athā (yathā)* - Dhaulī, Jaugaḍa, Kālasī and Pillar inscriptions ('*yathā*' elsewhere)

*āvaṃ, āvā (yāvat)* - Dhaulī, Kālasī, Pillar inscriptions, Giranāra, Shāhabājgaḍhī and Mānaseharā.

(B) The use of the word '*muti*' for '*mati*' :

(i) In the *Ācārāṅga*, there occurs the following usage, viz., *sahasammuiyāe* ( *se jaṃ puṇa jāṇejjā sahasammuiyāe*) - Ācā., 1.1.1.2. The following variants for this usage are found in its vṛtti, viz.; *sahasammuiē*, *sahasammaie*. The *Ācārāṅga Nirukti* (Gāthā No.65,67); and the *Uttarādhyayana* (28.17) have *sahasammuiyā* (Instr. Sing.). That means, *sammui* is the original word used in the sense of the word *sammati* = *svamati*.

(ii) The usages like *muta*, *muti* and *sammuti* are found in the Pāli *Suttanipāta* also, e.g., *diṭṭhaṃ suttaṃ mutaṃ*

(43.3; 51.17) *sammuti* (51.10), *mutiyā* (Instr. Sing., 47.12)

- (iii) Such usages are found in the Ashokan inscriptions also, e.g., *vedaniyamute* (= *vedanīyamataḥ*), *gulumute* (= *gurumataḥ*) in the Kālasī inscription No.13; *mukhamute* (= *mukhyamataḥ*) in the Shāhabazagadhī and Mānaseharā inscription No.13, and *mute* (= *mataḥ*) in Kālasī inscription No.6.

It is obvious from these examples that the usage *mute* was prevalent for the word *mataḥ*, and hence it came into use in the Pāli, and the archaic Ardhamāgadhī Prakrit also.

(C) The Case Termination 'āye' = 'āe' of Dative Singular :

The dative singular termination 'āe' for words ending in 'a' is very popular in the Ardhamāgadhī, as for instance, in *taṃ se ahitāe* (Ācā. 1.1.2.13). Pischel (361, 364) has quoted many examples of this usage from the Āgama texts. The predecessor of this case termination is 'āye' and it is to be found in the Ashokan inscriptions, too (Mehendale, p.28), e.g., *imāye aṭhāye*, (= *asmai arthāya*) in Dhaulī, 5.7, and *imāye dhanīmānusāthiye* (*asmai dharmānuśiṣṭyai*) in Dhaulī, 3.2. The form *aṭhāye* is found in the Shāhabāzagadhī and Mānaseharā, too. It is not found in the central, western and southern regions. This very case termination 'āye' changes to 'āe' in the north-western region during the later period, but in the rest of the regions the forms with 'āya' are found later on (Mehendale, p.283). Since no inscriptions of the later period are found from the eastern region, examples of that region cannot be given.

(D) Archaic forms of Imperative III. plu. (additional matter post Hindi Edn.) Ācā 2.1.357 (textual reading is *paribhāeḥa* but the variant is) *Pari(yā ?) bhāedha*-Mss. Khe, Jai. *suṇedha me* -Isibhā. 26.1

(E) The Use of the Present Participle Affix '-mīna' in the place of 'māna':

Sometimes the use of the Present Participle Affix '-mīna' is found in the place of 'māna' in the Ardhamāgadhī Āgama

texts. Sometimes the forms with ‘-mīna’ are consigned to the variants, and the forms with ‘-māna’ and ‘-māṇa’ are placed as the accepted reading. According to Pischel (562) this affix is found to a greater extent in the Ācārāṅga only, e.g., *ghāyamīna*, *samanujāṇamīna*, *aṇādhāyamīna*, *āgamamīna*, *abhivāyamīna*, *apariggahamīna*, *amamāyamīna*, *āsāemīna* (Ācā. Schübring, p.31, 33; (MJV. Sūtra, 192, 199) ; *vikāsamīna* (Sū. Kṛ.); *bhisamīna*, *bhibhisamīna* (Nāyādhammakahāo); numerous such usages are found in the Vyavahārasūtra; and the critical reading of the Ācā. Cūrṇi (p.41.7) edited by Puṇyavijayajī is also like this, viz. , *ārambhamīnā viṇayamī vadamīti* (Sūtra 62).

Here the question arises : Where did the Participle affix ‘mīna’ come from, and in which period was it prevalent ? We get the answer from the Ashokan inscriptions, as for instance,

*saṃpaṭipajamīna*, *vipaṭipādayamīna* - (Separate Dhauli Inscription);

*palakamamīna* - (Sahasārāma Minor Inscription),

*pāyamīna* - (Pillar Inscription)

*pakamamīna* - (Siddāpura, Rūpanātha, Bairat Minor Inscription, Yerraguḍi Erraguḍi Inscription)

*pakamamīna* - ( Brahmagiri Minor Inscription).

According to Mehendale (562), the affix ‘-mīna’ is not found after the Ashokan period. This proves that the Ardhamāgadhī texts, having usages with this affix are definitely as ancient as the Ashokan period.

(F) The Affix ‘-ttu’ (‘-ittu’) of the Absolutive Gerund :

According to W. Geiger the affixes of the Absolutive Gerund that are found, to a greater or lesser extent in Pāli, are as follows, viz., ‘-tvā’, ‘-tvāna’, ‘-tūna’, ‘-cca’, ‘-ya’, ‘-yya’, ‘-iya’, and ‘-yāna’ (208-214)

All these affixes (except the ‘-yya’) are found in the Ardhamāgadhī, of course with phonetic modifications; but there occurs one more termination, viz., ‘-ttu’ (‘-ittu’), which is not found in Pāli (Pischel, 577), for instance,

*jānittu* (Ācārāṅga), *caittu* (Uttarādhyayana), *pavisittu*, *pamajjittu* (Daśavaikālika), *vaṇḍittu* (Kalpasūtra), *suṇittu*, *bhuñjittu* (Daśavaikālika), etc.

All these examples are found in senior Ardhamāgadhī texts, and have been quoted by Pischel.

These same affixes are found employed in the Ashokan inscriptions. Hence, they could be prevalent only in the works belonging to that period. If they were not in currency at that time, how could they find place in the Ardhamāgadhī? Some instances from the Ashokan inscriptions are as follows:

*jānitu* / -*ttu* (Dhaulī Separate inscription) *sutu* / - *ttu* (Kālasī, Toparā), *śrutu* / - *ttu* (Shāhabazgaḍhī, Mānaseharā)<sup>1</sup>.

All the five peculiarities, shown above, viz., initial *y* = *a*-, *matī* = *mutī*, the Dative Singular termination - *āe*, the Present Participle Affix - *māna* = -*mīna*, the affix -*ttu* of the Absolutive Gerund, are found in the Ashokan inscriptions. We have no inscriptional evidences of the period anterior to them. Hence, we cannot say how much archaic they are than even the Ashokan inscriptions. But it is certain that the very fact of their occurrence in the Ardhamāgadhī Āgama texts proves that some of the Āgama texts are at least as old as the inscriptions of the Ashokan period.

(2) Peculiar Characteristics of the Eastern Dialect (of the Ashokan Period) available in the Ardhamāgadhī (G) *r* = *l*

In the Ardhamāgadhī Āgama texts, one finds numerous usages with *l* in places of *r*, as for instance :

In the First Śrutaskandha of the Ācārāṅga there are found *lāḍha* (294, 295, 298, 300), *lukkha* (176), *lūha* (99, 161, 198, 295, 310) *elisa* (177), *aṇelisa* (229), *elikkha* (297), *palichimḍiya* (145), *palichimḍiyāṇam* (115), *palichinṇa* (144), *paliochaṇṇa* (151), *palimokkha* (151), *urāla* (*udāra*, 263), etc.;

In the Sū. Kṛ. these forms are traced ;

(MJV. Edn.) *paligove* I.121, *palibhinda* 279, *paiiumca* 447, 560, *palimarṁtha* 448;

palimam̐thaga II. 713, palimokkha 717, palipāga 732, 33, palikkhīṇa 850, etc.

*antalikkha* (10, p.23.5), *palichañṇo*, (45.45) in the *Isibhā*.

*apalichañṇa* in the *Vyavahārasūtra*.

*palichanna* in the *Bṛhatkalpasūtra*.

*palimadda* in the *Niśīthasūtra*; etc

In his Prakrit Grammar, Pischel (257) has quoted numerous such examples, viz., *am̐talikkha* (*antarikṣa*) *pariyāla* (*parivāra*), *paliyanta* (*paryanta*), *ruila* (*rucira*), etc., from the *Ācā.*, *Uttarā.*, *Daśavaī.*, etc.

In this matter, he remarks that the usage of *r* = *l* occurs frequently in the *Ardhamāgadhī* as compared to other Prakrits. From this viewpoint, this language seems to be akin to the *Māgadhī*, and isolated from the *Mahārāṣṭrī* (Pischel, 257)

In the Ashokan inscriptions of the Eastern region, mostly *l* is found in place of *r*; hence, this characteristic clearly belongs to the Eastern region, and there is close affinity of the composition of the *Ardhamāgadhī* literature with the Eastern region i.e., the Magadha country leaves without any doubts.

(H) *k* = *g*

The change of the medial *-k-* = *-g-* is frequent in the *Ardhamāgadhī*; and the medial *-g-* is mostly retained. It was due to the influence of this language that this process must have continued in the Jaina Śaurāśenī and Jaina *Mahārāṣṭrī* (Pischel, 202). In other Prakrits also we sometimes find *-g-* in place of *-k-*.

The examples from the *Ardhamāgadhī* are *loga*, *asoga*, *āgāsa*, *egamega*, *jamagasamaga*, *kulagara*, *sāgapāgāe*, *siilogagāmī*, *appaga*, *phalaga*, etc.

According to Mehendle (p.271), the process of changing *-k-* to *-g-* belongs to the Eastern region, and it gradually spreads to the Central, Southern and Western regions.

The examples from the Ashokan inscriptions are *loga* (*loka*) in the separate inscription of Jaugaḍa, while on the other hand *loka* is found in others.

In his grammar Hemacandra, too, has given numerous examples of the change of *-k-* into *-g-*, which seems to be an indirect reference to the peculiarity of the *Ardhamāgadhī*. The mention of the elision of the medial consonants is there in the Sūtra 8.1.177; the examples given in the vṛtti on it are *loga*, *ego*, *sāvago* as those of the Vṛtti statement '*ityeva kasya gatvam*'. This is one more evidence in favour of the *Ardhamāgadhī* being the language of the Eastern region.

(I) The Use of the word '*sāmanā*' in the sense of '*samīpa*' :

In some of the works, known as *Aṅga*, of the *Ardhamāgadhī* Canonical literature, the word '*adūrasāmanā*' is found to be employed several times ; it means 'not away from (but) nearby'. i.e 'near', 'in the vicinity', 'beside'. This usage is found in the context of the way in which the disciple used to sit, with modesty, in front of the Gaṇadhara, i.e. the chief disciple of Mahāvīra while listening to the instructions as for instance, *Indabhūī nāman āṇagāre adūrasāmanā jāva ...*; for other such examples, see the *Āgamaśabadakośa*, Part I (1980) p.55.

The usages of both the words '*samanta*' and '*sāmanā*' are found in the Sanskrit literature. In the Vedic literature they are used in the sense of 'neighbouring', 'besides', i.e. 'nearby'. But, in the later Sanskrit literature, the word '*sāmanā*' is used in the sense of a 'feudatory king' (who used to sit near the Emperor, in his assembly). This same word is used in the sense of 'nearby' in the *Ardhamāgadhī* literature; there is no usage of the word '*samanta*' in its place.

The usage of the word '*sāmanā*' in the sense of a 'neighbour' is found in the Ashokan inscription of Dhaulī, Jaugaḍa and Kālasī, while that of '*samanta*' is found in the inscription of Shāhabāzgaḍhī and Mānaseharā. In the Giranāra inscription, there occurs the word, '*samīpam*' in its place. It is clear from this that, from the viewpoint of spelling, the usage of the word '*sāmanā*' has come down to the *Ardhamāgadhī* *Āgama* works, from the same region in which it was prevalent as such. Thus, there is no doubt about the fact that the composition of the *Āgama* works took place

in the Eastern region. The use of the word 'sāmanta' in the sense of a 'neighbour' or 'neighbouring' is found in the Pāli literature, too.

(J) The Anaptyxix (*svara-bhakti*) in the Conjunct Consonants with -y :

The conjunct consonants are generally simplified by assimilation in the Prakrit languages. But, in the Ardhamāgadhī, the instances of the anaptyxix are frequent in the usages where the -y is the latter member of the conjunct consonant, as for instance,

*aṇītiya (anītiya)* - Ācā., 1.1.5.45 ; *tahiya (tathya)* - Uttarā., 28.14; *kāriya (kārya)* - Isibhā., 11.3; *veyāvaḍiḍya (vaiyāvṛṭtya)* - Vyav. Sū., Ācā. 1.5.4.163.

Similar usages are found in the Pāli Suttanipāta also, as for instance,

*tathiya (tathya)* - Suttanipāta 50.5,6; *macchariya (mātsariya)* 49.2.

This process of simplification instead of assimilation of the conjunct consonants is found, according to Alsdorf, in the Ashokan inscriptions of the Eastern India, while in those of the North-Western and Western India they are either assimilated or just preserved', as for instance, *śakya = sakiya* (Jaugada), *saka* (Giranāra), *sakya* (Brahmagiri, Siddāpura); *ibhya = ibhiya* (Dhaulī, Jaugada), *ibhya* (Mānaseharā), *ibha* (Sāhbazgadhi, Kālasī);

*vyañjana = viyañjana* (Dhaulī, Jaugada, Kālasī), *vyañjana* (Giranāra).

(K) The Usages of Final 'a' = 'e' (with case-termination) in the words of the Ardhamāgadhī language :

The case-termination 'e' for the masculine nouns ending in-a in the Nominative Singular is found in general in the Ardhamāgadhī language; it is originally the salient feature of the Māgadhī language. But, in nominal forms other than this one, where there is final 'ah', the occurrence of 'e' in the place of 'ah' is linguistically noteworthy from the regional point of view, e.g.,

- (a) *puras = pure* (in *jassa natthi pure pacchā majjhe tassa kuo siyā* - Ācā., 1.4.4.145; *pure saṃkhaḍim vā pacchā vā* - Ācā., 2.1.2.338); *purekaḍa, purekamma, purekkhada, purekkhāra, puresamthaya*, etc. vide Pischel (345).
- (b) *adhas = adhe, ahe* (*uḍḍham adhe ya tiriyaṃ ca pehamāṇe* - Ācā., 1.9.4.320; *adhe disāto vā āgato* - Ācā., 1.1.1.1; *kāyaṃ ahe vi damisemti* - Sū. Kṛ., 1.4.1.3).
- (c) *heṭṭhā* is also explained as derived from the word *adhe*. *Adhestāt = (\*adheṣṭāt) = dhastāt = hastāt = heṭṭhāt, heṭṭhā* (see, Pischel, 107).
- (d) *bahavaḥ = bahave* (Ācā., 1.9.3.295, 297, 302; Sū. Kṛ., Uttarā, Uvāsagadasāo, Nāyādhamma, etc. see, Pischel, 380)
- (e) *nāmataḥ = nāmate* (*jahā nāmate agaṇikāe siyā* - Isibhā. 22, p.43.5; se *jahā nāmate* - Isibhā, 31, p. 69.20).
- (f) *naḥ = ne, ṇe = asmākam, (paridevamāṇā mā ṇe cayāhi iti te vadamti)* - Ācā, 1.6.1.182; see, Pischel, 419).

The practice of changing the final ‘*aḥ*’ of a word-form to ‘*e*’ instead of to ‘*o*’ has been prevalent specially in the Eastern India, as is evidenced clearly in the Ashokan inscriptions. Such a change is found in other word-forms too, over and above that in the word-forms having the termination of the Masculine Nominative Singular of the words ending in ‘*a*’. As for instance,

*lājine, (rājīṇaḥ)* - Dhaulī, Jaugada, Kālasī; *atane (attane = ātmanaḥ)* - Separate Jaugada inscription, Separate Dhaulī inscription; *piyadasine (priyadarśinaḥ)* - Dhaulī, Jaugada, Kālasī.

But in the inscriptions of other places there are found the usages with the final ‘*o*’ in place of ‘*aḥ*’ e.g. *rāṇo*, (Giranāra, Shāhabāzagadhī) *rājāno* and *priyadasino (Giranāra)*.

It is clear from these instances that the usage with ‘*aḥ*’ = ‘*e*’ is inherited by the Ardhamāgadhī from the



language of the Eastern India, and this is an irrevocable proof of the origin of the **Ardhamāgadhī** canonical works in the Eastern India.

(L) The Use of the Word '*akasmāt*' in the **Ardhamāgadhī** :

It is an important point to be noted that the use of the word *akasmāt* in its original form has been preserved in the senior **Ardhamāgadhī Āgama** work, '*ettha hi jāṇaha akasmāt*' (Ācā., 1.8.1.200, Schübring, p.33.14); *akasmād daṇḍavattie tti* (Sū.Kṛ., 2.2.698, three times).

Here, Śīlāṅkācārya, the commentator of the **Ācārāṅga** remarks : *akasmād iti magadhadese āgopālāṅganādinā saṃskṛtasyaivoccāraṇād ihāpi tathavoccārīta iti* (Ācā., MJV, p.70, f.n. 17; also see, Sū.Kṛ., p. 157, f.n. 23), i.e. this is the peculiarity of the Magadha country.

