The Non-inflected Genitive In Apabhramśa

S. N. Ghosal

Hemacandra in his Prākrit grammar (IV. 395) has prescribed the occasional loss of inflection in the genitive and expressed his approval for the use of such un-inflected forms in the Apabhramśa dialect. He does it not of his own accord but in pursuance of a rule of the Vālmiki-sūtras, which are assumed to be the original sources, to which the Prākrit grammars of the Western school owe their existence. This practice of employing the uninflected forms for the genitive was being followed thus by way of tradition for a long time and people engaged in literary pursuits, who had utilised this Ap. speech as a literary medium, did not hesitate to make use of such uninflected forms, as these were considered quite natural to the speech by the people. In course of providing illustrations of his sūtras Hemacandra has shown the use of the non-inflected genitive by citing one verse and there are some more verses in his Prākrit grammar, which bear clear evidence for such use in Ap. during his times.

Now Jacobi in his Bhavisattakahā (Grammatik § 23) has expressed grave doubts regarding the occurrence and use of the non-inflected genitives in Ap., which Hemacandra authoritatively sanctions by the above-mentioned sūtra. He suggests that the forms, which are recognised as instances of the non-inflected genitive, may be easily explained quite differently—rather as the preceding members of some
compounds, i.e., all such forms appear as first members, with which some other words are annexed as second members of the compounds.\(^1\)
As such forms are assumed as the constituents of compounds—particularly the first ones, they have obviously the right to shake off terminations and bear the semblances of so many uninflected forms.

Alsdorf, who attaches too much importance to this statement of Jacobi, rejects the sutra of Hemacandra as misleading and confusing. In his Apabhramśa Studien he makes an attempt to explain such non-inflected genitive forms quite differently—rather as first members of compounds, as Jacobi has done, sometimes as vocatives and sometimes, again, as adverbs. As he boldly advances his proposition being fully conscious of its full import we quote him verbatim, which may help us to make a correct appraisal of his stand. He states: “The same is the condition with other Jaina texts, which do not give any support to the sūtra of Hem. and the Vālmīki-sūtras. The condition of the stanzas of Materialen zur Kenntniss des Apabhramśa is also not otherwise. Whenever Pischel has been confused by this rule of Hemacandra and been persuaded to accept the non-inflected genitive as genuine the later investigation has shown that it should be construed as a fore-member of a compound or a vocative (in one case also as an adverb).”\(^2\)

Jacobi, however, claims to have found two real instances of uninflected genitive in the Bhavisattakahā (166, 4), about which he does not maintain any doubt. Forming the latter half of two lines they stand as: amarinda vi-jañavindavi. Alsdorf, who comes forward to

---

1 We quote the actual words of Jacobi, which run as: “Nach Hem. IV 345 soll die Genitivwendung gewöhnlich (prāyaḥ) abfallen. Aber in unserem Texte können solche unreflektierte Genitive durchweg als vordere Kompositums-glieder aufgefasst werden.” (Bhavisattakahā, Grammatik § 23). (Trans.: According to Hem. IV. 345 the termination of the genitive usually drops. But in our text such uninflected genitive can be throughout considered as the fore-member of the compound).
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justify Jacobi, suggests that the two words assumed to be the forms of non-inflected genitive, are not in fact such, as in Guṇe's edition the second one occurs with certain modification as: jāṇavindi vi. Alsdorf, who unhesitatingly accepts the reading of Guṇe, emends the first expression as amarindi vi (Apabhraṃśa Studien, p. 56). He made this emendation and seemed apparently justified in doing this, as he intended to maintain conformity with the rhyme of the word jāṇavindi, which comes immediately after it. As Alsdorf accepts this reading of Guṇe and modifies the text accordingly he assumes both the words amarindi and jāṇavindi as being inflected and bearing the termination of the loc. sing. Here it should be noticed that Alsdorf does not speak anything about two more uninflected forms, which Jacobi mentions and which stand as loyaṇa (for loyaṇahī 49, 6) and taruṇī (for taruṇihī 399, 10) (Bhav-visattakahā, Grammatik § 23).

From the above-referred extract of Alsdorf it follows that Pischel subscribed to the view of Hemacandra and admitted the loss of inflection in the case of genitive to be a fact (Grammatik der Prākrit Sprachen § 369). That this phenomenon is not a sporadic manifestation, but an outcome of a long-continued tendency in Ap., proceeds from the fact that two other cases too—namely the nom. and acc. both in the sing. and plur. throw off the terminations (He. IV. 344). Alsdorf, who has totally denied the occurrence of the uninflected gen. in Ap., has also come forward to explain such uninflected nom. and acc. forms in his own way. According to him such forms are, in fact, inflected like the regular ones, but they are characterised by certain tendencies, which go as the distinctive features of various NIA speeches (Apabhraṃśa Studien, pp. 5 ff). That Alsdorf does not give a correct view of facts will be clear from what follows.

