Non-Canonical Subjects in the Prakrit of Kōūhala's *Līlāvaī*

ANDREW OLLETT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Kōūhala's *Līlāvaī*, a romance in Prakrit verse from around 800 CE, has two types of constructions that present "syntactical difficulties" (according to the text's first editor): the use of *mhi* (I am) in the meaning of *maē* (by me), and the use of *amhēhi* (by us) and *tumhēhi* (by you) in the meanings of *amhē* (we) and *tumhē* (you). This article reviews the phenomena and puts them into the context of expressions of agency in related Indic languages, arguing that Prakrit's split ergativity is implicated in both cases. A further conclusion is that the particle *hi* is all but absent from Kōūhala's Prakrit.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to report two grammatical constructions that I noticed while editing and translating *Līlāvaī*, a romance in Prakrit verse from around 800 CE, by an author whom I will call Kōūhala. [1] Although both constructions relate to the way in which agency is expressed in Prakrit—and hence, more broadly, to the evolution of such expressions across the history of the Indic languages—they came to my notice for an entirely different reason. Most scholars of Middle Indic are aware, at least implicitly, that the repertoire of particles available in Sanskrit (e.g., *ēva*, *hi*, and *iti*) changes in interesting ways in Middle Indic languages such as Prakrit and Apabhramsha. Specifically, I noticed that the particle *hi* occurs very rarely in *Līlāvaī*. In Sanskrit *hi* occurs after the first word in a sentence and indicates that the sentence serves as a reason or explanation for a preceding statement; hence it is usually translated as "for." Since it is all but absent from Apabhramsha, and absent from the modern Indic languages (not even meriting an entry in Turner's *Comparative Dictionary*), it seemed likely to me that *hi* was simply not part of Kōūhala's Prakrit. [2] This hypothesis then led me to reconsider several passages in which the first editor of *Līlāvaī*, the learned

---

1. The author apparently identifies himself as Kōūhala in verse 22, although the possibility remains open that *kōūhalēṇa* simply means "enthusiastically" here. Following Upadhye 1966, I have called the author Kōūhala. My edition (Ollett 2021), and Upadhye's, are in the Devanagari script. In this article I will cite Sanskrit and Prakrit text in Roman transliteration (ISO-15919), with the following orthographic principles: (a) I write preconsonantal nasals as class nasals (hence *cintā* and *aṅga* rather than *ciṁtā* and *aṁga*); (b) I include a space between word boundaries falling between a consonant and a vowel (*tam amburāsiṁ* instead of *tamamburāsiṁ*); (c) I distinguish long *ē* and *ō* from short *e* and *o*. The manuscripts do not have separate signs for short *e* and *o*, and sometimes write *i* and *u* in their place; Upadhye introduced not one but two signs for each of these vowels in his Devanagari edition (one for a vowel that was variously written *ē*/*ō* and *i*/*u*, and another for a vowel that was written in all manuscripts as *ē*/*ō* but needs to be read as short for metrical reasons). Traditionally the Sanskrit vowels *ē* and *ō* have been transliterated without an indication of their intrinsic length because of the lack of a contrast in length in Sanskrit, but I have retained the macrons, even in Sanskrit, for the sake of uniformity between Sanskrit and Prakrit (and also to avoid the introduction of an entirely new diacritical mark, the breve, which in some scholarship serves to indicate shortness, in Indic languages other than Sanskrit, of a vowel that is inherently long in Sanskrit). A final terminological note: I use "Indic" rather than "Indo-Aryan" to refer to the language family that includes Sanskrit and Prakrit.

2. It occurs only once in Svayambhū's *Paümacariu* at 2.31.13.2: http://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil/2_prakrt/spaucaru.htm. I might therefore suggest emending this one instance (*sa hi*) to *sa vi*. I do not know how to account for the form of the Hindi particle *hī*, but in any case it is an exclusive particle, like Sanskrit *ēva*, and I doubt any historical connection to Sanskrit *hi*.

and careful A. N. Upadhye (first ed. 1949, second ed. 1966; all subsequent references in this article are to the 1966 edition), had identified the particle *hi*. Could these passages be read differently?

The particle *hi* occurs, in Upadhye's edition, in three environments:

1. in multiword expressions such as *tēṇa hi* ("that's why . . .," v. 576) and *ṇa hi* (v. 717);
2. after past particles, as in *paricintiyaṁ hi* (v. 167); and
3. after the pronouns *amhē* (first person plural, v. 435) and *tumhē* (second person plural, v. 264).

I will set aside the first category for the purposes of this paper. The second and third categories show that we are not, in fact, dealing with the Sanskrit particle *hi*. For it is not the case that the occurrence of the Sanskrit particle *hi* is restricted to the two environments listed above. By contrast, Sanskrit *hi* can come after any word at all—provided that it is the first word in a sentence. Most of the alleged uses of *hi* in *Līlāvaī*, since they do not occur after the first word, violate this restriction. The causal sense of *hi* is also more or less absent in all of the cases discussed below. One might suspect that *hi* is used simply as a verse-filler in *Līlāvaī*, without a causal sense or restrictions on its position, as it is sometimes used in inelegant Sanskrit. If that were the case, however, we would have to explain why it only happens to occur in the two environments listed above.