The preservation of the final '-r' of a word, e.g. *dhit*, is also found in the *Isibhāsiyāim*, (22.8).

The final '-āt' is found in the **Māgadhī** portion of the Sanskrit play the *Mṛcchakaṭīkam*, as in, *dūlāt paḍiṭṭho si* (Act II, preceding the verse No. 1).

Pischel (314) considers the usage '*akasmā*' in the **Ardhamāgadhī** to be incorrect, e.g. *akasmādḍaṇḍa* (Sūyagaḍaṅga, Ṭhāṇaṅga) and *akasmākaṇi* (Sūyagaḍaṅga). He suggests the usage of *akamhā* as proper in their place, since *akasmā* is purely a **Māgadhī** usage.

But, when the *akasmā* (Dhaulī Separate, 1.20,21 and Jaugaḍa Separate, 1.4.) is found in the Ashokan inscriptions of the Eastern region, its usage in the **Ardhamāgadhī** cannot be taken as incorrect. Instead, this usage should be regarded as strong evidence for determining the antiquity and the place of the origin of the **Ardhamāgadhī**. Hence, the suggestion of Pischel to adopt the word *akamhā* in the place of *akasmā* does not seem to be proper.

(M) The Absolutive Gerund '*kaṭṭu*' of the Root '*kr*' :

The affix of the absolutive Gerund '-ttu' has been discussed above. Here, some other facts are presented with reference to the usage '*kattu*' derived from the root '*kr*'.

According to Pischel (577) the usage of *kaṭṭu* or other forms with the (affix) termination *-ṭṭu* are found in a number of *Āgama* texts, such as the *Ācārāṅga*, the *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*, the *Uttarādhyanana*, the *Daśavaikālika*, the *Vyākhyāprajñapti*, the *Vipākasūtra*, the *Aupapātikasūtra*, etc. Over and above the *kaṭṭu* usage Pischel has quoted other usages also, viz., *avahaṭṭu*, *āhaṭṭu*, *samāhaṭṭu*, *sāhaṭṭu*, etc.

From the point of view of the phonetic change the termination *'-ttu'* has changed to *'-ṭṭu'*. The Absolutive Gerund form *kaṭṭu* of the root *kṛ* is found in the Ashokan inscriptions, like Separate Dhaulī and Separate Jaugada inscriptions of the Eastern region. In other regions, *'-tu'* (= *ttu*) in place of *'-ṭṭu'* (= *ṭṭu*) occurs.

Is it not proved, on the basis of this usage, that the **Ardhamāgadhī** texts were composed in the Eastern region ?

The relation, of the above mentioned characteristics with reference to the language of the **Ardhamāgadhī Āgama** texts, as found with those of the language of the Ashokan period proves the antiquity of the **Ardhamāgadhī** language. And, the particular characteristics that are similar to those of the language of the Eastern region in Ashokan period, prove that the **Ardhamāgadhī** texts were composed in the Eastern India. The Jaina tradition too claims that many years prior to Ashok (i.e. in the 4th century B.C. ) the First Redaction of the *Duvālasṃga*— *gaṇipīḍaga* = *dvādaśāṅga* — *gaṇipīṭaka* i.e. the initial twelve *Āṅgas* of the 45 *Āgama* Texts was done in Pāṭaliputra (capital of the Magadha country). Do the archaic and peculiar usages, that are found in the **Ardhamāgadhī** language, not support the date and place of their origin ? Generally, the time of the origin of senior *Āgama* texts is believed to be prior to that of the Pāṭaliputra\* Redaction.

: FOOT-NOTES :

1. The practice of writing or inscribing only one consonant in place of its duplication is found in the inscriptions, as for instance, *ttu* = *tu*.
2. Examples from the Ashokan inscriptions :
  - (a) *aṁtiyokasa sāmāntā lājāne*  
(Dhaulī, Jaugaḍa, No.2.2) :
  - (b) *aṁtiyogasā sāmāntā lājāno*  
(Kālasī, No.2.5);
  - (c) *aṁtiyokassa samānta rajano*  
(Sāhabāzgaḍhī, No.2.6);
  - (d) .. *gasa samānta rajane*  
(Mānaseharā, No. 2.6);
  - (e) *aṁtiyakasa sāmīpaṁ rājāno*  
(Giranāra, No.2.3).
3. See, 'Pāli-English Dictionary', wherein the usages from the *Dīghanikāya* and the *Vinayapiṭaka* are quoted.
4. L. Alsdorf : *Kleine Schriften*, pp.451-2; and see, Mehendale, No.43, p. 22.
5. The following forms are found there in Sanskrit language in the case of the word *puras* occurring as the first member of a compound, viz., *pura*, *purah*, *puras*, *puras*, *purā*, *puro*; there is no usage of *pure* in them.
6. See, 'Jaina Sāhitya Kā Brhad Itihāsa', Vol. I, *Prastāvanā* by Pt. Dalsukh Malvaniya, p. 51.

#### 4. THE ARDHAMĀGADHĪ LANGUAGE OF THE PRAKRIT GRAMMAR OF HEMACANDRA'

In view of the preceding chapters and after critically studying whatever a few characteristics of the *Ardhamāgadhī* language that have been mentioned by Hemacandra in his *Prakrit Grammar*, i.e., the eighth *adhyāya* of his *Siddhahaima-Śabdānuśāsanam*, can we not formulate an independent, and more comprehensive grammar of the *Ardhamāgadhī*, by adding some more points ?

Ācārya Hemacandra begins his Grammar of the Prakrit Languages with the sūtra '*Atha prākṛtam*' (Si.H. Śab, 8.1.1). In order to show the applicability (*pravṛtti*), inapplicability (*apraṛtti*), option (*vibhāṣā*), and variant usages (*anyat*), etc., and with reference to the rules given by him, he has formulated the next sūtra, viz., '*Bahulam*' (Si.H.Śab., 8.1.2). Then, the sūtra '*Ārṣam*' (Si.H.Śab., 8.1.3) is given to indicate the language of the seers.

In this connection, he has quoted an example' (from the *Āvaśyakasūtra*) in his *vṛtti*, i.e. the Auto-commentary, on the sūtra 8.4.287, viz., '*porāṇam addhamāgaha-bhāṣā-niyayaṁ havai suttam*', i.e., the ancient aphorism is fixed in the *Ardhamāgadhī* language. While explaining this, the terms '*ārṣa*' and '*ardhamāgadhī*' are shown to indicate the same language : *ityādinārṣasyārdhamāgadhā-bhāṣā-nityatvam* (*vṛtti* on 8.4.287).

It is surprising that Hemacandra has not given separately any rules for this *Ārṣa* or the *Ardhamāgadhī* language in his grammar. No independent literature of the *Māgadhī* language' is available, but Hemacandra has composed 16 sūtras (8.4.287-302) for this language. For the *Paiśācī* language, 22 sūtras (8.4.303-324) are there. No literature of the *Cūlikā* *Paiśācī* is extant, even then 4 sūtras (8.4.325-328) are there for it. The *Śaurasenī* literature has survived to a great extent in the *Digambara* tradition; even then, he has framed 27

THE ARDHAMĀGADHĪ LANGUAGE OF THE PRAKRIT GRAMMAR OF HEMACANDRA *sūtras* (8.4.260-286). And, for the Apabhramśa language 118 *sūtras* (329-446) are formulated. Even though the *Āgama* literature in the Ardhamāgadhī language is extant to a great extent, he has not given at any single place independent *sūtras* systematically for the language of the Śvetāmbara Jaina *Āgamas*, the sect to which he belonged.

Was it that he did not inherit any treatise on the grammar of the Ardhamāgadhī language, like that of the other Prakrits, through tradition ? Or, had the language of the Ardhamāgadhī literature undergone changes to such an extent that it was almost perplexing to formulate harmonious *sūtras* of grammar for it, independently ? From the *sūtras* of his Prakrit grammar, it seems that the specific characteristics that are noticed in the context of the Prakrits in general also mostly apply in the case of the Ardhamāgadhī, while some more peculiarities are mentioned at some places in due course in the *ṽṛtti*, i.e., the Auto-commentary. In the very beginning itself, after giving the *sūtra* 'ĀRṢAM' (8.1.3), he has explained in the *ṽṛtti*, saying '*bahulam bhavati*' and '*ārṣe hi sarve vidhayo vikalpyante*', i.e., in the *Ārṣa* there are varieties and all the rules optionally apply in its case. This would only prove that while he took trouble of formulating the grammar of all other Prakrit languages he did not do so for the Ardhamāgadhī, perhaps because he might have faced great difficulties in isolating the antiquarian characteristics from that literature. It was due to such an outlook that Pt. Becardas Doshi was not at all prepared to accept the Ardhamāgadhī as an independent language in his '*Prākṛta Vyākaraṇa*'. Of course, this has been criticized by Seth Hargovindadas', and Pischel has already given the status of an independent language to the Ardhamāgadhī.'

It is not necessary to remind that Bharatamuni in his *Nāṭyaśāstra* has specifically referred to the Ardhamāgadhī as one of the seven languages mentioned therein, and he has called it as an independent famous language.'

In his *Prasasti* at the end of his *Siddha-haimaśabdānuśāsanam*, Hemacandra has declared, by way of a justification for composing a fresh grammar, that he has composed a faultless (*niravama*) and formal (*vidhivat*) grammar. Does this statement apply in the case of the Ardhamāgadhī ? It seems, by his *sūtra* 'Bahulam' and by its explanation saying 'sarve vidhayo vikalpyante', the archaic (*Ārṣa*) language has been given very great freedom, and the grammarians got absolved from all limitations or it has been so stated on the line of Vedic grammatical rules because of in that language also there was no uniformity of affixes, suffixes and terminations as it was a conglomeration of various dialects and therefore the aphorism that 'chāndasi bahulam', similarly the Ardhamāgadhī incorporated the linguistic features of more than a single dialect according to the dictate of Lord Mahāvīra to his disciples to teach his religion to the public of different regions in their own mother tongues and therefore it became full of distinct and various forms and hence characterised as 'bahulam'.

In spite of this situation, could it have been possible to formulate an independent grammar incorporating the peculiar characteristics of the Ardhamāgadhī language ? This is being considered here.

### Peculiarities of the *Ārṣa* mentioned.

In his *vr̥tti* on the *sūtras* of the Prakrit grammar, Ācārya Hemacandra has referred to the peculiarities of the *Ārṣa* (Ardhamāgadhī) language 31 times at various places. Of these, one pertains to the main peculiarity, viz., about the case termination '-e' of the Nominative Singular of the Masculine Nouns ending in '-a'. Apart from this, he has referred to the case termination of the nouns twice. He has referred to once about the tense and once about the participle. All other statements mostly refer to phonetic changes.

On the basis of the examples quoted with regard to these peculiarities it becomes clear that Ardhamāgadhī was

THE ARDHAMĀGADHĪ LANGUAGE OF THE PRAKRIT GRAMMAR OF HEMACANDRA  
an archaic Prakrit language. The instances are as follows.

1. The change of Initial 'y-' to 'a-' :

The *sūtra* (8.1.245) is 'āder yo jah', i.e., initial *y*-changes to *j*-. but 'ārṣe lopo 'pi' is also mentioned, as for instance, *ahakkhāyaṃ* (*yathākhyātam*), *ahājāyaṃ* (*yathājātam*). This same process is found in the Ashokan inscriptions also. The process of changing initial *y*- to *j*- belongs to a very late period (Mehendale, p.274)<sup>1</sup>. This change occurs generally in the case of the indeclinables *yathā* and *yāvat* in the *Ardhamāgadhī*.

2. As an example under the *sūtra* 'ārṣe dugullaṃ' (8.1.119) the word *dugulla* (*dukūla*) is quoted. Here, instead of the elision of medial *-k*-, we find it voiced to *-g*-, while the point sought to be illustrated is the change of vowel and duplication of consonant (*duallaṃ*, *duūlaṃ*). But in the example of the *Ardhamāgadhī*, there occurs the change of medial *-k*- to *-g*- instead of its elision. The process of voicing is older than that of elision. We get once the instance of such a change, as in 'loga' (2.7) in the place of 'loka' in the Jaugada Separate inscription of Ashoka belonging to the Eastern region. We also get such an instance of the change of medial 'k' to 'g', as in *upāsaka* = *uvāsaga*, in an inscription of Khāravela.

3. Along with this, there is shown the change of medial *k* to *g* in the *vṛttī* on the *sūtra* 8.1.177 which prescribes the elision of the medial unvoiced consonants, as for instance, *egattaṃ*, *ego*, *amugo*, *sāvago*, *āgāro*, *titthagaro*, and it is added that there are a number of such instances in the *Ārṣa*. All this is the process of voicing, and it became prevalent in many such words of the Jaina Saurāśenī and Jaina Mahārāṣṭrī, under the influence of the *Ardhamāgadhī*. According to Mehendale<sup>2</sup>, this process of the voicing of the unvoiced consonant spread to other regions from the Eastern one. According to Pischel, too, the medial *-k*-changes to *-g*- in the *Ardhamāgadhī*.<sup>3</sup> In fact, should not this change have been mentioned by Hemachandra as a peculiarity of the *Ārṣa* in his Prakrit grammar ?

4. In the *sūtra* 8.2.138, the examples 'avaha' and 'uvaha' for the word 'ubhaya' are quoted, and the *vṛtti* adds 'ārṣe ubhayokālam', it means that in the Ardhamāgadhī the medial 'bh' does not change to 'h' in this word. It is not invariable that the medial 'bh' generally not changes to 'h' in the archaic Prakrit language. This characteristic is traced in the senior Āgama texts edited by western scholars like Jacobi, Schübring, Charpentier, Alsdorf, etc.

5. Medial dental *n* = *n* or (cerebral) *ṇ*:

As per the *sūtra* 8.1.228, the medial dental -*n*- changes to cerebral -*ṇ*-, but the *vṛtti* adds 'ārṣe āranālam, anilo, analo ityādy api'.

This trait of the change of medial dental -*n*- to cerebral -*ṇ*- belongs to South India as per the Ashokan inscriptions, and it spreads to other regions later on; it is not at all a linguistic feature of the Eastern India".

6. Under the *sūtra* 8.1.254, about 25 examples of the change of *r* to *l* have been quoted in the *vṛtti*, at the end of which it is added 'ārṣe duvālasaṅge ityādyapi'. In the Ashokan inscriptions the forms (for the word *dvādaśa*) that are found are *duvāḍasa* and *duvāḷasa*. Later on the 'ḍ' and 'ḷ' changes to 'l'. The process of the change of 'r' to 'l' does not belong to the Śaurasenī or Mahārāṣṭri; or it rather belongs to the Māgadhī and therefore to the Eastern region. It is more probable that those words, as with such a change, as are found in the *Vṛtti* came down from the Ardhamāgadhī to the other Prakrits and became popular therein.

7. In the *vṛtti* on the *sūtra* 8.1.26., the parallels given in the *Ārṣa* for the words *maṇaḥsilā* and *atimuktakam* are *maṇosilā* and *aimuttayam*, respectively, while for the Prakrits the forms given are *maṇamsilā* and *aimumtayam*, respectively. This process of transforming one of the assimilated conjunct consonant into anuswāra, maṇassilā = maṇamsilā and aimuttayam = aimumtayam, is believed to be belonging to a later period.



8. In the *sūtra* 8.2.17 'kṣ' is equated with 'cch', and it is stated in the *ṛtti* that 'ārṣe ikkhū khīraṃ sārīkham ityādyapi drśyante', i.e., 'kṣ' changes to 'kkh', too. In the Ashokan inscriptions, this is the peculiarity of the Eastern region. In other regions 'cch' is found. Later on in all the regions 'cch' and 'kkh' are found simultaneously (Mehendale, p.217)

9. In the *ṛtti* on the *sūtra* 8.1.57, the statement 'ārṣe purekamman' has been quoted by way of an example of 'as' = 'e'; thus *purah* = *pure*. This process belongs to the Eastern region. In the Ashokan inscriptions, '-e' occurs in the case of the forms of the Nominative as also the Ablative and Genitive Singular of the words wherein the *visarga* is found at the end with the preceding vowel -a-, i.e. -aḥ. The usages *nāmate* and *ṇāmate* (for *nāmataḥ*) are found in the *Isibhāsiyāim* (Adh. 22 and 31, pp.43.9 and 69.20, respectively).

10. The case termination '-e' of the Nominative Singular of the Masculine Nouns ending in '-a', is the principal characteristic of the *Ardhamāgadhī*, as per the *sūtra* 8.4.287; this is the linguistic peculiarity of the Eastern India.

11. While mentioning the forms 'abbavi' and 'abbavī' (for *abravīt* of the root *brū*) of the past tense, it is stated in the *ṛtti* (on the *sūtra* 8.3.162) that 'ārṣe devindo iṇam abbavī', i.e., the form in the *Ardhamāgadhī* is *abbavī*. And, the form *bemi* (= *bravīmi*) of the Present Tense has been given as an example in the *ṛtti* statement 'ārṣe bemi' (on the *sūtra* 8.4.238).

Both these forms are archaic and are generally found in the most ancient Prakrit works only<sup>12</sup>. Such forms are not found in the later Prakrit literature. Similar forms are found to occur in the senior works of the Pāli literature, too<sup>13</sup>.

