Nalini BALBIR

MORPHOLOGICAL EVIDENCE
FOR DIALECTAL VARIETY
IN JAINA MĀHĀRĀṢṬRĪ

This paper is concerned with literary Prakrits. Hence the term
"dialect" is understood as it is in Pischel's *Grammatik*[1] : Ardha-
māgadhī (= AMg), Māgadhī, Māhārāṣṭrī, Apabhraṃśa are currently
regarded as dialects.

The present study is based on two groups of works, the main dialect
of which is Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī (= JM)[2].

1. The first group includes the *niryuktis* and *bhāṣyas* which form the
earliest stratum of exegetical texts on the Jaina Canon. *Niryuktis* are
metrical commentaries, mostly, but not exclusively, consisting of lists
of catch-words. One can say of them what L. Renou has written
about the Brahmasūtras : "des notations concises de mots-clefs, avec
une syntaxe rudimentaire, qui les rend souvent inintelligibles sans le
secours d'une *vṛtti* ou 'glose'"[3]. They can also aptly be compared
with the Pali *uddānas*, "sommaires versifiés", to quote Helmer
Smith[4], all the more so since in both cases the brevity of style affects
the grammar. The following material has been surveyed : the
Āyāraṅga- and Sūyagaḍa-nijjuttis; the Dasaveyāliya-nijjutti
(= DasavN); parts of the Uttarajjhāyā- and the Oha-nijjutti
(= UttN; OhN); the Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya (= BKBh) and the Nisītha-

---

1. R. PISCHEL, *Grammatik der Prākrit-Sprachen*. Strassburg, 1900 (Grundriss der
Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde I, 8) = Pi.
2. A standard description of JM is provided, for instance, in H. JACOBI, *Ausgewählte
Erzählungen in Māhārāshṭrī. Zur Einführung in das Studium des Prâkṛit*. Leipzig, 1886
(reprint Darmstadt, 1967), p. XXI-LXIX : Jacobi's Māhārāṣṭrī is in fact Pischel's JM.
3. Śaṅkara, *Prolégomènes au Vedānta*. Texte traduit du sanskrit par L. RENOU. Paris,
1951, p. IV.
4. *Saddanīti*. La grammaire palie d'Aggavaṃsa. Texte établi par H. SMITH, vol. IV,
Tables. Lund, 1949, 5.3.2.1. (and 8.9.5); CPD II, 9 *s.v. uddāna*.

bhāṣya have been occasionally consulted [5]. Special emphasis has been laid upon the Āvaśyaka-niryukti and bhāṣya (= ĀvN, Bh) [6], which I have studied at leisure [7]. Finally, the Mahānisīha-sutta has also been examined in this survey [8].

2.   The second part of the corpus is represented by narrative works which are probably early, to wit : the Vasudevahiṇḍi, mainly written in prose, and the Tarangavaī and the Paumacariya in verse [9]. The cūrṇis explaining the niryuktis, as well as Prakrit portions of the ṭīkās, also belong to this layer : the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi [10] and Haribhadra's ṭīkā (= ĀvC ; ĀvH) [11] are here given the first place.

There is obviously a great difference between these two groups from the points of view of style and contents, but they show a linguistic unity, and, to some extent, they can all be viewed as "specimens of Archaic Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī" [12].

The aim of the present investigation is to identify and analyse *morphological* traces of dialectal variety in the selected corpus. In other words, it focuses on forms which are ordinary features of

5. *Ācārānga and Sūtrakṛtāngasūtram.* With the niryukti of Ācārya Bhadrabāhusvāmī and the commentary of Śīlānkācārya... reedited with appendices, etc., by Muni Jambūvijayajī. Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1978 ; W. B. BOLLÉE, *Studien zum Sūya-gaḍa...* (I) Textteile, Nijjutti, Uebersetzung und Anmerkungen. Wiesbaden, 1977 (Schriftenreihe des Südasien-Instituts der Univ. Heidelberg 24) ; E. LEUMANN, *Daśavai-kālika-sūtra und -niryukti,* nach dem Erzählungsgehalt untersucht und herausgegeben..., ZDMG 46 (1892), p. 581-612 ; UttN : E. LEUMANN, *Die Legende von Citta und Sambhūta,* WZKM 6 (1892), p. 34-46 ; OhN : A. METTE, *Piṇḍ'esaṇā.* Das Kapitel der Oha-nijjutti über den Bettelgang. Wiesbaden, 1974 (Abh. der Geistes- und Sozialwiss. Kl. 1973, Nr. 11) ; BKBh : *Brihat Kalpa Sutra* and Original Niryukti... and a Bhashya.... Ed. by Guru Shri Chaturvijaya and his Shishya Punyavijaya. Bhavnagar, 1933, 1936, 1938, 1942, 6 vols.
6. For references see below n. 11.
7. Nalini BALBIR, *Études d'exégèse jaina : les Āvaśyaka.* Paris, 1986. 3 vols. 976 + 111 p. (Unpublished DLitt. Dissertation, Université de Paris-III).
8. W. SCHUBRING, *Das Mahānisīha-Sutta.* Berlin, 1918 ; J. DELEU-W. SCHUBRING, *Studien zum Mahānisīha.* Kapitel 1-5. Hamburg, 1963 (Alt-und Neu-Indische Studien... Univ. Hamburg 10).
9. See L. ALSDORF, *The Vasudevahiṇḍi, a Specimen of Archaic Jaina-Māhārāṣṭrī,* BSOAS 8 (1935-1937) = *Kleine Schriften,* Wiesbaden, 1974, p. 56-70 ; *Saṃkhitta-Tarangavaīkahā...* edited and translated [in Gujarati] by H. C. BHAYANI, Ahmedabad, 1979 (L.D. Series 75) ; H. C. BHAYANI, *Another rare specimen of Archaic Jain-Māhārāṣṭrī : Taraṃgavaīkahā of Pādalipta,* "Sambodhi" 7 (1978-79), p. 114-119 ; Ācārya Vimalasūri's *Paumacariyaṃ...* Second revised ed. by Muni Shri Punyavijayaji. Varanasi, 1963 (Prakrit Text Society Series 6).
10. *Āvaśyakacūrṇi.* 2 vols. Ratlam, 1928-29. References to page and line numbers.
11. *Āvaśyakaniryukti* with Haribhadra's commentary. Bombay. Āgamodaya Samiti, 1916-1917 : references to page and line numbers. (Reprint Bombay, Vikrama saṃvat 2038).
12. See *Paumacariya,* intr. [by V. M. KULKARNI] p. 32.

dialects other than JM, but sporadically appear in JM texts. It will be seen that the main dialect (JM) is torn between two extremes : the strong pressure of the Canonical language, and a faint, but unquestionable, attraction toward Apabhraṃśa [13]. In addition, attention is paid to some peculiar forms which are as yet not known from any dialect, but have tried, though unsuccessfully, to make their way into a specific layer of the language : they apparently predate classical JM where they have not been admitted. Finally, scanty remains of a practically lost dialect, the so-called " alt " or " echt " AMg (Lüders-Alsdorf) will be examined. They are preserved in six *vaitālīya*-stanzas in the commentaries.

(I)

A. Early JM is still under the influence of Canonical *Ardhamāgadhī*, and the line between the two dialects is not always easy to perceive [14]. But a distinction has to be made between all-pervading AMg features, and what may be called " Ardhamāgadhisms ", i.e. sporadic forms, the occurrence of which is to a large extent dependent on the literary context or the subject treated. Both these points will be considered in due order.

A fundamental and well-known feature of AMg is the *-e* nominative singular of *-a* stems. It determines a clearcut distinction in the chosen corpus between the language of the narrative works and that of the niryuktis, for it is conspicuous by its absence in the former, where only *-o* is found [15], while it is quite frequent in the enumerative verses of the latter group. Thus commenting upon the nominative *niravalāve* of ĀvN 1274, Haribhadra observes :

> " It has been often reported that the first case (i.e. nominative) has the ending *-e* in Prakrit ".

13. For the relationship between JM and AMg, see the important statement by Alsdorf, BSOAS 8 (1935), p. 332-33 = *Kleine Schriften*, p. 69-70; on AMg and Apabhraṃśa influence see K. R. CHANDRA, *A Critical Study of Paumacariyaṃ*. Vaishali, 1970, p. 577-78. To quote S. GOLDSCHMIDT, *Prākṛtica*. Strassburg, London, 1879, p. 30 : " Die Depravierung der Māhārāṣṭrī- Texte unter dem Einfluss der Apabhraṃśa ist sehr alt ".
14. See SCHUBRING, *Mahānisīha* (as in n. 8), p. 84; L. P. TESSITORI, *L' " Uvaesamālā " di Dharmadāsa*, " Giornale dellà Società Asiatica Italiana ".25 (1912), p. 172.
15. ALSDORF, BSOAS 8 (1935-1937), p. 328 = *Kleine Schriften*, p. 65 : " The nom. sing. masc. of A-stems ends in *-o* without a single exception ".