It should be mentioned here that the phenomenon of the disintegration of terminations, which showed its first beginnings in Ap., became more prevalent in the subsequent period. In the late Ap., which was otherwise known as Avahaṭha in the east and Piṅgala in the west, all the cases showed the tendency to discard their inflections, as a result of which there developed with the people a practice to employ the non-inflected words, i.e., base-forms, in a sentence or a verse. This task imposed a heavy premium upon the imagination of a man, who had to ascertain the meaning of a line by considering the position of words in the sentence. As these analytical tendencies characterised the speech of the later Pkt., particularly Ap. and late-Ap., it is not proper to disown the feature and consider it unreal as a figment of imagination.
We quote certain forms from the Prākṛta-paṅgala and make an attempt to show the use of non-inflected forms in all cases. The forms are selected at random.

Nom. phala, bhuaṅgama (I. 6), abuha (I. 11), nīsaṅka (I. 72), surasari (I. 111), gaṅga (I. 119), kamta (I. 135), vīra Hammīra (I. 147) etc.

Acc. nāva (I. 9), saṁtāra, kugati (I. 9), saṁpaa, suha (I. 98), durīta (I. 104), pakkha, bāmdha (I. 106), ḭagga, karabāla (I. 106), abhaavara (I. 111), citta (I. 135) etc.

Inst. manimānta (I. 6), sahaja (I. 7), kohā (I. 92), pakkha pakkha (I. 106), atta (I. 116), navakesu (I. 135), pāabhara, (I. 147) etc.

Abl. mitta, bhicca (I. 37), uāśiṇa, sattu (I. 38) etc.

Gen. bāha, kohāṇa, sulatāna (I. 106), kaṇa (I. 126), mecha (I. 147), sarasaī (I. 153), raapipahu (I. 163) etc.

Loc. rana (I. 87), adhaṅgā, giva (I. 98), rana, dia (I. 106), naṇa, gala, sīra (I. 111), sīsa (I. 119), jujjha (I. 126), dūra digantara, sabbadesa (I. 135), gaṇa (I. 166) etc.

While accounting for the loss of inflections of cases in Ap. we should take certain facts into consideration. Jacobi suggests that in Pāli and Pkt. the final sound of a word became gradually weak and it very often submitted to the overwhelming influence of the initial vowel of the following word. This tendency of weakening of the final sound became so forceful that in Ap. there was total elision of the final vowel occasionally—sometimes before an initial vowel with indefinite quantity and sometime even without it (e. g., Ap. naremi < Pkt. narena). But this feature, of which the first beginning was noted in Ap., became a characteristic of the New Indo-Aryan speeches in general in the subsequent period (Sanatkumāracarita, Grammatik § 8). Now, as the elision of a vowel demands that there should be the shortening of a long vowel prior to its final disappearance Ap. shows this feature too in a number of declensional forms. We may cite a few instances for the clarification of the matter:


This clearly demonstrates that in Ap. the final syllable sustained considerable weakening, as a result of which the final vowel occasionally under suitable circumstances totally disappeared.
Now Jacobi has given some explanation for the loss of the final vowel in a word in Ap. According to him the mode of accentuation—the heavy stress on the penultimate syllable—was responsible for the weakening or the loss of the final vowel in a word. The strong accent on the initial vowel in the following word might also have helped greatly in the matter. But here another fact should also be taken into consideration. The penultimate stress was not the only mode of accentuation in Pkt. or Ap. The system of the initial stress was also found working in the development of the speech Pkt. in all its stages. This has been clearly stated by Jacobi, according to whom the Aufton (i.e. the rising accent) sometimes becomes more vigorous and suppresses this penultimate stress. We consider the preponderance of

---

3 This seems to follow from the following statements of Jacobi, which he has expressed in the *Sanatkumārācaritam* (Grammatik § 8) :

Bei langer Pännultima wurde dann auslautende kurze vokal in Pāli und Prākrit als Nachlaut betoner Silbe stehend soweit geschwächt, dass er auch vor leichtem Anlaut abfallen konnte.

