BULLETIN

OF

The School of Oriental Studies

(University of London)

The Prakrit underlying Buddhistic Hybrid Sanskrit

By Franklin Edgerton

A SANSKRITIST who reads for the first time a Buddhistic Sanskrit text such as the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka is struck at once by peculiarities of vocabulary and style which differentiate it from normal Sanskrit. If he limits himself to the prose parts, ignoring the verses, he will rarely encounter forms or expressions which are definitely ungrammatical, or at least more ungrammatical than, say, the Sanskrit of the epics, which also violates the strict rules of Pāṇini. Yet every paragraph will contain words and turns of expression which, while formally unobjectionable (if, perhaps, non-Pāṇinean), would never be used by any non-Buddhist writer. If our Sanskritist is also familiar with Pali, he will soon notice that many of these words and turns of expression are identical, *mutatis mutandis*, with Pali words and turns of expression. For example, in *SP.*, 76, 10 (I refer to page and line of the Kern-Nanjio edition of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka), and often, *ātmabhāva* occurs in the sense of " body ". The word is a quite normal and innocent-appearing Sanskrit formation, and occurs, e.g., in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 1, 2, meaning " existence (or reality) of the self (soul) " ; in the meaning " body ", however, it occurs only in Buddhistic Sanskrit, but there quite commonly. Now it cannot be accidental that its phonetic equivalent in Pali, *attabhāva*, has precisely this meaning. Again, all readers of Pali are very familiar with the common expression *yena . . . tena . . .*, " where (someone or something was), there (someone else went)." In themselves, *yena* and *tena* are perfectly normal Sanskrit (as well as Pali) forms ; but this use of them, I believe, is not known except in Pali and Buddhistic Sanskrit, though frequent there. These are characteristic examples which could be multiplied many times, as all students of the field are well aware.

Such students also know, of course, that this is by no means the whole story. In the *verses* of such works as the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka or the Lalitavistara (and in the prose of, e.g., the Mahāvastu, which in this respect is unusual ; much more rarely in the prose of most other works, at least as presented in our editions), there also occur many *forms* which are unknown to Sanskrit grammar, of any period,

and would be felt as barbarous and impossible in any genuine or
" normal " (non-Buddhist) Sanskrit work. They are, in brief, middle-
Indic ; in a broad sense, Prakritic. This fact, together with those
mentioned above, led some scholars of a generation or more ago (such
as Childers) to the not unnatural supposition that these Buddhistic
Sanskrit works were translations, or re-workings, of Pali originals.

More careful study of Pali itself, and of other relevant materials,
has shown that this hypothesis does not fit the facts. The striking
linguistic resemblances between Pali and Buddhistic Sanskrit do not
indicate any direct relation between the two dialects, or between the
literary works composed in them. But the relation, though indirect,
is nevertheless certain. Both contained originally texts which were
based on canonical texts composed in an earlier dialect, Prakritic
in character, in which there must have existed at one time a consider-
able body of (perhaps only oral) Buddhist literature. Neither the
Pali nor the Sanskrit Buddhist canon is " original ", nor is either based
on the other ; both contain, or once contained, essentially (in their
older parts) translations or recasts of compositions in that older
Prakrit. As time went on, both languages were then used in original
compositions (most of our actually extant Buddhistic Sanskrit texts
are, in fact, original, rather than translations or re-workings) ; but in
such a way that the traditional link with what we may call the proto-
canonical Prakrit was not wholly broken. At least in vocabulary,
and (particularly on the Sanskrit side) for a long time also in morphology
and even phonology, Buddhist writers, both northern and southern,
used idioms which were clearly under the influence of a linguistic
tradition stemming from that protocanonical Prakrit.

The fact that Pali is itself a middle-Indic dialect, and so resembles
the protocanonical Prakrit in phonology and morphology much more
closely than Sanskrit, makes it harder to trace such influences in it.
Yet, as Professor Sylvain Lévi has shown,[1] Pali is not free from them ;

---

[1] See his brilliant and important article of 1912, *JA.*, Ser. 10, vol. 20, pp. 495–512.
I hope that Professor Lévi would accept my formulation of the matter as above,
which I think differs little in principle from his, though he uses the term " pre-
canonical " rather than " protocanonical ", meaning, I take it, antecedent to the
historically known Buddhist canons. Since I think (and I presume the great French
savant would agree) that a " canon " in some sense doubtless existed in that language,
I prefer " protocanonical ", with Professor de la Vallée-Poussin (*Indo-européens et
Indo-iraniens*, p. 202). The most important bibliographical references on the subject
will be found in these two places and in J. Mansion, *Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue
sanscrite* (1931), pp. 105–9, where will also be found interesting speculations as to
the manner of development of the curious " Buddhistic Sanskrit " dialect.

for instance, it now and then presents forms with loss of intervocalic mutes, or sonantizing of intervocalic surds, contrary to the laws of the Pali language. Lévi has also shown that similar traces of this protocanonical Prakrit can be detected in occasional words and phrases occurring in the Asokan and other early inscriptions.