He further quotes one of the pādas mentioned in Hemacandra's grammar to illustrate this peculiarity of ārṣa [16].

In fact, the actual situation is quite confused. The attempt undertaken by Schubring to study carefully the distribution of -e and -o nominatives in the Mahānisīha-sutta has revealed some tendencies : -o is, for instance, found in āryās; -e and -o are found side by side in ślokas, etc. [17]. But no clear and general conclusion can be drawn. The same can be said of the ĀvN, where a mixture of endingless stems, and -e and -o endings is likely to be seen in the same verse. Moreover, -e occurs even in traditionally neuter nouns such as dāṇa (ĀvN 458), nikkhamaṇa (ibidem), bhoyaṇa (ĀvN 726), etc. Whether these -e nominatives are true remnants of the Eastern dialects or merely testify to the loss of the masculine-neuter gender distinction, is difficult to decide.

The lengthening of the vowel before the -ka- suffix is a distinct Eastern feature [18] (e.g. -āka, -ūka). In the Jaina Canon, it is especially evidenced in the comparatives in -tarāga, instances of which were listed long ago by Weber for the Viyāhapannatti [19]. We find them sporadically in the niryuktis. Thus vipulatarāgaṃ (DasavN 38), gāḍhatarāgaṃ (DasavN 211), annayarāgaṃ (DasavN 333). For nouns : mūlāgaṃ in the Āyāranga-nijjutti (178), and muhuttāgaṃ in the Ohanijjutti (523).

Some of the Ardhamāgadhisms, i.e. archaisms, scattered in the older layer of JM will be now reviewed.

The locative in -ṃsi is, together with the -e nominative, a basic characteristic of AMg. Alsdorf noticed that this type of locative is an artificial relic in the Vasudevahiṇḍi, for the forms mostly occur in an inserted Ṛṣabhacarita, i.e. in a passage which on account of its contents was probably highly liable to the influence of the Canonical phraseology [20]. Of the forms quoted by him, kucchiṃsi also appears in ĀvBh verses, also in a mythological context, where Mahāvīra's birth and the transfer of the embryo are narrated :

jaṃ rayaṇiṃ uvavanno kucchiṃsi mahāyaso Vīro (Bh 47cd),

" the night when the glorious Vīra was born in the (brahmin lady's) womb", clearly recalls the Canonical phrase :

16. e-kārāntaś ca prākṛte prathamānto bhavatīty asakṛd āveditaṃ yathā "kayare āgacchai ditta-rūve " [= Utt. 12.6ab; quoted ad Hemacandra 4.287] ity ādi, ĀvH 664a, 7.
17. SCHUBRING, Mahānisīha, p. 84-86.
18. Pi § 70 : it is met with in Eastern Asokan inscriptions : see e.g. H. LUEDERS, Bruchstücke Buddhistischer Dramen. Berlin, 1911, p. 40.
19. A. WEBER, Ueber ein Fragment der Bhagavatī... "Abhandlungen der Kgl. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin", 1865-66, p. 438.
20. ALSDORF, BSOAS 8 (1935), p. 328 = Kleine Schriften, p. 65 with fn. 1.

jaṃ rayaṇiṃ vakkamaī / kucchiṃsi mahāyaso arihā[21].

And again :

> *aha divase bāsīi vasai tahiṃ māhaṇīe kucchiṃsi* (Bh 48ab),

"and he lived for 82 days in this brahmin lady's womb"[22].

The same contextual dependence proves to be true in some cases where *-asā* is used, more or less adverbially, as an instr. sg. of *-a* stems.

Thus, for instance, in the Canonical language[23], we find an instrumental *paogasā* analogically built on the archaic adverbial form *vīsasā* (cf. Ved. *visras*) as both terms occur as a pair[24] : they refer to phenomena happening " by (karmic) impulse " or " by spontaneous development ". The pressure imposed by the phraseology is the strongest factor. The old form remains unchanged in the Sūyagaḍa-nijjutti 5b (and 14b) :

> *davve (bhāve) paoga-vīsasā paogasā mūla uttare c'eva*[25].

Bhayasā " fearfully " occurs in a śloka pāda common to the ĀvN (1208c) and the Mūlācāra (7.103c), thus in a development which is probably rather old : it is the eleventh of the 32 faults which should be avoided in the carrying out of the *vandana*[26].

A look at a few verbal forms will also prove, if necessary, that the boundary between AMg and early JM is far from being hard and fast.

Thus, for instance, the absolutive in *-ttāṇaṃ*, which is considered to be an Eastern feature of the Canonical language[27], is occasionally met

21. *The Kalpasûtra of Bhadrabāhu*. Ed... by H. JACOBI. Leipzig, 1879 (reprint 1966), § 46b. — On the gender of *kucchi*, see R. L. TURNER, *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. London, 1966, No. 3213 : in Sk., *kukṣi-* is exclusively masc. ; in Middle-Indian, it usually tends towards the fem. ; in Neo-Indian, it is mostly fem.

22. And also ĀvBh 52cd *Siddhattha-bhāriyāe sāhara Tisalāe kucchiṃsi*; 57cd *jaṃ rayaṇiṃ sāhario kucchiṃsi mahāyaso Vīro*; 58ab *tihī nāṇehī samaggo devī Tisalāe so a kucchiṃsi.*

23. E.g. J. DELEU, *Viyāhapannatti... The Fifth Anga of the Jaina Canon...* Brugge, 1970 : VI 3²; VIII¹⁻²; VIII 9ᵃ.

24. See also Pi § 364 "*paogasā = prayogena* parallel mit *visrasā* von *visras*"; in Middle-Indian *-asā* develops as an adverbial ending : see bibliography for Pali and Prakrit examples in O. von HINUEBER, *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Ueberblick*. Wien, 1986, § 298.

25. " In materieller Hinsicht (Im geistigen Bereich) (gibt es Karaṇa) auf Anstoss oder von selbst. (Karaṇa) auf Anstoss (erscheint als) primär und sekundar " : BOLLÉE, *Studien zum Sūyagaḍa*, p. 11, 33 ff.

26. E. LEUMANN, *Uebersicht über die Āvaçyaka-Literatur...* Hamburg, 1934, p. 18a, line 9 and p. 12b, line 56 : *bhayasā, bhaeṇaṃ vandai "mā nicchubbhīhāmi sanghāo kulāo gaṇāo gacchāo khettāo " tti* as the cūrṇi explains.

27. Pi § 583; L. A. SCHWARZSCHILD, *Some Forms of the Absolutive in Middle Indo-Aryan*, JAOS 76 (1956), p. 113-114 [111-115].

with in our sources. A few cases have been listed by Alsdorf and Bhayani for the Vasudevahiṇḍi (2 ex.) and the Tarangavaī (3 ex.) [28]. I have noted some others in the Ohanijjutti : *oṇāmittāṇaṃ* (Bh 273b), *akkamittāṇaṃ* (N 389b), *asohaittāṇaṃ* (N 416d), *vibhāvaittāṇa* (N 491b), *paḍikamettāṇa* and *paḍilehettāṇa* (p. 176, 1. 21-22). In the ĀvN, one such absolutive occurs in a stanza which is a quotation. It is found in a pair of ślokas ultimately borrowed from the Uttarajjhāyā [29] :

> *kahiṃ bondiṃ caittāṇaṃ? kattha gantūṇa sijjhaī?*
> *ihaṃ bondiṃ caittāṇaṃ, tattha gantūṇa sijjhaī* (ĀvN 958cd, 959cd = Utt. 36.55cd, 56cd, etc.).

" Where do [the perfected souls] leave their bodies, and where do they go, on reaching perfection ?... they leave their bodies here (below), and go there, on reaching perfection " [30].

Even there, we notice that the two suffixes, *-ttāṇaṃ* and *-tūṇa* are found side by side!

Other instances of absolutives in *-ttāṇaṃ* available in the ĀvN are free from contextual constraint. They are : *osakkaittāṇaṃ* (N 183 = 743), *vogasittāṇaṃ* (N 653; ct. *vyavakalayya*), and *āpucchittāṇa* (N 1366, 1519; Bh 111) [31].

There is also some slight evidence of the " Ātmanepada " aorist in *-itthā* [32], which is rather common in the Canonical language [33]. It is preserved in the Tarangavaī (2 ex.) [34]. The Uttarajjhāyā-nijjutti (vs. 390) has :

> *taṃ soūṇa kumāro bhīo... palāitthā* [35].

" Having heard this, the prince was scared and ran away ". In the ĀvN (vs. 487d), the solemnity of the context and style and the retaining of an older form perhaps go together :

28. ALSDORF, BSOAS 8 (1935), p. 332 = *Kleine Schriften*, p. 69; H. C. BHAYANI, " Sambodhi " 7 (1978-79), p. 115 (as above n. 9).