A detailed discussion of the long-term trajectory of the particle *hi*, from its Indo-European origins (*$\hat{g}^h i$; see Dunkel 2014: II.272–74) to its eventual disappearance, would require a separate treatment. But there is no doubt that it did disappear from the Indic languages, and that this disappearance is reflected in Middle Indic texts. As noted above, it has left no trace in Apabhramsha or the modern languages (Hindi, Bengali, Marathi, etc.). Within Middle Indic it is used frequently in Ashoka's inscriptions. It occurs frequently in Pali texts, in the expected second position. In Ardhamagadhi it appears somewhat more rarely, and much more often in verse than in prose; moreover it very often fails to be in second position.[3] This strongly suggests that it was already becoming an emphatic or indeed meaningless particle, parallel to its function in Epic Sanskrit to provide an extra syllable or to resolve a hiatus (Oberlies 2003: 4). In the language of the *niryukti*s, the versified commentaries on Jain canonical texts and some of the earliest available texts in Prakrit properly speaking, the particle *hi* is virtually absent.[4] In Gandhari the presence or absence of *hi* seems to be linked to genre and register. It appears in Buddhist literature, including the Gandhari *Dharmapāda*, but it is absent from inscriptions and the Niya documents from Central Asia, the latter of which are the latest Gandhari documents to survive.[5] This would again suggest that *hi* was a feature of Gandhari as a "Buddhist literary language" but not as a spoken or transactional language.

Within Prakrit literature properly speaking, which scholars sometimes call "Māhārāṣṭrī" or "Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī," there are, of course, plenty of authors who freely use the particle *hi*, among them Haribhadra and Uddyōtana, both quite close in time to Kōūhala. Moreover, a general principle of Prakrit grammar is that Sanskrit words can always be used, as long as they are made to conform to Prakrit's phonological and morphological rules. In accordance

---

3. For Ardhamagadhi I base these observations on the electronic texts of the Jaina *āgama*s prepared by Muni Deepratnasagar, available on https://jainelibrary.org/, ID numbers 003701–003789 (odd numbers only). As an example, see *Uttarajjhayaṇaṁ* v. 909 (25.30): *pasubandhā savvavēyā jaṭṭhaṁ ca pāvakammuṇā ~ na taṁ tāyanti dussīlaṁ kammāṇi balavanti* **hi** ~~ "The binding of animals (to the sacrificial pole), all the Vēdas, and sacrifices, being causes of sin, cannot save the sinner; **for** his works (or *karman*) are very powerful" (tr. Jacobi [1895: 140]).

4. I base this observation on the *niryukti*s collected in Vijayajinēndrasūri 1989.

5. I base this observation on the data collected in the *Gandhari Dictionary* of Stefan Baums and Andrew Glass: https://gandhari.org/

with this principle, a Sanskrit word like *hi* can never really be excluded from the Prakrit lexicon. We might nevertheless ask whether and how *hi* is used in Prakrit works prior to Kōūhala's *Līlāvaī*, and specifically in three well-known and influential works: Hāla's *Sattasaī* (*Seven Centuries*), Pravarasēna's *Sētubandha* (*Building the Bridge*), and *Taraṅgalōlā* (an abridgement of the earlier *Taraṅgavaī* by Pālitta).[6]

The particle *hi* is completely absent in the *Sētubandha*. In *Taraṅgalōlā*, a work of 1,639 verses, *hi* appears in its expected role once (v. 609): *tuṭṭhā hi tē gōrī* "For Gaurī is pleased with you." Twice, however (vv. 1357 and 1360), it appears in the expression *i(t)ō hi* "from here," where it has neither the meaning nor the position of Sanskrit *hi*. I assume that *iōhi* is actually a "clarification" of *iō* (< *itas*) using the ablative suffix *hi* (Pischel 1981 [1900]: §365), and hence formed in the same way as Prakrit ablatives like *mūlāhi* (*mūlā* [< *mūlāt] + *hi*).[7] This might help to explain one of its two occurrences in Weber's edition of the *Sattasaī*. In v. 602 it appears in the expression *iha hi daḍḍhagāmammi* "in this damn (lit. burnt) village." Once again, it has neither the meaning nor the position of Sanskrit *hi*. We may consider it, provisionally, an instance of clarifying case-marking applied to the indeclinable *iha*. The other occurrence is in v. 948, found only in the "second Teliṅga recension," where the text reads *kahaṁ taṁ ti ṇō hi jāṇāmō* "I don't know how it will happen." Here *hi* at any rate does not seem to have its usual meaning; just possibly *ṇō hi jāṇāmō* should be glossed as *nō abhijānīmaḥ*. All of this suggests that the particle *hi* was marginal in the literary language represented by these three works, and its use in later Prakrit texts may be due to the influence of Sanskrit.

If it is not the particle *hi* in the contexts noted above—namely, after past passive participles and after personal pronouns—then what is it? I argue that Kōūhala's Prakrit has two unusual, but nevertheless explicable, syntactic features. He uses forms of the copula to indicate agency, even in ergative (or passive) constructions, and he uses instrumental forms of the personal pronouns in place of nominative forms. Both involve what might be called "non-canonical subjects" (see Aikhenvald, Dixon, and Onishi 2001) or subjects that are expressed in ways other than the expected nominative case forms or person-number suffixes. These features are "unusual" in that they have not been noted at all in literary Prakrit. That does not mean, however, that they are isolated idiosyncracies. Grammatical systems related to the expression of agency—including the verbal system and the pronominal system—underwent significant changes over the *longue durée* of the Indic languages. Prakrit provides some evidence for some of these changes as they were taking place. Kōūhala's Prakrit, like some other Middle Indic languages, reintroduces person agreement to a past tense system that otherwise exhibits only gender and number agreement. And his use of instrumental forms for nominative forms anticipates developments in the pronominal system of several languages attested subsequently.

