Comparative Study of the Language of the Ācārāṅga and the Isibhāsiyāiṁ both edited by Prof. Schubring.

- K. R. Chandra

While going through the text of the Śvetāmbara Jain canonical works one is unable to form a proper idea of the main linguistic features of the Ardhamāgadhi language. In the edited texts there is a mixture of archaic and younger usages. In the absence of any authentic grammatical treatise on Ardhamāgadhi and due to the oral tradition a number of phonetical and morphological changes entered the original Amg. from time to time and place to place. This historical truth is well-known to all of us.

We are giving below a comparative list of usages from the ch. IX of the Ācārāṅga[1] and the Isibhāsiyāiṁ[2] both belonging to the earliest strata of the Amg. canonical works. When we compare linguistically the usages from these two works one is surprised to note that Ācārāṅga (Erster Śrutaskandha), the earliest Amg. text is full of Mahārāṣṭrī usages without any Amg. usage whereas the Isibhāsiyāiṁ has generally the archaic (Amg.) usages with some what Mahārāṣṭrī usages also.

Comparative List of Usages

Medial -k- (मध्यवर्ती -क्-)

Ācārāṅga, I, Ch. 9	Isibhāsiyāiṁ
अणेग, एगचरा, एगत्त, एगया, एगेंसि, पावगं; एगइया, कंटए, मूसिय, लोइय, लोए, वियड	अणेक, एकं, एकन्तं, एका, परलोक, पावक, मूसिकार-; एगग्ग, एगतो, एगो
(-k- = -g- and -a-, -y-) (no original -k-)	(-k- = generally -k- and -g- also but no -a-,-y-)

Ācārāṅga	Isibhāsiyāiṁ
Medial -g- (मध्यवर्ती -ग्-)	
नाओ	णागो
(-g- = -a-)	(-g- = -g-)
Medial -j- (मध्यवर्ती -ज्-)	
तेओफासे	तेजसं, तेजसा
(-j- = -a-)	(-j- = -j-)
Medial -th- (मध्यवर्ती -थ्-)	
अहाकडं, अहासुयं	अधासच्चं, जधा;
जहा	जहा
(-th- = -h- only)	(-th- = mostly -dh- and sometimes -h-)
Medial -d- (मध्यवर्ती -द्-)	
वितिच्छेयं, सया	सव्वच्छेदं, सदा;
	इयाणिं
(-d- = -y-)	(-d- = mostly -d- and sometimes -y-)
Medial -dh- (-ध्-)	
मेहावी, विविहं, विही,	मेधावी, विविधं, समाधि,
अहियासए, दुविहं, समाहि	अधियासेज्जा, दुविधा;
	दुविहं, मेहावी
(-dh- = -y-)	(-dh- = mostly -dh- and sometimes -h-)
Medial -n- (मध्यवर्ती -न्-)	
अणु- uniformly	अणु- mostly but sometimes अनु- also; medial -n- also. अनवदग्गं, अनिव्वाणं, निच्चानिच्चं

Ācārāṅga	Isibhāsiyāiṁ
(medial -n- = -ṇ- uniformly)	(sometimes medial -n- also)

Medial -p- (मध्यवर्ती -प्-)

अइवाय- .	अतिपातं
(-p- = -v- uniformly)	(sometimes -p- = -p- also)

Medial -t- (मध्यवर्ती -त्-)

Nouns (नाम-शब्द)

अइ-(uniformly)	अति-(mostly)
अइवाय-	-अतिपातं
अरइ	अरति
रइं	रती
सीयपिण्डं	सीताहतो

Pronouns (सर्वनाम)

एयं, एएर्हि	एतं, एयं, एतेण

Nominal Suffixes (नाम-विभक्तियाँ)

भगवया, मईमया, पुरओ	अरहता, एगतो, पुरतो

Termination of Present Tense (वर्तमान काल का प्रत्यय)

अइवत्तई, अच्छइ, गच्छइ, झाइ, लुप्पई, सेवइ	पवत्तती, अच्छती, गच्छति, झाति, लुप्पती, सेवते; अच्छइ कुणइ, गच्छइ

Past Passive Participle (भूत कृदन्त)

अइवाय, अहासुयं, अभिन्नाय, कप्पिया,-गए,ठियं,विरए,समिए हयपुव्वो, हिमवाए (-t- = -y- and -a- but no -t-)	अतिपात, विस्सुत, परिन्नात, कप्पिता, -गते, ठितं, विरते, समिते, पडिहत, पातो; हयणायकं (-t- = -t- mostly and sometimes -t- = -y-)

It is not a thorough list of all the usages but some examples are given here to form a tentative idea.

The above comparative list of usages clearly indicates that the editor has adopted Mahārāṣṭri usages only in the edition of the Ācārāṅga whereas he has given proper place to the archaic usages in the Isibhāsiyāiṁ. Ācārāṅga is the earliest canonical text and therefore how could it have younger usages (of Mahārāṣṭrī) when there are archaic usages in the Isibhāsiyāiṁ which is in no way a composition of earlier date than that of the Ācārāṅga. While re-editing the first chapter of the Ācārāṅga[3] linguistically I had an opportunity to go through various Mss. of the text but there was no uniform elision of medial consonants as prescribed by the Prakrit grammarians.[3] On this ground and considering the antiquity of the text as well as the liguistic form of the contemporary Pāli language and additionally the form of the language of the Aśokan inscriptions of the East of the 3rd century B. C. did it not occur to Prof. Schubring that his edition of the Ācārāṅga needs to be re-edited linguistically in the light of the linguistic form of the Isibhāsiyāiṁ. I have no knowledge whether he has discussed this problem anywhere. If he has done so to clarify this odd situation I would like to have information about it from the indologists who are aware of it. Otherwise the language of the Ācārāṅga edited by Prof. Schubring becomes unauthentic and unreliable and the same rule applies to his editions of other Jain Amg. texts.

Further I would like to draw the attention of the indologists that his predecessor Prof. H. Jacobi had also edited the Ācārāṅga in 1882 A.D. but he has preserved all the medial (non-aspirate and aspitate) consonants wherever they were not found elided in the Mss. He did not make any attempt to standardize the language of the whole text either into Mahārāṣṭri or Ardhamāgadhi when the latter of these two is said to be akin to Pāli in the Preface to his edition of the Ācārāṅga. The question is why did Prof. Schubring prefer to distort the original Amg. into Mahārāṣṭri Prakrit when the Jacobi's edition and the Mss. retaining the original medial consonants were before him. This situation

is very odd and it requires a proper answer for the solution of the problem. Finally it would be worthwhile that Prof. W. Schubring's editions of Jain canonical works get re-edited linguistically, otherwise the form of the language of his editions does not seem to be correct and gives a distorted look.

●

Foot-notes

1. See the glossary at the end of the Ācārāṅga-Sūtra, ed. W. Schubring, Leipzig, 1910.

2. See the इसिभासियाइं का प्राकृत-संस्कृत शब्द-कोश, के. आर. चन्द्र, प्राकृत टेक्स्ट सोसायटी, अहमदाबाद, 1998.

3. See the आचारांङ्ग, प्रथम श्रुत-स्कन्ध, प्रथम अध्ययन, विभाग-२, pp. 32 to 46, comparative tables of usages in various Mss. (especially the usages from the Ms. from Poona which is consulted by Prof. Schubring but he has not adopted archaic usages from it.)