29. Cp. SCHWARZSCHILD, *loc. cit.*, p. 113 : " (This type of absolutive) occurs also in Jain Māhārāṣṭrī and Jain Śaurasenī in passages that are under the influence of the Śvetāmbara Jain Canon ".

30. Trsl. H. JACOBI, " Sacred Books of the East ". Vol. XLV. Oxford, 1895 (reprint, Delhi, 1964), p. 211.

31. A similar analysis can be given for the absolutives in *-yāṇaṃ* : e.g. *samupehiyā-ṇaṃ* (ĀvBh 207c = 210c = 211c, etc.) is an old form found in a triṣṭubh : see Pi § 592.

32. The passive-active distinction tends to be abolished and we get a system sg. 3 *-itthā* / pl. 3 *-isu* : see C. CAILLAT, *Some Idiosyncrasies of Language and Style in Asoka's Rock Edicts at Girnar*, in " Hinduismus und Buddhismus ". Festschr. U. Schneider, Freiburg, 1987, n. 41.

33. Pi § 517.

34. BHAYANI, " Sambodhi " 7 (1978-79), p. 115.

35. LEUMANN, WZKM 6 (1892), p. 41 (as above n. 5).

Magahāĕ niruvasaggaṃ muṇi uu-baddhammi viharitthā.
"During summer and winter, the monk (i.e. Mahāvīra) led his religious life in Magadha without suffering any attack".

B. On the other hand, some verbal endings which have been scantily documented so far in the Canonical Prakrit, are now confirmed since they occur in early JM literature. They may be of some help in giving a more precise idea of the characteristics of both dialects.

The present first person singular in *-aṃ* (instead of *-āmi*) was known from a unique form in the Canon : *jāṇaṃ*, "I know" in the Āyāradasāo[36]. It has also been recorded in the Vasudevahiṇḍi (15 ex.), in the Tarangavaī (26 ex.) and in the Mahānisīhasutta (at least 25 ex.)[37]. In the selected corpus of niryuktis, etc., it appears once, if I am not mistaken :

> *eyaṃ icchaṃ nāuṃ, gaṇivara, tubbh' antie niuṇaṃ* (ĀvN 691d;
> ṭīkās *icchāmi*),

"This I want to know from you, the best of the gaṇins, in all its details".

Instances of the *-e* optatives used as preterites, also known in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit and Epic Sanskrit[38], were collected by Pischel, especially from the Uttarajjhāyā[39]. They also occur in the niryukti-language, and they are explained in the Sanskrit commentaries by an aorist-form, a past participle in *-tavant*, or sometimes also by an indicative present as if the *-e* forms were temporally unmarked. Thus, for example, in the Uttarajjhāyā-nijjutti (vs. 92cd)[40] :

> *vaṇiya-mahilaṃ*[41] *caittā tattammi silā-yale vihare* (ct. *vyahār-*
> *sīt*)[42].

"Having renounced the merchant's wife (with whom he had enjoyed life, Arahannaa) led his religious life (i.e. died by fasting) on a burning rock";

36. Quoted by Alsdorf, BSOAS 8 (1935), p. 321 = *Kleine Schriften*, p. 58; commented in von HINUEBER, *Das ältere Mittelindisch* (as above n. 24), § 420; cp. in AMg and JM the future 1 sg. *-āmi* or *-aṃ* : Pi § 520.

37. See, respectively, ALSDORF, *loc. cit.*; H. C. BHAYANI, "Sambodhi"..., p. 114; SCHUBRING, *Mahānisīha*, p. 90, and, more detailed, DELEU-SCHUBRING, *Studien zum Mahānisīha*, p. 12. — These lists include both present indicative and optative forms (*-ijjaṃ*).

38. See von HINUEBER, *Das ältere Mittelindisch*, § 445 with references; L. RENOU, *Grammaire sanscrite*. Paris, 1930, p. 412, § 292 note.

39. Pi § 466, to which add e.g. Utt. 21.10 *pavvae* (*prāvrājīt* in the ct.).

40. *Śrī-Uttarādhyayanasūtram*, prathamo vibhāgaḥ. Ujjain, 1950, p. 132.

41. Ed. *vaṇiya-mahila*.

42. And also UttN 376cd in LEUMANN, WZKM 6 (1892) p. 34 : *so vi ya* (i.e. *Muṇicando*) *Sāgaracandassa antie pavvae samaṇo*.

or in the ÃvN (vs. 197ab) :

> *aunāpannaṃ juale puttāṇā Sumangalā puṇo pasave* (ÃvH *prasū-tavatī*).

"Sumangalā gave birth to 49 twin sons" [43].

The Ãv. cūrṇi retains a form of the active past participle in *-tavant*, for which Pischel (§ 569) gave a single example, namely *puṭṭhavaṃ* from SPṚŚ- in the Ãyāraṅga with a passive meaning :

> *na ya... ṇhāo, na ya bandhavehi vi ai-ṇehaṃ katavaṃ* (ÃvC 249, 11) : "(When he was about to reject worldly life), (Vardha-māna) neither took a bath, nor had any excessive feeling of affection for his relatives".

Finally, a last example will show how forms which were at first considered doubtful could later be well established when new texts were discovered and analysed. An indeclinable ending *-ī(y)a* which can function as an imperfect, aorist of perfect had been mentioned by the main Prakrit grammarians [44], but no actual form were recognised in the texts until the Vasudevahiṇḍi provided undisputable cases (4 ex.) [45]. The single instance found in the Canonical literature also came to light, namely Uttarajjhāyā 13.18d (triṣṭubh) [46] :

> *(vayaṃ...) vasīya* (ct. *avasāva, uṣitau* [47]) *Sovāga-nivesaṇesu* almost glossed by the next verse (19b) :

> ... *vutthā mu Sovāga-nivesaṇesu*,

"We lived in the hamlets of Śvapākas" [Jacobi].

More material has been sorted out from the Tarangavaī (34 occurrences) [48]. I shall only add my gleanings from the niryuktis. From the Sūyagaḍa-nijjutti, we have (vs. 85ab) :

> *pucchiṃsu Jambu-ṇāmo ajja-Suhammā tao kahesīya*,

"Jambūsvāmin asked, then the noble Sudharma said".

43. Other similar instances are : *samuttāre* with a subject in the plural, ÃvN 471 (ct. *samuttāritavantau*); *pāse* ÃvBh 1 (ct. *dṛṣṭavān*); *pesae* ÃvBh 34 (ct. *preṣitavān*); *uvacchubhe* "they threw" ÃvBh 67; *bhave* ÃvN 1150 (ÃvH *chāndasatvād abhūt*); ÃvN 340, 516, Bh 59, 77, 109.

44. Reference in Pi § 466 : *acchīa, geṇhīa*, etc.

45. ALSDORF, BSOAS 8 (1935), p. 325 = *Kleine Schriften*, p. 62.

46. See L. ALSDORF, *The Story of Citta and Sambhūta* in *Felicitation Volume presented to Prof. S. K. Belvalkar*. Benares, 1957, p. 207, n. 1 = *Kleine Schriften*, p. 191, n. 1.

47. See Jaina-Ãgama-Series edition. Bombay, 1977, p. 145, n. 10.

48. BHAYANI, "Sambodhi" 7 (1978-79), p. 115.

There are about twenty occurrences in the ĀvN, e.g. :

> *Jiṇa-Cakki-Dasārāṇaṃ vanna pamāṇāiṃ nāma gottāiṃ*
> *āū pura māi piyaro pariyāya gaiṃ ca sāhīa*[49] (368).

"He (= Bharata) revealed (ct. *siṣṭavān*) the colour and the size, the name and the family, the life-span, the city, the mother and father of Jinas, Cakravartins, Baladevas, Vāsudevas and Prativāsudevas (= Dasāras)".

Others are *pucchīa*, "he asked" (ĀvN 367); *uvāsīya*, "he fasted" (ĀvN 528, 529; ct. *upoṣitavān*); *ṭhāsīya*, "he remained standing" (ĀvN 530), *kāsīya*, "he did" (ĀvN 178, 190, 366, 501, 513, 531; ĀvBh 11, 65, 66), *āsīya*, "there were..." (ĀvBh 5, 6, 8, N 969)[50]. All this calls for three remarks.

1. "The possibility of declaring the final *ya* of the forms in question... to be... a spurious *ya*" (= *ca*) has been considered by Alsdorf[51], but, I think, rightly rejected, all the more so since, out of a total of 58 instances now available, half are located at the end of a sentence, in positions where a *ca* would make no sense : e.g. Tarangavaī 105cd,

> *nāmaṃ ca bandhavā me piuṇo soūṇa kāsīya,*

"Having listened to my father ('s opinion), my brothers gave me a name".