Before discussing the evidence of Kōūhala's *Līlāvaī*, I would like to address an apparent contradiction: on the one hand, I am claiming that Prakrit attests to changes that were taking place across the long history of the Indic languages and in particular, in the late first millennium CE; on the other hand, I maintain that Prakrit is "an exclusively literary language"

---

6. For the *Sētubandha* I used the SARIT version of Goldschmidt's edition, prepared by Eszter Berki and Dániel Balogh: https://github.com/sarit/SARIT-corpus/blob/master/pravarasena-setubandha.xml. For the *Sattasaī* I used my e-text, based on Weber's edition: http://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil/2_prakrt/halsatsu.htm and checked against the printed edition (Weber 1881). For *Taraṅgalōlā* I used an e-text I prepared from Bhayani's edition (Bhayani 1979).

7. There is one further occurrence in *Taraṅgalōlā*, namely, v. 722 (*iṇaṁ hi ṇaṁ*), but the meaning of the passage is obscure.

(Ollett 2017: 8), which was more or less fixed by the beginning of that millennium, and which in any case did not closely represent the language that Kōūhala or his contemporaries would have spoken. In a sense, this reflects the basic paradox of the Prakrit language: it was cultivated as a literary language by "an elective subculture of experts and connoisseurs" (Ollett 2017: 143), but it was cultivated *as* a "demotic" language, intended to represent the everyday speech of everyday people. This "demotic" character was surely "notional" (Ollett 2017: 70), and self-consciously so on the part of Prakrit authors, but still the ruse of writing in everyday language was central to the project of writing in Prakrit. Kōūhala himself provides one of the clearest examples of this trope. In the introduction to his poem, he says that his wife had asked him to tell her a story. He begged off, claiming ignorance of the "arts of language" (*sadda-sattha,* v. 38). But she insisted: "My love, who needs the 'arts of language'? All they do is block the path to enjoyment for people like me. In the end, language is just what reveals a meaning clearly, without troubling the heart. What need do I have of rules? That's why you should tell a story in the Prakrit language, one that can hold a simple girl's interest" (vv. 39–41).[8]

Even a highly standardized language such as Sanskrit is susceptible to influence from the vocabulary and structures of spoken languages. To take just one example, Jamison 2009 examines the growth of a type of noun formation in Sanskrit and Middle Indic (suffixation by *ka*) that was associated with more popular and informal registers of the language. She distinguishes between the "real" growth of this formation, which happened in the spoken language and was therefore "below-the-radar" (p. 314), from its "apparent" growth, which is to say, its increased frequency in the textual sources that are available to us (the quotation marks are Jamison's). In the case of the *ka*-suffix, Jamison accounts for its "apparent" growth by the textualization of discourse associated with more popular registers of Indic speech, including the teachings of the Buddha and his disciples: "the *ka*-forms that had been around all along have more fully penetrated textual materials that will be preserved" (p. 315).

If we conceive of Prakrit as a vernacular, then there is no reason why "real" linguistic changes should not "appear" in textual sources; if, however, we conceive of it as a stable literary language, the expectation is reversed, and we must explain why "real" changes can "appear" in our texts at all. My general impression is that syntactic change was much more likely to slip in to the texts than morphological change. Regarding morphology, there was a clear criterion for which forms were acceptable in literature and which were not: the usage of earlier poets, as well as the statements of the Prakrit grammarians.[9] But regarding syntax, the criterion could only have been what was intelligible to the author and his readers or listeners, especially in the absence of a textualized body of syntactic rules.[10] It might therefore have been possible to compose a Prakrit text that was, in terms of its phonology and morphology, largely consistent with earlier literary texts, but which nevertheless could replicate the syntactic patterns of everyday speech. In this way "real" speech could have been more than a purely notional source of linguistic authority for Prakrit authors, although I

---

8. [. . .] *piyaama kiṁ tēṇa saddasatthēṇa ~ jēṇa suhāsiamaggō amhārisajaṇassa ~~ uvalabbhaï jēṇa phuḍaṁ atthō akaatthiēṇa hiaēṇa ~ so ccēa parō saddō ṇiccō kiṁ lakkhaṇēṇa mha ~~ ēmēa muddhajuaīmaṇōharaṁ pāaāē bhāsāē* [. . .]

9. We do not know what the state of Prakrit grammar was at the time that Kōūhala was writing. By the beginning of the ninth century, it is very likely that the *Prākṛtaprakāśaḥ* (*Light on Prakrit*) ascribed to Vararuci had already been composed and at least some grammatical descriptions of Prakrit in Prakrit verse were available (see Ollett 2017: 143–53).

10. I assume that the syntactic tradition of Kashmir, represented by the *Samanvayadik* (Slaje 1992), was not available to Kōūhala, but in any case syntax is well known to be underrepresented in traditional Indian grammar.

doubt that it was conscious or deliberate on their part. Perhaps Kōūhala might have corrected the phenomena described below if they were pointed out to him as inconsistent with earlier Sanskrit and Prakrit models. Or perhaps he would simply ask, with his wife, whether the meaning was revealed clearly enough.

