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MORPHOLOGICAL EVIDENCE FOR DIALECTAL VARIETY IN JAINA MĀHĀRĀŚṬRĪ

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

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

1. The first group includes the *niryuktis* and *bhāsyas* 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 Šmith⁴, all the more so since in both cases the brevity of style affects the grammar. The following material has been surveyed: the Āyāranga- and Sūyagaḍa-nījjuttis; the Dasaveyāliya-nījjuttis (= DasavN); parts of the Uttarajhāyā- and the Oha-nījjuttī (= UttN; OhN); the Brhatkalpabhāṣya (= BK Bh) and the Niṣītha-


⁴ *Saddanīṭī*. La grammaire palie d'Aggavamsa. 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. Special emphasis has been laid upon the Āvaśyaka-niryukti and bhāṣya (= ĀvN, Bh)\(^6\), which I have studied at leisure\(^7\). Finally, the Mahānīśīha-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 Vasudevahāndī, mainly written in prose, and the Tarangavātī and the Paumacariya in verse. The cūrṇis explaining the niryuktis, as well as Prakrit portions of the īkās, also belong to this layer: the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇī\(^10\) and Haribhadra’s īkā (= 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


6. For references see below n. 11.
12. See Paumacariya, intr. [by V. M. KULKARNI] p. 32.
dialecs 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. 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 vaitāliya-stanzas in the commentaries.

(I)

A. Early JM is still under the influence of Canonical Ardhamaṅgaḍhī, and the line between the two dialects is not always easy to perceive. 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, 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.”


He further quotes one of the pādas mentioned in Hemacandra’s grammar to illustrate this peculiarity of ārṣa. 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 Mahānīśīha-sutta has revealed some tendencies: -o is, for instance, found in ārṣā; -e and -o are found side by side in ślokas, etc. 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 dāna (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 (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 Viyāhapanatti. We find them sporadically in the niryuktis. Thus vipulatarāga (DasaV 38), gādhatarāga (DasaV 211), annayarāga (DasaV 333). For nouns: mūlāga in the Āyāranga-nijjutti (178), and muhuttāga in the Ohanijjutti (523).

Some of the Ardhamāgadhisms, i.e. archaism, 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 Vasudevaiṇḍi, for the forms mostly occur in an inserted Rṣabhacarita, i.e. in a passage which on account of its contents was probably highly liable to the influence of the Canonical phraseology. Of the forms quoted by him, kucchımısi also appears in ĀvBh verses, also in a mythological context, where Mahāvīra’s birth and the transfer of the embryo are narrated:

\textit{jaṁ rayaṇim uvavanno kucchımısi mahāyasos Vīro} (Bh 47cd),

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


17. SCHUBRING, Mahānīśīha, 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.


Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī

jam rayanîṃ vakkamaī | kucchiṃsi mahāyasas arihā 21.

And again:
aha divase bāsīī vasai tahim māhanī 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 Sūyagāḍa-
nijjuttī 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 Mūlacāra (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 -tīnāṃ, which is considered to be
an Eastern feature of the Canonical language 27, is occasionally met

§ 46b. — On the gender of kucchi, see R. L. Turner, A Comparative Dictionary of the
Indo-Aryan Languages. London, 1966, No. 3213 : in Sk., kukiṣṭi- 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-bhāriyāṃ sāhara Tisalāṇi kucchiṃsi; 57cd jam
rayanīṃ sāhario kucchiṃsi mahāyasas Viro; 58ab tihi nānehī samaggo devi Tisalāṇi so a
kucchiṃsi.
23. E.g. J. Deleu, Viyāhapanmitti... The Fifth Anga of the Jaina Canon... Brugge,
1970 : VI 32; VIII 1-2; VIII 98.
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 Hinüber, Das ältere Mittelindisch im Ueberblick. Wien,
1986, § 298.
25. “In materieller Hinsicht (Im geistigen Bereich) (gibt es Karana) auf Anstoss oder
von selbst. (Karaṇa) auf Anstoss (erscheint als) primär und sekundär” : Bollée,
Studien zum Sūyagatā, p. 11, 33 ff.
26. E. Leumann, Uebersicht über die Āvacya-Literatur... Hamburg, 1934, p. 18a,
line 9 and p. 12b, line 56 : bhayasa, bhaeṇam vandai “mā nicchubbihāmi sanghāo kulāo
ganāo gacchāo khetāo” tī 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 Vasudevahinḍi (2 ex.) and the Tarangavāi (3 ex.) 28. I have noted some others in the Ohanijjutti: onāmitṭāṇaṃ (Bh 273b), akkamitṭāṇaṃ (N 389b), asohaitṭānaṃ (N 416d), vibhāvaitṭāna (N 491b), pādikamettāṇa and pādilehetṭāṇa (p. 176, l. 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 Uttarajhāyā 29:

kahīṃ bondiṃ caitṭāṇaṃ? kattha gantūṇa sijjhai?
iham bondiṃ caitṭāṇaṃ, tattha gantūṇa sijjhai (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, -ttānaṃ and -tūna are found side by side!

Other instances of absolutes in -ttānaṃ available in the ĀvN are free from contextual constraint. They are: osakkaitṭānaṃ (N 183 = 743), vogaśittānaṃ (N 653; ct. vyavakalayya), and āpucchittāna (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 Tarangavāi (2 ex.) 34. The Uttarajhāyā-nijjutti (vs. 390) has:

tām soṇa 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:

29. Cp. SCHWARZSCHILD, loc. cit., p. 113: “(This type of absolutive) occurs also in Jain Māhārāṣṭri and Jain Šaurasenī in passages that are under the influence of the Śvetāmbara Jain Canon”.
31. A similar analysis can be given for the absolutes in -yāṇaṃ: e.g. samupehiyānaṃ (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”. Festscr. U. Schneider, Freiburg, 1987, n. 41.
33. Pi § 517.
35. LEUMANN, WZKM 6 (1892), p. 41 (as above n. 5).
Magahāṇē niruvasaggaṃ muṇi uu-baddhammi vihariththā.
“During summer and winter, the monk (i.e. Mahāvira) 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 -ām (instead of -āmi) was known from a unique form in the Canon: jāṇam, “I know” in the Ayāradasāṇa. It has also been recorded in the Vasudevāhinī (15 ex.), in the Tarangavānī (26 ex.) and in the Mahānīhiśasutta (at least 25 ex.). In the selected corpus of niryuktis, etc., it appears once, if I am not mistaken:

eyam iccham nāuṃ, ganivara, tubbh’ antie niuṇam (ĀvN 691d; tīkās 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, were collected by Pischel, especially from the Uttarajñāyā. 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 Uttarajñāyā-nijjutti (vs. 92cd):

vaniya-mahilam caitā tattammi silā-yale vihare (ct. vyahār-śīt) 42.

“Having renounced the merchant’s wife (with whom he had enjoyed life, Arahananna) 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 Hinüber, Das ältere Mittelindisch (as above n. 24), § 420; cp. in AMg and JM the future 1 sg. -āmi or -ām: Pi § 520.
37. See, respectively, Alsdorf, loc. cit.; H. C. Bhayani, “Sambodhi”..., p. 114; Schubring, Mahānīhiśa, p. 90, and, more detailed, Deleu-Schubring, Studien zum Mahānīhiśa, p. 12. — These lists include both present indicative and optative forms (-iijam).
39. Pi § 466, to which add e.g. Utt. 21.10 pavvae (pravrājī in the ct.).
41. Ed. vaniya-mahila.
42. And also UttN 376cd in Leumann, WZKM 6 (1892) p. 34: so vi ya (i.e. Municando) Sāgaracandassa antie pavvae samaṇo.
or in the ĀvN (vs. 197ab):

aunāpannam juale puttāṇā Sumangalā puṇo pasave (ĀvH prasūtavatī).