12. While explaining, in the *sūtra* 8.1.206, the change of 'ṛ' to 'ḍ' in the affix of the Past Passive Participle, the *ṛtti* states that *kṛta* changes to *kaḍa*, as in *dukkaḍam*, *sukaḍam*, and *hata* to *haḍa*, as in *āhaḍam*, *avahaḍam*.

This Process, too is found in the Ashokan inscriptions, wherein *kṛta* changes to *kaṭa*\*, and this very 'ṛ' later on gets voiced and becomes 'ḍ'.

13. In the *ṛtti* on the *sūtra* 8.2.146, while giving an example of Absolutive Gerund, it is stated '*kaṭṭu iti tu āṛṣe*', i.e. the termination in the Ardhamāgadhī is cerebralised to '*ṭtu*'.

This peculiarity belongs to the Eastern region of the Ashokan period". In the other regions, the termination '*-ttu*' (dental) occurs.

Could all these characteristics not have been arranged together systematically at one place in the form of the *sūtras*, as has been done in the case of other Prakrit languages ? For these latter, even their stray peculiarities are put together and explained in the *sūtra* form. For Instance :

(a) In the case of the *Śaurasenī* :

- (1) *pūrvasya puravaḥ* (8.4.270), i.e. the word *pūrva* becomes *purava*;
- (2) *ktvā iyadūṇau* (8.4.271), i.e., the affixes for the Absolutive Gerund are '*-iya*' and '*-dūṇa*'.

(b) In the case of the *Māgadhī* :

- (1) *vrajo jaḥ* (8.4.294) is explained in the *ṛtti* as *māgadhyām vrajeḥ jakārasya ñño bhavati*, e.g., *vaññādi* ;
- (2) *tiṣṭhaḥ ciṣṭhaḥ* (8.4.298), e.g., *ciṣṭhadi* ;
- (3) *ahaṁ -vayamoḥ hage* (8.4.301), i.e., *ahaṁ* and *vayaṁ* become *hage*.

(c) In the case of the *Paiśācī* :

*hṛdaye yasya paḥ* (8.4.310), the example quoted in the *ṛtti* is *hitapakam*;

(d) In the case of *Prākṛta*

- (1) *kirāte ca* (8.1.183), as in *cilāo*;
- (2) *saṅkhale khaḥ kaḥ* (8.1.189), as in, *saṅkalam*;

- (3) *chāge laḥ* (8.1.191), as in *chālo*, *chālī*;
- (4) *sphaṭike laḥ* (8.1.197), as in, *phaliho*;
- (5) *kaḥude haḥ* (8.1.225), as in *kauhaṃ*;
- (6) *bhramare so vā* ( 8.1.244 ), as in *bhasalo*;
- (7) *yaṣṭyāṃ laḥ* ( 8.1.247 ), as in, *laṭṭhī*.

He had enough material for formulating independent aphorisms in the case of the *Ardhamāgadhī* as is evident from the examples he has quoted for the *Ārṣa* language. Apart from this he could have made a special statement for the initial 'n' = 'ṇ', and could have formulated the *sūtras* for the change of 'jñ', 'nn', 'ny' to 'ṇṇ', as has been done in the case of *Māgadhī* by him in a *sūtra* ' *nya-ṇya-jñā-ñjāṃ ṇṇāḥ*' ( 8.4.293). All these fall under the archaic linguistic process. Their change to the retroflex 'ṇ' or 'ṇṇ' is also a later process of evolution. In the examples ( except the *Dhātvādeśa* of the Fourth *Adhyāya*) given by Hemacandra himself, the occurrence of the initial 'n' and the initial 'ṇ' is found in the ratio of 8:1, i.e., generally, we find only 'n' in the initial position; similarly, the 'nn' in the place of 'jñ', 'nn', 'ny' occurs more frequently while the 'ṇṇ' is comparatively scanty.

Similarly, a *sūtra* could have been formulated to state that the guttural and palatal nasals ( of the *K*-class and *C*-class ) could be used with the respective consonants of those classes; in this connection, he states in his *vr̥tti* of the initial *sūtra* ( 8.1.1 ) that the nasals do occur in the conjunct form (with its own class); and, in 8.1.30, it is prescribed that when they occur jointly ( with their own classes), they are optionally changed to *Anusavāra*. In spite of this, among all the usages quoted<sup>16</sup> in Hemacandra's *Prakrit* grammar, mostly these conjunct nasals are used, and not the *Anusvāra* in them.

### No Mention of Some of the Characteristics

The characteristics that are not at all mentioned in the *Prakrit* grammar of Hemacandra are as follows. Among these, some are of course much popular, and some have been preserved sometimes in the form of archaic usages.

## (a) Much popular usages :

- (1) The termination '*am̐si*' of the Locative Singular, e.g., *nayaram̐si*, *logam̐si*, *rāyahāṇim̐si*;
- (2) The termination '*ittae*' of the Infinitive;
- (3) The termination '*āe*' of the Dative Singular (of Masculine Nouns ending in -a.
- (4) The terminations '*iyā*', '*iyāṇa*', '*iyāṇam̐*', and '*ittāṇam̐*' of the absolutive gerund ( 8.2.146);
- (5) Although the termination '*ccā*' of the absolutive Gerund has not been mentioned along with those of other participles but it has been as if indirectly referred to in connection with the phonological change of '*tva*' = '*cca*' (8.2.15), as in *soccā*, *bhoccā*, *ṇaccā*. But, the '*ccāṇam̐*' is not at all mentioned.

## (b) Occurring Sometimes :

- (1) The usage of *akasmā* or *akasmāt*;
- (2) About the occurrence of usage with medial -*ta*- (popularly known as 'ta' *śruti*).
- (3) The usage of -*d*- and -*dh*- in the place of -*t*- and -*th*-, respectively, in the medial position;
- (4) The termination -*bhi* of the Instrumental Plural;
- (5) The termination -*mhi* of the Locative Singular of Pronouns;
- (6) The termination -*ya*, -*yā* and -*ye* of the oblique Singular forms of Feminine Nouns;
- (7) The termination -*mīna* of the Present Participle;
- (8) The termination -*i* and -*im̐* of the Third Person Singular of Past Tense.

Of these characteristics, the usages of the occurrence of '*d*-' and '*dh*-' respectively, for the medial '*t*-' and '*th*-' are of course found in the Māgadhī and the Śūaraseṇī, but such usages are found irregularly seldom in the Ashokan inscriptions, and in the same way in Pāli too. The termination

'bhi' is found in older Pāli works. The feminine terminations '-ya', '-yā' and '-ye' of the singular are found in the ancient inscriptions and in the Pāli language. The present participle with the affix '-mīna' occurs in the Ashokan inscriptions. The terminations '-i' and '-im' of the past tense (3rd person singular) occur in the Pāli, while the former is found in the Ashokan inscriptions.

(c) Examples of Archaic Terminations of the Past Tense from the **Ardhamāgadhī** :

(1) *-i* - as in, *abbavi* ( Sen, No. 149, p.165); *bhuvi* = *abhūvīt* (Viyāhapaṇṇatti, Pischel, 516);

(2) *-im\** - as in, *bhuviṃ* ( Isibhā. Adh. 31, p. 69.18; Nārmdīsūtra, Pischel, 516 );

(d) Examples of similar Archaic Terminations from the Pāli literature :

(1) *-i* - as in, *agami*, *kari*, *vedi*, ( Sen, No.149, pp. 164-165 ) ;

(2) *-im\** - as in, *agamim*, *carim*, ( Sen, No.149, pp. 164-165 ) ;

(e) Examples from the Ashokan Inscriptions :

(1) *-i* - as in, *nikhami* (Dhaulī, 8.2), *nikrami* (Shahabazgaḍhī, 8.17; Mānaseharā, 8.35).

(2) \* These may be compared with the R̥gvedic usages like *akramīm*, *vadhīm* (Sen, No.149, p.165).

All these peculiarities have somehow been preserved in the ancient works of the **Ardhamāgadhī** literature since the period of the initial inception of the **Ardhamāgadhī** literature is as old as that of the Pāli literature, and it took place in the Eastern region where Lord Mahāvīra and Lord Buddha preached; and such linguistic processes are found in the Ashokan inscriptions of this same region. In view of these evidences, therefore, it is important to note that the **Ardhamāgadhī** language is as archaic as the Pāli and the language of Ashokan inscriptions.

## : FOOT – NOTES :

1. This is a somewhat revised version of my paper entitled '*Ardhamāgadhī Bhāṣā Aura Ācārya Hemacandra kā Prākṛta Vyākaraṇa*', published in the '*Sambodhi*', vol. XVI, 1989, pp.42-51; it is presented here with due thanks to the editor of the Journal.
2. '*Pāia-sadda-mahaṇṇavo*', (2nd Edn., 1963) *Upodghāta*, p.45, f.n. 4.
3. No exclusive work in Māgadhī is extant, except the Māgadhī that is used in the Sanskrit dramas.
4. '*Pāia-sadda-mahaṇṇavo*' (1963), *Upodghāta*, p.35.
5. Pischel, 16-17.
6. Bharata's N.S., "..... *saptabhāṣāḥ prakīrtitāḥ*" (17.47).
7. One more sūtra (8.3.137) should be added to those ones that are mentioned by Nitti Dolchi. Cf., '*The Prakrit Grammarians*' (1972), p.180, f.n.1. The topics in the *ṽṛtti* on various *sūtras* of Hemacandra's **Prakrit Grammar** ( 8.4) are as follows :

Number of <i>Sūtra</i>	Topic	Number of <i>Sūtra</i>	Topic
1	Ārṣam	1	Final consonant
2	Phonetic change of vowel	1	Indeclinable
2	Change of 'aḥ'	1	Nipāta
2	Initial non-conjunct consonant	1	Case suffix of noun
5	Medial non-conjunct consonants	2	Optional case terminations
4	Initial conjunct consonants	1	Past tense
7	Medial conjunct consonants	1	Participle
23		8	= 31 Total <i>Sūtras</i>

The *sūtra*-numbers, in the Prakrit grammar of Hemacandra ( 8.4 ), treating the above topics are as follows, *pāda*-wise:

THE ARDHAMĀGADHĪ LANGUAGE OF THE PRAKRIT GRAMMAR OF HEMACANDRA

*Pāda* I. 3, 26, 46, 57, 79, 118, 119, 151, 177, 181, 205, 228, 245, 254, (=14);

*Pāda* II. 17, 21, 86, 98, 101, 104, 113, 120, 138, 143, 146, 174 (=12);

*Pāda* III. 137, 162, (=2); *Pāda* IV. 238, 283, 287 (=3);  
14+12+2+3 = 31 ( Total ).

8. Mehendale, M.A., *'Historical Grammar of Inscriptional Prakrits'*, Poona, 1948.
9. *ibid.*, p. 271.
10. Pischel, R., *'Comparative Grammar of the Prakrit Languages'*, para 202.
11. Cf., Mehendale, *op. cit.*, p. 276;
12. Cf., Pischel, 515.
13. Cf., Geiger, *'Pali Literature and Language'*, No. 159, IV; Sen, pp. 163-166, Nos. 145-149.
14. See, *The Word Index to the Ashoka ke Abhilekha* by Rajabali Pandeya, Jñāna Maṇḍala Ltd., Vārāṇasī, V. S. 2022.
15. *Ibid*
16. See the Index of Words appended to the *Prakrit Grammar of Hemachandra* by P. L. Vaidya, Poona, 1928.

## 5. THE ORIGINAL ARDHAMĀGADHĪ FORM OF THE WORD 'KṢETRAJÑA'

The Prakrit forms of the word '*kṣetrajñā*' occur sixteen times in the First Śrūta-skandha of the Ācārāṅga' (Sūtras 32 (4), 79 (1), 88(1), 104 (1), 109 (5), 132 (1), 176 (1), 209 (1), 210 (1), they are found variously in the different editions, as shown below :

- (a) (1) *kheyanna* only, in the edition of Schübring;
- (2) *kheyanna* nine times, and *kheyanna* seven times, in the Āgamodaya Samiti edition;
- (3) *kheyanna* once, and *kheyanna* fifteen times in the JVB. edition;
- (4) *kheyanna* twice, *khetanna* six times, and *khettanna* eight times in the MJV. edition.

### (b) Variants :

- (1) There is only one variant *khettanna* (thrice from the *Cūrṇi* and five times from the G Ms.) in Schübring's edition;
- (2) There is no variant in the edition of the Āgamodaya Samiti;
- (3) Two variants are noticed, viz., *khettanna* and *khettanna* (from the Ca Ms. and the *Cūrṇi*, respectively) in the edition of Jaina Vishva Bharati;
- (4) Five variants, viz., *khittanna*, *khedanna*, *khedanna*, *kheyanna* and *kheanna*, are found in the edition of Mahāvira Jaina Vidyālaya. It is surprising that there is no mention of the variant *khettanna* in this edition, while Schübring has quoted the variant reading *khettanna* from a Palmleaf Ms., and *Cūrṇi*.

### (c) The various Prakrit words with phonetic changes used in different editions are as follows :

- (1) *kheyanna*, *kheyanna*, *khetanna*, *khettanna*

These four variants have not been adopted uniformly by different editors.



- (2) The forms noticed as variants in the above editions are *khettanna*; And *khittaṇṇa*, *khedanna*, *khedaṇṇa*, *kheyanna* and *kheanna*, as mentioned (in b,4) above.
- (3) Thus, we get in all nine forms which can be classified in four types as follows -
  - (i) *kheyanna*, *kheanna* (nn) -jñ = -nn;
  - (ii) *khetaṇṇa*, *kheyāṇṇa* (ṇṇ) -jñ = -ṇṇ;
  - (iii) *khettanna*, *khettaṇṇa*, *khittaṇṇa* (tt) - tr = tt;
  - (iv) *khedanna*, *khedaṇṇa* (d) - tr = t = d.

In some forms  $t = d = a = y$ .

- (d) (1) The word '*kṣetrajñā*' occurs in Sanskrit literature and it is used in the following senses':  
knowing localities, familiar with the cultivation of the soil, clever, cunning, knower of the body, i.e. the soul, the conscious principle in the corporeal frame, dexterous and skilful.
- (2) The Pāiṇya-sadda-mahaṇṇavo gives '*khedajñā*' as the Sanskrit equivalent of the words *kheyanna* and *kheanna*, with the following meanings :  
clever, knower, dexterous, skilful. There is no mention of the other Prakrit forms as shown above, in this Prakrit Dictionary.
- (3) In the Āgama-śabda-kośa, Aṅga-suttāṇi (JVB. Edn.) both the words *khettaṇṇa* and *kheyāṇṇa* are given along with *kṣetrajñā* as their Sanskrit equivalent.'
- (e) The author of the Cūrṇi, explains this word as follows:
  - (1) *khittam jāṇati khittaṇṇo* ; (2) *khittam āgāsam, khittam jāṇatīti khittaṇṇo, tam tu āhārabhūtam dāvva-kālabhāvāṇam amuttam ca pavuccati, muttām'uttāṇi khittam ca jāṇanto pāeṇa dāvva-dīṇi jāṇai / jo vā saṃsāriyāṇi dukkhāṇi jāṇati so khittaṇṇo paṃdīto vā.*
- (f) The commentator of the *Ācārāṅga* mostly explains '*kṣetrajñā*' by the word '*khedajñā*' and also gives

the meanings *nipuṇa* = 'expert', *abhyāsa* = 'study', *śrama* = 'effort', etc. (Āgamo, Edn., p. 124). Sometimes the word '*kṣetrajñā*' is explained as 'expertise'. Śīlāṅkācārya, in his commentary (on Sū. 132) explains '*khedajñā*' thus : '*jantu-duḥkha-paricchetrbhiḥ*'. In fact the original word was '*kṣetrajñā*' which later on changed to '*khedajñā*' also. But, the Prakrit words '*khedaṇṇa*' and '*khedanna*' are found mostly in the paper manuscripts only.'