It is, however, in Buddhistic Sanskrit that we find the clearest and most extensive evidence. Quite naturally ! For when Buddhist monks began to adapt the language they used to the " respectable " language of the Brahmans, any imperfections in the adaptation would necessarily show up much more glaringly, than when they simply turned it into another Prakrit (such as Pali, in essence, was) ; because the linguistic gap between the two media was far wider. A relatively early stage in this adaptation is represented by the verses of, say, the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka. Here every line shows evidence of Prakrit influence ; and that too not only in vocabulary, but also in phonology, and especially in morphology. As time went on, the tendency was to approximate more and more the forms of standard Sanskrit, until finally almost the only remaining trace of Prakrit consists in the peculiar Buddhist vocabulary. (It should be emphasized, however, that this vocabulary is itself evidence of appurtenance to a separate linguistic tradition, quite distinct from " standard " Sanskrit. For it is not merely a question of technical terms relating to religion, but very largely of terms of every-day life. They can be explained only as marks of a *distinct language*.) There seem to be reasons for assuming, in general, that the more Prakritic a text looks, the earlier it is. To be sure this cannot be taken as a hard and fast rule. What is certain is, that nearly all Buddhistic works in Sanskrit (at any rate, until a late period) belong to a continuous and broadly unitary linguistic tradition ; their language is a thing separate from the tradition of Brahmanical Sanskrit, and goes back ultimately to a (semi-) Sanskritized form of the protocanonical Prakrit. The number of Buddhist writers who stood outside this tradition, that is who wrote in what is virtually standard Brahmanical Sanskrit, seems to have been very small. We may guess that it was limited to converts who had received orthodox Brahmanical training in their youth, before adherence to Buddhism. Aśvaghoṣa is an example of this exceptional type. His Sanskrit can probably not be distinguished from that of Brahmanical writers in phonology or morphology, and only to a slight extent, if at all, does he make use of the peculiar Buddhist vocabulary. Now it is " taken as certain that he was of Brahman family, and had enjoyed

a thorough Brahmanical education before he went over to Buddhism "
(Winternitz, *Hist. Ind. Lit.*, vol. ii, 1933, p. 257).

It seems to me no exaggeration to speak of this hybrid Sanskrit of
the Buddhists as a *language*, in its own right. Not a vernacular, of
course ; a literary language ; an artificial language, if you like. I
grant, also, that it appears in various markedly different phases,
distinguished chiefly by great differences in degree of Sanskritization
(approach to normal Sanskrit in phonology and morphology). But
these phases are aspects of a unitary tradition, connected with each
other by direct lines. To trace these lines in detail would be to construct
a relative chronology of the Buddhist Sanskrit literature. It must
be admitted that this is at present impossible. Perhaps it will never
be possible. Nevertheless the underlying unity of linguistic tradition
seems undeniable.

It is signalized, first, by the peculiar and persistent vocabulary
referred to above. Boehtlingk included some of it in his great Sanskrit
dictionary (how many words, or special meanings of words, are there
recorded only from Buddhist works !) ; but perhaps the larger part is
not included in any Sanskrit dictionary. And, in strict linguistic
logic, it should not be there ; that is, unless we stretch the meaning of
" Sanskrit ". The fact that Pali contains so large a proportion of these
words seems to prove that most of them must belong to the special
vocabulary of the protocanonical Buddhist Prakrit. (It may be noted
in passing that they are, in general, not " common Prakrit " ; relatively
few, I believe, will be found in Prakrit guise in Sheth's *Prakrit Dic-
tionary*, for instance.) They characterize all periods of Buddhist
(hybrid) Sanskrit. We need a special dictionary of this language.

It is signalized, secondly, by peculiarities of syntax and style.
I recall the *yena . . . tena* construction (above) ; or the use of third
person singular verbs with subjects of any person or number, which
goes beyond the limits recorded by Pischel (*Gram. d. Pkt. Spr.*, §§ 515–17)
for any Prakrit, even for Ardhamāgadhī, which goes farther than the
other Prakrits.[1] Some of these (such as *yena . . . tena*) are likewise

---

[1] This use of *āsī* or *āsi* (Skt. *āsīt* or *āsīs*) is common Prakrit. In the Saddharma-
puṇḍarīka we find not only *āsīt* or equivalent (as well as *asti*) so used, but also, e.g.,
abhūt with subject *aham* or *tvam* (*SP.*, 22, 11 and 64, 11 both prose) ; and in fact any
third person singular verb may be so used (e.g., *aham . . . akarod*, 258, 7). In such
a late text as the Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra I note (8, 6) *atra tāḥ parṣadaḥ sarvā ekaikasmin
hi dr̥śyate* (3 sg. with pl. subjects). In Pali, *atthi* (Skt. *asti*) is used with plural subject
(Geiger, *Pali*, § 141), but that seems to be as far as Pali goes in this direction.

found in Pali ; even when this confirmation is lacking, it may reasonably be assumed that most of them were inherited from the proto-canonical Prakrit.[1]