The examples from *Līlāvaī* below are cited from my edition (Ollett 2021). Among the differences between my edition and Upadhye's edition (Upadhye 1966), some are based on a different interpretation, and some are based on a different reading of the manuscript evidence. Upadhye used manuscripts from Jaisalmer [J], Patan [P], and Bikaner [B], as well as an article by M. Ramakrishna Kavi [K] that cited verses from an as-yet unidentified manuscript. I used, in addition, a manuscript from Nepal [N].

FIRST PERSON MARKERS

Kōūhala uses the phrase *paricintiamhi* quite often. Here is its first occurrence in the text, when one of the main characters, Vijaāṇanda, reaches the ocean (v. 167):

(1)   *daṭṭhuṁ tam amburāsiṁ ṇaravaï **paricintiamhi** hiaēṇa* . . .
         When I saw the ocean, Lord, **I thought to myself** . . .

Upadhye's edition reads *paricintiyaṁ hi*. In a long note (p. 344), discussing similar phrases throughout the text, he states that the reading of PJ is generally *paricintiyamhi*, whereas B often reads *paricintayamhi*. We can add to this summary that N reads *paricintiamhi* everywhere except v. 167, where it reads *paricintaamhi*. After briefly entertaining the possibility of adopting B's reading and understanding the form as *paricintayāmi*, he favors PJ's reading and offers two interpretations: first, to understand *paricintiyamhi* as *paricintiyaṁ hi*, i.e., a past passive participle in the neuter gender followed by the particle *hi*; second, to understand it as *paricintiyā mhi*, i.e., as the past participle in the feminine gender followed by the first person copula *mhi*. The participle would have an active rather than a passive sense. Since the last interpretation is acceptable only when the speaker is a woman, Upadhye says "we can accept one or the other interpretation . . . according to context."

Upadhye was a careful editor whose conjectures, I found in re-editing *Līlāvaī*, were confirmed again and again. Nevertheless I do not think any of the three interpretations he offers for this phrase is correct.

(1) It cannot be a finite verb in the first person singular (*paricintayamhi* = *paricintayāmi*), because the manuscripts favor the reading *paricinti(y)amhi*, and the form in several similar phrases, discussed below, is that of the past passive participle rather than the present stem (*pucchiamhi* in 183, *bahumaṇṇiamhi* in 192, *bhaṇiamhi* in 863). Pischel (1981 [1900]: §454) has noted that the first person singular ending is properly *āmi* in Prakrit and that the ending *amhi* is "falsch."[11] Moreover a verbal stem ending in *aya* in Sanskrit should end in *ē* in Prakrit, giving *paricintēmi*.

(2) If it represented *paricintiaṁ hi*, one wonders why it is consistently written as *paricintiamhi*, with a conjunct consonant. Moreover, as noted above, Kōūhala hardly uses the particle *hi* at all. In any case *hi* would not have its usual position or meaning in ex. 1. If it is a "verse-filler," it would have to be explained why it only occurs in expressions like this.

(3) Finally, it is unlikely to represent *paricintitā asmi* because, as Upadhye notes, we should expect this form only when the speaker is a woman, and not, as in the case above, when the speaker is a man; the corresponding masculine form, were it to exist, would be

---

11. Pischel refers to Theodor Bloch (1893: 47), who explains the confusion of *ahmi* for *āmi* as influenced by past participles ending in *mhi*.

**paricintiomhi, which does not occur. And on top of this, we would have to motivate the active use of the passive participle.

So how do we explain *paricintiamhi*? First, let's make some generalizations about its use. It is only used in the first person, when the narrator relates a thought that he or she has had. As noted above, it makes no difference to the form whether the narrator is the male Vijaāṇanda (167, 188, 251, 987) or the female Kuvalaāvalī (464, 473, 605, 648, 778). It is followed by the word *hiaēṇa* when it occurs at the end of the first line of a *gāhā* (251, 648, 778). When it occurs at the beginning of a line, it is sometimes followed by the word *hiaē* (473, 605, 684, 987) and sometimes not (188, 464). It is sometimes preceded by a converb, the agent of which is the same as the person whose thoughts are introduced by *paricintiamhi*: *nivvaṇṇiūṇa* (251, 778), *vilaviūṇa* (648), *daṭṭhuṁ* (167) or *daṭṭhūṇa* (684). This should make it clear that *paricintiamhi* would be translated into Sanskrit as *paricintitaṁ mayā* "I thought," and is accompanied by the adverbial modifier *hiaē* or *hiaēṇa*, both meaning roughly "to myself" (lit. in or by means of my heart).

The only question that remains is its form. On this interpretation, *paricintiamhi* should correspond in meaning to *paricintitaṁ mayā* in Sanskrit, that is, a passive or impersonal verb, with the agent expressed in the instrumental case. It seems clear that *mhi* is functioning as a marker of a first person agent, and hence equivalent to the instrumental forms *mayā* or *asmābhiḥ* in Sanskrit. The problem is how we account for this form. Does it derive from an instrumental form of the first person pronoun? Or should we consider it to be the same as the first person singular form of the verb "to be," which is also *mhi* in Prakrit (from Sanskrit *asmi*)?[12]

The first option might seem to be more attractive: if there is a form in Prakrit that means "by me" to hand, why postulate that this is *also* expressed by the form that otherwise means "I am"? One problem, however, is that the required form is not exactly to hand. *Mhi*, as an instrumental form of the first person pronoun, is neither attested in literature outside of the potential cases in question here nor mentioned by the Prakrit grammarians.[13] One possibility, then, might be to say that all of the cases of *mhi* in the sense of *mayā* in *Līlāvaī* are to be corrected to one of the forms mentioned by the grammarians, for instance, *mi*. Another, more acceptable possibility would be to say that *mhi* derives from *amhē*, a form that is mentioned by Hēmacandra. In fact there is one case where *mhi* does seem to represent *amhē,* used in an instrumental sense:

(2)   *abbīaṁ piva hiaaṁ tissā **uvalakkhiaṁ amhi***
        We could tell that she [and the princess] were one at heart. (784)

Context tells us that the agent of *uvalakkhiaṁ* should be plural (see *bhaṇiā amhēhi* in the very next verse).[14] As I will argue below, we here have a case of a nominative form *amhi* (shortened from *amhē*) being used in an instrumental sense. But it seems impossible to give a similar explanation to the instances of *mhi*, for two main reasons: first, as noted below (p. 280), an agent marked with *mhi* is described by an adjective in the singular; second, *mhi* must be enclitic, both in terms of its position and to account for the loss of the initial vowel, but there is already an enclitic form of the first person plural pronoun that Kōūhala uses

---

12. I thank the reviewers for *JAOS* for suggesting that I give further thought to a derivation of *mhi* from an instrumental form of the first person pronoun.

13. See Hēmacandra 8.4.109–10 (Pischel 1877: 94), which lists the forms *mi*, *mē*, *mamaṁ*, *mamaē*, *mamāi*, *maï*, *maē*, *mayāi*, and *ṇē* in the singular, and *amhēhi*, *amhāhi*, *amha*, *amhē*, and *ṇē* in the plural.

14. So Upadhye (p. 370), who interprets *amhi* as an instrumental plural form of the first person pronoun.

frequently in an instrumental sense, namely, *ṇē.* In fact I have noted no instances where *mhi* has first person plural reference.

It seems more likely to me that all of the cases of *mhi* in *Līlāvaī,* except for the one just discussed, represent the copula *mhi* (Sanskrit *asmi*). When the primary verbal predicate is a past participle, which shows gender-number agreement rather than person-number agreement (or "adjectival concord" rather than "personal concord" in the terms of Masica 1991: 260), the form *mhi* serves as a first person marker. We can start with cases where the verb is in the passive voice, and the speaker is the *patient* of the verbal action:

> (3)   ***pariumbia mhi*** *vaaṇē ṇaaṇēsu kavōlapāsēsu*
> He kissed me (= "**I was kissed**") on my mouth, my eyes, and my cheeks. (853)
>
> (4)   *aviṇaamaggaṁ haalōaṇēhĩ* ***ṇīa mhi***
> My damn eyes led me ("**I was led**") down the road to immodesty. (489)

In these examples, *mhi* clearly represents *asmi.* Functionally, *mhi* gives person-marking to a verb that lacks it. In passive sentences like these, the person-marking is associated with the *patient* rather than the agent, who is either unexpressed (ex. 3) or expressed, as usual, by a separate instrumental phrase (ex. 4). A participle + *asmi* (or *aham*) in passive constructions is standard in Sanskrit as well.

Incidentally, these examples show, by the shortening of *ā* before *mhi,* that the initial conjunct *mh* counts as two consonants. If we strictly observe the constraint that a vowel can be followed by no more than two consonants in Prakrit, then when the participle is in the neuter singular nominative case and therefore ends in *aṁ,* the sequence *aṁ mhi* will have to be modified in one of the following four ways: (1) reading *mh* as a single consonant, namely, an aspirated nasal; (2) reading *amhi,* thus absorbing the *anusvāra* into the following nasal, which tends to be supported by the manuscripts; (3) reading *aṁ hi* (the reading Upadhye generally adopts in his edition, without manuscript support); and finally (4) reading *aṁ mi,* eliding the *h* rather than the *m,* which is read by B alone among the manuscripts of *Līlāvaī,* but may be found in other texts (see p. 290 below).

In cases like *paricintiamhi,* we can understand the form *mhi* in a similar way, namely, as providing person-marking to a verb that lacks it. The major difference, of course, is that it is the *agent* rather than the *patient* that is marked in these cases. *Paricintiamhi* is one of several cases where *mhi* accompanies an intransitive verb that is used impersonally, expressed as the neuter singular form of the past participle (*paricintiaṁ*). Since the verbal predicate in these cases does not agree with the agent in gender-number marking, we would not expect a form equivalent to "I am" (*asmi*) to do the person-marking, but rather a form equivalent to "by me" (*mayā*). And in fact Kōūhala very often uses phrases like *bhaṇiaṁ ca maē* "and I said," where the agent of speaking is marked as first person by an instrumental form of the pronoun, as we would expect. What, then, are we to make of cases like *paricintiamhi*?