- (g) The Prakrit forms (readings) that are adopted for the word '*kṣetrajñā*' in the MJV. Edition of the *Ācārāṅga*, and its variants noticed from various manuscripts (palmleaf and paper) are as follows :

<u>Adopted Reading</u>	<u>Variants and Mss. of MJV. Edn.</u>
(Basic manuscript & Sūtra No.)	
1. <i>khettaṇṇa</i> - 32, kham., I., Cū.	<i>khetaṇṇa</i> , Sam., He. 1,2; <i>kheyanna</i> , <i>kheanna</i> (elsewhere)
2. <i>khettaṇṇa</i> -32, I., Cū.	<i>kheyanna</i> , <i>kheanna</i> (elsewhere)
3. <i>khettaṇṇa</i> -32, I., Cū.	<i>khetaṇṇa</i> , Sam., <i>Kham.</i> , He.1,2 ; <i>kheyanna</i> , <i>kheanna</i> (elsewhere)
4. <i>khettaṇṇa</i> -32, I., Cū.	<i>kheanna</i> , He. 3; Lā., Jai.; <i>khetaṇṇa</i> (elsewhere)
5. <i>khettaṇṇa</i> - 79, Śām. <i>Kham</i> Cū.	<i>khetaṇṇa</i> , Kham., Jai ., <i>kheyanna</i> , Sam.; He. 1,2,3; Lā. 3; I.; Cū.
6. <i>khettaṇṇa</i> - 104, (everywhere)	Here the reading <i>khetaṇṇa</i> in the <i>Cūrni</i> (p.100.1)
7. <i>khettaṇṇa</i> - 176, kham.	<i>khetaṇṇa</i> , Khe., Jai., I.; <i>kheyanna</i> (elsewhere)
8. <i>khettaṇṇa</i> - 210, kham.	<i>khetaṇṇa</i> , Khe., Jai.; <i>kheyanna</i> (elsewhere)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 9. <i>khetañña</i> - 132,<br>(elsewhere)        | <i>kheañña</i> , Saṁ., <i>khedañña</i><br>He. 1,2,3; Lā.; <i>khittañña</i> ,<br>Cū.  |
| 10. <i>khetañña</i> - 209, khe., Jai.,          | <i>kheyañña</i> (elsewhere)  |
| 11. <i>khetañña</i> - 109,<br>(elsewhere)       | <i>khetañña</i> , Kham.;<br><i>kheyañña</i> , He. 1,2,3; I.,<br>Śām.                 |
| 12. <i>khetañña</i> - 109 Cū(?)                 | <i>kheyañña</i> , Śām, Khe, Jai.,<br>I., He., 1,2,3; <i>khedañña</i> ,<br>Saṁ, Kham. |
| 13. <i>khetañña</i> - 109(elsewhere)            | <i>khedañña</i> , Kham..   |
| 14. <i>khetañña</i> - 109(elsewhere)            | <i>kheyañña</i> , Śām., He., 2,3,<br>Lā., I.; <i>khettañña</i> , Cū.,                |
| 15. <i>kheyañña</i> - 88, (not clear)           | <i>khittañña</i> , Cū.; <i>khedanna</i> ,<br><i>kheyanna</i> (in other Mss.)         |
| 16. <i>kheyañña</i> - 109, except<br>Khemū Cū., | <i>kheyanna</i> , He., 1,2,3, Lā.,<br>Jai., I.                                       |

**(h) A Critical Survey of the Selection of Readings by Editors :**

The individual peculiarity of Schübring is that he does not mention the variant readings which are against his accepted principles. It is, therefore, difficult to say what variants were found by him, until we review the material utilized by him. He has given only one variant '*khettanna*', and he has rejected it in preference to the reading '*kheyanna*' which he has adopted everywhere. He has preferred '*nn*' in the place of '*jñ*' and '*tt*' in place of '*tr*.' and '*y*' in that of '*t*'. In the notes, he has mentioned both the words *kṣetrajñā* and *khedajñā* as Sanskrit equivalents.

The numerous Prakrit transformations of the word '*kṣetrajñā*' can be explained from the point of view of historical linguistics, in the following manner :

*kṣetrajñā* = *khettajñā* → *khettanna* → *khetanna* → *khedanna* → *khedañña* and *kheyanna* → *kheyañña*.

- (1) *khettajñā* - (From the view-point of linguistic peculiarity) a word (of the stage of the Pāli, Māgadhī and Paisācī.) From the regional view-point it

- dialectically represents the West, North-West, and South (according to the Ashokan inscriptions).
- (2) *khettanna* - Characteristic of the Eastern region (as per the Ashokan inscriptions). It is an important point that the First Redaction of the Jaina Āṅga Āgamas was done in the Eastern India at Pāṭaliputra.
  - (3) *khetanna* - The original word '*khettanna*' changed to '*khetanna*', because the optional elision of one of the consonants occurring in a conjunct one is recognised in the Prakrit language.
  - (4) *khedanna* - When the centre of religious preaching (i.e. Jainism) shifted from Magadha (East) to the North-West (to Mathurā, i.e., the Śūrasena region), the medial '*r*' changed to '*d*', thus transforming the word '*khetanna*' to '*khedanna*'. This change of '*r*' to '*d*' occurs in the region of Mathurā, where the Second redaction of the Jaina Āgamas was fixed up; this change of '*r*' to '*d*' is the main feature of the Śaurasenī.
  - (5) *kheyanna* - Again, when the centre of (i.e. Jainism) religious propagation shifted further to the Western region (of Gujarat and Saurashtra), the word '*khedanna*' was transformed into '*kheyanna*' (due to elision of the medial unvoiced consonant and introduction of '*y*' as well as the change of the dental nasal to the cerebral one. Note that the place of the fixing up of the Third Redaction of the Jaina Āgamas was Valabhī (in Gujarat).

Thus, the elision of the medial consonant (as also *y-śruti*) and the change of '*n*' to '*ṇ*' are accepted as the linguistic processes of a later period, particularly of this very (Western) region; it is quite proper both from the chronological as well as the regional points of view (based on the evidence of inscriptions).

In this manner although the archaic Prakrit form '*khettanna*' (the ancient form prevalent in the Eastern India, i.e., the Magadha country) changed to '*kheyanna*' in the later

period ( in the Western India) due to the regional influence, even then, if the reading '*kheyanna*' occurs to a greater extent in the manuscripts of the later period, the original ancient form of the word used in the Jaian *Āgama* texts must have been '*khettanna*' only.\* From this view-point, the reading '*kheyanna*' adopted by Schübring proves to be not proper, nor does the reading '*kheyanna*' adopted by other editors. It is a point worth a special attention that among the readings that occur in the *Cūrṇi*, the use of 'y' in the place of 'tt' is rather rare.

When the word '*khettanna*' passed through the stages of '*khedanna*' (i.e. 't' → 'd') or '*khedaṇṇa*' (i.e. 'n' → 'ṇ') due to the linguistic changes occurring in the Prakrit, the original component '*kṣetra*' of the basic word '*kṣetrajña*' was forgotten due to the ignorance of the original tradition, and it was taken to be rather '*kheda*' and began to be understood in the sense (i.e. , 'grief' or 'fatigue') of the latter. The way in which the word '*mātra*' changed to '*matta*' - '*māta*', - '*māya*'; '*pātra*' to '*patta*', '*pāta*' and '*pāya*', and '*ātma*' to '*ātta*', - '*āta*' and '*āya*', in the same way the word '*kṣetra*' changed to '*khetta*' → '*kheta*' → '*kheya*'. Hence, the tradition of deriving the word from '*khedajña*' is a later one', and not at all proper. However, Pischel (276) has given only the word '*kheyanna*', and as its Sanskrit equivalent '*khedajña*', but in the same place he has given '*mātrajña*' as the Sanskrit equivalent of the Prakrit word '*māyanna*', then why not *kheyanna* should stand for *kṣetrajña*.

The gist of all this investigation and analysis is that the original word in the Ardhamāgadhī was '*khettanna*' only, which was related to the Sanskrit word '*kṣetrajña*' meaning 'the knower of the Self,' and not at all to the word '*khedajña*'; this new equivalence is the contribution of a later period. With the process of linguistic change in the developments in the Prakrit language, under the influence of different times and places, the word '*khettanna*' underwent many metamorphoses and took many forms, and all these have survived to this day in the different editions of the *Acārāṅga*. It is

hardly necessary to say that in the new edition of the Āgamas, only the reading '*khettanna*' should be adopted as proper, appropriate and the archaic one.

Similarly, from the point of view of different times and places, the word took many shapes, and these are found in different forms in different manuscripts of the three stages of the collation of the versions of the Āgamas. The cause of all this is the influence of the local usages of the changing times and places. If this word was uttered by Lord Mahāvīra, and was given a word-form by the Gaṇadharas in writing and recitation of their compilation of his teachings, as also in the First Redaction of the Jaina *Āṅga Āgamas* compiled in Pāṭaliputra, the form of this word must have been '*khettana*' as is evidenced by the Ashokan inscriptions of the Eastern region; and hence only this form of this word should be taken as original and appropriate. If this be unacceptable, the next choice would be the (Śaurasenī) reading '*khedanna*' or '*khedaṇṇa*' of the Second Redaction as but proper. In case this too is not acceptable, the third choice should be the reading '*kheyanna*' only of the Third Redaction fixed up in Valabhī. Thus, it will ultimately mean that it is Devardhigaṇi who composed the Āgama texts and his language is influenced by the Mahārāṣṭri rather than the Māgadhī. But the question that arises is, how can the usages of the anterior period and prevalent in different times and places occur in the same composition of a same later date. The only explanation in such a case is that, if this work is an ancient text, and that too of the Eastern region (Magadha-deśa), the only proper and acceptable archaic reading of the word should be the '*khettanna*' one; and this should be adopted in the Ācārāṅga text. This is the only conclusion justified on the basis of the linguistic and historical development. By chance, as an additional evidence, we find the readings '*a-khettanna*' (642), '*a-khettanna*' (641), '*khetanna*' (680) in the printed MJV. edition of the Second Śruta-skandha of the Sūtrakṛtāṅga. Do the last two readings, not support the reading '*khettanna* or *Khetanna*' of this word ?

: FOOT-NOTES :

1. Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya Edition, edited by Muni Jambūvijaya, 1977.  
(Additional matter post-Hindi Edition)  
In the *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* (MJV. Edn.) the text and variants are as follows:  

(Text)	(Variants in Mss.)
(a) <i>khetanna</i> 2.1.641	(a) <i>khetanna</i>
<i>khetanna</i> 2.1.641, 680	<i>kheyanna</i>
<i>kheyanna</i> 2.1.640	<i>kheyanna</i>
(b) <i>khetanna</i> 2.1.639, 642	(b) <i>khetanna</i>
<i>khetanna</i> 1.15.619; 2.1.643	<i>kheanna, kheyanna</i>
<i>kheyanna</i> 1.6.354; 2.1.640	<i>kheyanna, khetanna</i>
2. (a) *Sanskrit-English Dictionary* by Monier Moneir-Williams, Oxford, 1899, p. 332, col. 2 : Under 'Kṣetra' ... "-jñā, mfn. knowing localities, TBr. iii; AitBr.; TāṇḍyaBr.; SBr. xiii; ChUp.; familiar with the cultivation of the soil (as a husbandman). L.; clever, dexterous, skilful (with gen.), MBh. i, 3653; cunning, L.; (as) m. 'knowing the body', i.e. the soul, the conscious principle in the corporeal frame, ŚvetUp.; Mn. viii, 96; xii, 12 & 14; Yājñ.; MBh. Hariv. 11297, &c."  
 (b) *kṣetrajñā = ātmā (kṣetrajñā ātmā puruṣaḥ)* - Amarakoṣa 1.4.29; 3.3.33
3. The word '*khetanna*' occurs among the variants in the section b (3) of this chapter.
4. *Āyāraṃgasuttaṃ*, MJV. Edn. (1) p.26, f.n. 8; (2) p. 39, f.n. 10.
5. *ibid.*, p.26, f.n. 8; p. 39, f.n. 10 (He. 1,2,3 and Lā. Mss.
6. Why should the preference be not given to archaic readings when such readings are already found in the manuscripts of the original texts and the *Cūrṇi*? The use of both the readings, '*khetanna*' and '*khetanna*' is found in the *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*, 2.641; 2.641, 680 respectively.
7. No such word like '*khetajñā*' is noticed in the Sanskrit and Pāli Dictionaries.

## 6. THE TEXTUAL READING OF THE OPENING SENTENCE THE *UPODGHĀTA* OF THE *ĀCĀRĀṆGA*

While passing on orally to his disciple Jambūswāmī the teachings of Lord Mahāvīra, that were listened to by him as they were uttered by the Lord, the Gaṇadhara Śrī Sudharmāswāmī with the words : “*suyam me āusam ! teṇam* (v.l. *teṇa in Cūrṇī*) *bhagavayā evam akkhāyam ...*” ( the beginning of the First Uddeśaka of the First Adhyayana of the First Śruta - skandha of the *Ācārāṅga* )

We may think first, on the two words of this statement, ‘*āusam*’ and ‘*teṇam*’ from the context in the sentence, and then the three words, viz., ‘*suyam*’, ‘*bhagavayā*’ and ‘*akkhāyam*’ from the linguistic point of view.

There can be nothing to remark regarding this statement if it has been added subsequently – a very very long time posterior to the age of Sudharmāswāmī, for establishing a system of narration. But, if this statement had existed right from the time of the redaction of the First Council (prior to the Fourth century B.C. i.e. even before Aśoka), it definitely deserves to be deliberated upon.

Sudharmāswāmī was a direct disciple of Lord Mahāvīra, and Jambūswāmī that of the former. From the point of view of time, Lord Mahāvīra was not a past teacher far removed from Sudharmāswāmī, so as to necessitate the latter to use the words ‘*teṇam bhagavayā*’, i.e. ‘by that Lord’, for Lord Mahāvīra. If the intervening period had been very long, and it had been an incident of past, such a usage would have been justified; otherwise it does not seem proper.

There is no unanimity about this usage among the commentators in Sanskrit and the *cūrṇīkāra* too. About the possibility of the reading ‘*āusamteṇa*’ in the place of ‘*āusam teṇa*’, the author of the *Cūrṇī* (p.9) writes : “*ahavā āusamteṇa, jīvātā kahitam athavā āusamteṇa gurukulavāsam ahavā āusamteṇa sāmipādā vinayapuvvo sissāyariyakamo darisio hoi āvasamta āusamtaggaṇeṇa /”*.



While explaining the meaning of “*śrutam mayā āyuṣman*”, in his *vṛtti* (p.11), Śīlāṅkārcāya states : “*mayeti sāksān na punaḥ pāramparyeṇa*”, i.e. ‘by the usage mayā the author means that he had himself listened directly, and not by tradition (later on). Further, he adds : “*yadī vā āmrśatā bhagavat-pādāravindam..., āvasatā vā tad-antika ity anena gurukulavāsaḥ kartavya ity āveditam bhavati, etac cārtha-dvayaṁ ‘āmusamteṇa āvasamteṇa; ity etat pāthāntaram āśrityāvagantavyam iti*”. Since this has been explained thus, it seems but proper to think that Sudharmāswamī listened to the teachings of Lord Mahāvīra while he was staying with and serving the latter. From this viewpoint only the reading ‘*āusamteṇa*’ seems to be proper. This same reading, viz., “*suyam me āusamteṇa bhagavatā evam akkhāyaṁ*” is found in the Second Śruta-skandha (Sūtra 638) of the Ācārāṅga (MJV), and the same reading is found in the *Cūrṇi*, too; moreover there is the reading ‘*bhagavatā*’ in the place of ‘*bhagavayā*’ (Ācārāṅga, MJV. Edn. p. 227 f.n. 2).

#### Other References :

In some other context, the usaga of the word ‘*āusamto*’ is found several times in the Eighth Adhyayana of the First Śruta-skandha of the Ācārāṅga itself, when a Bhikṣu addresses a Gāthāpatī or the latter addresses the former, as for instance; *āusamto gāhāvātī* (8.2.204; 8.5.218); *āusamto samaṇā* (8.2.204; 8.3.211). Looking to these usages, as also that of ‘*āuso*’ as a Vocative in the Sūtrakṛtāṅga, e.g., *vaccagharagaṁ ca āuso khaṇāhi* (1.4.2.13) when the former usage is found to occur several times in the Ācārāṅga and the Sūtrakṛtāṅga, it has to be considered as to how proper is the usage of the word ‘*āusam*’.

(1) The usages in the Ācārāṅga, First Śruta-skandha : *āusamto gāhāvātī* (1.8.2.204); *āusamto samaṇā* (1.8.3.211); *āuso* (1.8.2.204); Similar usages occur many times in the Second Śrutaskandha (2.1.9, 396, 399 etc.; cf. Index to the edition).

(2) The usages in the Sūtrakṛtāṅga : *āuso* (1.3.3.198); *ahāuso* (2.6.837); *ayam āuso* (2.1.649);

*samañāuso* (2.1.644); *āusaṃto* (2.7.845, 846, 848, 851 etc.). About more than twenty times the usages of *āuso* and *āusaṃto* are found in this work too.

(3) Usages in Other Works : Similar usages are found in other works also. For instance : *evāmeva samañāuso : je amhaṃ niggaṃtho vā'...* (Nāyādhammakahāo, N. V. Vaidya's Edn. Ch. 4, p.67; Ch. 5, p. 82; Ch. 7, p. 89); *āuso Tetali-puttā ehi tā āyāpāhi* (Isibhā. Schübrig's Edn. Ch. 10, p.23.5; *āuso Tetali-puttā katto vayāmo* (ibid., p.23.11).

(4) Usages in the Pāli Tripiṭaka Literature : Here too, the usage of the word '*āvuso*' in the Vocative is found to occur, with 'v' in the place of 'y' as it is there in *āvudha* (= *āyudha*). The form '*āvuso*' (Voc. Plu.) is taken to have been an abridged one of *āyusmanto*, while the regular form is believed to have been *āyusmant*.

We may, now, consider the phonetic changes found to have occurred in the words '*suyam*', '*bhagavayā*' and '*akkhāyāmi*'. The first and the third words are Past Passive Participles, while the second one is form of the Instrumental Singular. Looking to the similar usages found in the *Ācārāṅga* itself, the phonetic changes that have occurred in them, do not seem to be proper. Some of the usages in the First Śrutaskandha of the *Ācārāṅga* (MJV) are as follows :

1. *ahā sutam vadissāmi* (1.9.1.254).
2. (a) *bhagavatā pariṇṇā paveditā* (1.1.1.7; 2.13; 3.24; 4.35; 5.43; 6.51; 7.58);  
 (b) *bhagvatā paveditam* (1.2.5.89; 6.3.197; 8.4.214; 8.5.217; 8.5.219; 8.6.222, 223);  
 (c) *māhaṇeṇa matimatā* (1.9.1.276; 9.2.292; 9.3.306; 9.4.323).
3. (a) *esa maggo āriehim pavedite* (1.2.2.74);  
 (b) *muṇiṇā hu etam paveditam* (1.5.4.164);  
 (c) *jam jinehim paveditam* (1.5.1.168);  
 (d) *paveditam māhaṇeṇam* (1.8.1.202);  
 (e) *buddhehim evam paveditam* (1.8.2.206);  
 (f) *nāyaputteṇa sāhite* (1.8.8.240);  
 (g) *cariyāsaṇāim...jāo būṛao āikkhaha tāim...* (1.9.2.277);

Thus, several such usages, like *suta*, *pavedita*, *sāhita*, *būita*, as also like *bhagavatā*, *matīmatā*, etc., are found to occur in the First Śrūta-skandha of the Ācārāṅga itself. From this point of view, the introductory sentence in the context should have been : ‘*sutaṁ me āusaṁteṇa bhagavatā evaṁ akkhātāṁ*’.