“Sumangalā gave birth to 49 twin sons”

The Āv. cūrṇi retains a form of the active past participle in -tavant, for which Pischel (§ 569) gave a single example, namely puṭṭhavam from SPRŚ in the Āyārānga with a passive meaning:

na ya...ṇhāo, na ya bandhavehi vi ai-ṇeham katavam (ĀvC 249, 11): “(When he was about to reject worldly life), (Vardhamāna) 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 -i(y)a which can function as an imperfect, aorist of perfect had been mentioned by the main Prakrit grammarians, but no actual form were recognised in the texts until the Vasudevahindi provided undisputable cases (4 ex.)

The single instance found in the Canonical literature also came to light, namely Uttarajjhāyā 13.18d (tristubh):

(vayam...) vasiya (ct. avasāva, uṣita) Sovāga-nivesaṇesu almost glossed by the next verse (19b):

...vutha mu Sovāga-nivesaṇesu,

“We lived in the hamlets of Śvapākas” [Jacobi].

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

pucchiṃsu Jambu-ṇāmo ajja-Suhammā tao kahesiya,

“Jambūsvāmin asked, then the noble Sudharma said.”

43. Other similar instances are: samuttāre with a subject in the plural, ĀvN 471 (ct. samuttāritavatītu); pāse ĀvBh 1 (ct. drṣṭavān); pesae ĀvBh 34 (ct. preṣitavān); uvacchubhe “they threw” ĀvBh 67; bhave ĀvN 1150 (ĀvH chāndasatvād abhūt); ĀvN 340, 516, Bh 59, 77, 109.

44. Reference in Pi § 466: acchīa, genhīa, etc.


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

*Jina-Cakki-Dasārāṇam vanna pamāṇāṁ nāma gottāṁ aū pura māi piyarō parīyāya gaim ca sāhīa* 49 (368).

"He (= Bharata) revealed (ct. śiṣṭavān) 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 Pratīvāsudevas (= Dasāras)."

Others are *pucchīa, “he asked”* (ĀvN 367); *uvāśīya, “he fasted”* (ĀvN 528, 529; ct. *upoṣitavān*); *thāśīya, “he remained standing”* (ĀvN 530), *kāśīya, “he did”* (ĀvN 178, 190, 366, 501, 513, 531; ĀvBh 11, 65, 66), *āśīya, “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,

>nāmaṁ ca bandhavā me piṇo soūna kāśīya,

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

2. Two thirds of the -i(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 Vasudevahinḍī, 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 *Prākritaprayākaśa* 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 Vasudevahinḍī).

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. Vasudevahinḍī : *aham... gacchīya* and (*aham)... *dine gacchīya*, quoted by ALSDORF, loc. cit.; Tarangavaī 800cd to *ham... / hiyaemam puva-gayā, pacchā (ya) pāehim gacchīya*; 1106cd *tāhe parissaṃmah ham cintīya chuhaṃ ca tanhaṃ ca*; 1377ab ahayam anantara-bhave io ya āśīya hatthi-pādi hatthi; 639cd (*aham*) *uvavāsa-pāranam suha-maṇena khamanassa kāśīya.*
īa bhūte (= Vṛ 7.23). bhūte vartamāṇād dhātoḥ pratyayasya īa ādeśaḥ syāt (= Bhāmaha’s ct.) : āśī, gehī, hasī, padīya (=) āsī, agrahī, ahasat, apaṭhaṭ, ityādi. puruṣa-traya-rūpāṇi ekavacana-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 (kāṣīya, ṭhasīya, 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 Apabhramśa 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 Ohanijjuti (vs. 452, fourth gaṇa - - - - of an āryā) 56, or Mihila in the Uttarajhāyā-nijjuti (vs. 396, second gaṇa - - - -) 57. While reading the ĀvN, I came across many such forms: in sixth gaṇas - - - - , puccha (366, 492, 1310), padima (489), Aojha (383), Campa (1284), Vinīṭa (382), etc.; in sixth gaṇas - - - - , padima (516), Vijaya (520); in a sixth gaṇa - , puccha (348); in other metrical positions, padima (490), pavvaṇja (1298), māla (Bh 95), anukampa (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 Apabhramśa 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 Prākrita-Prakāśa... of Vararuchi... The first complete edition by E. B. Cowell. Reprint Delhi, 1977 (Oxford, 18951), p. 65, note 10 and p. ix about the W manuscript.
55. See Alsdorf's suggestions, loc. cit.
56. Mette, Pind'esana, p. 179.
57. Leumann, WZKM 6 (1892), p. 43.
58. Leumann, ibidem, p. 42.
59. PI § 100, § 374; G. V. Tagare, Historical Grammar of Apabhramśa. Poona, 1948, § 89.
60. For bare-stems in Digambara Prakrit, see K. Okuda, Eine Digambara Dogmatik. Das fünfte Kapitel von Vaṭṭakeras Mūḷācāra... Wiesbaden, 1975, p. 30 ff.
JM narrative works have emphasised that, to some extent, unquestionable 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 Vasudevahinḍī, 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 jāneppi in pāda c:

\[
\text{cira-santhu vā 'liya-santhuena}
\text{mellāvī va 65 dhuva addhuvēnam}
\text{jāneppi tujham pagai-ssabhāvam}
\text{panno naro ko tuhu [tuha] vissasejja?}
\]

“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 Sagarāla, 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:

\[
\text{na vetti rājā yad asau Śakaṭālaḥ kariṣyati}
\text{vyāpādyā Nandam tad-rājye Śriyakam sthāpayiṣyati} 67.
\]

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 absolute 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).


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


"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 jānai jaṃ Sagadālo karehii:
rāya- Nandaṃ mārevinu Śiriyam rajje ṭhavehi tti.

a. rāyā Nandu ĀvH 649b, 3, Devendra’s ct. on Utt 29a, 1; b. kāhii ĀvH, Sagadālu karesai, DevUtt; c. rāya-Nandam is the reading of ĀvH; Nando rāyā, ĀvC II 184, 10 is obviously wrong; rāya Nandu, DevUtt; mārevinu ĀvC, mārettā ĀvH, DevUtt; d. ṭhavehii ĀvH; rajji ṭhavevai DevUtt.

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

Nandu rāyā na vi jānai, jaṃ Sagadālu kāhii
rāyā-Nandaṃ mārevinu, Śiriyam rajjē ṭhavehii

Leaving aside these difficulties, both Apabhraṃśa absolutes in the aforesaid quotation have been reinterpreted in Haribhadra’s tīkā: jāneppi has become jānemi, which makes very little sense; mārevinu has been normalized as mārettā.

Occasionally, we come across a first person singular in -ami: e.g. in the Mahānīṣīhasutta, niddhaami. The narrative works and Canonical prose commentaries show the use of the declinable postpositions tanaya and ccaya attached to pronominal bases, and quite common in Apabhraṃśa: e.g. tujja-ccaya ĀvC 468, 11-12 (versus ĀvH tumam atṭhāe), tassa ccayaṇi pottāṇi ĀvC II 289, 14, etc.; mama tanaṇaṃ ĀvC II 198, 12 (versus H m. kaṇaṃ) ĀvC II 196, 10, etc.

70. Pi § 454; TAGARE, op. cit., § 136, p. 286.
71. SCHUBRING, Mahānīṣīha, p. 90.
72. And ĀvH 295a, 8; 565b, 5. — On -cca(ya) which serves to build possessive adjectives in Marathi, see H. C. BHAYANI, Some Interesting Features of the Prākṛit of the Nānapancamikahā BHV 12 (1951), p. 157, referring to Hemacandra’s Prakrit Grammar 2.149, etc.
The fairly large number of past participles in -ellaya, particularly in the Ávasyaka 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:

\[ganiyā-māue ya jaṁ sahassam... dinnellayām tām se darisyām,\]
\[“she showed him... one thousand (dināras) which the courtezan’s mother had given to her” (ĀvC 467, 9)\]