(Trans.: In Pāli and Prākrit the short final vowel with a long penultimate behaved as to have stood after the accented syllable, and became so much weak that it could drop even before the light initial sound.)

Also

"Die Schwächung und Verdumpfung jedes auslautenden a nahmen ihren Fortgang so dass es im Apabhramśa ausfallen konnte, ohne einer besonderen durch die stärkere Betonung der vorhergehenden Silbe (Pännultima) zu bedürfen, namentlich wieder bei anlautenden u." (Trans.: The process of weakening and discolouring of the final sound a continued so that it could totally elide in Ap. without requiring a special weakening through stronger accentuation of the preceding syllable (penultimate), specially before the initial u.)

4 Jacobi has expressed this view in the following words: "Je nach einer grossen Anzahl von Doppel-formen zu schliessen muss der Aufton den Wort-ton, wenn er auf der zweiten Silben lag, überwunden haben, was also auf eine Neigung hinausläuft, in solchen Fallen den Accent auf die erste Silbe zurückzuziehen. Die zurückziehung der Accents von der zweiten auf die erste Silbe giebt sich Kund in der Kürzung der zweiten. (1) Die erste Silbe ist lang: ānīta wird in Pāli und Prākrit meist ānīta bez. ānīya, durnīta im Prākrit zu durnīya..... (2) Die erste Silbe ist Kurz. Im Prākrit wird meist oder oft aliṣa zu aliya, karisha zu karīsha"...Jacobi—Über die Betonung im klassischen Sanskrit und in den Prākrit-sprachen, ZDMG
the initial stress—the Aufton of Jacobi—to be more responsible for the loss of the final vowel of a word; because, as it is easy to understand, excessive stress on the initial syllable would very easily condition the laxity of pronunciation in the final syllable of a word, which would ultimately lead to its weakening or disappearance. Be it the initial stress or the penultimate stress—that the heavy stress accent on any syllable other than the final was responsible for the elision of the final vowel in a vocable seems to be clear from all the fore-going statements.

Now it is to be considered that in an inflected word as the terminational element appeared at the end being affixed to the stem it is the endings which suffered most from phonetic decay or elision. The stem element was successful in resisting considerably the onslaught of phonetic reduction due to its privileged position—namely of its constituting the fore-part of a word. This has been very categorically asserted by Turner in his paper "The phonetic weaknesses in the terminational Elements in Indo-Aryan" (JRAS 1927, pp. 227 ff.). Now in this process of final weakening it is easy to comprehend that some weak endings would give way and suffer from total elision. But this fate was not in store for all the terminations. Because there were surely some, which were stronger and could stem the rushing tide of disintegration, which seemed to sweep away the old phonetic system coming down traditionally from a long time. It would be clarified by a reference to the history of the Aryan speech during the later period particularly at the time of the New Indo-Aryans.

The history of the Aryan speech shows that during the days of the New Indo-Aryan only two case forms remained. The one was the direct, which was the descendant of the old nom. and the other the oblique, which was the surviving form of any of the cases like gen., dat., loc. or inst. On account of its being the only surviving form

Vol. 47, p. 581. [Trans.: From the double forms it is possible to infer that the rising accent (Aufton) has suppressed the word-accent (i.e.) penultimate stress), when the latter has remained on the second syllable and betrayed a tendency to shift altogether in such cases the word-accent upon the initial syllable. The shifting of the accent from the second to the first makes itself known by the shortening of the second syllable. (1) The first syllable is long: ānīta becomes in Pāli and Pkt. ānīta and ānīya respectively, durnīta becomes changed to duṇṇiya in Pkt. ... (2) The first syllable is short: In Pkt. mostly or often aliya becomes changed to aliya, karīsha to karīsha....]
for the six cases the latter was irrespectively used for all of them. But soon it was found that as it was used for so many cases it was not capable of indicating the various meanings of the different cases. So there developed a new device to indicate case-relations in the New Indo-Aryans. Independent words carrying definite case-indicating meanings were added to the oblique forms and these were used regularly as substitutes for the inflected words of the previous period.

Now it may be asserted that this was not a strange phenomenon appearing as a freak, on the contrary it was a development common to the speech-habit of all the New Indo-Aryans. Sometimes, again, these post-positions integrated in such a manner with the oblique-forms that the latter along with the post-positions assumed the semblance of original homogeneous words betraying phonetic decay due to their coming through the ages. Now all these facts—namely the loss of different inflections, the emergence of two case-forms—the direct and the oblique and the universal practice of employing the post-positions could lead but to the only conclusion that Ap. too, which is slightly archaic than these speeches and remains intimately connected with them by way of forming a stage in the evolution of the Aryan speech, must have manifested, at least shown, the beginning of similar features—particularly the tendency of disintegrating the inflectional elements of vocables.