2. Two thirds of the *-ī(y)a* pasts are used as a third person singular. One fifth of these verbs has a subject in the plural (see e.g. Tarangavaī 105 just mentioned)[52]. Two instances are used as a first person plural (Utt. 13.18 quoted earlier; Tarangavaī 1045), and six as a first person singular (two in the Vasudevahiṇḍi, four in the Tarangavaī[53]). Thus we have here a polyvalent fossilized form. This peculiarity has been taken note of in the "modern recension" of Vararuci's *Prākṛtapra-kāśa* transmitted by Cowell's manuscript W, where it is said :

---

49. *Sāhīa* also appears twice in the Tarangavaī (593 and 1131).
50. Both these last forms are equally well documented in the Tarangavaī (and the Vasudevahiṇḍi).
51. BSOAS 8 (1935), n. 1, p. 325 = *Kleine Schriften*, p. 62. — In most cases, the (Indian) editors naturally print as two words.
52. Pi § 516, p. 360 on the invariability of preterite forms.
53. Vasudevahiṇḍi : *ahaṃ... gacchīya* and *(ahaṃ)... diṇe gamesīya*, quoted by ALSDORF, *loc. cit.*; Tarangavaī 800cd *to haṃ... / hiyaeṇaṃ puvva-gayā, pacchā (ya) pāehiṃ gacchīya*; 1106cd *tāhe parissamaṃ haṃ cintīya chuhaṃ ca taṇhaṃ ca*; 1377ab *ahayaṃ aṇantara-bhave io ya āsīya hatthi-paḍihatthī*; 639cd *(ahaṃ) uvavāsa-pāraṇaṃ suha-maṇeṇa khamaṇassa kāsīya.*

īa bhūte (= Vr 7.23). *bhūte vartamānād dhātoḥ pratyayasya īa ādeśaḥ syāt* (= Bhāmaha's ct.) : *āsīa, gehīa, hasīa, paḍhīa* (=) *āsīt, agrahīt, ahasat, apaṭhat, ityādi. puruṣa-traya-rūpāṇi ekava-cana-bahuvacana-rūpāṇi ca boddhavyāni* [54].

The last sentence may suggest that the same form is valid for all three persons and both numbers,

3.   The derivation of the *-ī(y)a* pasts is a difficult question. Some of them are clearly based on an aorist stem (*kāsīya, ṭhāsīya, āsīya*); others, like *cintīya*, seem to be built on the present stem; a few others, like *gacchīya, vocchīya*, etc., are ambiguous [55].

C.   Traces of *Apabhraṃśa* influence are not equally wide-spread in the corpus analysed here.

They are doubtful at the stage of verse-commentaries. For instance, the niryuktis provide evidence for shortening in the nominative singular of feminine *-ā* stems. Thus we meet *citta-sabha* in the Ohanijjutti (vs. 452, fourth gaṇa ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ of an āryā) [56], or *Mihila* in the Uttarajjhāyā-nijjutti (vs. 396, second gaṇa ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑) [57]. While reading the ĀvN, I came across many such forms : in sixth gaṇas ⏑ – ⏑, *puccha* (366, 492, 1310), *paḍima* (489), *Aojjha* (383), *Campa* (1284), *Viṇīa* (382), etc.; in sixth gaṇas ⏑ ∕ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑, *paḍima* (516), *Vijaya* (520); in a sixth gaṇa ⏑, *puccha* (348); in other metrical positions, *paḍima* (490), *pavvajja* (1298), *māla* (Bh 95), *aṇukampa* (Bh 2), etc. Though it is probably less significant, a similar tendency can be observed in the case of *-ī* stems : thus *devi* (OhN 452, ĀvN 1288, sixth gaṇa ⏑ – ⏑), *aḍavi* (ĀvN 146, sixth gaṇa ⏑), *Bāṇārasi* (UttN 391 [58]). All this corresponds to the normal situation in Apabhraṃśa [59]. But one must be cautious since these endings mostly appear in enumerative verses, where there seems to be a certain amount of grammatical freedom, and since they are bound by metrical constraints [60].

On the other hand, however, after Jacobi [61], various editors of early

---

54. *The Prākṛita-Prakāśa...* of Vararuchi... The first complete edition by E. B. COWELL. Reprint Delhi, 1977 (Oxford, 1895[1]), p. 65, note 10 and p. ix about the " W " manuscript.

55. See ALSDORF's suggestions, *loc. cit.*

56. METTE, *Piṇḍ'esaṇā*, p. 179.

57. LEUMANN, WZKM 6 (1892), p. 43.

58. LEUMANN, *ibidem*, p. 42.

59. Pi § 100, § 374; G. V. TAGARE, *Historical Grammar of Apabhraṃśa*. Poona, 1948, § 89.

60. For bare-stems in Digambara Prakrit, see K. OKUDA, *Eine Digambara Dogmatik. Das fünfte Kapitel von Vaṭṭakeras Mūlācāra...* Wiesbaden, 1975, p. 30 ff.

61. *Bhavisatta Kaha von Dhanavāla. Eine Jaina Legende in Apabhraṃśa.* München, 1918, p. 58* ff. : " Vulgarismen ".

JM narrative works have emphasised that, to some extent, unquestio-nable Apabhraṃśa forms such as absolutives in -evi, -eppi, -eviṇu have crept in. This trend is documented in Vimalasūri's Paumacariya, in the Dhūrtākhyāna and the Līlāvaīkahā [62]. Some attempts have been made to discover a similar trend in the Vasudevahiṇḍi, but, in my view, they have remained rather unconvincing since they are not all based on absolutely undeniable criteria [63].

I shall here consider two narrative stanzas quoted in the Āvaśyaka commentaries which show dialectal variety and efforts towards standardization.

The first one is a triṣṭubh included in the " Tale of the Elephant-Driver" [64]. It shows ordinary JM features, except for the absolutive jāṇeppi in pāda c :

> cira-santhuo vā 'liya-santhueṇa
> mellāvio va [65] dhuva addhuveṇaṃ
> jāṇeppi tujjhaṃ pagai-ssabhāvaṃ
> panno naro ko tuhu [tuha] vissasejjā ?

" He who was (your) intimate since long is forsaken for the sake of another made intimate through a lie, he who is reliable for the sake of an unreliable. Knowing your innate behaviour which reasonable man could trust you ? " [66]

The second stanza has a problematic wording. The brahmin Vararuci who wants to take revenge on Sagaḍāla, the faithful Jaina minister of king Nanda, spreads a rumour in order to drive them apart from each other. In Hemacandra's clear Sanskrit it runs as follows :

> na vetti rājā yad asau Śakaṭālaḥ kariṣyati
> vyāpādya Nandaṃ tad-rājye Śrīyakaṃ sthāpayiṣyati [67].

62. Examples are conveniently collected in SCHWARZSCHILD, Some Forms of the Absolutive... (see above n. 27), p. 114 who notes : " (The short forms -evi and -ivi) are the most frequent in Apabhraṃśa from the beginning, and they appear in Prakrit texts influenced by popular speech where the Ap. endings of the absolutive have penetrated ", see also K. R. CHANDRA, A Critical Study (as above n. 13), p. 554-578, esp. p. 572 (karevi 2 x ; suṇevi 1 x).

63. K. R. CHANDRA, Apabhraṃśa Forms in the Vasudevahiṇḍi, " Sambodhi " 4, 3-4 (1975-76), p. 34-39.

64. ĀvC 461, 14-465, 6 ; ĀvH 349a, 1-352a, 2 ; etc. See A. METTE, The Tale of the Elephant-Driver in its Āvaśyaka-Version in Siddhantacarya Pandit Kailashchandraji Shastri Abhinandanagranth. Rewa (M.P.), 1980, p. 549-559.

65. The cūrṇi edition 464, 11 reads mellevi tāva, a difficult reading ; mellāvio va is the emendation proposed by Mrs METTE, loc. cit., p. 553.

66. Trsl. A. METTE, loc. cit., p. 553.

67. Pariśiṣṭaparvan VIII, 50. Ed. H. JACOBI. Calcutta, 1932[2].

"The king is not aware of what Śakaṭāla will do : he will murder Nanda, and put Śrīyaka [his own son] as the king".

The Prakrit tradition, however, is quite corrupt :

Nando rāyā na vi jāṇai jaṃ Sagaḍālo karehii :
rāya- Nandaṃ māreviṇu Siriyaṃ rajje ṭhavehi tti.

a. *rāyā Nandu* AvH 649b, 3, Devendra's ct. on Utt 29a, 1 ; b. *kāhii* AvH, *Sagaḍālu karesai*, DevUtt ; c. *rāya-Nandaṃ* is the reading of AvH ; *Nando rāyā*, AvC II 184, 10 is obviously wrong ; *rāya Nandu*, DevUtt ; *mārevinu* AvC, *mārettā* AvH, DevUtt ; d. *ṭhavehii* AvH ; *rajji ṭhavesai* DevUtt.