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

\[tīse gabbho laggo. sā ya amaccena bhanīelliyā,\]
\[“she became pregnant. She had been told by the minister” (ĀvC 448, 13)\]

These forms foreshadow the -l- participles of Western Neo-Indian languages: Marathi and Gujarati 77. In Gujarati, the suffix -elo (-i, -u) 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 Apabhramṣa and to Gujarati and Marwari, IA 44 (1915), p. 102, with a few instances quoted from Leumann’s Ṇv. Erzählungen [ADD, p. 524].
75. See also Sántisūri’s Uttarādhayayana-ṭīkā quoted by ALSDORF, A New Version of the Agudadatta Story NIA 1 (1938), p. 284 = Kleine Schriften, p. 110: tāva ya āgao parivāyao jakkha-deulāo saiellae dālidda-purise ghettüna, 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 ...kumāram ammā-piyaro... sarisyānam... sarisāelām rāya-kulehinto āniliyānam... rāya-vara-kannānam pānim ginpā-
vīntsu, Viyāhapannati 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 puvram amaccena āsi bhāniyā. — Other instances are ĀvC 280, 5 māriello; ĀvC 290, 5 dīthello; ĀvC 466, 1 laddhellayām; ĀvC 529, 13 gaellao; ĀvC 11 188, 3 thielāgā; ĀvH 188a, 9 jāelāo, etc.
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, bhāsyas, cūrnīs (and Prakrit portions of the āṅkā).

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 Brhatkalpabhāṣya verse (6101) where two girl-friends are exchanging harsh words (pharusa):

\[
\begin{align*}
  \text{kenānīām pisiyām?...} \\
  \text{kim khū! tumaṁ piyē ānīām...}
\end{align*}
\]

"Who has brought this flesh? ... Who else? Your own father has brought it!" (āṅkā : tvādiyena pitrānītam)\textsuperscript{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 samām jamei... piyāe samām gao, "he ate with his father, ... went with his father" (ĀvC 544, 9); rāyāe ghosāviyām, "the king has a proclamation made" (ĀvC II 154, 5), and so on\textsuperscript{80}.

These forms also function as a genitive-dative. For instance: aham ca piyāe kūram ānāmi, "and I am bringing rice to my father" (ĀvC II 57, 12); rāyāe paesu pado, "he threw himself at the king’s feet" (ĀvC II 182, 9 = H); rāyāe samīva gao, "he went to the king" (ĀvH 418b, 3), etc.\textsuperscript{81}

Ambiguity may arise in the case of elliptic phrases such as rāyāe puchiyam 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 cūrnī reads rāyāe, piyāe, while the parallel text of the āṅkā has the ordinary JM instrumentals and

\textsuperscript{79} On tumaṁ sporadically used as a genitive. Pi § 420-421.

\textsuperscript{80} E.g. rāyāe ninte na diśho 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 samām jūm ramai ĀvC 550, 4 (= H); māya-piyāe suyām ĀvC II 206, 8 = Śāntisūri’s āṅkā on Utt., 302a, 1.

\textsuperscript{81} See also rāyāe uvanīo ĀvC II 154, 7 (= H); "he was brought near to the king"; rāyāe pāya-vadio ĀvC II 154, 8 (= H), etc.
genitives rāīṇā, rānnā, ranno, piṇā, piṇo 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 rāīṇā instead of keeping rāyaē, 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 rāyaē, provided by a good manuscript, and prefer rāē “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 rāyaē, 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. ūśman (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.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
mālā & → & māyā & → \\
mālāe & → & māyāe & \rightarrow \\
x & → & x \\
\end{array}
\]

