

THE COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE ṢATKHAṆḌĀGAMA AND THE PRAVACANASĀRA

K. R. Chandra

The *Ṣatkhaṇḍāgama*¹ and the *Pravacanasāra*² are regarded as 'senior' texts of the *Siddhānta* by the Digambara sect of the Jains. The dates of their composition are uncertain, varying as they do from early Christian centuries to sixth and eighth century A. D. Some scholars assign earlier date to the *Ṣatkhaṇḍāgama* whereas others to the *Pravacanasāra*. The authors of the former work according to the commentator Vīrasena (A. D. 815) are Puṣpadanta and Bhūtabali, and of the latter, the illustrious Kundakundācārya.

A study of the language of the above-noted two texts is attempted for deciding on the chronological priority of the one over the other. This study covers the PS fully whereas the SA's four parts of the 1st volume are covered.

The editors of these works in their Introductions, claim that their language seem to be of the earlier Christian centuries. I here propose to test the validity (or otherwise) of their claims through the study of the linguistic usages that are available in these texts.

In the beginning, we will compare the main features of their language with that of the grammar of Śaurasenī as quoted by Hemacandra³.

(i) Initial and medial dental n-, -n- -न्, -न्-), conjuncts-nn-(न्न्-) and -ññ-(-ञ्ज-), and conjunct of palatal nasal with a palatal consonant -ñc- (ञ्च) are optionally quoted by Hemacandra in his Prakrit grammar, e.g. नाड्यं, निच्चिन्द, नेदि, मारुदिना, पदिञ्जेन, अन्नं, संपन्ना, कञ्चुइयं but in the ŚA and the PS there throughout is used. The cerebral nasal ñ-, -ñ-, -ññ- and *anuswāra* — for palatal (-ñ-)

(ii) Hemacandrācārya prescribes the augment -ssi- (-स्सि-) for the future tense, e.g. भविस्सिदि, करिस्सिदि, etc. but in the PS we come across -ssa (-स्स-) only, e.g. भविस्सदि २.२०, जीवस्सदि २.५५.

(iii) The bhuv- and huv- stems of the root √bhū as quoted by Hemacandra, e.g. bhuvadi, huvadi are not traced in the SA and the PS.

In the text of PS, Upadhye at times has adopted words of the usage of Mahārāṣṭrī when the variants in the MSS. are of the Śaurasenī usage⁴.

Pravacanasāra, Ch. I

(A) Text	Variant	verse no.	Text	Variant	Verse no.
अहिओ	क्	अधिगो २४, २५	जहा	थ्	जधा ६८
लोय	क्	लोग ३३	तह	थ्	तध ४, १६
सयलं	क्	सकलं ३४	तहा	थ्	तधा ५३, ६८, ७६

सहियं	त्	सहितं, -दं	७६	जइ	द्	जदि	६७
अइसय	त्	अदिसय	१३	अहिओ	ध्	अधिगो	२४
रयणं	त्	रदणं	३०	तिहा	ध्	तिधा	३६
सुयकेवलि	त्	सुदकेवलि	३३	लहदि	भ्	लभदि	८१

On the other hand one would find that at several places the readings of the Śaurasenī usage have been adopted leaving out those of the Mahārāṣṭrī usage found in the same works (Mss).

(B) Text		Variant	verse no.	Text		Variant	Verse no.
अधिक	क्	अहियं	१९	कधं	थ्	कहं	५०
पत्तेगं	क्	पत्तेयं	३	जदि	द्	जइ	३१, ५०
-लोग-	क्	-लोय-	१६	सदा		सया	२२
खाइगं	क्	खाइयं	५०	अधिक-	ध्	अहिय-	१९
घादि-	त्	घाइ-	१९	चक्रधरा	ध्	चक्रहरा	७३
मुंचदि	त्	मुंचइ	३२		भ्		
होदि	त्	होइ	३१	अणुभवन्ति		अणुहवन्ति	७५

When Upadhye is of the opinion that the date of Kundakunda, the author of the *Pravacanasāra* falls in the beginning of the Christian era⁵, then why are the Mahārāṣṭrī usages given preference in place of the Śaurāṣṭrī usages ? This question remains unanswered.

I am at this juncture tabulate what Upadhye and Jain's edited versions of the respective works show on the state of phonetic changes in the language of the texts of PS⁶ and SA⁷ :

PS : Upadhye	SA : Jain
1. A tendency towards <i>preservation</i> of intervocalic consonants than that of elision.	Medial consonants are elided also.
2. Medial-k-is generally <i>voiced</i> and at time elided.	-g- for medial -k- but it is <i>often</i> elided.
3. Medial -g- <i>retained</i>	—
4. Medial -t- <i>normally changed to -d-</i> at times dropped.	<i>often</i> -d- for medial -t-.
5. Medial -th- <i>at times softened</i> and also changed to -h-.	sometimes -th- = -dh- but <i>often</i> -h,
6. Medial -d- <i>almost preserved</i> , very scarcely elided.	—

7. Medial -dh- is <i>normally preserved</i> and at time changed to -h-.	Medial -dh- sometimes preserved but <i>often</i> changed to -h-.
8. Medial -bh- generally changed to -h- at times retained.	—

These findings reveal that phonetically the language of PS is of an earlier stage than that of the SA.