But the absolutive form is striking and has led K. R. Chandra to restore the verse as an ordinary Apabhraṃśa *dohā* :

Nandu rāyā na vi jāṇai, jaṃ Sagaḍālu kāhii
rāyā-Nandaṃ mārevinu, Siriya rajjĕ ṭhavehii [68].

Leaving aside these difficulties, both Apabhraṃśa absolutives in the aforesaid quotation have been reinterpreted in Haribhadra's ṭīkā : *jāṇeppi* has become *jāṇemi*, which makes very little sense ; *mārevinu* has been normalized as *mārettā* [69].

Occasionally, we come across a first person singular in *-ami* [70] : e.g. in the Mahānisīhasutta, *niddahami* [71]. The narrative works and Canonical prose commentaries show the use of the declinable postpositions *taṇaya* and *ccaya* attached to pronominal bases, and quite common in Apabhraṃśa : e.g. *tujjha-ccaeṇa* AvC 468, 11-12 (versus AvH *tumaṃ aṭṭhāe*), *tassa ccayāṇi pottāṇi* AvC II 289, 14, etc. [72] ; *mama taṇaeṇaṃ* AvC II 198, 12 (versus H *m. kaeṇaṃ*) AvC II 196, 10, etc. [73].

68. K. R. CHANDRA, *Apabhraṃśa Passages in the Pre-Tenth Century Śvetāmbara Prākrit-Sanskrit Works* in *Contributions of Jainism to Indian Culture*. Ed. R. C. DWIVEDI. Varanasi, 1975, p. 31 [30-41].

69. Apabhraṃśa influence is also felt in "Digambara Prakrit" : see W. DENECKE, *Digambara-Texte*. Eine Darstellung ihrer Sprache und ihres Inhalts. Hamburg, 1922 (Diss.), p. 7 ff. ; IDEM, *Mitteilungen über Digambara-Texte*. Festgabe für H. Jacobi. Bonn, 1926, p. 166 f. ; W. SCHUBRING, *Kundakunda echt und unecht*, ZDMG 107 (1957), p. 567 = *Kleine Schriften*. Wiesbaden, 1977, p. 354.

70. Pi § 454 ; TAGARE, *op. cit.*, § 136, p. 286.

71. SCHUBRING, *Mahānisīha*, p. 90.

72. And AvH 295a, 8 ; 565b, 5. — On *-cca(ya)* which serves to build possessive adjectives in Marathi, see H. C. BHAYANI, *Some Interesting Features of the Prākrit of the Nāṇapancamīkahā* BhV 12 (1951), p. 157, referring to Hemacandra's Prakrit Grammar 2.149, etc.

73. See L. A. SCHWARZSCHILD, *Notes on two Postpositions of Late Middle Indo-Aryan : TAṆAYA and RESI, RESAMMI* BhV 19 (1959), p. 77-87 ; J. BLOCH, *Application de la cartographie à l'histoire de l'indo-aryen*. Paris, 1963, p. 6 ff.

The fairly large number of past participles in *-ellaya*, particularly in the Āvaśyaka prose commentaries has been attributed to the influence of popular speech [74]. Either they are merely equivalent to *-ta* participles, or they function as adjectives implying anteriority, in contradistinction to a *-ta* participle used as the main verb. For instance :

> *gaṇiyā-māue ya jaṃ sahassaṃ... dinnellayaṃ taṃ se darisiyaṃ*,
> " she showed him... one thousand (dināras) which the courtezan's mother had given to her " (ĀvC 467, 9) [75].

Elsewhere, the *-ellaya* participle works as a pluperfect, indicating an incidental event, and is sometimes emphasised by a particle (*ya, kira*) :

> *tīse gabbho laggo. sā ya amaccena bhaṇielliyā*,
> " she became pregnant. She had been told by the minister " (ĀvC 448, 13) [76].

These forms foreshadow the *-l-* participles of Western Neo-Indian languages : Marathi and Gujarati [77]. In Gujarati, the suffix *-elo* (*-ī, -ũ*) serves to derive from a verbal base an adjective exactly corresponding to what we saw in the first Prakrit example just mentioned, endowed with a resultative value [78].

74. See L. P. TESSITORI, *Notes on the Grammar of the Old Western Rajasthani with Special Reference to Apabhraṃça and to Gujarati and Marwari*, IA 44 (1915), p. 102, with a few instances quoted from Leumann's *Āv. Erzählungen* [ADD. p. 524].

75. See also Śāntisūri's Uttarādhyayana-ṭīkā quoted by ALSDORF, *A New Version of the Agaḍadatta Story* NIA 1 (1938), p. 284 = *Kleine Schriften*, p. 110 : *tāva ya āgao parivvāyao jakkha-deulāo saiellae dālidda-purise ghettūṇa*, and his convincing explanation of *saiellae* as " who had been sleeping ". — Such forms are already sporadically documented in the Canon : e.g. in the narrative cliché ...*kumāraṃ ammā-piyaro... sarisiyāṇaṃ... sarisaehiṃ rāya-kulehinto aṇilliyāṇaṃ... rāya-vara-kannāṇaṃ pāṇiṃ giṇhā-viṃsu*, Viyāhapannatti XI, 1 (*Suttāgame* I. Gurgaon, 1953, p. 642, l. 19), *ubi alia*.

76. Cp. the parallel version included in Haribhadra's Upadeśapada (Baroda, 1923), p. 29a, vs. 10) *aha sā puvvaṃ amaccena āsi bhaṇiyā*. — Other instances are ĀvC 280, 5 *māriellao*; ĀvC 290, 5 *diṭṭhellao*; ĀvC 466, 1 *laddhellayaṃ*; ĀvC 529, 13 *gaellao*; ĀvC II 188, 3 *ṭhiellagā*; ĀvH 188a, 9 *jāellao*, etc.

77. J. BLCCH, *Indo-Aryan from the Vedas to Modern Times*. English edition... Paris, 1965, p. 267 ; IDEM, *Application de la cartographie à l'histoire de l'indo-aryen*. Paris, 1963, p. 26.

78. See G. P. TAYLOR, *The Student's Gujarātī Grammar*. Bombay, 1908², § 152, p. 153 ; H. M. LAMBERT, *Gujarati Language Course*. Cambridge, 1971, p. 133 ; *ubi alia*.

(II)

The series of forms which will be discussed now cannot be attributed to any known dialect, but they may be taken as isolated representatives of underlying tendencies, or attempts at innovation. As such they are not out of place here. They seem to belong to only one part of our corpus, namely the niryuktis, bhāṣyas, cūrṇis (and Prakrit portions of the ṭīkās).

Very frequently we come across a polyvalent oblique ending *-āe* attached to the masculine stems *piyā* and *rāyā*. *Piyāe* and *rāyāe* are used as instrumentals singular. Thus in a Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya verse (6101) where two girl-friends are exchanging harsh words (*pharusa*) :

> *kenâṇīaṃ pisiyaṃ ?.../*
> *kiṃ khū ! tumaṃ piyāe âṇīaṃ...*

"Who has brought this flesh? ... Who else? Your own father has brought it!" (ṭīkā : *tvadīyena pitrânītam*) [79].

In the prose commentaries (especially of the ĀvN) the examples are numerous : e.g. *rāyāe leho visajjio*, "the king sent a message" (ĀvC 546, 13); *piyāe samaṃ jemei... piyāe samaṃ gao*, "he ate with his father, ... went with his father" (ĀvC 544, 9); *rāyāe ghosāviyaṃ*, "the king has a proclamation made" (ĀvC II 154, 5), and so on [80].

These forms also function as a genitive-dative. For instance : *ahaṃ ca piyāe kūraṃ āṇāmi*, "and I am bringing rice to my father" (ĀvC II 57, 12); *rāyāe paesu paḍio*, "he threw himself at the king's feet" (ĀvC II 182, 9 = H); *rāyāe samīvaṃ gao*, "he went to the king" (ĀvH 418b, 3), etc. [81].

Ambiguity may arise in the case of elliptic phrases such as *rāyāe pucchiyaṃ* which could either mean "it was asked by the king" or "to the king". Though it is generally clarified by the context, this difficulty could perhaps account for the fact that such forms had a very short life and were never really admitted by the tradition. There are variants, for, quite often, the cūrṇi reads *rāyāe, piyāe*, while the parallel text of the ṭīkā has the ordinary JM instrumentals and

---

79. On *tumaṃ* sporadically used as a genitive, Pi § 420-421.

80. E.g. *rāyāe ninteṇa diṭṭho* ĀvC II 155, 4 (= H); *rāyāe vāriā mo* ĀvC II 182, 2 (= H); ĀvC II 154, 9 (= H); ĀvC II 181, 8 et 10 (= H); ĀvC II 184, 3 (= H); *rāyāe samaṃ jūaṃ ramai* ĀvC 550, 4 (= H); *māya-piyāe suyaṃ* ĀvC II 206, 8 = Śāntisūri's ṭīkā on Utt., 302a, 1.