We can exclude the possibility that *maē* is used for a first person agent that is grammatically singular whereas *mhi* is used for one that is grammatically plural, because in several examples the agent is described by an adjective in the singular (here *haāsāē* = Sanskrit *hatāśayā,* "whose hopes are dashed"):[15]

> (5)   *taṁ tārisaṁ dupecchaṁ daṭṭhūṇa hu bhavaṇaaṁ* ***haāsāē***
>   ***paricintiamhi*** *hiaē haddhī kiṁ ṇērisaṁ ēaṁ*

---

15. Upadhye prints *paricintiyaṁ hi* in 684 and *uvasappiyaṁ hi* in 597.

> When I saw the house in that state, so painful to look upon,
> my hopes were dashed, and **I thought to myself** [=**I whose hopes were
> dashed** . . .],"Surely this is not really how it is." (684)

(6)   *uvasappiamhi amuṇiavihipariṇāmaṁ haāsāē*
        I [=**I whose hopes were dashed** . . .] **drew near**, knowing nothing of how
        my fate would change. (597)

These examples also show that the participles do not agree with the agent. Besides the marking by *mhi*, the agent is referred to by an adjective in the *instrumental singular* case (feminine in these examples), whereas the participles are neuter singular (*paricintiaṁ* and *uvasappiaṁ*). It would therefore appear that *mhi* marks first person singular agreement, and not just with participles that are used passively, where *mhi < asmi* is expected, but also with participles used impersonally, where we would expect *maē < mayā* instead of *mhi < asmi*. Further examples of the latter are *vicintiamhi* "I thought" or "thinking was done by me" (407) and *bhaṇiamhi* "I said" or "speaking was done by me" (863).[16] I myself am inclined to see "the same" *mhi* in both cases, i.e., not to interpret one as derived from *asmi* and the other from some other source, in part because its person-marking function is the same in both environments.

If *mhi* can express a first person agent with participles used *impersonally*, then we might expect it to do the same with participles used *passively*. In fact we have seen *mhi* used with passive participles above (exx. 3 and 4), but there it marked the *patient* of the verb. Consider, however, the following examples:

(7)   *bahu maṇṇiamhi*[17] *bōhitthiēhĩ jaṁ taṁ samullaviaṁ*
        I was grateful for what the sailors said. (192)
(8)   *ēvaṁ hiaē paribhāviūṇa valiamhi*[18] *vakkala-varillaṁ*
        Thus in my heart I gave up, and **I twisted**
        my outer garment, made of bark. (650)

Here we might be inclined to interpret the participles, which are in the neuter singular, as impersonal, were it not for the fact that a patient is explicitly mentioned ("what the sailors said," lit. "what was said by the sailors," and "my outer garment, made of bark"), in both cases in the neuter singular (*bōhitthiēhĩ jaṁ taṁ samullaviaṁ* and *vakkala-varillaṁ*). Hence the participles are used passively. The word *mhi* would therefore seem to mark the *agent* of the verb. Whether *mhi* is to be taken as expressing an agent or patient seems to depend on whether another patient is expressed in the sentence, as in exx. 7 and 8, or not, as in exx. 3 and 4. The same principle applies to the following example:

(9)   *tē jāṇa-vattiā* **pucchia mhi** *sāhēha kō kattha*
        I asked the crew members [=they were asked by me], "Please tell me who
        is where." (183)

The participle (*pucchiā* before *sandhi*) is in the masculine nominative plural, agreeing with *tē jāṇa-vattiā* "the crew members," who are the patients of the verb. Because this construction is clearly passive, Upadhye was forced to abandon his usual interpretation of past

---

16. In the former case, Upadhye referred to his interpretation of *paricintiaṁ mhi* (p. 357). In the latter case, Upadhye prints *bhaṇiyamhi* and explains in his notes (p. 372): "*bhaṇiyamhi = bhaṇitā + asmi = bhaṇitavatī asmi*."

17. Upadhye prints *maṇṇiyaṁ hi* and refers to his interpretation of *paricintiyaṁ hi* in his notes (p. 346).

18. Upadhye prints *valiyamhi* and gives *valitaṁ hi* (*valāmi vā*) in his Sanskrit translation. In his notes (p. 367) he suggests as an alternative "*valiyamhi = valitāsmi*, for *valitavatī asmi*, past p[assive] p[article] used actively."

passive participle + *mhi* as equivalent in meaning to past active participle + *asmi*. In his notes (p. 346) he attempts to explain either *mi* (B's reading) or *mhi* (the reading of P and J, to which we can add N) as a special instrumental form of a first person pronoun, deriving it from either *mē* or *amhē*. These derivations are forced and ad hoc, as I noted in connection with *amhē* above (p. 278). Once again, I think it is preferable to interpret *mhi* in the same way in all of these examples, namely, as the marker of a first person singular argument for a verb that lacks person agreement; the argument is either the agent or the patient, depending on the verb's transitivity and the presence or absence of another patient.

I therefore propose that in Kōūhala's Prakrit, *mhi* had ceased to function exclusively as a copula, but was in the process of being grammaticalized as a first person marker for a variety of participial constructions. I say "in the process of" because, for Kōūhala, *mhi* was only one of several strategies available for marking a first person argument. As noted above, the non-enclitic instrumental pronoun *mae* is still used in passive and impersonal constructions, and in fact outnumbers *mhi* by a little less than five to one (sixty-eight vs. fourteen instances). But it is noteworthy that *mae* and *mhi* are never used in the same sentence. This suggests that they fulfill similar functions. What considerations might have led Kōūhala to use one or the other form? They are, of course, metrical alternatives, and we might expect *mae*, being non-enclitic, to carry greater emphasis than the enclitic *mhi*. Hence we might expect *mae* to be used especially in cases where the topic changes, while *mhi* is used in cases where a first person argument is already known from context.