82. Pi § 391 and 399.
83. For instance: rāyaē varagā pesiyā ĀvC II 58, 4; rannā ĀvH 558b, 7; piyāē suvam ĀvC II 206, 8; piṇā ĀvH 718a, 3; rāyaē sūtā bhanīyā ĀvC II 279, 7; rannā ĀvH 814b, 9; rāyaē H 694b, 4; rannā ĀvC; rāyaē samīvam gao ĀvH 418b, 3; ranno ĀvC 547, 4; piyāē kūram ānāmi ĀvC II 57, 12; piṇo 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.
86. Pi 364.
87. Pi § 389: “Die Feminina der Verwandtschaftswörter werden auch als -ā- Stämme flectirt.”
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 (māya, piyā) before extending to the word "king", may not be necessary. 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, and found in the Āv prose commentaries: e.g. pavvajām kayāio, "he renounced the world" (ĀvH 714b, 2); Titthayaro dharmam kahiyāio, "the Tīrthaṅkara taught the Law" (ĀvH 237b, 6 = tiṭkā on Brhatkalpabhāṣya vs. 1205); to samane bhaniyāio, "then he told the monks..." (ĀvH 312b, 11), etc. An older instance is provided by the last verse of the Sūyagaḍa-nijjutti (205ab):

Pāsavaccijo pucchiyāio ajja-Goyamañ Udago.

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

A comparison of parallel passages in Āv cūrṇi and tiṭkās 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: pavvajāyā kayā (ĀvC II 202, 12); in place of dh. kahiyāio (above), the cūrṇi (332, 3) reads pakahiio, 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.

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

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

Akāri and karissaṁ are clearly put in asyndeton as a past and a future, and the phrase may represent an old formula (akāriti 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 dhiṭuna, instr. of dhiṭā, Ed.].
92. The tales belonging to the namaskāra-vyākhyā of the Āvaśyaka-Cūrṇi, IT 11 (1983), p. 130.
93. And also, in the feminine, piviyaād "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 Hinüber, 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 karisñyamiti anenatītānāgatopādānena... 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. 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?

(III)

Old JM sources also retain another type of linguistic rarity, namely a small number of vaitāliya-stanzas composed "in einer Sprache, die man aufgrund ihres l für r, aber nicht ş für s/s als die echte Ardhamāgadhī bezeichnen darf", to quote Alsdorf’s words. 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 Uttarajñānānijjutti, the second one in the anonymous Manipaticarita, a narrative work of unknown date closely connected with the Āvāṣyaka 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". In his Études jaina, Alsdorf observed that there had probably been more such


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


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 cūṇī and Haribhadra’s ṭīkā, later continued by parallel versions found in the Ākhyānakamaniṃkoṣa, the Kumārapālapaṭibodha and the Kathākoṣa 102. It is also found in Devendra’s commentary on Uttarajñāyī 1.3 103. It is in the form of an enigmatic prophecy announced by a heavenly voice:

\[
\text{samane jai Kūlavālāe Māgahiyaṃ ganīyaṃ lamehīi lāyā ya Asogacandae Vesālīṃ naghalīṃ gahissai}
\]


"If the ascetic Kūlavālaka enjoys the courtezan Māgadhikā, the king Āsokacandraka will take the city of Vaiśālī." 104.

We are faced with an historical fact clothed in legend and fantasy, namely the last phase of Kūnika Ajātasattu’s imperialism. Āsokacandra 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 Kūnika took the city of Vaiśālī from his enemy Cētaṇa by guile: the courtezan seduced the monk who then became Kūnika’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 (vaitāliya) and the language clearly prove

104. It refers to an event of his early childhood: ĀvC II 166-167; ĀvH 678b-679a; Prakrit Proper Names..., Ahmedabad, 1970, s.v. Kūṇa.
it. 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 nagarīṃ, the Kathākośa has rāvā; the verb lamehī, 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 vaitāliya 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-cūrṇī, 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 Triṭaśiśa-lākāpurusacaritra which also includes the same story, our stanza is in the shape of a Māgadhī śloka characterized by the l (lamiijja) and the palatal sibilant, thus śamane, Veśāliṃ, but gahissadi.

\[\text{gānīyam ce Māgadhiyam śamane Kulavālaka lamiijja Kūnie lāvā to Veśāliṃ gahissadi (10.12.316)}\]

My second group of AMg vaitāliyas occurs in a dogmatical context in the Brhatkalpabhaṣya. 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 Śvetāmbara Jainas: the distribution of clothes (paribhāyane BKBh 4308) among nīgganṭhas and nīgganṭhīs.