81. See also *rāyāe uvaṇīo* ĀvC II 154, 7 (= H); "he was brought near to the king"; *rāyāe pāya-vaḍio* ĀvC II 154, 8 (= H), etc.

genitives *rāiṇā, rannā, ranno, piuṇā, piuṇo*[82], and vice-versa[83]. Hence, probably, the suspicions of modern scholars. In his critical edition of the Kokkāsa-story (included in the Āv commentaries), Alsdorf introduced the usual *rāiṇā* instead of keeping *rāyāe*, which both Leumann and the Indian editors had read[84]. In another case, it seems to me that Jacobi was wrong to leave aside the reading *rāyāe*, provided by a good manuscript, and prefer *rāīe* " in the night " which makes no good sense in the particular passage[85].

But how are we to explain these forms which are, to my knowledge, not listed by any Prakrit grammarian or any modern study? One could think of the dative in *-āe*, which may have spread to masculine and neuter stems in *-a* starting from the feminine[86]. I would be inclined to put forward a possible analogy with feminine *-ā* stems, for from a synchronic viewpoint there is no difference between *mālā*, an ordinary *-ā* stem, *māyā* "mother"which in Prakrit belongs to the same category[87], and *rāyā*, if we consider the nominative forms. " The reaction of the feminine on the masculine "[88] is not unknown : in Pali, for instance, *usumā, usmā* "heat" < Sk. *ŭṣman* (masc.) can be inflected as a feminine *-ā* stem, as the oblique in *-āya* shows[89], or as a neuter. In the present case, however, we would have to admit that a purely formal analogy has prevailed over the basic masculine-feminine gender distinction in words referring to animate beings, and this may explain why these forms quickly disappeared.

mālā	*māyā*	*piyā*	*rāyā*
→	→	→	→
mālāe	*māyāe*[90]	x	x

82. Pi § 391 and 399.

83. For instance : *rāyāe varagā pesiyā* ĀvC II 58, 4 ; *rannā* ĀvH 558b, 7 ; *piyāe suyaṃ* ĀvC II 206, 8 ; *piuṇā* ĀvH 718a, 3 ; *rāyāe sūtā bhaṇiyā* ĀvC II 279, 7 ; *rannā* ĀvH 814b, 9 ; *rāyāe* H 694b, 4 ; *rannā* ĀvC ; *rāyāe samīvaṃ gao* ĀvH 418b, 3 ; *ranno* C 547, 4 ; *piyāe kūraṃ ānāmi* ĀvC II 57, 12 ; *piuṇo* ĀvH 558,b, 1, etc.

84. ĀvC 540, 6 = ĀvH 409a, 8 = ĀvM 512b, 2 ; L. ALSDORF, *Zwei neue Belege zur "indischen Herkunft" von 1001 Nacht*, ZDMG 14 (1935), p. 302 with fn. 2 = *Kleine Schriften*, p. 545. Alsdorf's edition is based on the manuscript which was prepared by Leumann when he thought of continuing his *Āvaśyaka- Erzählungen*.

85. H. JACOBI, *Ueber die Entstehung der Çvetâmbara und Digambara Sekten*, ZDMG 38 (1884), p. 2 = *Kleine Schriften*. Wiesbaden, 1970, vol. II, p. 816 : *so (= Sivabhūī)... rāyāṇaṃ uvagao "..." rannā bhaṇiyaṃ "..." tāva rāīe* (v.l. *rāyāe) annayā bhaṇio*. The fact that the preceding sentence has *rannā* could explain Jacobi's choice. The same situation is repeatedly seen in Āv. commentaries; it could account for the fact that the abnormal *rāyāe* was eliminated.

86. Pi § 364.

87. Pi § 389 : " Die Feminina der Verwandtschaftswörter werden auch als *-ā*- Stämme flectirt ".

88. J. BLOCH, *Indo-Aryan*, p. 140.

89. *CPD* II 13 *s.v.* AMg *umhā* has both fem. and masc. genders.

90. This form of the instrumental is precisely available in the JM of the Āv. Erzählungen : see Pi § 392.

A transitional stage, which supposes that the analogy first took place in a pair of kinship nouns (*māyā, piyā*) before extending to the word "king", may not be necessary[91].

A similar problem of linguistic authenticity and origin arises with the active past participles in *-āio*, fem. *-āiā*, already briefly hinted at by Mrs. Mette[92], and found in the Āv prose commentaries : e.g. *pavvajjaṃ kayāio*, "he renounced the world" (ĀvH 714b, 2); *Titthayaro dhammaṃ kahiyāio*, "the Tīrthaṃkara taught the Law" (ĀvH 237b, 6 = ṭīkā on Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya vs. 1205); *to samaṇe bhaṇiyāio*, "then he told the monks..." (ĀvH 312b, 11), etc.[93]. An older instance is provided by the last verse of the Sūyagaḍa-nijjutti (205ab):

Pāsavaccijjo pucchiyāio ajja-Goyamaṃ Udago.

"Udaga, a follower of Pārśva, asked the noble Goyama"... The Sanskrit gloss renders the verb as *pṛṣṭavān*.

A comparison of parallel passages in Āv cūrṇi and ṭīkās shows that attempts have been made to exclude these odd forms. Thus, instead of *p. kayāio*, quoted earlier, a passive construction is used in the cūrṇi : *pavvajjā kayā* (ĀvC II 202, 12); in place of *dh. kahiyāio* (above), the cūrṇi (332, 3) reads *pakahio*, and Malayagiri's commentary has *kahei*. Undoubtedly, these participles were considered strange. Pischel nowhere mentions them, though at least three instances are found in Leumann's *Āvaśyaka Erzählungen*, the material of which he had used for his *Grammatik* : *seviyāio* (p. 23, v. l. 15); *jīviyāio* (p. 23, l. 9 and p. 25, l. 9) is the only example of an intransitive verb in this category. However, as was suggested by Mrs. Mette, they could be Prakrit counterparts of Pali and Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit derivatives in *-tāvin*[94].

Finally, attention is drawn to an isolated and curious form preserved in an āryā of the Āyāraṅga-nijjutti (vs. 67ab) :

tattha "akāri karissaṃ" ti bandha-cintā kayā puṇo hoi.

Akāri and *karissaṃ* are clearly put in asyndeton as a past and a future, and the phrase may represent an old formula (*akārīti kṛtavān*

91. Strangely enough I have not come across this type of form in other terms like *bhāyā* "brother", etc. [Cp. in G. FUSSMAN's article § 18.3 *dhituṇa*, instr. of *dhītā*, Ed.].

92. *The tales belonging to the* namaskāra-vyākhyā *of the* Āvaśyaka-Cūrṇi, IT 11 (1983), p. 130.

93. And also, in the feminine, *piviyāiā* "she drank", ĀvC 152, 10 (= H); *nindiyāiya tti* "she blamed herself", ĀvH 486a, 10, etc. [ADD. p. 524].

94. METTE, *loc, cit.*; references in von HINUEBER, *Das ältere Mittelindisch*, § 494; and cp. F. EDGERTON in *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar*. New Haven, 1953, § 22.51 : "So far as I can find, no such usage is recorded in Pkt.".

karissan ti karisyāmîti anenâtîtânāgatôpādānena... is the gloss of the ṭīkā) : "The thought (which creates) bondage, viz. 'I have done / I shall do' is being made". The reading is certain; the form looks identical to a Sanskrit so-called "passive" -*i* aorist, which may be used very rarely with an active meaning [95]. But would not it be rather rash to think of such an explanation, all the more so since *akāri* here appears as a first person singular? [96]

(III)

Old JM sources also retain another type of linguistic rarity, namely a small number of *vaitālīya*-stanzas composed "in einer Sprache, die man aufgrund ihres *l* für *r*, aber nicht *ś* für *s/ṣ* als die echte Ardhamāgadhī bezeichnen darf", to quote Alsdorf's words [97]. They show how Eastern and Western dialects can mix together or at least can be found side by side.

So far, two groups of such stanzas had been brought to light by Alsdorf himself. The first one has been traced in the Uttarajjhāyānijjutti [98], the second one in the anonymous Maṇipaticarita [99], a narrative work of unknown date closely connected with the Āvaśyaka tradition. In the latter case, the metre has undergone many distortions in the course of time.

The importance of such verses lies in the fact that they can be seen as remains of the original Eastern dialect from which the Canon was later transposed, and thus of a stage earlier than the so-called "Ardhamāgadhī" of the Śvetāmbara Canon and a "missing link dans notre reconstitution d'histoire linguistique" [100]. In his *Études jaina*, Alsdorf observed that there had probably been more such

---

95. "Apparemment par influence des finales en -*īt*", L. RENOU, *Grammaire Sanscrite*. Paris, 1930, § 318, p. 441 ; *ākāri* is already Vedic, cf. L. RENOU, *Grammaire de la langue védique*. Lyon, 1952, § 350; *ubi alia*.