This does indeed seem to be the case. By my count, a little more than half of the verses where *mhi* is used have an *explicit first person form* in the *immediately preceding verse*, where it is the *same person* who is marked with both *mhi* and the other first person form. I am using this as a proxy for contexts where the listener will know exactly to whom *mhi* refers, which, I propose, is the condition of its use. Here is one such example:

(10) *ēvam **ahaṁ** pi ṇarāhiva vāāsammāṇajaṇiapariōsō*
uvaviṭṭhō dūrāsaṇṇamaṇaharē maṇisilāvaṭṭē
*ṇivvaṇṇiūṇa doṇṇi vi ṇaravaï **paricintiamhi** hiaēṇa* [. . .]
In the same way **I** too was gratified to be honored by their words,
Your Majesty, and I took my seat on that charming jewel-studded
slab at some distance from them. When I took a close look
at them, Your Majesty, **I thought to myself** [. . .]. (250–51)

A first person subject has already been "activated," by being explicitly evoked (*ahaṁ*), by the time the listener reaches *paricintiamhi*. By contrast, this condition is not met in the vast majority of contexts in which *mae* is used. In fact, *mae* is often used to *change* the referent of the first person, from one speaker to another. Thus, when an explicit first person form occurs in the preceding verse, it has a *different* referent than the following *mae*. Here is an example:

(11) ***aham** ēttha tassa ujjāṇavāliā māhavīlaā ṇāma* [. . .]
*ēvaṁ sōūṇa **mae bhaṇiā** sā bhaṭṭaütta dhaṇṇāsi*
"My name is Māhavīlaā, and **I** am the keeper of his garden [. . .]."
When I heard this, good sir, **I told** her she was lucky [. . .]. (374–75)

Here *aham* refers to Māhavīlaā, and after she finishes speaking, Kuvalaāvalī, to whom *mae* refers, resumes her narration.

So far we have only discussed first person examples. Kōūhala does use *si*, the second person singular of the copula, after participial predicates as well. But in all of these examples, *si* would correspond to *asi* in Sanskrit: in other words, it marks a nominative subject, the patient

of a passive verb or the agent of an active verb, rather than an instrumental subject, the agent of a passive verb. Examples include *ciñcilliā si* "you were decorated" (94), *parisēsiā si* "you were left" (655), *saccaviō si* "you were seen" (709), and *caliā si* "you went" (850). But the copula *si* serves an additional function in *Līlāvaī* that is worth noting here: it combines with *taṁ*, the reflex of **tvam* 'you', to form *taṁ si* (perhaps better printed *taṁsi*), an innovative nominative singular form of the second person pronoun. The motivation of such a form is not difficult to guess: *taṁ* is also the reflex of the demonstrative pronoun in a variety of case forms (corresponding to Sanskrit *tam*, *tām*, and *tat*), and it would be ambiguous if used on its own. Note, too, that *si* is not added to other forms of the second person pronoun. Here is one example:

> (12) **taṁ si** *ṇa* **gaā si**
>   **You have** not **gone**. (550)

Not only is the verb here marked as second person singular by the addition of the copula *si* (*gaā si* = *gatāsi* in Sanskrit), but a subject pronoun is used, which is also formed by the addition of the copula *si,* in this case to the inherited personal pronoun. This compound pronoun is used frequently in *Līlāvaī* (twelve times) and in other Prakrit texts, such as the *Vasudēvahiṇḍī*.[19] Although *si* is not used with an instrumental sense (= *taē* "by you") in *Līlāvaī*, it is broadly comparable to *mhi* in that it provides person-marking to a form that would otherwise lack it (although here a personal pronoun is used in addition, which is never the case for *mhi*). I have not noted other forms of the copula (*mhō < *smaḥ* or *tthō < *staḥ*) used with participial predicates, or indeed anywhere else, in *Līlāvaī*.

Let us then entertain the hypothesis that Kōūhala's Prakrit includes a verbal construction that is innovative from the perspective of Sanskrit and earlier Prakrit texts. From the point of view of its formation, there is nothing very surprising about new verbal constructions arising from the collocation of existing verbal forms. Sanskrit has plenty of them. I am thinking, first of all, of the so-called periphrastic future (*luṭ*), historically formed from a verbal adjective in *tṛ* followed, in the first and second person alone, by a form of the copula. Nor is it surprising that the new construction has arisen in the past tense, for there was a tendency for conjugated past tense forms to disappear from the Indic languages: they are marginal in early Prakrit, and they have completely disappeared from Kōūhala's language. Instead, as is well known, past participles are used to express past tense verbal predicates, such as *kaaṁ* "[it was] done" instead of the aorist *kāsīya* "did." Because such participles are opportunistically passive—that is, passive if the verb is transitive and active otherwise—this led to an asymmetry between the past and the non-past verbal systems in Middle Indic, and indeed for many registers of Sanskrit: the agent of active verbs was generally expressed with a nominative case form in the non-past and with an instrumental case form in the past. To use the terminology of Dixon 1994, widely adapted subsequently, the loss of conjugated past tense forms led to a system of split ergativity: in the non-past, the agent of an intransitive verb (S) and the agent of a transitive verb (A) shared nominative case marking against the patient of a transitive verb (O), which had accusative case marking, resulting in nominative–accusative alignment (S = A); in the past, the agent of an intransitive verb (S) and the patient of a transitive verb (O) were generally expressed with nominative case marking, in contrast

---

19. For instance, *Vasudēvahiṇḍī*, p. 191 (Caturavijaya and Puṇyavijaya 1983): *jaï ēvaṁ **tumaṁ si** mē puttaṁ viṇāsentaō, taō tava samīvē ēva pāṇē pariccayāmi* "If you were to have my son destroyed like this, then I will die right here in front of you"; *Līlāvaī* v. 708: *kattha puṇō **taṁ si** dīsihisi* "Where will you be seen again?"; *Līlāvaī* v. 931: *vaccejjasu vijaāṇanda **taṁ si*** "You must go, Vijaāṇanda." This confirms the usage *tumaṁ si* pointed out in the *Vasudēvahiṇḍī* by Alsdorf (1936: 327), which he suspected of containing an interpolated *si*.