In fact this shaking off of terminations indicated a great landmark in the development of the Aryan speech, since it deprived it of its synthetic character and gave it the stamp of an analytical one, which was something new in the entire history of the old Indo-Aryan. This affinity of Ap. with the modern Aryan speeches enables us to assume that the Aryan speech showed the beginnings of analytical features from the days of Ap., in which we notice first the tendency of disintegrating the inflectional elements. In this perspective it is possible for us to assert that the loss of inflection in gen. or nom. and acc., which Hemacandra prescribes, is quite natural to the speech and is not an outcome of confusions, to which Hemacandra is alleged to have fallen a victim. To make any attempt to deny it is to disown facts and make a distortion of the same. So we think that the statement, which Alsdorf has made, does not provide a correct assessment of facts.

We have referred above to the occurrence of two instances of uninflected genitive in the Bhavisattakahā—a fact, which Jacobi accepted as true but was contradicted by Alsdorf. The latter doubted the G.J.V. 13
genuineness of the forms, as he put much reliance upon the text of Guṇe, that represented one as an uninflected word and the other as an inflected. Here it is necessary to consider whether Alsdorf is justified in accepting the text of Guṇe as correct and attributing to the uninflected word the appearance of an inflected form by emendation. A little reflection shows that the text of Guṇe is not much reliable, because the words, which ought to have preserved rhyme owing to their being the latter portions of two hemistiches of a verse, have neglected it altogether—a fact that can scarcely be overlooked. Further the agreement between Guṇe and Jacobi regarding the acceptance of one of the two forms as non-inflected strongly speaks for the assumption of the same as such. So Alsdorf’s emendation appears to be uncalled-for and, according to our estimate, the same does not serve Alsdorf’s purpose of refuting the occurrence of non-inflected gen. in Ap., for which he has made so strenuous efforts.

Here the following fact too should be taken into consideration. As we come to learn from Jacobi, Kṣemarāja’s commentary upon the Upadeśasaptatikā contains 353 Ap. stanzas, which possess many uninflected forms. Among the latter though such forms, which represent the nom. and acc. cases, show a palpable preponderance, the stems conveying the sense of the genitive are not negligible. Again, as we learn from the same source, like the Bhavisattakahā the Nemiṇāhacarīu too shows the sporadic use of the non-inflected gen. in Ap. (Introduction to Sanat., p. XXIII).

We like to point out further that in his introduction to the Sandeśa-rāsaka H. C. Bhayani took up the problem and discussed it in some detail. He believes that during the later days of Pkt. the inherent tendencies of the speech were such that the old inflexions, obtained traditionally, were fast disappearing and making the language shorn of terminational elements. The disintegration of the old morphological system paved the way for the use of the stem-forms in all numbers and cases—a phenomenon which is remarkably found in the old Mārwāri speech, commonly known as Ćingal. Such a situation surely helps one to surmise that the tendency, of which we find wide application in some NIA speech, begins to sprout in Ap., where the nom. acc. and gen. alone according to the grammarians shake off terminations. So Bhayani could not lend his support to the view of Alsdorf, however convincing might his arguments be (Sandeśa-rāsaka, Intr. § 51, p. 26)

Now let us examine the verses, which are assumed to have
possessed the non-inflected forms, but which Alsdorf interprets differently in his endeavours to refute the occurrence of uninflected gen. in Ap. We quote first the verse, which Hemacandra presents as his illustration to the śūtra IV. 345. Pischel presents the verse as:

*savgarasaahin tu vanniąi dekkhu amhāra kañtu |
aimattahaṁ cattānkusahaṁ gaya kumbhāim dārantu ||

Pischel translates the verse as:

"Look he, who is praised in hundreds of fights, is my husband, who splits the temples of wild elephants that defy the iron rod (of the rider)."  