I find a third indication of the linguistic independence of the hybrid Sanskrit of the Buddhists in its metrical principles. This subject requires more extended treatment than I can give to it here ; I am dealing with it more fully in a paper which I expect to publish shortly in a volume of studies in honour of Professor Kuppuswami Sastri of Madras. The metre of such a text as the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka is constructed on principles which in some important respects are quite different from any found in Vedic or Sanskrit metres, of any period. I may add that these principles have never been understood, or at least correctly formulated in print ; and that they were badly misunderstood by Kern and Nanjio in their edition, with results which seriously vitiate the form of the text as printed there. In part, at least, the same principles reappear in the metres of other Buddhist Sanskrit texts, such as the Lalitavistara. To mention only one important feature : the substitution of two short syllables for a long is permitted *ad libitum* (with certain definite restrictions in the case of some metres). This reminds us of the well-known *āryā* group of metres ; but in Sanskrit the principle is practically limited to that group, which stands quite apart from other metrical types ; and even there it is not applied in the same way. Very scant traces of a similar tendency were detected by Hopkins (*Great Epic*, 301) in the epic *triṣṭubh* ; but they may perhaps be interpreted differently, and in any case they never amounted to such a clearly defined metrical licence. Here again I believe that the hybrid Sanskrit of the Buddhists must be assumed to have inherited a feature of the protocanonical Prakrit ; for no other origin is easily conceivable. Moreover the *āryā* type, revealing somewhat similar principles in the one matter just mentioned, is commonly regarded as of Prakrit origin.

The fourth, and most striking, distinctive feature of this hybrid

[1] Similarly, *etad abhūt* (or *abhavat*, or the like) = Pali *etad ahosi*, " this thought occurred to . . ." (with genitive). An interesting construction, for which I do not know a parallel in Pali, but which is rather frequent in hybrid Sanskrit, is *mā* (*haiva*) with the optative in the sense of " isn't there danger that . . . ? " *SP.*, 76, 5 (prose) *tat kiṁ manyase śāriputra : mā haiva tasya puruṣasya mṛṣāvādaḥ syād* . . . " so what think you, Śāriputra ? isn't there danger that lying would pertain to that man (i.e. that he would be guilty of lying) ? " A useful " Outline Syntax of Buddhistic Sanskrit " has been published by Sukumar Sen in the *Journal of the Department of Letters*, University of Calcutta, vol. 17 (1928). It is, however, far from complete ; e.g., it fails to record the *mā* + optative construction just mentioned.

Sanskrit is, of course, the large number of forms which violate Sanskrit grammar, as to phonology or morphology or both. It is from these, if at all, that we must hope to discover the grammatical structure and original location of the protocanonical Prakrit whence they were taken over.

For this purpose we need first of all a comprehensive grammatical study of Buddhist hybrid Sanskrit. This is needed, incidentally, for other purposes, too; for the philological interpretation of the texts, and even for the correct editing of them. Most of the existing editions and translations are quite defective, because they were made without adequate knowledge of the grammar of the language, not to speak of its metrical principles and other features. In fact, almost nothing systematic has been done in this field. The only monograph I know, aside from Sen's (above, p. 505, n. 1), is Weller's dissertation, *Über die Prosa des Lalita Vistara* (1915), which limits itself to the grammatically less important part (the prose) of a single text. Otherwise we have only the stray observations of individual editors and translators, which are not only scattered and unsystematic, but often positively misleading.

The importance and interest of the subject seem to justify, then, the undertaking of a Grammar and a Dictionary of the hybrid Sanskrit of the Buddhists; and this is the task which I have ventured to set myself, perhaps audaciously, but I hope without minimizing its great extent and its substantial difficulties. It will require minute textual study of at least the older and more important literary works and the relevant inscriptions, and should involve frequent reference to such Tibetan and Chinese versions as are available. Having been engaged on it much less than a year, I can speak as yet only on the basis of very tentative and incomplete results; in fact, chiefly on the evidence of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, backed by only casual reading in other texts.

Unfortunately, as has been intimated, we cannot use the printed text of SP. uncritically (and this is only too commonly the case with editions of Buddhist Sanskrit texts). In part the editors may fairly be blamed for this; quite often they quote the correct reading in their critical notes, but introduce a false reading in the text, misled by erroneous ideas regarding the language or the metrical structure.[1]

[1] The "romanized and revised" edition of *SP.* by Wogihara and Tsuchida, Tokyo, 1934 ff., of which I have seen the first two parts, corrects some of these errors, but leaves the majority untouched. It by no means supersedes the Kern-Nanjio

But in part it was not their fault. Professor Lüders has shown (in Hoernle, *Manuscript Remains*, etc., 161) that the Kashgar recension of SP. contains noticeably more Prakrit forms than the Nepalese version on which the printed text is chiefly based, though with some reference to the group of Kashgar MSS. called collectively " O " by the editors. (Lüders' observation was anticipated by Kern, Preface to ed., vi.) Particularly in the prose, the Kashgar fragments show such Prakritisms often enough to suggest that originally the prose of SP. may have been, like that of the Mahāvastu, no less Prakritic than the verses. It looks as if an attempt had been made to " correct " it in later times. The verses may have escaped much of this process because the metre made it more difficult. But they did not escape it entirely, as Lüders shows (cf. also just below). A complete edition of the Kashgar recension, if it were possible, would doubtless come closer to the original form. Yet even it surely suffered some of the same " correction ", since sometimes its readings are less Prakritic than the Nepalese.