In this very context, let us notice the usages found in the *Isibhāsiyāim*, which has been edited by Schübring himself. In this work, the use of the phrase, “ ... *arahatā isiṇā būitāṁ*” occurs with the name of the concerned seer, in the beginning of each and every chapter. Thus, the usage ‘*arahatā*’ occurs 43 times, that of ‘*būitāṁ*’ 37 times, and that of *būiyāṁ* 7 times.

Compare with this the readings, in the Ācārāṅga, viz., ‘*bhagavayā .. akkhāyaṁ*’ in the light of the one, viz., “*arahatā... būitāṁ*” in the *Isibhāsiyāim*.

Veteran scholars have accepted the *Isibhāsiyāim* to have been as old as the four senior Ardhmāgadhī Āgama works, viz., the Ācārāṅga, the *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*, the *Uttarādhyayana* and the *Daśavaikālika*. Why then should there be such a difference in the languages of these two works ? From this point of view, the correct and archaic reading in the Ācārāṅga would have been ‘*sutaṁ me āusaṁteṇa bhagavatā evaṁ akkhātāṁ*’. And, this very reading is supported by the following readings from the *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* :

- (i) *suyāṁ me āusaṁteṇa bhagavatā evaṁ akkhāyāṁ* (2.1.638);
- (ii) *suyāṁ me āusaṁteṇaṁ bhagavatā evaṁ akkhātāṁ* (2.3.722); and
- (iii) *sutaṁ me āusaṁteṇaṁ bhagavatā evaṁ akkhātāṁ* (2.2.694).

So far as the question of the change of the medial dental ‘n’ to the cerebral ‘ṇ’ is concerned, it should have been the former only, originally. The process of the change of ‘n’ to ‘ṇ’ belongs to the period subsequent to the Christian Era, particularly prevalent mostly in the South, West and North-West In-

dia, as is evident from the Ashokan inscriptions and those of the subsequent period.'

According to the additional material found after the publication of its original Hindi edition 1991-92, the reading 'āusante ṇam' seems to be the proper one in the place of the 'āusanteṇam', 'ṇam' as an indeclinable and 'āusante' as the Māgadhi form (of āyusmat) in the Vocative Singular.

### : Foot-notes :

1. I am thankful to Professor M.A. Dhaky of Varanasi, for assessing the reading from this point of view.
2. Three types of forms are found for the Vocative, viz., āusam, āuso and āusanto. Of these, the form 'āuso' is Singular, and the 'āusanto' is Plural of Honorific Singular. It should be noted that wherever the usage 'āusam' occurs, it is preceded by the word 'teṇa' or the 'teṇam'. Hence, it seems it was from the original word 'āusanteṇam' that the element 'teṇam' or 'teṇa' got separated in the course of the later period. In this connection it seems now, in the light of fresh researches, that the original reading must have been 'āusante ṇam', in accordance with the usage in the Māgadhi language. Cf. Ācārāṅga, Prathama Śrutaskandha, prathama Adhyayana, edited by K.R. Chandra, Prākṛta Jaina Vidyā Vikāsa Fund, Ahmedabad, 1997, p. 76.
3. Cf. Pāli Tripiṭaka Concordance, p.345; the reading in the Vijayodayāṭikā of the Mulārādhana is thus - 'sudaṁ me āussanto bhagavadā evam akkhādanī' (Ācā., Introduction, p. 36, MJV. Edn., 1977). This sentence is in 'Śaurasenī Prākṛta in which the form is 'āussanto' then why not 'āusante' form in the Amg. Prākṛta with the Nominative and Vocative Singular suffix - e. of the -a ending Masculine Noun in Māgadhi.
4. Cf. Paramparāgata Prākṛta Vyākaraṇa Kī Samīkṣā aur Ardhamāgadhi, edited by K. R. Chandra, Prā. Jain Vidyā Vikāsa Fund, Ahmedabad, 1995, Adhyāya No. 7 and 8.
5. Cf. Ardhamāgadhi Bhāṣā meṁ Sambodhan Kā Eka Vismṛta Prayoga 'Āusante', Śramaṇa, July-December, 1995, Pārśvanātha Vidyāpīṭha, Varanasi.

## 7. RECONSTRUCTION OF THE ORIGINAL ARDHAMĀGADHĪ : AN ENDEAVOUR

The teachings of Lord Mahāvīra about the aspects of proper conduct like non-violence, as recorded in the First *Uddeśaka* of the Fourth *Adhyayana* of the First *Śruta-skandha* of the *Ācārāṅga*, the most ancient text of the Jaina Ardhamaṅgadhi literature, are as follows :

*“savve pāṇā savve bhūtā savve jīvā savve sattā na  
hamtavvā na ajjāvetavvā na parighettavvā na  
paritāveyavvā na uddaveyavvā”*. 1.4.132

This means : no being should be killed, nor should any being be tormented in any way. This is the pure, regular and eternal religion (*Dharma*) that has been taught by the self-realized souls.

The text of words of Lord Mahāvīra emphasizing this fact have been edited as follows in the different editions of the *Ācārāṅga* :

- (i) *esa dhamme suddhe nitie sāsae samecca logaṃ  
kheyannehiṃ paveie* (Schübring's Edn., 1.4.1);
- (ii) *esa dhamme suddhe ñie samicca loyaṃ kheyaṇṇehiṃ  
paveie* (Āgamo. Edn., 1.4.1.126);
- (iii) *esa dhamme suddhe ñie sāsae samicca loyaṃ  
kheyaṇṇehiṃ paveie* (JVB. Edn., 1.4.1.2);
- (iv) *esa dhamme suddhe ñitie sāsae samecca loyaṃ  
khetanṇehiṃ pavedite* (MJV. Edn., 1.4.1.132).

Among the words used in these four editions, the following readings of the text are not uniform :

(Sanskrit)	(Schu.)	(Agamo)	(JVB.)	(MJV.)
1. nitya	= nitie	ñie	ñie	ñitie
2. sametya	= samecca	samicca	samicca	samecca
3. lokam	= logaṃ	loyaṃ	loyaṃ	loyaṃ
4. kṣetrajñaiḥ	= kheyannehiṃ	kheyaṇṇehiṃ	kheyaṇṇehiṃ	khetanṇehiṃ
5. praveditah	= paveie	paveie	paveie	pavedite

It is clear that these variant readings have been adopted, as per the different individual beliefs about the principles of the speech, (and not according to the historical and

evolutionary developments in the Prakrit language, nor having taken into consideration the nature of the teacher's speech as prevalent at the time and place), and under the influence of the rules of the Prakrit grammarians (which being not historical chronologically, do not explain the peculiarities of the Ardhamāgadhī language). Consequently, there are found the variants in their readings. It is necessary to understand properly the how and why of this imparity.

- (1) Some editors have changed the 'e' to 'i' when it precedes the conjunct consonant, as in *samicca* (for *samecca*).
- (2) Some editors have effected the elision of medial 'r' or of medical 'd', as in *niie* (for *nityah*) *paveie* (for *praveditah*).
- (3) Some editors have changed the initial dental 'n' to cerebral 'ṇ', as *nitie*, *ṇiie*, (for *nityah*).
- (4) Some have elided the medial 'k', by 'y' while some other has voiced it to 'g', as in *loyam*, *logam* (for *lokam*); in *loyam* there is 'y' -śruti of the residual vowel.
- (5) Some have changed the medial 'jñ' to 'nn' and some others to 'ṇṇ' as in *kheyanna*, *kheyanna* (for *kṣetrājñā*).
- (6) Some have changed the 'tr' to 'r', while some others the 't' to further 'y'.
- (7) Some have changed the medial 'd' to 'r' (from *khedajñā*), while some others to 'y'.

It seems, from these variants, that each editor had his own particular assumption about the Ardhamāgadhī language. The main reason for this situation is that no Prakrit grammarian has given us a compact grammar of the Ardhamāgadhī language.

If we consider all these variants, and examine as well as review them critically, we will realise to some extent at least as to how such a difference has occurred in them. It seems, from the phonetic changes found in these words, that :

- (1) Some editor may have felt the likeliness of the intrusion of Pāli language in the word '*pavedita*', and hence thought it proper to adopt '*pavedia*' only;

- (2) Some may have suspected the 'r' – śruti in the 'khetanna' and 'nitiya' and so they adopted 'kheyenna' and 'niie', 'niie' only;
- (3) Some may have been influenced by the rule of elision, and so thought it necessary to elide medial 'r' and 'd' and adopt the reading 'paveia';
- (4) Some may have felt the change of 'jñ' to 'nn' as improper (i.e. going against the phonetic rule of Prakrit), and so changed it to 'ññ' in accordance with the grammatical rule.

In these adopted readings :

- (1) There is Pāli too, as in *pavedita*;
- (2) There is Pāli and Ardhamāgadhī too, as in *samecca*;
- (3) There is Ardhamāgadhī too, as in *logam*;
- (4) There is Mahārāṣṭrī too, as in *loyam*, *niie*, *kheyanna*; and
- (5) There are, on the other hand, the linguistic peculiarities of the Eastern region during the Ashokan period as in 'logam', 'niie' and (kheya)nne(him). It seems, from this analysis, that as a result of all these, the Ardhamāgadhī language as is found at present is practically a hotchpotch of many Prakrit (languages) dialects.

In whatever manuscripts that were availed of by each of the editors, there were variant readings too, but they have left out some of them. In fact, if considered from the viewpoint of historical development of the Prakrit (M.I.A.) languages, there were preserved in some or the other Mss. the archaic elements (i.e. retention of medial consonants of the original language; but they were not at all taken into consideration. For instance :

- (1) The variant reading 'khattannehimi' was available there in the *Cūrṇi* and in the G manuscript, those were utilised by Schübring;
- (2) The variant reading 'khattannehimi' was there in the C manuscript utilised for the JVB. edition;

(3) The variant reading '*khittañña*' was there in the *Cūrṇi* utilised for the M J V. edition.

In spite of this situation (instead of adopting the reading '*khetanna*' in its original archaic form) why should the readings '*kheyanna*' or '*kheyañña*' be adopted, when both these forms belong to the later period from the viewpoint of linguistic evolution, first comes '*kheyanna*' and later on '*kheyañña*'.

In the *Ācārāṅga* (First Śruta-skandha), Schübring has uniformly adopted the only reading '*kheyanna*' through out, but the form '*kheyañña*' is also found adopted in the JVB. edition; the form '*kheyañña*' is adopted in the Āgamo. edition; and all the three forms, viz., '*kheyañña*', '*khetanna*' and '*khettañña*', are found adopted in the MJV edition, but '*kheyanna*' is no where found. The equivalent of this word is '*kṣetrajña*' in Sanskrit which means '*ātmajña*' or the Self-realized one. But, later commentators have connected it with '*khedajña*' through conjecture and ignorance about the original form and sense of the word; and further they have endeavoured to explain it whimsically, deriving it from the latter conjectural word. In view of this latter derivation, the medial '-d-' is supposed to have been elided, and the residual '-a-' changed to '-ya-' glide. This would be a change like the one in *mātra* → *mātta* → *māta* → *māya*, and *pātra* → *pātta* → *pāta* → *pāya* similar to the development of *ātma* → *ātta* → *āta* → *āya*.

(1) It was, therefore, not necessary to replace '-tr-' by '-d-'.

(2) In the archaic Prakrit language '-tr-' has changed to '-tt-' and not to '-t-' or '-y-'.

(3) In the Ashokan inscriptions' of the Eastern region '*jñ*' has been found to have been represented by '*nn*' and not by '*ññ*'.

(4) Generally, the phonetic change of '*nn*' to '*ññ*' appears to take place in the period subsequent to the Christian Era, and that too from the Southern and North-Western regions.



(5) 'nn' = 'ṇṇ' is purely a Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit' pnonetic process, not the one of Pāli, Māgadhī, Paiśācī or Śaurasenī as per the grammarians themselves.

(6) The usage with 'nn' = 'ṇṇ' in the original (i.e. archaic) Ardhamāgadhī, therefore, is tantamount to forcibly knowingly or unknowingly transforming it into Mahārāṣṭrī. Has this not happened in the past ? and is yet happening ? due only to ignorance about the genuine characteristics of the original Ardhamāgadhī language ?

(7) Prof. Schübring has throughout adopted 'nn' for 'jñ', but in adopting 'y' in place of 'tr' and in leaving off 'tt', he has chosen improper reading. It seems unavoidable to point out that he too has been influenced by the derivational equivalence with the word 'khedajñā'. He has adopted 'nitiya' in place of 'nitya'; which is quite proper as it is archaic form. But, 'niya' and 'ṇiya' are purely artificial, and looks as if it is the literal implementation of the rule of elision of the medial '-t-' without taking into consideration the archaic trait of the language of East India of the Ashokan times.

(8) It is surprising to find that neither the word 'nitiya' (which is archaic), nor the 'ṇiya' or 'niya' are there in the Prakrit Grammar of Pischel.

(9) There has been the prevalence of anaptyxis in the ancient inscriptions and ancient Prakrit, as for instance, 'kya' = 'kiya' 'tya' = 'tiya', 'vya' = 'viya', etc.; in conjunct consonants whereas assimilation of them belongs to a later period.

(10) The change of 'e' to 'i' (preceding the conjunct consonants), e.g., 'samicca' in place of 'samecca', will not be found everywhere, nor is it a characteristic of antiquity.

(11) The Ardhamāgadhī literature is full of the usage of medial 'k' = 'g'; which is sporadically traced in (the Ashokan inscriptions of) the Eastern region, in the form of an option only. Elision of medial 'k' is the common characteristic of the Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit; and this process of elision belongs to a much later period. The elision of medial 'd' and 't',

as in 'paveiya' ← 'pavedita', is also the peculiarity of the later Prakrits. In the Śaurasenī and the Māgadhi, the 'd' is generally retained, and in the Pāli and the Paisācī, the 't', too.

(12) The Ardhamāgadhi is related more to the Māgadhi, but not to the Mahārāṣṭrī; the very occurrence of the element 'Māgadhi', in the name 'Ardhamāgadhi' of this language indicates its antiquity. Had it not been so, the language could have been termed as 'Ardha-Mahārāṣṭrī' or 'Ardha-Śaurasenī' ?

(13) From this viewpoint, whatever archaic forms (nominal, verbal and of participles) occur in the senior texts of Ardhamāgadhi, they indicate that this language is nearer to the Pāli and Ashokan dialect of the East but not to the Mahārāṣṭrī.

(14) Originally, the Ardhamāgadhi language was not a mixture of Māgadhi and Mahārāṣṭrī : it is the distortion of the process of a later period.

Now, therefore, if the sentence under discussion belongs to the age of Lord Mahāvīra, being the very utterance from his holy mouth, or if it be the faithful reproduction of his speech in the written form by his Gaṇadharas, the sentence should, in that case, read as follows :

*'esa dhamme suddhe nitie sāsate' samecca logaṃ (or lokaṃ)\* khetannehi' pavedite'*

If this speech is not as it was uttered by Lord Mahāvīra, or it was not as presented by the Gaṇadharas, or it is not the reading of the First redaction at Pāṭaliputra of the fourth century B.C., but rather of the Third and Final redaction fixed up in the time of Devardhigaṇi at Valabhī (fifth-sixth century A.D.), or it was he who has compiled/composed the scriptures, in that case there is no question of any discussion for us, and anyone can accept/adopt whatever reading that may occur in the context\*.

: FOOT NOTES :

1. For confirmation of this type of opinion, see, *Kalpasūtra*, Ed. Muni Puṇyavijayaṃ, Sarabhai Manilal Navab, Ahmedabad, 1952, Introduction, p.7.
2. Cf. '*Paramparāgata PrākṛtaVyākaraṇa kī Samīkṣā aura Ardhamāgadhi*', Chapter 9, K.R. Chandra, 1995.
3. *ibid.*, Chapter 10.
4. Cf. Mehendale. 1948, pp. 22-24
- 5-7. The elision of 't' in '*sāsate*' seems to be improper. The ancient text like the *Isibhāsiyāim* is full of the usages with medial '-t-'. The use of the suffix '*hī*' for the Instrumental Plural in the place of '*hi*' is also of the later period.

For the research work about the medial '-t-', '-k-' and the case termination '-hi' that has been carried out after the publication of its original Hindi edition, see '*Paramparāgata PrākṛtaVyākaraṇa kī Samīkṣā aura Ardhamāgadhi*', K.R. Chandra, Prākṛta Jaina Vidyā Vikāsa Fund, Ahmedabad, 1995, Chapter 4, and mainly viii on p,27; and p,28; chapter 15, p,135. See also on pp, 142-144 for the readings with the medial '-t-' quoted from the auto-commentary on the *Viśeṣāvaśyaka-bhāṣya*; also, cf. '*Ācārāṅga, Prathama Śrutaskandha, Prathama Adhyayana*', K.R. Chandra, Prākṛta Jaina Vidyā Vikāsa Fund, Ahmedabad, 1997, for the reading reconstructed from linguistic viewpoint.