Alsdorf suggests that the word *gaja* can never be considered as an instance of uninflected gen., since it stands as the first member of a compound, in which *kumbhāim* stands also as a constituent. Now the question is whether Alsdorf is justifiable. Here it should be mentioned that there are certain difficulties, for which it is very hard for us to accept the proposition of Alsdorf. In the second line of the verse it is to be found that there occur too adjectives namely *aimattaha* and *cattānkusaha*, which qualify the word *gaya* 'elephant' and describe certain conditions of the same. Now if we be ready to accept the suggestion of Alsdorf we shall have to construe them as standing in apposition to and as such describing some situation of the entire compounded form *gaya-kumbhāim* 'the temples of elephants'—a supposition, which would be meaningless both from the standpoints of grammar and significance. In the Tatpuruṣa compound, one must not forget, the emphasis lies on the second member of the compound, i.e., *kumbhāim* in the present case. Now if what is spoken about the elephant be spoken about its temples, as has been done here, one must be put to a great confusion regarding the real significance of the proposition. This can never be the situation and we can boldly say that the adjectives must have stood for *gaya* and not for *kumbhāim*. So Alsdorf's statement "the construction is free, not usual but not impossible"  does not conform to reason. A similar case is to be noted here in the verse IV. 384, which reads according to Pischel:

5 "Siehe, der in Hunderten von Kampfen geschildert wird, das ist unser Geliebter, der die Stirnerhöhungen überaus wilder Elefanten spaltet, die dem Haken (des Reiters) nicht gehorchen."

6 "Die konstruktion ist frei und nicht gerade gewöhnlich, aber sicher nicht unmöglich."
bali abbhatthani mahumahanu lahuhiu sò i |
jai icchahu va'dhattanahum dehu ma maggahu koI ||

Pischel translates the verse as:

“As he begged to Bali Viṣṇu became small (he assumed the shape of a dwarf = he lowered himself). If you hanker for greatness (high position = respect etc.) give but do not pray for anything.”\(^7\)

Here Pischel and some others would consider the word bali as a form of the non-inflected genitive, but Alsdorf would take it as a component of the compound, which has been formed by this word along with the following one, i.e. abbhatthani. Alsdorf points out that Pischel did not make such a construction of his own accord, but he was urged to do it on the authority of the commentary of Udayasaubhāgyaganin, who gives the translation of the first two words of the first line as baler abhyarthane and supplied the inspiration for accepting the expression bali as a non-inflected form, which ought not to have been done according to his own estimate. But Alsdorf takes it as the first member of a compound on the authority of Trivikrama, who translates the same as balyabhyarthane. We admit that the arrangement of the word bali is such in the verse that both the interpretations are justifiable. So we cannot accept one and reject the other.

A similar case is found also in the verse IV. 401, 3.

bimbahari tanu raana-vaṇu kiha thi siri Ananda?
niruvama-rasu pič piavi janu sesaho dinni mudda?

Pischel translates: “Oh Ānanda! Why does there occur on the bimba-like lip of the slim lady a mark of the teeth? After he has derived (properly drunk) matchless pleasure the lover has given as if a seal to the rest”\(^8\). Alsdorf points out that Pischel is inclined to accept the word tanu as signifying “of the slim lady” and to assume it as a form of the non-inflected gen. on the suggestion of Udayasaubhāgyaganin who presents the commentary of the relevant portions as : tanvyāḥ bimbadhare. But he suggests that the word tanu should be

---

\(^7\) “Als er Bali bat, wurde auch Viṣṇu klein (=er nahm Zwerggestalt an, und =er niedrigte sich). Wenn ihr grösse (=hohe stellung, Ansehen usw. willt, gebet, (aber) bittet um nichts.”

\(^8\) “O Ananda, weshalb befindet sich auf der Bimbalippe der schlanken eine zahnwunde (die die Wonne des Glücks verrät) ? Von dem Geliebte wurde, nachdem er den unvergleichlichen genuss gehabt (eigentlich : getrunken) hatte, auf den Rest gleichsam ein Siegel gedrückt.”
considered as an adjective forming a compound with the following expression raṇa-vaṇu and it conveys the meaning ‘small’, which Pischel too assumed in his edition of Hemacandra’s Pkt. grammar. Further he surmises that the stanza stands in the form of a question and an answer, i.e., the first part is an enquiry and the second a reply to it. Here one should note that in Alsdorf’s interpretation one misses a specific reference to the lady on whose lip the seal of the teeth is imprinted and as such its acceptance deprives the poem of much of its nicety. But as Pischel’s translation is based on the commentary, which is believed to have preserved the traditional meaning and commanded authority, it should be preferred. So the word tanu should be considered as a form of the gen., which is conspicuous by the absence of inflection.

The verse IV. 332. 2 is also assumed to have possessed a form of the non-inflected gen. It stands as:

aṅgahim aṅgu na miliu hali | ahareṁ aharu na pattu |
pia joantie muha-kamalu | emrai suraĩi samattu ||

Pischel translates the verse as:

“Oh friend! my limbs have not been united with those of him, my lips have not been in contact with those of him. As I only see the lotus-like face of my darling the pleasure is complete.”