I wish further to emphasize the fact that in the verses of SP., initial consonant combinations, which in Prakrit would be simplified, were *always* pronounced as single consonants (cf. Kern, Preface to ed., xi, which understates the facts). For, not only do they fail to make long a preceding syllable ending in a short vowel ; but even originally long final vowels, which in this text are regularly shortened *metri causa* (but only *metri causa*, never otherwise !), are shortened before such combinations, when a short syllable is required, e.g., *SP.*, 90, 3 *viditvă trāṇaṁ* (third syllable short ; *-tvă* for *-tvā* occurs only *metri causa* ; here it implies *t-* for initial *tr-*). This metrical shortening proves that the composer pronounced a short syllable, despite the writing of two initial consonants. Such pronunciation of conjunct consonants, as if single, is never indicated internally ; that is, it occurs always, and only, where standard Prakrit phonology would require or at least permit it. (The beginning of the second element of a compound is usually treated as initial, though there is some fluctuation ; this accords perfectly with Prakrit usage.) Conversely, also, metrical *lengthening* of a final short vowel occurs before such combinations ; this necessarily implies the same Prakritic pronunciation,

edition. I cannot refrain from expressing regret, in passing, that the editors saw fit to compose their footnotes in Chino-Japanese, a needless hardship for western users of the book, and peculiarly inconsistent in a work which prints the Sanskrit text in roman transliteration.

since if two consonants were pronounced there would be no reason to lengthen the vowel. So, *SP.*, 27, 15, where all MSS. read *vineṣyatī* or °*te*; the former is doubtless to be read, and has metrical lengthening for °*tĭ* before the word *prāṇa-*, which was, therefore, pronounced *pāṇa-*. Such lengthening is very common *metri causa*, but never occurs otherwise.[1] Again, in *SP.*, 162, 6, we find a *pāda*: *vayaṁ ca lokaś ca anugṛhītaḥ* (or °*tāḥ*). The eighth syllable must be long; according to the writing, the metre is faulty. Hence the Tokyo edition emends to *anū*°. But all MSS. read *anu*°, and this must be kept. The word was pronounced *anugg*°, as in Pali (*anuggahita-*) and Prakrit (*aṇuggahia-*, °*hīa-*). Likewise *parigṛhītāḥ*, *SP.*, 89, 8, all MSS.; Tokyo edition emends to *parī*°, because a long syllable is required, but we must understand *parigg*°. There are not a few other metrical indications that originally the language was at least pronounced (whether written or not) more Prakritically than it is written in any of our MSS.

It is reasonable to assume with Lüders that where the MSS. differ, those showing Prakritic forms are more primary than those with correct Sanskrit forms; and that the original SP. was "written in a language that had far more Prakritisms than either of the two versions" (Kashgar and Nepalese). I cannot, however, agree with Professor Lüders when he goes on to say that he is "inclined to believe that the original was written in a pure Prakrit dialect which was afterwards gradually put into Sanskrit." This hypothesis makes it difficult to explain the many correct Sanskrit forms, often quite foreign to all known Prakrits, which occur side by side with Prakrit or semi-Prakrit forms, in all manuscripts and frequently guaranteed by the metre. To mention only a single instance, no Prakrit dialect has any trace of the Sanskrit perfect, except the isolated *āhu* (and *āhaṁsu*), and the like is true of Pali except in artificial *Kunstsprache* (see Pischel § 518, Geiger, § 171). But in SP. (including the verses) perfects, while not very common, are quite familiar, and are used no more incorrectly than other verb forms. I cannot doubt that they belong to the original language of our work, which was not a pure Prakrit but a hybrid dialect, based on a Prakrit, but partially

---

[1] Both editions emend to *vineṣyatĭ*, misunderstanding the matter here treated. Very rarely do we find a final short vowel before an initial consonant group in a metrically long syllable. Such cases are not a whit commoner in the MSS. than before single initial consonants. In all of them some special explanation must be sought, or emendation resorted to.

Sanskritized from the start. The extent of this original Sanskritization is very hard to determine; certainly it did not go as far as our editions suggest.

What, now, was the Prakrit, underlying Buddhist hybrid Sanskrit? According to Sylvain Lévi (cf. p. 502, n. 1 above), p. 511, "one of the languages of the land of Magadha." Lüders (l. c., 162) is more definite; on the basis of vocatives plural in -āho from a-stems, which he says are found " only in Māgadhī ", he thinks we may " assert that the original text of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka was written, if not in pure Māgadhī, in a mixed Sanskrit which was based on that dialect ".

I cannot agree with so definite a statement as this. The voc. pl. ending -āho cannot be called exclusively a peculiarity of Māgadhī (see No. 5, below). Our language lacks any trace of some of the most striking characteristics of Māgadhī, such as the substitution of l for r, and of ś for s; the nom. in e of a-stems was also not characteristic of it (see No. 11, below). Lévi's more cautious formula, " one of the languages of Magadha," may be right, or at least not far wrong. There is some evidence which suggests an eastern origin, at any rate. But even this can hardly be proved on linguistic evidence at present. Certainly no identification with any known specific Prakrit is possible. On the contrary, there is evidence which forbids any such identification. It seems that the language underlying hybrid Sanskrit was different from any Prakrit known to the later grammarians, at least. It is, however, possible to find a considerable number of individual points of agreement with specific Prakrits. And it turns out that nearly all of them point to either (1) Ardhamāgadhī, or (2) Apabhraṅśa. I have found very few Prakritic features which do not occur in one or the other of these, and a number which belong to one or both of them almost or quite exclusively. It is worth emphasizing that the language was different from Pali in many important ways, while specific agreements with Pali are very few, minor, and dubious. The same is quite as true of Māgadhī, with which I do not know of a single exclusive agreement. Indeed, I have failed to find, so far, any unmistakable evidence of specific agreement with any known Prakrit except AMg. and Ap. Yet our language also differs from each of these on important points.