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 -śś- is different in a future (bhaviṣadi) and elsewhere (maṇuṣa) : J. BROUGHT, 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 samvat 1965 and the Sanskrit chāyā available in H. M. JOHNSON, Triṣaśiśalākāpurusacaritra 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 vaitāliyas is somewhat loose, we can deal with them simultaneously.

4325. jai tāva dalant’ agālīno dhammādhamma-viṣesa-bāhilā bahu-saṃjaya-vinda-majjhake uvakalaṇe si kim eva mucchio?
4330-31. khamae laddhīṇa ambale dāu gulūṇa ya so vaḷiṭṭhae bei gulum “em eva sesae deha jaīṇa”, gulūhī vuccāī :
“sayam eva ya dehi ambale tava je loyai ettha saṃjae “, 
ii chandiya-pesio tahim khamao dei lisīna ambale.
4362-63. vayaṇaṁ na vi gavva-bhāliyaṁ elisayaṁ kusalehī pājiyaṁ ahavā na vi ettha lūsimo pagai esa ajāune jāne.
mūleṇa viṇā hu kelise talu pavale ya ghane ya ṣobhaï?
na ya mūla-vibhinnae ghaḍe jalam-aḍīṇī dhalei kaṇhuī.

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 triṣṭūbh: it has been observed that vaitāliyas and triṣṭūbhs are closely connected 109.

The next two vaitāliyas 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.
Then comes a *drśānta*:

"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* (*agālīna*, *bāhilā*, *uvakalane*, *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 sarvatraśi ra-kārasya la-kārādesah "ra-sor la-śau"* 111 *iti Māgadhā-bhāṣā-lakṣaṇa-vasāt* 112.

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

*khamao dei lisiṇa 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: *vayaṇam na vi... pūjīyam*.

Again, these are examples of the conflict between conservatism and normalization. Finally, the accusative plural *ambale* (4330, 4331; Sk. *ambarāṇī*) 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 Apabhramśa 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.
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 (Vasudevahinḍi, Tarangavāi, Āvaśyaka-cūrni...). 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’ārdhamāgadhī (nomin. sg. en -e, loc. sg. -msi, instr. sg. -asā dans la flexion thématique, absol. en -tānaṃ, aor. « moyen » en -īthā) dont on peut souvent montrer que l’intrusion est conditionnée stylistiquement ; B. quelques désinences verbales d’occurrence rare dans le prakrit canonique, que les progrès de la documentation montrent attestées en jm. (1. sg. présent -am, désinence -e en valeur de prétérit, participe en -tavaṃ, forme fossilisée de l’aor. en -īya) ; C. certaines désinences qui évoquent l’apabhramśa (cas direct sg. -a des thèmes en -ā, absol. en -evi, 1. sg. présent -ami, participe

---

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).


INDEX FORMANTIUM

-a; nom. sg. of -ā stems, 512.
-am, pres. 1 sg., 509.
-ami, pres. 1 sg., 514.
-āsā, instr. sg. of -ā 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.
-īthā, aor. ending, 508 f.
-īya, preterite ending, 510 f.
-e/-o, nom. sg. of -ā stems, 505 f.
-e, optative-preterite ending, 509 f.
-eppi, absolutive, 513 f.
-ellaya (Guj. -elo), past participle, 515 f.
-evīṇu, absolutive, 514.
-ccaya-, postposition, 514.
tanaya-, postposition, 514.
-tarāga-, comparative, 506.
tavam (cf. -tavant), past participle, 510.
tānam, absolutive, 507 f.
-mā, loc. sg., 506 f.
l- (opp. r-), 519 f.

PRAKRIT DIALECTS

Apabhramśa, 412 ff.
“Archaic Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī”, 503 f.
Ardhamāgadhī, 505 ff.
“Digambara Prakrit”, nn. 60, 69.

Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī, 503
Māgadhī, 521.