He advances such an interpretation on the authority of a statement of the commentator, which runs “priyasya mukhakamalam” etc. It is to be marked here that both Pischel and the commentators take the word pia as a non-inflected form for the gen. meaning ‘of the darling’. But quite contrarily Alsdorf interprets it as a form of the voc. With a view to keeping harmony with such an assumption he presumes that the verse is a dialogue in which the first line constitutes the statement of the lover, while the second the reply of the beloved. Accordingly Alsdorf translates the first line of the stanza as: “Oh friend! my limbs have not been united with those of you, my lips have not been in touch with yours.”

The second line, which constitutes the reply, is reproduced as “Oh darling! as I see


10 “(Meine)Glieder, O Freundin, haben sich mit (deinen) Gliedern nicht vereinigt, (meine) Lippe hat deine Lippe nicht berührt.”
your lotuslike face the pleasure becomes complete.”

To us this interpretation of the stanza appears phantastic and far removed from the truth. There is not the slightest indication in the verse, which may ensure one such a conclusion. The fact is that here a lady is disclosing her love-adventure of the night to her friend and also his failure in the feat. That such is indeed the situation follows from the use of the term hāli in the stanza, which, as it is commonly known, is employed exclusively by a lady for addressing her female friend. So it conforms with the situation we delineate above and holds brief for the interpretation which Pischel and others suggest. Hence Alsdorf’s attempts to interpret the word pīa as a case of address and to twist the meaning of the verse on the basis of his assumption, seem to meet with total failure, which led ultimately to the demolition of his conclusion.

Pischel intends to see another instance of non-inflected gen. in the verse IV. 356, which reads:

\[\text{jaī taho tuṭṭāū nehaḍā maĩ sahun navi tilatāra }\]
\[\text{taṁ kihe vaṅkahiṁ loaṇahiṁ joijjaū sayavāra ||}\]

Here Pischel takes the word tilatāra as a form of the non-inflected gen., which qualifies the pronominal stem taho standing at a distance from it. He translates the verse accordingly: “If with regard to me the love of him, whose eyeball gleams as a sesame corn, has not disappeared then why am I looked with side-glances for hundred times?”

Alsdorf does not accept this construction and interpretation of Pischel. According to him the word tilatāra has got nothing to do with the pronominal form taho, contrarily it is an expression used as a case of address referring to a form of the second person sing., which is to be inferred from the context. So he translates the verse as: “oh you, whose eye-ball gleams as a sesame corn, if his love for me has not disappeared…….”

Here it needs definite mention that Alsdorf has got the support of the commentator UdayasaubhāgyaGaṇin, who gives the following exposition of the

11 “Liebster, wenn ich nur den Lotus deines Antlitzes sehe, ist dadurch schon die wollust vollständig.”

12 Wenn die Liebe von ihm, dessen Augensterne wie Sesamkörner (glänzen), zu mir nicht geschwunden ist, weshalb werde ich dann hundertmal mit schiefen Augen angesehen.

13 “O du, dessen Augensterne wie Sesamkorner (glänzen), wenn seine Liebe zu mir nicht geschwunden ist.....”
verse: he tilatāra | tilavat snigdhā kaṇīṅīkā yasya saḥ | tasya saṁvodhanam | yadi tava sneho mayā sāha nāpi trūṭitaḥ tat katham aham tvayā vakrābhhyāṁ locanābhhyāṁ śatavāraṁ vilokyे ityarthaḥ. It is interesting to note that P. L. Vaidya takes the expression tilatāra as an adjective, which qualifies the word nehaḍā and unequivocally conveys the meaning ‘intense, violent, poignant etc.’. Accordingly he translates the verse as: “If her intense (tilatāra, literally in which the pupil of the eye is full of love like sesamum) love for me is lost, and then nothing is left of it...”

Here it is very difficult to say as to which of the interpretations is correct, because the analytical nature of the speech, in which the verse is composed, gives it the utmost flexibility that admits of multiformed turns and twists of words. Naturally interpretations vary. Pischel does not seem to have found wide support from the scholars, since according to his interpretation the two words—the noun and the adjective—are intervened by a large number of expressions.