I shall now list briefly the linguistic features of this language which seem to me to suggest specific agreement with particular Prakrits, ignoring those which are common to all or most Prakrits. The following collection, then, contains all the evidence now known

to me which could be used in localizing the protocanonical Prakrit of the Buddhists. It must be remembered that it is chiefly gathered from a single work, the SP. (to which I refer by page and line of the Kern-Nanjio edition) ; it therefore makes no claim to completeness or finality. The prime reference-work for most Prakrits is, of course, Pischel's grammar ; specific references to it are generally omitted as unnecessary. For Apabhraṅśa, however, it needs to be supplemented by the later works of Jacobi (*Bhavisatta Kaha*, abbreviated *Bhav.*, and *Sanatkumāracaritam*, abbreviated *San.*), and Alsdorf (*Kumārapālapratibodha*, abbreviated *Kum.*).

1. The nom. and acc. sg. masc. and nt. of *a*-stems ends very commonly in either *a* or *u*. (The regular Sanskrit forms are also common ; this may, indeed, generally be taken for granted of all the forms I shall mention.) Of these, *a* is common in Ap. and occasional in verses in AMg. and Mg. ; *u* is recorded by Pischel only for Ap. and Ḍhakkī[1] (a little-known dialect classed as midway between Mg. and Ap., and by some grammarians considered a form of Ap., though it agrees with Mg. in some important respects such as the change of *r* to *l*). Certainly *a* is a phonetic development from *as* (*aḥ*) or *am* (*aṁ*), with phonetic loss of final consonant. Similarly *u* in the nom. represents a shortening of *o*, the common Prakrit ending. Pischel regards *u* as phonetically derivable also from *am*, *aṁ*. It is true, at any rate, that *u* occurs also for other final *am* (as well as other *as*, *o*) ; likewise *a* for other final *as* and *am*. E.g. *ahu* = *aho* (interjection) 62, 4 and 16 ; *bhūya*, 96, 2, and *bhūyu*, 95, 1, = *bhūyas* ; *ahu* and *hu* = *aham*, 62, 15 and 195, 5, and often (probably also *ha* = *aham*, 195, 4, and 88, 10) ; *mahya* = *mahyam*, 86, 8, etc. These forms are largely regulated by metrical requirements ; they are the shorts to *o*, *am*. Yet *u* also occurs in a metrically indifferent position : *utpannu* 177, 9, initial in an *anuṣṭubh*. Were it not for such forms as *ahu* = *aham* (and Ap. *mahu*, *majjhu* = *mahyam*, etc., Pischel § 351), one might be tempted to question *u* from *am* as a phonetic change, and regard the acc. forms in *u* as transferred from the nom., and the nt. from the masc. For our language seems to have been similar to Ap. in this, that it tended to make no formal distinction between masc.

---

[1] The *u*-forms occur also, very often, in the language of the " Prakrit Dhammapada " of the Dutreuil de Rhins MS., edited first by Senart and later by Barua and Mitra. A systematic linguistic study of this dialect has yet to be made ; it has evident affinities with our dialect, and must certainly be taken into careful consideration in future work on this subject. To identify it with our dialect would be premature, to say the least.

and nt. forms (see No. 6, below), nor between nom. and acc. forms. Namely :—

2. In general, most Prakrit nom. and acc. forms are used interchangeably, as in Ap. Since final nasals and anusvāra are often dropped, especially *metri causa*, and final visarga likewise (see the preceding paragraph), some of these ambiguous forms may be regarded as proper to either case (i.e. derived by phonetic process from both Sanskrit forms). However, there are cases where metre, at any rate, cannot be directly concerned. Thus at the end of a *pāda*, or in an otherwise metrically indifferent position : *ṣaṣṭi* 303, 11, *agrabodhi* 310, 12, both nom. Or after a long vowel (as in Ap., Alsdorf, *Kum.*, 58), *tṛṣitāṁ dhāraṇī tarpet*, 126, 14 (for *dhāraṇīṁ*). AMg. and even Ś. (Pischel § 379) have noms. in *iṁ*, *uṁ*, regarded by Pischel as the phonetic equivalents of *ī*, *ū* ; in our text they are rare,[1] but cf. *lokadhātuṁ* nom. 31, 9, and *bodhiṁ* nom., probably to be read with MSS. for ed. *bodhi* in 63, 8. For metrical reasons, the acc. sg. of even fem. *ā*-stems may be reduced not only to *am* (*pūjam īdṛśīm*, 15, 3, *imam eva cintām*, 61, 11 *et passim*), but even to *a* (*ima buddhabodhiṁ*, 95, 8 ; *carya = caryām*, 120, 7, 149, 8, *et passim*), which also occurs as nom. of *ā*-stems. Since *nt*-stems, as in Pali and Prakrit generally, often add the thematic vowel *a* and are declined like *a*-stems, it follows that their nom. and acc. forms often coincide, ending in *a* or *u* like genuine *a*-stems. In the plural much the same state is found. Not only *ā* (without regard to the nature of the following sound), but also, and very commonly, *a* (as in Ap.) occurs as nom. pl. of *a*-stems ; the latter, to be sure, apparently only *metri causa*. Both occur also as acc. pl., especially *a* (*nirgata . . . dārakān*, 88, 1), but also *ā* (*buddhā ca bodhiṁ ca prakāśayāmi*, 47, 12, for *buddhān*). Nay, even the regular Sanskrit nom. ending *āḥ* is used as acc. : *magnāḥ*, 54, 8, agreeing with *sattvān* ; *-pūrṇāḥ* acc., 9, 3. The same is found in later texts, e.g., Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra, 6, 5, *apsaravargāś ca* (*pratigṛhṇa*), where the puzzled editor suggests emendation. As to *i*- and *u*-stems, we find an astounding variety and confusion in the nom.-acc. pl. forms ; those actually found resemble AMg. more than any other Prakrit, and contrast strikingly with the simple state of things in Ap. which uses *i*, *u* for both. The regular Sanskrit nom. in *ayas*, *avas* may be used as acc. : (*buddhān*) *bahavo*, 207, 10, *rātrayo* acc. even at the end of a *triṣṭubh-jagatī pāda* where *rātrī(ḥ)* would have done quite as well