96. There are only sporadic traces of this type of aorist in Middle-Indian, namely a few Pali forms : see, recently, von HINUEBER, *Das ältere Mittelindisch*, § 462, with reference to GEIGER, § 177.

97. L. ALSDORF, *Das Jātaka vom weisen Vidhura*, WZKS 15 (1971), p. 28 = *Kleine Schriften*, p. 385.

98. UttN 137, 138 : L. ALSDORF, *Les études jaina*. État présent et tâches futures. Paris, Collège de France, 1965, p. 23-25; IDEM, *Ardha-Māgadhī* in *Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Ueberlieferung...* Herausgegeben von H. BECHERT. Göttingen, 1980, p. 17-23.

99. L. ALSDORF, *Zwei Proben der Volksdichtung aus dem alten Magadha* in *Beiträge zur Indienforschung*. Ernst Waldschmidt zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet. Berlin, 1977, p. 17-24.

100. ALSDORF, *Études jaina*, p. 23.

evidence, but that it had partly been obliterated by standardization :
" Il semble certain qu'avant leur normalisation par les copistes, il y
[en] ait eu bien davantage [scil. de " ces premiers témoignages directs
de la véritable semi-māgadhī jaina "], et il est possible qu'on en
trouverait d'autres en examinant de plus près la grande masse de
textes des commentaires " [101].

I think I can now draw attention to two more similar passages.

Like the above mentioned stanzas discovered by Alsdorf, the first
one is narrative. It is quoted in the Āvaśyaka tradition, first embodied
by the Āvaśyaka cūrṇi and Haribhadra's ṭīkā, later continued by
parallel versions found in the Ākhyānakamaṇikośa, the Kumārapāla-
pratibodha and the Kathākośa [102]. It is also found in Devendra's
commentary on Uttarajjhāyā 1.3 [103]. It is in the form of an enigmatic
prophecy announced by a heavenly voice :

> samaṇe jai Kūlavālae Māgahiyaṃ gaṇiyaṃ lamehii
> lāyā ya Asogacandae Vesāliṃ nagaliṃ gahissai
>
> a. s. jahā Dev.; b. lamehii ĀvC, lamissae Dev., lagehii ĀvH, lagissae
> Kumārap., labhissai Ākhyānakam., gamissae Kathāk.; infra about these
> readings; c. so all except ĀvC tada lāya : better? rāya A. Kathāk.; d.
> nagariṃ ĀvCH, Kathāk.! Vesālī-nagaliṃ Ākhyānakam.

" If the ascetic Kūlavālaka enjoys the courtezan Māgadhikā, the king
Aśokacandraka will take the city of Vaiśālī ".

We are faced with an historical fact clothed in legend and fantasy,
namely the last phase of Kūṇika Ajātasattu's imperialism. Aśokacan-
dra is a pet name invented by the Jainas for this Magadhian king, who
is also well-known to Buddhist sources [104]. The stanza alludes to the
way in which Kūṇika took the city of Vaiśālī from his enemy Ceṭaka
by guile : the courtezan seduced the monk who then became Kūṇika's
agent. This particular episode has no counterpart in Buddhist
sources : Ajātasattu managed to take Vaiśālī in a different, more
orthodox way! There is however no doubt that this stanza is an old
one : the contents, the metre (vaitālīya) and the language clearly prove

101. Ibidem, p. 25.
102. ĀvC II 174, 3*-4* = ĀvH 685a, 5* [cf. A. METTE, IT 11 (1983), p. 139]; Ācārya
Nemicandra's Ākhyānakamaṇikośa with Ācārya Āmradeva's Commentary. Ed. by
Muni Shri Punyavijayji. Varanasi, Ahmedabad, 1962 (Prakrit Text Series 6). vs. 13,
p. 273; Somaprabha, Kumārapālapratibodha. Ed... Munirāja Jinavijaya. Baroda, 1920,
p. 162; I. HOFFMANN, Der Kathākośa. Text und Uebersetzung... München, 1974, p. 439.
103. In H. JACOBI, Das Kālakācārya-kathānakam, ZDMG 34 (1880), p. 291, fn. 1.
104. It refers to an event of his early childhood : ĀvC II 166-167; ĀvH 678b-679a;
Prakrit Proper Names..., Ahmedabad, 1970, s.v. Kūṇia.

it [105]. Both -e nominative endings, preservation of l-s, and s-s show that the dialect is authentic AMg.

Nevertheless a look at the main variants testifies to a tendency towards normalization : the Āvaśyaka-editions have nagariṃ, the Kathākośa has rāyā; the verb lamehii, lamissae (Sk. RAM), which seems to be the original reading, appears not to have been understood any more and is replaced by loose equivalents : LAG, LABH, or GAM in its technical meaning "to have sexual intercourse with". Nor are we surprised to see that in the Kathākośa, a Sanskrit work interspersed with Middle-Indian quotations, the rhythm of the vaitālīya has been altered.

On the other hand, we have two curious instances of what might be called hypercorrection. Throughout the tradition, the ascetic's name appears as Kūlavālaka, in the AMg stanzas as well as in the prose accounts. The Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi, however, distinguishes between verse and prose and hands down a westernized form of the name in the surrounding prose, viz. Kūlavāraka.

I find the second detail more puzzling : in Hemacandra's Triṣaṣṭiśa-lākāpuruṣacaritra which also includes the same story, our stanza is in the shape of a Māgadhī śloka characterized by the l (lamijja) and the palatal sibilant, thus śamane [106], Veśāliṃ, but gahissadi [107].

gaṇiyaṃ ce Māgadhiyaṃ śamane Kulavālake
lamijja Kūṇie lāyā to Veśāliṃ gahissadi (10.12.316) [108].

My second group of AMg vaitālīyas occurs in a dogmatical context in the Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya. These five verses (1 + 2 + 2, scil. 4325, 4330-31, 4362-63) are milestones in a section otherwise composed of ordinary āryās (BKBh 4308-4366) and devoted to the discussion of a question which was undoubtedly of great importance for the Śvetām-bara Jainas : the distribution of clothes (paribhāyaṇe BKBh 4308) among nigganthas and nigganthīs.

---

105. Cp. H. JACOBI, *Buddhas und Mahāvīras Nirvāṇa und die politische Entwicklung Magadhas zu jener Zeit*, "Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akad. d. Wissenschaften...", 1930, p. 567 = *Kleine Schriften*, vol. II, p. 813.

106. As expected : see Pi § 202, Māgadhī śāvaka = Sk. śrāvaka, etc.

107. We expect -śś- : see Pi § 520. Is this inconsistency due to an error? However, cp. Gāndhārī Dharmapada where the phonetic development of -sy- is different in a future (bhaviṣadi) and elsewhere (maṇuśa) : J. BROUGH, *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*. London, 1962, § 59.

108. This is the text as improved with the help of the aforesaid parallel versions. Both the Bhavnagar edition of Vikrama saṃvat 1965 and the Sanskrit chāyā available in H. M. JOHNSON, *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritra or the Lives of Sixty-Three Illustrious Persons...* Translated into English, vol. VI. Baroda, 1962 (G.O.S. 140), p. 326, n. 249 (with the correction of p. 379) are unsatisfactory.

Though the connection between the five vaitālīyas is somewhat loose, we can deal with them simultaneously.

4325. *jai tāva dalant' agālino dhammādhamma-visesa-bāhilā*
bahu-saṃjaya-vinda-majjhake uvakalane si kim eva mucchio?
4330-31. *khamae laddhūna ambale dāu gulūna ya so valiṭṭhae*
bei guluṃ "em eva sesae deha jaīna", gulūhī vuccaī :
"sayam eva ya dehi ambale tava je loyai ettha saṃjae",
ii chandiya-pesio tahiṃ khamao dei lisīna ambale.
4362-63. *vayanaṃ na vi gavva-bhāliyaṃ elisayaṃ kusalehī pūjiyaṃ*
ahavā na vi ettha lūsimo pagaī esa ajānue jane.
mūlena vinā hu kelise talu pavale ya ghane ya sobhaī?
na ya mūla-vibhinnae ghaḍe jalam-ādīṇi dhalei kanhuī.

The first stanza indirectly hints at the quarrels which cropped up when the monks came to share among themselves the clothes received from the laymen, and it warns them against envy :

" When even householders who are unconcerned by the difference between *dharma* and *adharma* (agree to) give (their own garments), how can you, who are living in a group of numerous self-controlled ascetics, be infatuated with a mere implement? ". We should notice by the way that the following verse (4326) is a triṣṭubh : it has been observed that vaitālīyas and triṣṭubhs are closely connected [109].