In the following verse quoted in the Materialen zur Kenntniss des Apabhraṃśa from Čanda’s Prākṛta-lakṣaṇa we note a word—namely joiā, which Pischel intends to accept as a form of the gen. and Alsdorf as one more instance of the non-inflected gen., which he is inclined to refute. The verse, in the text of which Pischel does not find any thing irregular, appears in his Materialen zur Kenntniss des Apabhraṃśa as:

kālu laheviṇu joiā jīva jīva mohu galēi |
tīva tīva daṁsaṇu lahai jo niameṁ appu muñeĩ |

With the assumption that the word joiā is a form of the gen. Pischel translates the verse as: “As in the course of time his delusion disappears the Yogin obtains enlightenment,—the Yogin, who recognizes the Ātman by austerities.”

We like to point out here that Alsdorf rightly traces the verse, which occurs in the Paramātma-prakāśa (Nr. 86), where the correct text is expected to occur. He quotes the verse as:

kālu laheviṇu joiā | jimu jimu mohu galēi |
timu timu daṁsaṇu lahai jiu, | niameṁ appu muñeĩ ||

Now Alsdorf makes an assumption here. Basing upon Pischel’s acceptance of the form joiā as gen. he thinks that the form is originally a non-inflected stem, but though in the gen. it gets the lengthening of

14 “In dem Masse, wie mit der zeit seine Verblendung schwindet, erreicht der yogin die Erluchtung, der durch Busse den Ātman erkennt.”
the final vowel in the same manner by which the non-inflected forms in the nom. or the acc. get final vowels lengthened in Ap. So the final long vowel of the form (i.e. of joiā), according to his estimate, does not in any way affect its assumption as a non-inflected word. But as he is intent on striking at the root of the conception of the traditional use of the non-inflected gen. in Ap. he considers the word as a form of the vocative case. According to his assumption the word was originally joiāī (*yogikaka), which by the loss of the final vowel u and the concomitant lengthening of the preceding vowel a by way of compensation developed into the present joiā. Such an assumption of Alsdorf—namely of construing joiā as a form of the vocative, one may likely suggest, is obviously based upon the following sanskritisation of the verse, which L. B. Gandhi presents: kālam labdhvā yogin! yathā yathā maho galati | tathā tathā darśanaṁ labhate jīvo niyaṁemātmānam jānāti |. It needs no mention that Alsdorf accepts his interpretation, which invariably follows from the above construction.

It should be stated here that Alsdorf has cited several instances, where the word joiā has been subject to the similar use and been considered as a case of address. We must admit that Alsdorf’s assumption is quite conforming to reason and there is nothing objectionable in it. But this does not in any way entitle us to consider Pischel’s supposition of the word as gen. to be wrong and leading to confusion. Because the word joiā many be quite rightly supposed as a regular form of the gen. which proceeds from the word yogikasya and shows the following course of development in Ap.: yogikasya > joiassa > jaiśa > joiāha > joiāa > joiā. It may be stated that the Prākṛta-paiṅgala shows the copious use of such gen. ending in the vowel ā and unquestionably supports the statement, which Pischel makes in unequivocal terms. We may quote a few instances from the Prākṛta-paiṅgala, which would clarify the matter and substantiate our statement: jā addhaṁge pabbāī I. 82 (yasya ardhāṅge Pārvatī), jāā jā addhaṁga I. 119 (jāyā yasya ardhāṅge), veālā jā saṅga I. 119 (vetālāḥ yasya saṅge), jā diṭṭhe mokkhaṁ pāvijja I.119 (yasya diṭṭe mokṣaḥ prṛpyate) etc. The gen. forms here very strongly suggest that the word joiā too ending in the vowel ā may be easily accepted as a form in the gen. The interpretation of the verse too will not suffer from any injury by such a supposition, since it will be construed with the word mohu, which comes after it though intervened by a few words. Such a situation goes to support the proposition of Pischel, whom we cannot reject unless we meet with any argument going to the contrary.
THE NON-INFLECTED GENITIVE IN APABHRĀMŚA : 201

One cannot understand why Alsdorf was so eager to assume jóīā as an endlessless form and how it could help him to refute the occurrence of the non-inflected gen. in Ap. Pischel has nowhere stated that jóīā provides an instance of the uninflected gen., against which Alsdorf raised his voice of protest.¹⁵ To assume a form to be used in the gen. does not necessarily imply that it has sustained the loss of inflection, from which the word jóīā did not actually suffer, as the above shows. So Alsdorf has tried to attribute something to Pischel, for which the latter cannot be held responsible. If this be the position, Alsdorf’s attempt to refute Pischel does not in any way help the former in establishing his proposition—namely, to demonstrate the use of the non-inflected gen. in Ap. as wrong.