8. Additional matter Post-Hindi Edition :- But the wording of this sentence in the *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* itself (MJV. Edn.) is as follows :

*esa dhamme dhuve ṇitie sāsate samecca logaṃ khetanṇehim pavedite* (sūtra No. 2.1.680) and moreover there is the textual reading *ṇitie* in place of *ṇitie* in the Sū. Kṛ. (2.6. 822). This proves beyond doubt that textual readings suggested above would stand to be original and archaic.

## 8. PRINCIPAL CHARACTERISTICS OF ARCHAIC OR ORIGINAL ARDHAMĀGADHĪ

The language that was spoken in half region of the Magadha country or the language which contained half of its characteristics as similar to those of the **Māgadhi** language and the other half which were prevalent in the neighbouring regions was known by the name **Ardhamāgadhi**. Keeping this tradition in mind, and on the basis of the archaic usages that have still survived in the Prakrit grammar, ancient Pāli literature i.e., senior Pāli works, ancient and senior **Ardhamāgadhi** works and manuscripts of the *Āgama* literature, *Cūrṇīs* etc., the indigenous characteristics of the original **Ardhamāgadhi** can be determined, and those characteristics can serve as our guide for editing the ancient works whose seniority or antiquity can be determined on the basis of the topic of contents, style and metre of the individual **Ardhamāgadhi** work. I may humbly put forth the main characteristics of Amg. as follows :

1. In the case of the Indeclinables in Saṃskṛta with initial 'y-', if 'a-' is found in the place of 'y-', it should be given preference.
2. The medial unaspirate consonants should not be elided, as is generally done in the case of the **Mahārāṣṭrī**. (It cannot be denied that the process of eliding medial consonants has been encouraged in course of time due to the recitational facility of the text with predominance of vowels.)
3. Generally it would not be proper to prefer the medial 'h-' in the place of the medial aspirate consonants.
4. The medial 'k' or the 'g-' found in its place, as also the original medial 'g-' should be preferred.
5. The medial 't-' should not be elided with the impression that it is -t- of the phonetic change (i.e.-t- *śruti*), since the interpolation of the -t-*śruti* in manuscript - writing belongs to a very late period.

6. If the medial ‘-d-’ and ‘-dh-’ are sometimes found in the place of the medical ‘-t-’ and ‘-th-’, respectively, they should be taken as preserving an ancient characteristic. If sometimes medial ‘-t-’ is found in the place of medial ‘-d-’, it should be taken as representing an ancient stage, anterior to the process of elision.
7. If sometimes ‘-ḷ-’ is found, as in the case of the Pāli, it should not be changed, as a rule, to ‘-d-’. (Cf. The example of the word ‘*kaḷabha*’ quoted by Hemacandra in his *vṛtti* on his sūtra 8.1.7; and also the examples of ‘*leḷu*’ and ‘*leḷumsi*’ quoted by Pischel, 304, 379.). For the usage of words like *kīḷa*, *khela*, *chhaḷa*, *ṇaḷāḍa*, *taḷāga*, *taḷāva*, *tāḷa*, *dohaḷa*, *pīḷa*, *phaḷiḷa*, *phāḷiya*, *veḷu*, *soḷasa*, etc., in Ardhamāgadhī (cf. Pischel’s Index of words).
8. The initial dental ‘-n-’ should be preferred and the dental ‘-ṇ-’ of the word *na*, an indeclinable, should be preserved as such (as has been in practice with the western editor-scholars like Jacobi, Schübring, Alsdorf etc. and some Indian editors).
9. If sometimes the dental ‘-n-’ is found in the medial position, it should not be deemed necessary to change it to cerebral ‘-ṇ-’ everywhere.
10. The ‘-l-’ found in the place of ‘-r-’ should be preserved as it is a specific feature of Māgadhī.
11. If a reading with anaptyxis, in the place of assimilation of conjuncts is found, it should be preferred, e.g., *daviya* (for *dravya*), *nitiya* (for *nitya*), *tathiya* (for *tathya*), *agaṇi* (for *agni*), *usina* (for *uṣṇa*).
12. The guttural nasal ‘-ṇ-’ and the palatal ‘-ñ-’ occurring with the homogeneous consonants of their own class should be preserved as such as is the case with the western editors. The practice of changing them to *Anusvāra* everywhere should not be insisted upon.
13. If a conjunct of palatal nasals ‘-ññ-’ is found, it should not be taken as fit to be discarded on the ground of

the grammatic rule as it does not provide us with the factual practice that was in vogue in the ancient times.

14. The conjunct consonants 'jñ', 'nn', and 'ny' should be changed to 'nn', as is being done by the Western editors. Let it be specifically noted that the change of conjuncts 'ny' and 'rñ' to dental 'nn' has been the peculiarity of the Eastern India of the Ashokan period.
15. The *arahā* for *arhat* or *arahanta*; *attā* or *ātā* for *ātman*; *khattanna* for *kṣetrajña*; and *akasmāt* - all these are archaic usages; hence they should be preserved.
16. Like *pure* for Samskrit *purās*, *adhe* for Skt. *adhas* should be preserved.
17. If the case suffix '-e' of the Nominative Singular of Masculine Noun ending in '-a' is found, it should not be changed to '-o'; it should be preserved as such.
18. If the case suffix '-ni' is found in the Nominative and Accusative Plural forms of Neuter Nouns, it should be preserved as such.
19. If the forms with archaic suffix of the Instrumental Singular of words ending in consonants e.g. *maṇasā*, *vacasā*, *teyasā*, *tavasā*, *cakkhusā* (Pischel 408), and if sometimes forms, like *ātasā*, *kāyasā*, *pannasā*, *balasā*, *bhayasā* (Pischel 364), with the termination '-sā' in the case of the words ending in vowels, are found, they should be preserved.
20. If the termination '-bhi' of the Instrumental Plural is found, as in *thībhi*, (Ācā. Sū. 1.84), *pasūbhi* (Uttarā. 9.49), it should not be changed to '-hi'.
21. The terminations '-āya' or '-āe', used for the Dative Singular, of the Nouns ending in '-a' should not be changed.
22. If '-e' is found in the place of '-o', in the Ablative Singular forms of Nouns and Pronouns ending in '-a', wherein a visarga occurs in the final position ('- :') of Skt. forms it should not be changed. It is one of the peculiarities of the Ashokan inscriptions of the Eastern region. As per this very rule, the 'ne' (for *naḥ* = *asmākam*) should not be changed to 'no'.

23. Similary, if there occurs an archaic form of the Ablative Singular as a Participle, e.g., *padiso*, and *kamaso* (in the sense of the Instrumental Singular) in the case of words ending in consonants and the forms with the case suffix '-so', like *savvaso* etc., in the case of words ending in vowels it should be preserved.
24. If the case suffix '-mhā' of the Ablative Singular occurs, it should be preserved since it is an older suffix evolved from '-smāt'.
25. The Nominal suffixes '-ya', '-yā', '-ye' (or even '-i' and '-ā') of the oblique nominal cases (from the Instrumental to the Locative Singular), in the case of Feminine words, should not be deemed fit to be discarded, taking them to be the case-suffixes of the Pāli language.
26. The case suffixes '-to' or '-o' of the Genitive Singular of the Present Participle should be preserved as instances of archaic forms.
27. The various historical case suffixes '-ssim', '-ssi', 'smim', 'smi', 'mhim' or 'mhi' of the Locative Singular should be preserved. (The error of confounding 'sa' and 'ma' mutually is found not only in the manuscripts, but also in the inscriptions; consequently, at times the '-ssi' or 'am̐si' are found to have been changed to '-mmi' or 'am̐mi' in some instances.
28. If there occurs the termination '-ti' of the Third person Singular of the Present Tense it should not be changed to '-i' (see the text of Ācārāṅga edited by H. Jacobi, 1882).
29. If the termination '-te' of the Present Tense of the Third Person Singular in Atmanepada is found, it should not be changed to '-ti' or '-i' or '-tī' or '-ī'.
30. The terminations '-e' and '-yā' of the Optative Mood are older than its later '-jja' and '-jjā' forms; they should, therefore, be preferred.
31. The archaic terminations, like '-si', '-sī', '-im', '-ī', 'tthā', 'itthā', '-u', '-ū', '-ssam', '-amsu', '-imsu', of the Past Tense,

that have somehow or otherwise survived, should be preserved.

32. The suffix ‘*ḍa*’ of the forms in Past Passive Participles of the roots eding in ‘*ṛ*’ as also of some other roots, as found in *kaḍa*, *maḍa*, *nivvuḍa*, *avahaḍa*, *gaḍa*, etc., should not be changed.
33. The termination ‘*mīna*’ of the Present Participle, if found as in the Ashokan inscriptions, should be preserved; it indicates antiquity.
34. The absolutive terminations ‘*ttā*’, ‘*ttāṇam*’, ‘*ya*’ (‘*iya*’), ‘*yā*’, ‘*yāṇam*’, ‘*ccā*’, and ‘*ccāṇam*’ are considered to be older ones.
35. The termination ‘*ttae*’ (‘*ittae*’) of the Infinitive is older one.
36. The usage of ‘*bhava*’ for the root ‘*bhū*’ should be considered as older than that of ‘*bho*’, ‘*hava*’, ‘*ho*’, and ‘*hu*’.
37. Those historical forms that are connected with the Ancient Indian Language (OIA), even if the phonetic changes may have occurred in them in some instances, should be preserved as such, whether they may be the forms of Nouns or Verbs or Participles or Indeclinables.





**REVIEWS AND OPINIONS**  
**ON THE**  
**ĀCĀRĀṄGA**  
**PRATHAMA ŚRUTA-SKANDHA**  
**PRATHAMA ADHYAYANA**  
**(Linguistically Re-edited)**  
**(Page xxx + 328; Price : Rs.150-00)**

**K. R. CHANDRA**

**Prakrit Jain Vidya Vikas Fund**  
**Ahmedabad**  
**1997**

The editing of a Jaina *Āgama* text - be it Śvetāmbara or Digambara is one of the most difficult tasks of Prakrit scholars. For the last more than one hundred and fifty years, both occidental and oriental scholars have been trying their best to edit Jaina *Āgama* texts faithfully and correctly, and for this, they have accepted some principles for the Prakrit literature, and the Jaina *Āgama* texts, in particular. Though J. Stevenson translated the *Kalpasūtra* along with the *Navatattva* (London, 1848), he did not mention the MSS from which he had translated the text. Later on, a critical edition was prepared by Jacobi (Leipzig, 1879). At present, though we find some discrepancies with the printed editions of the *Kalpasūtra*, it is still a kind of the earliest reference to the *Kalpasūtra* used by many scholars. But the best edited text of the Jaina canonical literature, as far as we know, is A. Weber's edition of the *Bhagavatī-sūtra*. (*Ein Fragment der Bhagavati*, in ABA. 1865 (pp. 367-444) and 1866 (pp. 155-352)).

It was as early as 1865-66, Weber realized certain orthographic difficulties of the manuscript for selecting a particular reading. As a result, in his introduction he has laid down certain principles for editing Jaina canonical texts. Later on, Hermann Jacobi (*Ācārāṅgasūtra*, London, 1882), Pischel (*Deśināmamālā*, Bombay, 1880) and many others have all faced the problems of editing Prakrit texts in general, and Jaina *Āgama* texts, in particular. In modern times Hiralal Jain, A. N. Upadhye, Dalsukh Bhai Malvania, Harivallabh C. Bhayani and many others have edited Jaina *Āgama* and Prakrit texts and encountered insurmountable difficulties in selecting certain readings for the texts whenever they have collated a text from some manuscripts.

When the world of Prakrit has been wavering for a long time to find out the correct and faithful reading of the *Āgama* text, it was, at that time the edition of K. R. Chandra's *Ācārāṅga*, the first chapter of the first Śrutaskandha appeared in the horizon a few months ago. Dr. Chandra has been working on this text for a long time, and as a prelude to

his edition he has written several articles and books on the problems of finding out the original language of the *Āgama* text. The present text i.e. the edition of *Ācārāṅga*, is an outcome of that long persistent labour. In his edition he has discussed again quite a lot on how to edit a Jaina *Āgama* text, and what type of reading is to be selected for the restoration of the original language of the Ardha - Māgadhī texts. It goes without saying that he has laboured much on this point, and from that point of view, he has been successful in presenting the text faithfully. Linguistically also this text will help the scholars to find out different readings of the printed texts. I can vouchsafe sincerely that this text will furnish us lots of material for the future generation to work on.

It is true, indeed, that there might be some scholars who may not like all his arguments as applied to the text. Some of the readings he has selected for the main body of the text can be altered with the readings of the text given by him in the footnotes. The reading of the very beginning of the text may be altered as per reading of the other texts and some may feel that some of the readings may not represent the original language of the text. For example Chandra's reading *sutaṁ me āusante(?) ṇaṁ* can be altered as *sutaṁ me āusaṁ teṇaṁ*, in this sort of reading the difficulty is with the euphonic combinations *santena*. This sort of *sandhis* is not very happy in Prakrit. Moreover, *teṇaṁ* is a very common word used in most of the Ardhamāgadhī canonical texts and this is not to be separated by any way, particularly when it is an adjective to the next word *Bhagavatā evaṁ akkhātāṁ*. In some of the commentaries of the *Āgama* text where the words *teṇaṁ kāleṇaṁ teṇaṁ samayeṇaṁ* are found, some commentators tried to separate *te* and *ṇaṁ* and so also *kāle* and *ṇaṁ* and take some sort of explanations which did not go on a par with the original intended meaning of the text. However, as far as the general notions are concerned, certain remarkable features of this edition can be mentioned.

One of the noticeable things in his edition is the absence of *ya-śruti* in Amg., even though consciously or unconsciously in some places, perhaps, *ya-śruti* is printed, e.g. at page 118 : 35 the reading *jātimaraṇamoyaṇāe* which, to my mind seems to be a sort of *ya-śruti* with the loss of the intervocalic consonant. The reason for this reading is that one of the editions has given this reading *moyaṇāe* without any variation. From his edition it appears that the author thinks that *ya-śruti* is not one of the vital features of Amg., as most of the scholars think, but is a later development in later Prakrits. Of course in accepting the reading *moyaṇāe* the author has given his explanation for the retention of *ya*-(see page 12 : 12), yet this simple restoration shows that the author has partly accepted *ya-śruti* at least in those places where he has no other alternative readings available in any edition.

It should be borne in mind that *ya-śruti* has a long history in Indian languages. Pāṇini (400 B.C) has recorded this phenomenon for the Sanskrit language (comp.Pā.viii.3.18). This was also found, of course, very rarely in Pali probably as a remnant of Sanskrit (Geiger. *Pali Literature and Language* , 60). In Prakrit, of course, it is abundantly found because some of the intervocalic consonants constantly drop out as a result the remaining vowels after 'a' or 'ā' have a slightly (*ya*) like *śruti* which is linguistically also very very correct. D. C. Sircar has mentioned an *ya-śruti* in the *Būrhikhan Brahmi* Inscription in Bilaspur District, M. P. He says "The epigraphy may be palaeographically assigned to a date about the close of the first century B.C."....."The language of the Inscription is Prakrit. Interesting from the epigraphical point of view is the *ya-śruti* in the names *Payāvati* for *Prajāpati* and *Bhāradāyī* for *Bhāradvājī*. But there is no case in which a surd has been modified into a sonant." (*Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society, Culture and Heritage Number*, Bangalore, 1956, pp.221-24). And in almost all the manuscripts of the Amg. texts this type of *ya-sruti* is found. So, I do not know how

far it is right to think that there was no *ya-Śruti* in the Amg. text. (For a detailed study of the problem, see my article- *Ya-Śruti in Prakrit*. Jain Journal, Vol-xxvi, No.3 January, 1992, pp. 157-169). However. Dr Chandra, at least, has been consistant in not recording any reading with *ya-Śruti* (except in a very few cases) throughout the text and from that point of view he has maintained what he has said in the Introduction.

His other points like the initial and medial dental *n, jñā, nya* etc. need some more consideration than what he has said in the Introduction. The whole problem of editing Jaina *Āgama* texts is a severe one, and the problem is not like Sanskrit or Pāli. This is, indeed, true that we will have to accept some procedures to edit a Prakrit text, before we venture to improve upon the text. His inclusion of *-dha-* intervocally makes the text a Śaurasenī one. In some cases, intervocalic *-k-* is changed to *-g-* but in other cases *-k-* (intervocalic) is retained. However, I am not in a position to assess all these readings in this short space and time, but I am sure that this text will provide lots of interesting phenomena for future generations to come.

On the whole this edition is admirable and commands respect from the readers of Prakrit. One thing very praiseworthy is that what Dr.Chandra thinks as the correct reading, he has accepted and his conviction that the original language of the Amg. text was more archaic than what is found in later Prakrits is faithfully represented in the text. I personally believe this edition of Dr.Chandra will rouse stimulations in the minds of the scholars and for that reason this edition has a remarkable value in the scholarly world.