A sample analysis of phonetic changes in the SA. and PS. by us :

(A) *Pravacanasāra* (=PS), Ch. I (Verses 1 to 92).

Medial Consonants (Nos.)	(Percentage)	Critical Remarks on Prof. Upadhye's opinion.
-k- = -k- 1	3 %	Not fully correct because -k- is optionally voiced.
-g- 19	58 %	
-y- 13	39 %	
-g- = -g- 15	100 %	Fully correct.
-y- 0	0 %	
-t- = -t- 6	3 %	Fully correct.
-d- 162	78 %	
-y- 40	19 %	
-th- = -th- 0	0 %	Not correct because it is often changed to -h-.
-dh- 5	28 %	
-h- 13	72 %	
-d- = -d- 22	100 %	Fully correct.
-y- 0	0 %	
-dh- = -dh- 4	28.5 %	Incorrect because it is often changed to -h-.
-h- 0	71.5 %	
-bh- = -bh- 4	13 %	Fully correct
-h- 27	87 %	

The above-cited analysis reveals that there are 52 instances of retention, 186 instances of voicing and 103 instances of elision of medial consonants, i.e 15% retention, 49% voicing and 36% dropping, hence, the elision is more than twice the retention.

(B) *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* (SA), khaṇḍa 1, part 1, book 1 (sūtras 1 to 90).

Medial consonants (Nos.)	(Percentage)	Critical remarks on Prof. Upadhye's opinion.
-k- = -k- 2	3(-) %	It is mostly elided.
-g- 1	1.5(-) %	
-y- 69	95(+) %	
-g- = -g- 85	95(-) %	No comment
-y- 5	5½(-) %	
-t- -t- 0	82(-) % 18(+) %	Fully correct
-d- 72		
-y- 16		
-th- = -th- 0	0 %	Scanty instances
-h- 1	100 %	
-d- - -d- 24	32 %	No comment
-y- 51	68 %	
-dh- = -dh- 2	6(+) %	Fully Correct
-h- 31	94(-) %	
-bh- - -bh- 0	0 %	No comment
-b- 16	100 %	

The above-recorded analysis reveals that there are 113 instances of retention, 73 instances of voicing and 189 instances of elision, i.e. 30 % retention, 19.5% voicing and 50.5% dropping. In the PS the voicing is 49% i.e. 30% more than that in the SA but the dropping in the SA is 14% more than that in the PS.

Analysis of morphological usages.

Suffixes of Locative Singular

PS.	SA.
-ए ६४, -म्हि २६, -म्मि ११	-ए ३०, -म्हि २, -म्मि ४

-म्हि is an archaic declensional suffix of locative singular which is nearly 25 % in the PS. whereas in the SA. its percentage is only 6.

As far as the absolute forms are concerned the -दूण suffix is popular in the PS. and there is no -ऊण suffix in the PS. whereas Jain traces the absolute forms with the -ऊण suffix in the SA.

Thus both on the phonological and morphological grounds we find that the language of SA. is of a later stage than that of the PS. in the evolutionary process of MIA dialects.

Therefore the date of composition of SA. is younger than that of the PS. Thus Kundakundacārya happens to have lived a few centuries before the composition of the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*.

[As we have observed on Dr. Chandra's learned paper he contributed to the *Jambūjyoti* where, too, these two works were involved in comparison, his analysis and, as its result, the date-determinations made can be valid only after removing the earlier verses incorporated in the *Pravacanasāra*. -Editors]

Annotations :

1. SA = *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, Ed. H.L. Jain, Amravati 1939.
 2. PS = *Pravacanasāra* Ed. A. N. Upadhye, Agas 1964.
 3. See *Siddha-Haima-Śabdanuśāsana*, 8.4. 260, 261, 263, 269, 270, 274, 275, 277, 282 and 285.
 4. The editor has made use of four works (as Mss A, P, C And K) containing the text and commentary in Sanskrit. These Mss are of the 19th and 20th century A. D. and they were copied from Mss of 15th 18th century A. D. While editing the PS he has not given preference to any work (Ms.) for adopting a particular textual reading.
 5. "I am inclined to believe, after this long survey of the available material, that Kundakunda's age lies at the beginning of the Christian era". Introduction, p. 21, *Pravacanasāra*.
 6. PS "Intro.," pp. 106-120.
 7. SA Vol. I, Book 1, Preface, pp. 78-87.
-