---

[1] There are clear cases in the Lalitavistara, e.g. 49, 16 (Lefmann), *na cāsti tṛptiṁ* (all MSS.).

metrically, 91, 3, and even in prose *dundubhayaś* as acc. 69, 11. Besides, we find *ī* (and metrically *i*), *inas*, *īs* (even as nom. masc. !), *yas* as acc. (fem.), and in the fem. *īyas*, *īyo* (before a surd, 86, 1), *īyā* (before *ca*, 237, 3) and *iyas* as nom. or acc. indifferently. As in Ap., we thus find the language far advanced on the road to a declension containing only two forms in each number, a nom.-acc. and an oblique case, though the forms differ from those actually found in Ap. (The oblique cases, especially of the fem., are much confused in Prakrit generally.) It is as if, in this respect, we were dealing with an immediate precursor of a modern vernacular. The same confusion occurs in pronominal forms : *yūyam* as acc., 198, 1.

3. Very common are neuter nom.-acc. pl. of *a*-stems in *ā* (sporadic in various dialects, but especially AMg.) and *a* (usually *metri causa* ? regular in Ap.) : *balā*, 62, 2 ; *dvātriṅśatīlakṣaṇa mahya bhraṣṭā* (v. l. °*ṭa*) 62, 1. Though these have been interpreted as inheritances from Vedic, it is quite as likely that they are merely taken over from the masc., where they are very common (as we just saw) for Sanskrit *ās*, *ān* ; cf. No. 6, below.

4. Besides the general Prakrit ending *ū*, we find *u* in the nom.-acc. pl. of *u*-stems. This is not limited to syllables where the metre requires a short : *bahu me dharma bhāṣitāḥ*, 255, 7, in *anuṣṭubh* metre. This short *u* is not recorded by Pischel ; it seems to be characteristic of Ap. (Alsdorf, *Kum.*, 59).

5. Voc. pl. of *a*-stems in *āho*. Quoted by Lüders (l.c., see above) as exclusively Mg. But Ap. also has *aho*, *ahu*. The forms actually recorded by Jacobi and Alsdorf seem to show only short *a* in the penult, but this is probably a mere accident. They are not numerous in any case ; and it is an established principle of Ap. that stem-vowels in penultimate syllables may be either short or long (Jacobi, *Bhav.*, 28*, *San.*, 1, 9, 12 ; Alsdorf, *Kum.*, 55). Even the original *ā* of feminine stems is shortened frequently (usually, according to Jacobi, *Bhav.*, l.c.). The voc. pl. certainly contained *ā(ho)* originally, and it seems to me that our SP. form may much more plausibly be regarded as a link with Ap. than with Mg., since there is no other special agreement with Mg. The ending is not common, yet is sufficiently well authenticated ; e.g. in *kulaputrāho*, 253, 1, and 255, 11. All MSS. apparently have *amareśvarāho* in Lalitavistara (Lefmann), 47, 5. It is not recorded in AMg.

6. The pronoun *so*, properly masc., is also used as nt. nom. and acc. : *so* (= *tad*) *eva vicintayantaḥ* " pondering this same thing " 62, 7.

So Ap., and (in the forms *se*, *śe*) AMg. and Mg. (Pischel § 423). Jacobi and Alsdorf do not quote Ap. *so*, *su* as nt., but *San.*, 501, 3, has *su bhavaṇu* acc. nt., and both Jacobi and Alsdorf recognize *ehu*, *ihu* (= *eṣa*) as nt. This is probably to be regarded as part of the breakdown of the Sanskrit system of grammatical gender which characterizes Ap. and AMg. While some change of gender occurs in the other Prakrits and even in Sanskrit, it is these two dialects, and especially Ap., which carry it farthest; indeed to a point where, as Jacobi says (*Bhav.*, 31* f.), it is hardly possible to distinguish any longer between masc. and nt. in Ap.; and even the feminine is involved in the confusion. The verses of SP. approach this state. Very many nouns vary in gender, or at least show forms (in their own declension or that of modifiers) that were originally characteristic of different genders, and that, too, in close juxtaposition with one another. So in 87, 7 ff. the noun *yāna* is modified by both masc. and nt. adjectives and pronouns, in the same context. Masc. *catvāra(ḥ)* and nt. *catvāri* both go with the fem. noun *parṣāḥ*, 9, 1, 294, 11 (but *parṣa catasra[ḥ]*, fem., 25, 1); fem. *anuttarāṁ* with the nt. noun *jñāna(ṁ)* 10, 5 (perhaps influenced by thought of the fem. synonym *bodhi* ?); nt. *yāvanti* with the masc. form *sattvāḥ*, 9, 5, etc. The feeling for the distinctive generic force of the Sanskrit noun endings, and especially for the difference between masculine and neuter, was evidently very feeble.