Satya Ranjan Banerjee

JAIN JOURNAL, CALCUTTA, VOL.XXXI. No.4,

April, 1997, pp.134 -136

Co-editor of the *Dictionary of the Prakrit Proper Names* (Ahmedabad, 1977) , Mr.K.R.Chandra is known for his long-time interest in Middle-Indian Languages and in Jain traditions. At L.D.Institute of Indology of Ahmedabad, and at the Gujarat University where he has worked for a long time, he was able to closely follow the research and the thinking which led to the discovery and the collation of the ancient manuscripts on the palm-leaves of the canonical texts and of their comments, and then at the publication, by the Mahavira Jain Vidyalaya (MJV) of the Jain Agama Series, Bombay, 1968 and the following.

The difficulties, the codicological particularities and the linguistics were properly studied by the editors (Muni Punyavijaya at the head) who worked on it in the introduction of the first volume of the collection : they bring out the ceremonial criticism, very heavy, very polished, of which the new editions are well-stocked (equipped). But in the light of the entire lot of the documents thus made accessible gradually, K.R.Chandra judges that a lot of progress in the knowledge of the old Canonical language (authentic) can be accomplished, provided that first of all take into account methodically, systematically, all the lessons, that transmit the most ancient sources, to proceed in comparison to which the treatises prepare themselves.

It is with what they use in the present study, which will render to the making of the three publications of the same series; *Prācīn Ardhamāgadhī Kī Khoj Mem*(on the traces of the old Ardhamāgadhī), Ahmedabad, Vidya Vikas Fund 8, 1991, 110p, *Restoration of the Original Language of Ardhamāgadhī Texts*, Ahmedabad, 1994, (Prakrit Jain Vidya Vikas Fund), 93 p. and *Paramparāgat Prakrit Vyākaraṇ kī Samīkṣā aur Ardhamāgadhī*, Ahmedabad, 1995.

In short, as clarified in the introduction (chap.1) it is proposed here, after a very thorough study, to make an inventory of the most ancient attested forms in the 5 most ancient canonical treatises and every time that it finds itself

attested somewhere, to replace them with the most recent forms which had replaced them eventually in the course of the transmission. Hence, for example, the intervocalic consonants are often restored etc. as also the typically Ardhamāgadhī endings. (nouns-masculine, e.g.-e etc.)

There is the series of the collection undertaken : (chap. 2) comparison of the lessons of the *Ācārāṅga* in the different editions and the different manuscripts of the text, in the other *Āgamic* treatises and the ancient Prakrit texts, being successively : 1) Mahavira Jain Vidyalaya and Āgamodaya Samiti, (Mehsana : 2) MJV and Jain Vishva Bhārati (Ladnun); 3) of these three between them 4) and of the Vṛtti of Śīlāṅka (ed. Āgamodaya Samiti); then 5) 6) 7) MJV and three manuscripts on palm - leaves dating to the XV century. The same edition "MJV" (1977) is then compared (10,11) with the various manuscripts given and not held back at the Schubring editions or the MJV. itself. The following sections (12 to 15) compare, amongst others, the different nasal notations (initial intervocal in a group.....cf. Also in the *Uttarajhaya*, the *isibhāsiyāim*, the *Dasaveyāliya*, the *Vasudevahindī*, the *Paumacariya*, sections (18 to 24) the sixteenth reminds the teachings of Hemacandra. We see to which point the inventory must have been meticulous. It serves as base to the reediting linguistically of the *Ācār*. Book 1, Chap. 1, as proposed (thanks to the critical apparatus) by K.R.Chandra. (chap. 3 page 73-156)

Come then the statistics and the tables (chap. 4) which take to show that the weakening of the intervocal occlusives had been, in ancient Ardhamāgadhī, less advanced than what we are led to believe in most of the editions; then the alphabetical index of the examined vocabulary (chap.5), the conspectus of the Chandra edition and then editions previously cited, (chap. 6, page 198-269) then a few secondary annexes. Undeniably, the readings which were self-imposed by Mr.Chandra had been made with the utmost care and allow to ascertain, in fact, a difference between the forms



attested here and there in the manuscripts and those stated by the editors. The majority of differences are based on phonetical facts or rather, no doubt, on orthographical facts which do not let one note with rigorous exactitude. They are often tributaries of habit more or less conservative so good that they do not reflect exactly the state of the language that they transcribe. One must above all count with the conventions followed by certain transcribers (copyists) (cf. The first volume edited by MJV, Introduction, pages 87, 111, etc.)

Hence, in itself the spelling can only imperfectly inform on the point of evolution of a language at a given point of time, even less, in the occurrence than the manuscripts are several centuries later than the time of compilation of the canon, furthermore from those where were composed the most ancient treatises. Statements of the morphological facts are more convincing, especially when they are examined in the passage where the metre is a guarantee of the quantity of prose than, often, of the form of origin.

In all, even if one hesitates to blindly follow K.R.Chandra, it remains that his work, by a rare precision would be to contribute to the history of codicology and that he invites to the critical reading of the editions even those most scholarly.

Further more, on a lot of points, the history of languages used by the Jains demands a more detailed investigation, as had been shown, a few years ago, a chapter which examines the language of the *Mūlārāḍhanā* in the thesis of Karl Oetjens, Śivārya's *Mūlārāḍhanā*, Note : For insight on the fast unto death-Literature of the Jains (Hamburg, 1976).

Prof. (Madam) Colette Caillat

Original in French,

BULLETIN D'ÉTUDES INDIENNES, PARIS  
(English Translation by Nalini Balbir) No.15.

pp. 417-8, 1997

The First *Adhyayana* of the First *Śruta-skandha* of the *Ācārāṅga*, is considered to be the earliest and oldest composition of the Jaina Ardhamāgadhī *Āgamas*. It has been re-edited linguistically only. The task undertaken by its editor Dr. K. R. Chandra is a Herculean one as per the opinions of various scholars and particularly of the late *Āgama-prabhākara* Muni Shri Punyavijayajī and Pt. Bechardas Doshi. It took the editor ten years of pains-taking labour to prepare this edition as it was first of all very necessary to sort out the archaic word-forms of the original Ardhamāgadhī from the published authentic editions of the important *Āgamic* Ardhamāgadhī texts and from the all available manuscripts. It entailed the preparation of thousands of cards for recording the variant readings, to be arranged alphabetically in order to ascertain the original. By way of preparing the background of his researches, Dr. Chandra had published three works to do the spadework. The first one was about discovering the ancient archaic Ardhamāgadhī language of the 6th century B.C. when Mahāvīra delivered his sermons in that language to the laity. The next one was about the restoration of the original language of the Ardhamāgadhī texts. And the third one was the exploration of the ancient traits of the Ardhamāgadhī language from the Prakrit Grammar of Hemacandra and those of others.

The author knows well that right from the times of the 24th *Tīrthaṅkara* Mahāvīra, the emphasis has been on the contents of the sermons delivered by the great *Arhat*, than about the exact nature of the language, since the sermons were essentially oral, that it was the task of the direct principal disciples, known as *Gaṇadharas*, to reduce them to laconic aphoristic texts and preserve them in oral tradition, and that the texts thus preserved in oral traditions were sought to be reduced to written documents much later, from time to time centuries after the demise of Mahāvīra.

But, being a linguist by profession, the editor has taken up the uphill, and almost impossible, task of discovering the original nature of the language of the times of the great

*Tirthaṅkara*, and has been working on it with utmost missionary zeal. In this he has obtained the commendations and encomiums from veteran scholars of Prakrit language and Jainism, like Prof. A. M. Ghatage, Prof. G. V. Tagare, Dr. Nathmal Tatia, Prof. S. R. Banerjee, Shri J. P. Thaker, Shri M. A. Dhaky, Prof. Sagarmal Jain and many others, since it is beyond controversy that the language in which Lord Mahāvīra taught his sermons was definitely archaic Ardhamāgadhī.

It should be noted that the editor has gone about the task undertaken by him here very systematically, First he has presented the concordance of the orthographic variants *sūtra-wise* from the editions of the Mahāvīra Jain Vidyālay, the Āgamodaya Samiti, the Jain Vishvabharati, the Śīlaṅka's commentary and from several earliest known manuscripts of the 13th, 14th, and 15th centuries. Next he has documented variation between writing the nasal consonant as a dot or homo-organic (*para-savarnīa*) nasal, between the *n* and *ṇ*, between preservation, voicing or elision of the intervocalic stops or the stop-constituents of aspirate stops.

Dr. Chandra has given, in the fourth section statistical information about certain phonetic changes as seen in earlier and later word-forms, along with a complete alphabetical index of all the word-forms of the restored text, and has also presented in parallel columns, the restored text along with the corresponding texts according to the known earlier editions. Thus, the present work by Dr. Chandra succeeds in giving a glimpse of some phonological and morphological features of the original *Āgamic* Ardhamāgadhī, of which we find a later form in the Eastern Aśokan inscriptions. And the literary evidence based on comparative documentation and assessment of all available data substantiates it.

Dr. Chandra has tackled one of the several aspects of the task of restoring the *Āgamic* texts. Other requisites for forming a sound, authentic and trustworthy idea of the original character of the *Āgamic* texts and the historical

changes they have undergone, are those of tracing and locating old words and meanings, expressions, phrases, verses, stylistic devices, themes, legends and tales that are specific and commonly shared by the early stratum of the Ardhamāgadhī and the Pāli canonical texts.

This is indeed a stupendous, rather Herculean, task of important research work that may be taken up by other veteran scholars and students of the Ardhamāgadhī canon, for which Dr.Chandra has taken for himself the role of a torch-bearer, and which should be undertaken with regard to the senior texts of the Jaina canon. The importance and the stupendity of the undertaking can be realized when it is taken into account that Dr. Chandra could cover only a tiny fraction of the text of just one part of the one of the eleven *Āgamic* texts. Let us hope, inspite of his uneven health, he continues to inspire some of the like-minded scholars of Prakrit languages and Jainology to take up the bid and continue his researches in the field with all the earnestness it fully deserves.

N. M. Kansara.

SAMBODHI, VOL.XXII, pp. 242-44, 1998-99,

L. D. Inst. of Indology, Ahmedabad

Several works forming part of the Śvetāmbara Jaina *Āgama* (Canon) inform us that Mahāvīra delivered his religious discourses in the Addhamāgaha Bhāsā (i.e., Ardhamāgadhī language). He chose this language for his discourses as it was the spoken language of the people. It was so called, according to one view, because it was current in half of Magadha (modern Bihar) to which region Mahāvīra himself belonged. According to another view, the language was so called because it shared some of the features of the dialects that were current in the adjoining regions. In other words, it was not wholly, but only partly Māgadhī (ardhamāgadhī). But the language of the Śvetāmbara Jain canon which was finally fixed and reduced to writing at the conference of Valabhi under Devarddhi Gaṇin hardly shows char-

acteristics common to Māgadhi. On the contrary it shows surprisingly great affinity with Mahārāṣṭrī. Scholars of linguistics explain the transformation as an inevitable result of the powerful impact of the dominant literary Mahārāṣṭrī. It is a well known fact that from the days of Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa* Mahārāṣṭrī has enjoyed the enviable status of '*prakṛṣṭam prakṛtam*' - the best among all Prakrit languages. The language of the canon which was undergoing changes slowly and imperceptibly during the very long period of 1000 years from the days of Mahāvīra, when it came in contact with literary Mahārāṣṭrī, after migration, it was very natural, that it should be highly influenced by the latter (the literary Mahārāṣṭrī).

Muni Puṇyavijayaḥ has a somewhat different explanation. The phonological changes in the readings of the text had not been due to a natural process but these changes in the spelling of the words have been brought about intentionally by the later *Ācāryas* at different times or on account of losing contact with the original forms of the ancient Prakrit when the community of monks was unable to understand the original forms of the language (Ardhamāgadhi). *Ācārya* Abhayadeva, *Ācārya* Malayagiri etc., found it necessary to change old forms into the new or younger forms and it is they who have transformed old forms.

Whatever be the circumstances responsible for the changes, the fact remains that the original (Ardhamāgadhi) language of the Śvetāmbara Jain Canon is greatly influenced by the standard Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit.

Now, it is an admitted fact that the Jain *Āgama* texts are not *śabda-pradhāna* but *artha-pradhāna*. The Jains have tried to preserve the true meaning (*artha*) and not the original words (*śabda*) of Mahāvīra :

अथं भासइ अरिहा सुत्तं गंथंति गणहरा णिउणं ।

(Mahāvīra promulgates the true meaning of scriptures in the course of his religious discourses, and his

*Gaṇadharas* - immediate disciples or apostles undertake the task of arranging them in the *sūtra* - form, in the form of scriptures). If we remember this fact, we need not bother or worry too much about the nature of word forms—whether older or younger as both convey the original true meaning. Looked at from this point of view any attempt to restore old Ardhamāgadhī would amount to a futile exercise.

The above view is, it would seem, one-sided. The problem has another side too. From among the forty-five texts of the Jain *Āgama* some like the *Ācārāṅga*, *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* are decidedly the oldest which retain older forms of the ancient Prakrit to a considerable extent. By adopting modern tools and methods of research and generally accepted principles of text editing we can fairly certainly hope to restore the ancient Prakrit—Ardhamāgadhī—in which Mahāvīra spoke and his immediate disciples—the *Gaṇadharas*—tried to preserve his discourses.

Dr.K.R.Chandra, a veteran Prakrit scholar, has devoted a number of years to a study in depth of this problem of restoration of the ancient Prakrit - Old Ardhamāgadhī—in which Mahāvīra gave his religious discourses and his *Gaṇadharas* embodied them. In the work under review Chandra presents, after carefully applying the principles of restoration evolved by him, the restored text of *Āyāraṅga* 1.1 by way of a sample demonstration.

Chandra divides his work into the following six sections :

- Section 1 : consists of Introduction both in English and Hindi. (pp.1-12)
- Section II : presents Comparison of the word-forms of the text of *Ācārāṅga* with that of its various editions and manuscripts, other *Āgama* texts and older Prakrit texts. (pp.15-72)
- Section III : gives restored text of *Āyāraṅga* 1.1, on the basis of available archaic word-forms. (pp. 75-156)

- Section IV : gives information about certain phonetic changes as seen in earlier and later word-forms. (pp. 157-166)
- Section V : gives a complete alphabetical Index of all the word-forms of the restored text. (pp. 167-195)
- Section VI : presents in parallel columns the restored text along with the corresponding texts of the earlier well-known editions. (pp. 199-269)

At the end of this section (VI) H. Jacobi's text of the first chapter of Āyāraṅga is reproduced. Curious readers would find it instructive to compare Chandra's text with that of Jacobi (pp. 271-276). Then follows an Appendix presenting excerpts from the Reviews and Opinions on the linguistically re-editing of the Ācārāṅgasūtra and restoration of the original Ardhamāgadhī language. (pp.277-327)

In the beginning we meet with the opinions of Prof. Malvania, Prof.Bhayani, Prof.Ghatage and few more scholars. We have finally the views of Muni Puṇyavijayajī on the form of the original language of Jain Ardhamāgadhī texts as it is found altered in the preserved MSS.(pp.xi-xiv)

Dr. K. R. Chandra deserves warm congratulations for his brilliant piece of research. We earnestly hope he continues his work of editing the remaining part of Āyāraṅga on the same lines as followed in the present work.

V. M. Kulkarni

JOURNAL OF ASIATIC SOCIETY, BOMBAY,

Vol.73 for 1998, pp. 259-261.

The great teachers Mahāvīra and Gautama Buddha (Circa 600 B.C.according to Europeans and 1600 B.C. according to Yugābda) were contemporaries. They lived in adjacent areas and preached their gospels practically to the same people living in the same area. But the texts of their teachings that have come down to us show as if they belonged to different centuries, Pāli appearing to be older than Ardha-

Māgadhī (AMg.). The reasons are historical. Pāli the fortunate of the two, got royal patrons like Aśoka and Kaṇiṣka, while tracts of AMg. were preserved in their memory by Jain sages who depended on the support of their community which itself had to go through different vicissitudes resulting in their migration towards the West in the Mahārāṣṭrī-speaking area.

Not that the present Pāli is the actual *Buddha-Vacana* (Buddha's speech). Nor is it the language of the first *Sanḡitī* at Rājagṛha, convened by Mahā Kassapa immediately after *the emancipation (nirvāṇa)* of Buddha and tried to pool together Buddha's words as remembered by 500 direct disciples of Buddha.

Dr.B. C. Law in his *History of Pāli Literature* traces in Pāli the influence of Western Prakrits, especially the Gīṇar Edict of Aśoka. Whatever be the reason, but Pāli could retain some semblance to its older form.

AMg. texts were preserved in their memory by Jain sages. But when devastating famines visited Magadha, their patrons ordinary people themselves became victims of the famine and could hardly support the sages--repositories of certain sections of the *Āgama*. Hiralal Kapadia in his *History of the Canonical Literature of the Jains* gives us a long list of such sections which are irretrievably lost.

Hemacandra, the great polymath, in his Commentary on *Yoga Sūtras* notes : "Finding that the *Jina Vacana* (Jain Canon) was almost lost (*ucchinna-prāya*) as a result of the famine the revered *Ācāryas* Nāgārjuna and Skandila got (the remnant of it) written down in books".

(जिनवचनं दुष्प्रमाकालवशादुच्छिन्नप्रायमिति मत्वा भगवद्भिर्नागार्जुन-  
स्कन्दिलाचार्यप्रभृतिभिः पुस्तकेषु व्यस्तम् ।)

Finally Devardhi Gaṇi convened a conference at Valabhī in Kāthiāwād (Gujarat) in the 6th Cent. A.D. and recorded the available AMg. canon in books. This is generally regarded as the standard AMg. Canon now.