The next two vaitālīyas pertain to the sharing of the clothes brought by the *kṣapaka*, scil. the fasting monk who is often given a special treatment in the disciplinary texts [110] :

" Having brought the clothes and having given the best ones to his guru, the *kṣapaka* says to him : " In the same way, please give the other (clothes) to the monks ". The guru answers : " Give these clothes yourself to whatever ascetic you want ". Being invited and dismissed in this manner, the kṣapaka gives the clothes to the wise ".

I am struck by the pedestrian style of this short dialogue and by the apparently indiscriminate use of terms designating the Jaina monk (*jai, saṃjaya, lisi*). It looks rather queer in a section which otherwise shows concern for the religious hierarchy.

The last two verses reproach the behaviour of the rebellious monk who claims that the kṣapaka should show him deference :

" Such an arrogant word is not praised by the clever ones ". Or : " I should not be angry about that : such is the nature of a foolish person ".

109. ALSDORF,*Das Jātaka* (as in n. 97) = *Kleine Schriften*, p. 384.
110. See, for instance, C. CAILLAT, *Atonements in the Ancient Ritual of the Jaina Monks*. Ahmedabad, 1975 (L.D. Series 49), p. 113.

Then comes a *dṛṣṭānta* :
"Without a root, what tree would look excellent and thick? A pot with a broken base would never retain water, etc.". Throughout these stanzas we find the main "AMg" characteristic, the *l* (*agāliṇo, bāhilā, uvakalaṇe, gulu, ambale, talu* and so on). As in one of the two cases analysed by Alsdorf, the Sanskrit commentator has here observed the dialectal difference. He has taken note of its specific linguistic feature and quoted the famous sūtra on Māgadhī :

> *iha sarvatrâpi ra-kārasya la-kārâdeśaḥ "ra-sor la-śau"*[111] *iti Māgadha-bhāṣā-lakṣaṇa-vaśāt*[112].

The other features are not so consistent. Nominatives singular in *-e* do occur, for instance in the masculine nouns (*khamae* 4330, *je saṃjae* 4331, *ghaḍe* 4363, etc.), but *-o* forms are also found (*mucchio* 4325, *pesio... khamao* 4331). An extreme case is provided in 4331d :

> *khamao dei lisīṇa ambale,*

where *l* and the *-o* ending stand side by side. The neuter nominative does not show the Eastern ending *-e*, but the ordinary *-aṃ* :

> see 4362 : *vayaṇaṃ na vi... pūjiyaṃ.*

Again, these are examples of the conflict between conservatism and normalization. Finally, the accusative plural *ambale* (4330, 4331 ; Sk. *ambarāṇi*) reflects the loss of the masculine-neuter gender distinction in *-a* stems. For this particular word, it is already documented in Pali :

> *nānāratte ca ambare* (Ja VI 230, 29*).

*
* *

The main tendencies observed in this paper can now be summed up.

1. To some extent, we have seen that a distinction has to be drawn between the two groups of our corpus as far as dialectal influences are concerned.

2. The influence of 'AMg on JM seems to be partly limited by stylistic motivations. In several cases, we find in the context some elements which account for it. On the other hand, there are many linguistic features common to these two dialects.

3. The case of Apabhraṃśa is more difficult. Morphological evidence for the possible influence of this dialect on JM is scarce. It may be

---

111. See, for instance, Hemacandra's Prakrit Grammar 4.288.
112. Ṭīkā on the BKBh, vol. IV, p. 1173.

the influence of common speech, and will have to be supplemented by phonology and vocabulary.

4. A few instances have shown the elimination of innovations at work, or the normalization of intrusive dialect forms.

5. Writers or commentators very seldom take notice of intrusive, archaic, new or foreign forms. In other words, they are generally insensitive to the use of different dialects. It was probably no surprise to them. Their grammatical observations mainly concern cases of deviation from Sanskrit grammatical rules which they merely state as being due to *prākṛta-śailī-*. There is however a well-known exception, namely Uddyotanasūri, the author of the famous Kuvalayamālā who apparently thought about his own way of using dialects and gave a credible picture of linguistic variety in daily life [113].

In a paper which came to my knowledge only in May 1988, Prof. Bhayani has also listed instances of the past active participle in *-āiya-* (< *-āvika-*) and proposed a fourfold classification of the past participle extended with *-ellaya* which can be used 1) attributively, 2) predicatively in the simple past sense, 3) predicatively to convey pluperfect, 4) predicatively in the present perfect sense : *Notes on the Prakrit of the Early Commentaries of the Jain Canon*, in "Pratishthan Patrika", Research Bulletin of the Rajasthan Oriental Institute Jodhpur, 1987, p. 114-120 [113-124].

RÉSUMÉ

Deux groupes de textes relevant de genres littéraires différents sont ici examinés : d'une part, d'anciens commentaires versifiés du Canon śvetāmbara (*niryukti, bhāṣya*), de l'autre, des œuvres narratives (Vasudevahiṇḍi, Taranga-vaī, Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi...). On cherche à repérer dans ce corpus, dont le dialecte dominant est la māhārāṣṭrī jaina archaïque, des traces morphologiques incontestables de l'influence d'autres dialectes. (I) Ce sont : A. des traits caractéristiques de l'ardhamāgadhī (nomin. sg. en *-e*, loc. sg. *-ṃsi*, instr. sg. *-asā* dans la flexion thématique, absol. en *-ttāṇaṃ*, aor. « moyen » en *-itthā*) dont on peut souvent montrer que l'intrusion est conditionnée stylistique-ment ; B. quelques désinences verbales d'occurrence rare dans le prakrit canonique, que les progrès de la documentation montrent attestées en jm. (1. sg. présent *-aṃ*, désinence *-e* en valeur de prétérit, participe en *-tavaṃ*, forme fossilisée de l'aor. en *-īya*) ; C. certaines désinences qui évoquent l'apabhraṃśa (cas direct sg. *-a* des thèmes en *-ā*, absol. en *-evi*, 1. sg. présent *-ami*, participe

113. See *Kuvalayamālā* ed. A. N. UPADHYE. Bombay, 1970 (Singhi Jain Series 46), p. 77 ff.; and *Līlāvaīkahā* ed. by the same scholar. Bombay, 1949 (Singhi Jain Series 31) : the author himself says that he is writing in *marahaṭṭha-desi-bhāsā*, p. 75 ff.

passé en -*ellaya*). (II) On étudie ensuite une série de formes curieuses dont on ne peut déterminer l'appartenance dialectale, mais dont on constate qu'elles ont eu une existence éphémère en jm., avant d'être éliminées sous la pression des normalisations grammaticales (obl. -*āe* des noms du « roi » et du « père » ! participe passé actif en-*āio*). (III) Enfin, on a cru pouvoir enrichir le répertoire, naguère dressé par L. Alsdorf, des stances rédigées en « amg. authentique » (où *l* est conservé) en y ajoutant quelques exemples que les commentaires ont transmis vaille que vaille.

L'ensemble de ces faits montre notamment les conditions dans lesquelles s'effectuent les mélanges dialectaux : les archaïsmes côtoient les formes courantes, pourvu qu'ils soient bien intégrés au système linguistique (I. A.) ; les innovations marginales et difficilement explicables ne résistent pas (II ; III).

Février 1987.

INDEX FORMANTIUM

-*a,* nom. sg. of -*ā* stems, 512.
-*am,* pres. 1 sg., 509.
-*ami,* pres. 1 sg., 514.
-*asā,* instr. sg. of -*a* stems, 507.
-*āio, -āiā* (cf. -*tāvin*), past. participle, 518.
-*āe,* obl. ending of *rāyā, piyā,* 516 f.
-*āga-,* 506.
-*i,* nom. sg. of -*ī* stems, 512.
-*itthā,* aor. ending, 508 f.
-*īya,* preterite ending, 510 f.
-*e/-o,* nom. sg. of -*a* stems, 505 f.

-*e,* optative-preterite ending, 509 f.
-*eppi,* absolutive, 513 f.
-*ellaya* (Guj. -*elo*), past participle, 515 f.
-*eviṇu,* absolutive, 514.
-*ccaya-,* postposition, 514.
taṇaya-, postposition, 514.
-*tarāga-,* comparative, 506.
-*tavaṃ* (cf. -*tavant*), past participle, 510.
-*ttāṇaṃ,* absolutive, 507 f.
-*ṃsi,* loc. sg., 506 f.
l- (opp. *r-*), 519 f.

PRAKRIT DIALECTS

Apabhraṃśa, 412 ff.
"Archaïc Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī", 503 f.
Ardhamāgadhī, 505 ff.
"Digambara Prakrit", n. 60, 69.

"Echt Ardha-Māgadhī", 519 ff.
Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī, 503
Māgadhī, 521.