7. Final *e*, *o* very commonly become *i*, *u* when the metre requires a short. (In such cases *e* is occasionally, but rarely, retained in the writing; I have noted only a few cases of *tĕ*, 85, 12 and 13; 131, 4; 152, 11; curiously *mi* seems to be regularly written for *me* in such cases.) This reminds us especially of Ap., but it occurs also in verses in AMg. and other dialects (Pischel § 85). Since *me* is not an Ap. form, and *mi* = *me* is very common in SP., we may possibly regard this as a link to AMg. rather than Ap. In the loc. sg. of *a*-stems, *i* for *e* is specially frequent (so also Ap.).

8. Ap. is peculiar among Prakrits in confusing the instr. and loc. pl. (Jacobi, *San.*, 11). We may see the influence of such a dialect in 85, 1, *vilokayanti gavākṣa* (v.l. °*kṣe*) *ullokanakehi* " they look out at window(s) and loop-holes ". The parallel *gavākṣe* indicates that *ullokanakehi* is felt as loc.

9. In 67, 11 occurs the nom. sg. form *tuhaṁ* = *tvam*. Pischel records it only for Ḍhakkī; it is elsewhere attributed to Eastern Apabhraṁśa, which perhaps means about the same thing (Jacobi, *San.*, xxv; cf. Alsdorf, *Kum.*, 59). Another nom. *tuva* occurs, 93, 9; it

stands of course for *tuvaṁ*, with metrical loss of anusvāra. The form *tuvam* is Vedic (by Sievers' Law, cf. Edgerton, *Language*, 10, 235 ff.) and occurs also in Pali (under conditions no longer regulated by Sievers' Law). It seems, according to Pischel, not to be recorded in Prakrit literature. Since, however, it is quoted by the Prakrit grammarians, no special significance should probably be attributed to this seeming agreement between our dialect and Pali.

10. The same holds good, I think, of the only other formal agreement with Pali which I have noted. Pali has oblique case forms of *ā*-stems in *ā*, besides *āya*, *ayā*. As Geiger (§ 81, 1) says, this is evidently a contraction of the other forms, or of the Prakritic *āa* (or *āe*). At least one such form occurs in SP. : *disā*, loc., 191, 5. Since contraction of vowels after loss of an intervening consonant is fairly common in Prakrit generally, I am not inclined to attribute much significance to this agreement with Pali, though the form seems not to be recorded in Prakrit.[1]

11. Very rare is the AMg. Mg. nom. sg. masc. *a*-stem ending *e*, for normal Prakrit *o* (note that even Ḍhakkī has *o*). Clearly *o* (whence *u*, Nos. 1 and 7 above) was the regular ending in the Prakrit underlying our dialect. I have not found *e* in any substantive.[2] Perhaps the only clear case of it is *uttare*, 313, 8, which can only be nom. sg. masc. : no v.l. is recorded. Less certain is *ke-cit*, 115, 2, where the Kashgar reading is *kiṁcit*; furthermore, it is not impossible that *kecit* is meant as a plural (the noun is *bhogu* according to the reading adopted in the edition, and it is doubtful whether *u* can pass as a nom. pl. ending of an *a*-stem; but there is a v.l. *bhāga*, which might easily be nom. pl.).

12. We have referred above to the extensive use of 3 sg. verb forms with 3 pl., and also 1 and 2 sg. subjects. This seems to ·be characteristic of AMg. (Pischel §§ 516–18), which goes much farther than any other known Prakrit (for a possible trace in Ap. see Alsdorf, *Kum.*, 65). AMg. also uses 3 pl. forms in the same way (l.c.). In SP., at least once, a 2 sg. form *abhūh* is used with 3 pl. subject (176, 12 ; well attested in both recensions ; only one Nepalese MS. *abhūt*).

---

[1] I reserve for another occasion a fuller discussion of the oblique cases of fem. nouns, merely observing that the usual endings (when not regular Sanskrit) in SP. are, for all oblique cases, *āya*, *īya*, *ūya*. The first of these agrees precisely with Pali, but Prakrit (*āe*, *āa*) is not far removed. In other Buddhist works we find *āye* (*ābhāye*, instr., Lalitavistara, 122, 20, Lefmann), *īye* (*kṣāntīye*, ibid., 162, 3), etc.

[2] But note Lalitavistara (Lefmann), 74, 4, *bodhisattva brahmakalpasaṁnibhe* (nom. sg. ; no v.l. recorded). This is the only case thus far noted in LV.

I have not noticed a 3 pl. with sg. subject, but in 108, 17 (prose) I believe we must read *abhūvan*, with most Nepalese MSS. for ed. *abhūma* (subject *vayam* ; Kashgar MSS. *āsīt*). All sorts of 3 sg. forms are used indiscriminately with subjects of all persons and numbers ; they include optatives, perfects, etc.