Alsdorf cites the verse IV. 383. 3 and shows that Hemacandra has left here sufficient room for the assumption of the non-inflected gen. in Ap. According to P. L. Vaidya the verse stands as:

āyahiṁ jammahi annahi vi gori su dijjahi kantu |
gaya mattahā cattāṅkusaha jo abbhisāi hasantu ||

The chāyā in the second line occurs as: gajānāṁ mattānāṁ tyaktāṅkusānām etc........

Pischel translates: “Oh Gauri, in this birth and also in the others give me such a man as my husband, who laughingly faces the infuriated elephant, that has refused to obey the goad (of the driver).”¹⁶ Here one might consider the word gaya as to have shaken off the termination and as such non-inflected in form. But Alsdorf suggests that there is no scope for such a surmise, since by being the fore-member of the Karmadhāraya compound the word gaya combines with the immediately following word (i.e. mattaha) an

¹⁵ Pischel states “jóīā ist = *yogika und kann als Nominativ oder Genetiv Singular gefasst werden. Ich habe es hier als Genetiv übersetzt.” [Trans.: jóīa is = *yogika and can be assumed nom. or gen. sg. I have translated it by assuming it as gen.] Pischel has given in yogika the stem form of the word but the termination should be different if it be in the nom. or gen. (i.e. yogikah or yogikasya): here in jóīā both the possibilities occur. Here we do not find that Pischel considered the form jóīā as endingless, i.e., a non-inflected stem.

¹⁶ “Oh Gauri, gib mir in dieser Geburt und auch in den Andern ihn zum Geliebten, der lachend brüstigen Elefanten entgeengeht, die den Haken (des Reiters) nicht gehorchen.”
adj.—with which it has merely transposed place. If this position obtains the word gaya can quite easily be assumed as to have thrown off its termination.

But a little reflection shows that this argument of Alsdorf is sure to meet with a grave objection. Because the fundamental condition of samasa stands against it. If there was any scope for compound here it should have been amongst all the words gayahā, mattahā and cattaṅkusaḥ (an adj. like mattahā), which maintain a syntactical connection. The forming of compounds between the preceding two words leaving the third outside is forbidden and against the procedure of the construction of compounds (vide: samarthah, padavidhiḥ. Pāṇini 2.1.1). This condition stands in the way of our accepting Alsdorf’s proposition, even if we find some justification for the transposition of place between two components of the compound. Such being the condition we doubt whether anybody would accept the proposition of Alsdorf. Hence this verse, too, which Alsdorf cites in support of his argument, has got practically no worth in establishing his viewpoint.

Now it is possible for us to say that in all the above-discussed verses barring that of the Paramātma-prakāśa, which Alsdorf unjustifiably draws within the purview of his discussion, there are non-inflected gen. forms—most of which are to be interpreted as such and do not admit of any other explanation. But with regard to a few verses we are constrained to modify our statement and suggest that the acceptance of the stem-forms as genitive ones in such cases ascribes to the stanzas a very suitable construction leading to the development of a quite agreeable meaning—but that situation does not rule out the probability of the emergence of other interpretations, consequent on the sudden development of analytical tendencies in Ap. and post-Ap. speeches. These facts should be considered in the background of some other above-discussed phenomena—namely (1) the occurrence of a few non-inflected forms in the Bhavisattakahā and the Nemināhcarīu, (2) the copious use of such forms in the Prākṛta-paṅgala and other late-Ap. works, (3) the development of two cases—the direct and oblique in all the New Indo-Aryans, consequent on the disintegration of old terminations traditionally coming down and (4) finally the appearance of the new mode of using post-positions for indicating case relations in the modern Aryan speeches.

Now taking all these facts together into consideration it is possible for us to assert that the loss of inflection in gen. in Ap., which Hemacandra prescribes by formulating a sūtra in unequivocal terms, is
indeed a non-challengeable fact. The same, we can boldly say, is not a fortuitous manifestation, which baffles all attempts to render an account of the same—but contrarily, a natural development keeping perfect harmony with the tendencies, which were unfolding themselves in the great Aryan speech during its subsequent expansion—particularly at the time of its split into modern Aryan languages. So any attempt to deny the occurrence of the non-inflected gen. in Ap. is to disown established facts. So we consider that Alsdorf’s proposition is vulnerable to adverse criticisms and the same should be very cautiously scrutinised with due consideration of the above-discussed facts, before one finally accepts it.