After the fixation of the Canon, the era of scribal errors, emendations and additions (all unauthorised) began.



I was not surprised when I found six inexplicable variants of the word *kṣetrajña* (क्षेत्रज्ञ) in Mumbai's Mahāvira Jaina Vidyālaya (MJV.) edition of the *Ācārāṅga Sūtra* in Dr. Chandra's Hindi book : *Prācīn Ardhamāgadhī kī Khoj menī*. As a text critic, one gets used to it. But I was surprised to find that Dr. Chandra collected 75000 forms(cards) from ancient Jaina texts like *Ācārāṅga*, *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*, *Ṛṣi-bhāṣitāni*, *Uttarādhyayana*, *Daśavaikālika* and compared them with those in Pāli *Sutta-nipāta* and Eastern Edicts of Aśoka. With such tremendous labour, Dr.Chandra could ascertain some linguistic characteristics of the *Jina Vacana*-that too when no Prakrit grammarians including Hemacandra, treated AMg.in their treatises. Dr.Chandra's work was trail-blazing. That was in 1991.

Dr. Chandra persisted in his search for *Jina Vacana*. In 1994 Dr.Chandra published his monograph, "*Restoration of the Original Language of Ardha-Māgadhī Texts.*" Herein Dr. Chandra presents a critical comparative and scientific phonological and morphological study of variants of some vocables from *Ācārāṅga*, Part I (MJV.Ed.1977) and their old variants available in palm-leaf and paper MSS. of the same text. It proves the obvious influence of Mahārāṣṭrī on AMg. canon due to environmental circumstances, passage of time and Mahārāṣṭrī-oriented scribes who were naturally inclined to use pro-Mahārāṣṭrī forms for corrections (?), emendations, additions, etc..I doubt whether orthodox Jain teachers can (could) even think of "polluting" the *Jina Vacana* by modernising it for their followers.

With my friend Satya Ranjan Banerjee, I congratulate Dr. Chandra for this brilliant piece of research with meticulous care, though I do not agree with him (Dr.Banerjee) in tracing the affinity of AMg. with old Persian.

The present work under review is an epoch-making piece of research. Herein Dr. Chandra tries to reconstruct the original AMg. canon of *Ācārāṅga*, Part I, Chapter 1. Dr. Chandra is eminently capable of undertaking this epoch-making - somewhat revolutionary work.

Dr. Chandra has tried to take us one step nearer the *Jina Vacana*. His method is realistic. He has taken the best available edition of the *Ācārāṅga*, viz. of Mahāvira Jaina Vidyālaya, Mumbai (1977) as the basic text. It also contains some new AMg., i.e. pro-Maharaṣṭri forms. He substituted them with old AMg. forms culled from ancient (senior) AMg. texts like *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*, *Ṛṣi-bhāṣitānī*, *Uttarādhyayana*. He did not try to emend the text as per his discretion. Thus the restored text appears like one excavated at Vaiśālī or some other ancient site in Magadha. He has given us an alphabetical list of such words utilised by him (Part V, pages, 167-195), a tabular statistical statement of phonological changes in AMg. (See part IV, Pages 157-166) and he modestly states that this statistic table shows general tendencies in sound-changes in old AMg.

The most interesting part is his word to word comparison of his restored text with that in the editions of W.Schubring (1910), Agamodaya Samiti (1916), JVB.Ed (1974) and MJV.Ed. Mumbai (1977).

Any unbiased scholar will concede that the restored text presents the ancient AMg. (Part VI, pages, 198-269), as compared with other editions of the *Ācārāṅga*.

It is not feasible to discuss the phonological, morphological and syntactical characteristics of old AMg. in the context of the present work.

I think the Amg. forms traceable to Vedic Skt. rather than to classical Skt. may be regarded as original or older AMg. forms. Thus forms like *adhe* in *adhe disāto*, *adha*, *idha*, Aorist forms like *ahesi*, *āhaṃsu*, *akarissam* can be accepted as old AMg. Pischel in his *Grammatik der Prakrit Sprachen* (516, 517 & 518) has given Prakrit derivatives of Skt. past Imperfect and Perfect.

On the basis of his variants from various old AMg. texts Dr. Chandra notes the following characteristics of old (or original) AMg. :

(1) Retention of initial and medial dental nasal *n*, the change of *jñ*, *ny*, *nn* to *nn*. For example :

- (i) N retained : *na, natthi, neva, jonīo, anudisāo,*
- (ii) JÑ=NN : *sannā (saṃjñā), parinnā (parijñā),*
- (iii) NY=NN : *anne (anye), annesiṃ (anyeṣāṃ),*
- (iv) NN=NN : *paḍivanna (pratipanna).*

There are exceptions which show change to cerebral *ṇ*. For example: *ṇaṃ (nūnam), nāṇa (jñāna), appaṇa (ātman).*

(2) A tendency to retain intervocalic *k, c, t, or p* and occasionally to change them to *g, j, d*, (the earlier three respectively). The elision of medial consonants is Mahārāṣṭrism. Thus *kappati* is an old AMg form while *kappai* shows the influence of Mahārāṣṭrī and hence a younger form.

In morphology we find the following old terminations preserved in the restored text :

For example : Nom. Sg. -*e* (for the Mahārāṣṭrī -*o* which is frequently used in other texts of the Canon.

Neuter Nom. and Acc. plural suffix -*ni*, Instrumental Sg. -*ena* (not *enam*), Instrumental Plural *in-hi* (from Vedic-*bhiḥ* as in *karṇebhiḥ śruṇuyāma devāḥ*), Ablative Sg. -*to*., Locative Sg. -*ssim* (Old.Skt. -*smin*).

Sometimes editors unaware of the -*e* termination of Nom. and Vocative Sg. create some confusion. The main reason is that old MSS. do not separate words in writing as we do so today. All the letters are written without any adequate gap between two words. Thus we find the opening sentence of *Ācārāṅga* printed as follows :

(i) *Suyaṃ me āusaṃ teṇaṃ Bhagavayā evamakkhāyaṃ*

(ii) *Sutaṃ me āusaṃteṇa (or āusaṃteṇaṃ) Bhagavatā evamakhātāṃ*

(सुतं मे आउसंतेण (अथवा आउसंतेणं) भगवता एवमक्खातं)

The *Cūrṇī* interpretes : *mayā āvasatā* (मया आवसता) "By me while worshipping." Tradition tells us that Sudharman heard it directly. It is to Jambusvāmin that he calls "*āusaṃ (Āyuṣman)* Long-lived" (आयुष्मन्).

If the reading is taken as "*Āusaṃteṇaṃ*" (आउसंतेणं) that will qualify the instrumental Sg. *Bhagavayā* (भगवया). To call the Lord "*Āyuṣman*" (आयुष्मन्) is really strange.

The sentence, if the letters are arranged as follows, makes a logically good sense :

*Sutaṁ me āusaṁte naṁ Bhagavatā evamakkhātāṁ*  
(सुतं मे आउसंते णं भगवता एवमक्खातं)

"Oh Āyusman (Jambu)! I have heard etc."

The forms *āuse*, *bhaṁte* are common in other old AMg. texts and the *Cūrṇis* (For details vide: Chandra on "ĀUSAMTENAM" (आउसंतेण) in *ŚRAMANA*, July-Sept.1995).

Dr. Chandra has provided us with the text of the first chapter of the first part of *Ācārāṅga* published by Prof. H. Jacobi, 1882. Jacobi was lucky in securing perhaps the oldest Ms.(of 1292 A.D.). It is noteworthy that the old German Scholar more than a century ago, with scant MSS. material, could sense the old AMg. forms. In a way it supports the restored text (by Dr. Chandra), though he was not then aware of it.

Prof. Dr. K. R. Chandra, a devout Jain scholar, has been "haunted" with the cause of restoring the *Jina Vacana* to its pristine purity. He culled 75000 forms (cards) from old AMg. texts, pored over practically every letter of the standard editions of the *Ācārāṅga*, studied text-critical problems of such *Āgamic* works and presented a model edition of the 1st *Adhyayana* of the *Ācārāṅga* which even Sudharman will appreciate from High Heavens.

It is certainly creditable that Dr. Chandra has single-handedly prepared this excellent edition- a beacon for generations to come. But such epoch-making projects should be undertaken by some research institute founded for this specific purpose. Fortunately, Gujarat and Rajasthan have a number of good old *Bhaṇḍāras*. There are eminent scholars who can competently undertake such work. And the liberal munificence of the Śvetāmbara Jain community will certainly finance such a project.

Sangli, 4-7-98

G. V. Tagare

‘श्रमण’, वाराणसी, जनवरी-जून, २०००

As is shown by the many scholars' acknowledgements in your book they (Prakrit Scholars) fully recognize your point (Alsdorf once spoke to me about it with regard to the Thesis of Dr. Oetjens, one of his pupils) and appreciate your present work on *Āyāra*. Ch.1 as that of a *mārga-darśaka*. In my comment which I sent you on May 29th, however, I hinted already at the practical consequences. This work must be done principally in India where most of the manuscripts are. Who will do the job ?

Prof. Dr. W. B. Bollee  
Bamberg, Germany

Dec. 9th 1998

प्राकृत भाषा के प्रसिद्ध विद्वान् डॉ. के. आर. चन्द्र प्राचीन अर्धमागधी की शोध एवं पाठ-निर्धारण के कार्य में सन्नद्ध है। आचारांग-सूत्र के प्रथम श्रुत-स्कन्ध के प्रथम अध्ययन का भाषा की दृष्टि से पुनः सम्पादन इसी प्रयत्न का द्योतक है। उन्होंने आचारांग के अद्यावधि प्रकाशित प्रमुख संस्करणों एवं प्राचीन हस्तप्रतों के आधार पर आचारांग के अर्धमागधी रूपों को सुनिश्चित कर आचारांग का यह नया संस्करण तैयार किया है।

अर्धमागधी आगमों के प्रकाशित संस्करणों में पाठ-भेद की समस्या सर्वविदित है। अर्धमागधी भाषा पर विशेषतः महाराष्ट्री प्राकृत का प्रभाव दृष्टिगोचर होता है। डॉ. चन्द्र ने जब यह देखा कि आचारांग-सूत्र प्राचीन आगम है एवं उसके पाठों में भेद प्राप्त होता है तो उन्होंने इसका समाधान ढूँढ़ने का प्रयास किया। उसी का परिणाम प्रस्तुत ग्रन्थ है। इसमें उन्होंने आचारांग के प्रथम श्रुत-स्कन्ध के प्रथम अध्ययन का ही अर्धमागधी के उपयुक्त रूपों की दृष्टि से सम्पादन किया है। इसके लिए उन्होंने महावीर जैन विद्यालय, मुम्बई, जैन विश्वभारती लाडनूँ, आगमोदय समिति, शुर्ब्रिग आदि के संस्करणों, जैन ज्ञान भण्डार, खम्भात एवं जेसलमेर की ताड़पत्रीय प्रतियों और विभिन्न आगमों एवं वृत्तियों का उपयोग किया है। किन्-किन संस्करणों, हस्तप्रतियों एवं अन्य आगमों में एक ही शब्द के कौन-कौन से रूप उपलब्ध होते हैं, इसका तुलनात्मक विवरण बड़े परिश्रम से तैयार किया गया है। तुलनात्मक सारिणी में उत्तराध्ययन, इसिभासियाई आदि अन्य आगमों में प्राप्त शब्दों को भी रखा गया है। तुलनात्मक विवरण से अर्धमागधी के प्राचीन रूपों का निर्धारण करने में पर्याप्त सरलता हो गई है। पाठ निर्धारित करते हुए कुछ पाठ-भेद भी दर्शाये गये हैं। इस

के पाठों का निर्धारण करती है। पुस्तक के प्रारम्भ में पं.दलसुख मालवणिया एवं प्रो.एच. सी. भायाणी के विचार भी प्रकाशित हैं।

अब प्रश्न यह है कि डॉ. चन्द्र के द्वारा निर्धारित अर्धमागधी पाठ जैनाचार्यों, उपाध्यायों, श्रमण-श्रमणियों एवं विद्वानों द्वारा मान्य होते हैं या नहीं? क्योंकि आगम के प्रचलित पाठों में परिवर्तन आगम-परम्परा में आदरणीय नहीं है। किन्तु आगम का पाठ जब एक न हो, हर संस्करण में भिन्नता प्राप्त होती हो तो फिर उस भिन्न पाठ को आगम का प्राचीन मूल पाठ कैसे माना जा सकता है? भगवान् अर्धमागधी में प्रवचन कर गए यह सर्वमान्य है तथा गणधरों ने भी उसे आगम रूप में अर्धमागधी में ही ग्रथित किया है। फिर उन आगमों में भाषा की एक-रूपता क्यों नहीं है? उनमें भाषागत भेद क्यों पाया जाता है? भाषागत भेद के कारण उस शब्द का अर्थ भी सुरक्षित नहीं रहा है। अतः आगम का भाषागत एक रूप होना आवश्यक है। डॉ. चन्द्र का इस दिशा में प्रयास सराहनीय है। डॉ. चन्द्र ने यद्यपि पूर्ण शोध के साथ सम्यक् पाठ-निर्धारण का प्रयास किया है, तथापि इसे अन्तिम नहीं कहा जा सकता। कोई श्रद्धालु या विद्वान् इस दिशा में अपना मतभेद प्रकट कर सके तो इसके सही पाठ-निर्धारण में आगे भी सहायता मिलेगी।

डॉ. चन्द्र ने अर्धमागधी का पाठ निर्धारित करते समय प्राचीन पाठ को उपयुक्त माना है, किन्तु प्राचीनता का आधार क्या हो, इसके लिए उन्होंने कुछ नियम भी अपनाये हैं, यथा- (१) प्रारम्भिक मूल दन्त्य नकार को मूर्धन्य णकार में नहीं बदला है। (२) ज्ञ = न्न रखा गया है। (३) न्य, न्न = न्न अपनाया है। (४) व्यंजनों के साथ संयुक्त रूप में प्रयुक्त अनुनासिक व्यंजनों को यथावत् रखा गया है। (५) मध्यवर्ती अल्पप्राण व्यंजन के लोप और मध्यवर्ती महाप्राण के स्थान पर हकार से सामान्यतः दूर रखा गया है। (६) 'यथा' और 'तथा' के लिए 'अथा' और 'तधा' को प्राथमिकता दी गई है। (७) पुल्लिङ्ग प्रथमा एकवचन में 'ए', नपुंसक लिंग प्रथमा बहुवचन में 'नि', तृतीया एकवचन में 'एन' और 'ता', पंचमी एकवचन में 'तो', तृतीया बहुवचन में 'हि' और सप्तमी बहुवचन में 'सु' प्रत्ययों को प्राथमिकता दी गई है।

डॉ. चन्द्र का प्रयास निश्चित रूप से प्रशंसनीय है। आशा है वे सम्पूर्ण आचारांग एवं अन्य आगमों के प्राचीन भाषिक रूपों का भी निर्धारण करेंगे तथा विद्वान पाठक इससे लाभान्वित हो सकेंगे।

डॉ. धर्मचन्द्र जैन

‘साहित्य समीक्षा’,

‘जिनवाणी’, जयपुर, अगस्त १९९८

यह पुस्तक जहाँ जैन आगमों के संपादन की अर्वाचीन परंपरा का आदर्श नमूना पेश करता है वहीं आपकी इस क्षेत्र की साधना का ज्वलंत प्रतीक बन गया है। पूज्य आगमप्रभाकरजी द्वारा व्यक्त की गई अभिलाषा आज आपके द्वारा-भले एक अध्ययन के रूप में ही सही परिपूर्ण हुई है यह जैन संशोधन क्षेत्र की एक रोमहर्षक घटना कही जायगी। “संपत्स्यते हि मम कोऽपि समानधर्मा”-भवभूति की यह उक्ति यहाँ चरितार्थ होती है।

जब मैं पालि भाषा के परिचय में आया तो एक प्रश्न उठा कि आगमों की भाषा भी उसी देशकाल की है तो दोनों में इतना अंतर क्यों? आपका संपादित प्रथम अध्ययन देखने पर समाधान हुआ। अब पालि और अर्धमागधी में उतना ही अंतर मालूम होता है जितना कि दक्षिण और उत्तर गुजरात की गुजराती में हो सकता है।

‘त्रिपिटक’ बहुत पहले ही भारत से बाहर चले गए और वहाँ जैसे के तैसे रह गए। जैन आगमों को भिन्न भिन्न शतकों में जैन श्रमणों के बदलते हुए उच्चारों से प्रभावित होना पड़ा। आज के संशोधन-प्रधान और उचित सुविधापूर्ण समय में मूल भाषा तक पहुँचने के द्वार खुले हैं, फिर भी यह कार्य अत्यंत श्रमसाध्य है।

इस ग्रन्थ के हर पृष्ठ पर आपके प्रचंड परिश्रम के दर्शन होते हैं। इस प्रकाशन के लिए आप को बधाई और इसी प्रणाली पर आचारांग, सूयगडंग जैसे प्राचीन आगमों का पुनः संपादन आपके हाथों से ही संपन्न हो यह मंगल कामना प्रेषित करता हूँ।

मुनि भुवनचन्द्र

दिनांक : ४-८-९८

मोटी खाखर (कच्छ, गुजरात)