13. AMg. has verb forms in *e* which look like optatives but are used as past indicatives (Pischel § 466, end), and in general, as Pischel there shows, AMg. reveals a strange confusion between optative and aorist forms. Our text seems to have the same phenomenon. In 190, 7, *spṛśe* can only be past indic. in meaning (in describing a past Buddha's attainment of enlightenment, *spṛśe sa bodhiṁ*) ; usually such a form is optative (=*spṛśet*) but that is quite impossible here. Conversely, forms in *ī* occur, which look like aorists (Skt. -*īt*), but seem to be interpretable only as optatives : e.g., 291, 12, *sarveṣu maitrībala so hi darśayī* " he shall show the power of kindness to all beings". Metre cannot be concerned here, since it occurs at the end of a *pāda*. (Similarly 295, 2, 4, 7, 8.) The explanation is obscure ; probably it is connected with formal, phonetic confusion between *ī* for *e(t)* in the opt. and *ī* for *ī(t)* in the aor. In any case we have here another, and a rather striking, agreement with AMg.

14. Fairly common is the 2 sg. imperative ending *āhi*. It seems, according to Pischel (§ 468), to be specially characteristic of AMg. and (in the form *ahi*) Ap., though it occurs occasionally in other Prakrits. It is also known to Pali.

15. Quite frequent are presents of the type *kurva-ti*, from the root *kṛ*. They are found only in AMg. and (evidently under the influence of this canonical language of the Jains) in Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī and Jaina Śaurasenī ; not in Ap. Since Pali also has *kubbati*, but evidently as a borrowed form, not native to the dialect (it is used chiefly in gāthās), we may conclude that it was peculiar to the protocanonical Prakrit and to AMg. (of course in the form *kuvva-i*).

16. Another striking agreement with AMg. appears in the gerunds in -*yāna* = AMg. -*yāṇa(ṁ)*, peculiar to that dialect (Pischel § 592), e.g. *śruṇiyāna*, 61, 9, etc. ; about a dozen instances have been found in SP.

17. On the other hand, gerund-forms in *i* (and *ī*) point rather to Ap., where alone *i* is recognized as a gerund-ending. Pischel § 594 explains it as for Prakritic -*ia* with loss of final *a* (query : rather directly from -*ya* by " saṁprasāraṇa " ?). Jacobi does not recognize it as occurring in his Ap. texts, but there is at least one case in *San.*, *suṇi*, 445, 5 (" having heard that the sun, the friend of the world, had

gone to rest ") ; and three forms occur in *Kum.* (Alsdorf, 63). In SP. the ambiguity of the ending makes the interpretation often doubtful ; for the same ending occurs in the opt. and aor. indic. (above, No. 13), and sometimes even a noun form is conceivable (nom.–acc. sg. or pl. of *i*- or *in*-stem). But there are cases where it seems to me that any other interpretation than as gerund is implausible : *abhyokiri*, 325, 4 ; *upasaṁkramī*, 11, 11 ; *kārāpayi*, 152, 5 (to be rendered " and after causing stūpas to be made for them when they have entered nirvāṇa, he will honour them ", etc.) ; *upasaṁkramī*, 191, 1 (note that this clause stands between two precisely parallel clauses, in both of which the verb form is an unmistakable gerund, *viditva* and *abhyoki-riyāṇa*) ; *na uttarī prārthayi nāpi cintayī*, 213, 10, " (for we were satisfied with mere nirvāṇa,) not asking for, nor even thinking of, anything further." Perhaps also *abhyokiri*, 228, 15 (which, however, might be considered 3 sg. opt. with Burnouf and Kern).

18. " Short vowels, internal as well as final, are very commonly lengthened for purely metrical reasons, especially in AMg. and Ap." (Pischel, § 73). And further : " In Ap. verses, long and short vowels interchange according to the needs of meter and rhyme " (ib. § 100). In our dialect it is no exaggeration to say that any vowel may be lengthened or shortened to fit the metre. It is mostly final vowels which are treated so cavalierly ; they are lengthened and shortened without the slightest compunction, and so commonly that examples need not be quoted. But also internal vowels : *adhyeṣami*, 1 sg., for °*āmi*, 38, 2 ; *khudrāka* for *kṣudrakāḥ*, 127, 3 ; *anābhibhūḥ* for *ana*°, 128, 4. I regard this as another link with AMg. and more especially with Ap. ; no other Prakrit goes so far as these two. It should be added that the regular Prakrit " law of morae " applies here too. (The best statement I know is in Geiger, *Pali*, § 5f. : double, i.e. long, consonant, and also short nasalized vowel, may interchange with long vowel at any time, without regard to etymological origin.) Hence, instead of metrical lengthening of a final short vowel, it may be nasalized, or the initial consonant of the next word may be doubled. So *sādhuṁ* (=*sādhu*) *ti ghoṣaṁ*, 55, 12 (in the very next line occurs the equivalent *sādhū*) ; *daśa-ddiśāsu*, 32, 14 and often, also *daśasu-ddiśāsu*, 55, 11, etc. For further details see my article soon to appear in the volume in honour of Professor Kuppuswami Sastri.

I think this evidence is sufficient to indicate that the protocanonical Prakrit, on which Buddhist hybrid Sanskrit was based, was a dialect closely related to both Ardhamāgadhī and Apabhraṁśa, but not identical with either.