to the agent of a transitive verb (A), which had instrumental case marking, resulting in ergative–absolutive alignment (S = O). Split ergativity is one of the major innovations in the verbal system of the Indic languages and had knock-on effects on their pronominal systems as well.[20]

I am summarizing this relatively well-known linguistic situation because it seems to me that Kōūhala's innovations, at least those discussed in this article, are related to the expression of the categories of person within a verbal system characterized by split ergativity. In such a system, there is some uncertainty—or at least I myself feel uncertain—about which participants should count as the *subject* of the verb. In the part of the system with nominative-accusative alignment, it seems clear that nominative forms should supply the subject. But in the part of the system with ergative-absolutive alignment, is the subject the patient, in the nominative case, or the agent, in the instrumental case? In the case of transitive verbs we might be inclined to the first option, which would also commit us to reading these forms as passive:

(13) *sahasatti samāsīṇā* **saccaviā** *sā* **maē** *kumarī*
       was seen by me *or*
       Immediately **I saw** the princess sitting there. (904)

Of course, such constructions are "passive" in the sense that the verbal predicate, *saccaviā*, agrees in gender and number with the patient of the verb. But this is simply how transitive verbs are expressed in the past tense in Kōūhala's Prakrit; an active construction is not possible. Moreover, with most intransitive or optionally intransitive verbs, there is no patient for the verb to agree with, which might lead us to identify the agent, expressed in the instrumental case, as the subject:

(14) **siṭṭhaṁ** *ca* **maē** *tissā sundari ēvaṁvihāu amhē vi*
       It was said by me to her, "beautiful girl, we are just as you see" *or*
       "Beautiful girl," **I said** to her, "we are just as you see." (377)

Of course, it is not always possible to identify an *instrumental* case form as the agent, and therefore subject, of a verb in the past tense, because verbs of motion express their agent in the nominative case (see ex. 12).

Hence agents are marked differently in the past tense according to the transitivity and semantics of the verb. In this situation, *mhi* effectively serves to mark first person agents in the same way: regardless of whether we would expect the agent to be nominative or instrumental in Sanskrit (*aham* or *mayā*), it can be marked with *mhi* in Kōūhala's Prakrit. Now I am not claiming that agent-marking is the primary function of *mhi*—it does mark first person *patients*, after all, as we saw in exx. 3 and 4—but only that it happens to play this role in the verbal system of Kōūhala's Prakrit.

The creation of a new kind of verb-marking in the past tense, as limited and optional as it is in *Līlāvaī*, bears comparison with a similar development in the language of the Niya documents (Jamison 2000), a variety of Gandhari that was used in the kingdom of Kroraina, on the southern rim of the Tarim basin, in the third century CE. In these documents, forms adapted from the copula, *mi* (< *asmi*), etc., added to what is etymologically a past passive participle, mark the *agent* of the verb, not the *patient*, as first person singular (etc.). Hence *triṭhemi*, formally equivalent to *dṛṣṭō 'smi* in Sanskrit, does not mean "I was seen" but "I

20. See Klaiman 1978; Hock 1986; Bubeník 1995 and 1998: 133–60 for discussions of the historical dimensions of this system.

saw." If the subject is expressed, it is in the nominative case. See the examples cited by Jamison (2000: 71–72 [exx. 15–16], 70 [ex. 17]):

> (15) **ahu** *sumiṁna* **triṭhemi**
>   **I saw** a dream. (*triṭhemi* ≈ *dṛṣṭō 'smi*) (157)
> (16) *eda vivada* **tuo** *aṁñatha* **kiḍesi**
>   **You treated** this dispute differently. *kiḍesi* ≈ *kṛtō 'si*) (46)
> (17) *ra[ja]de* **jaṁna** *dura* **gataṁti**
>   **People went** far from the kingdom. (*gataṁti* ≈ *gatā santi*) (760)

With this new construction the past tense exhibits the same nominative-accusative alignment (S = A) as the present tense, thus generalizing a single alignment pattern throughout the verbal system (Jamison 2000: 67). I am not claiming there is any *historical* relationship between the new constructions in Central Asian Gandhari and Kōūhala's Prakrit; in fact, the former may reflect the influence of Gandhari's Iranian neighbors, as a reviewer has pointed out. They just reflect similar responses to the asymmetry of the verbal system in general and the problem of subject-marking in the past tense in particular.

The Niya documents invite us to ask whether the addition of *mhi* onto a past participle represents a new *inflected* form, as it does in Central Asian Gandhari (Jamison 2000: 66). Here there is a crucial difference. In the Niya documents, the newly formed past tense has person-number agreement, expressed univocally through the ending; before the ending the participle always appears in its masculine form (supported, in the singular at least, by the equivalence of the masculine singular ending *ē* and the thematic vowel *ē* of secondary verbs, as Jamison notes [2000: 66]). In *Līlāvaī* the forms with *mhi* have a "double-marking" system, with person-number agreement expressed through *mhi*, and gender-number agreement expressed by the ending of the past participle. In some passive constructions of transitive verbs (exx. 3 and 4), to which we might add cases of *si* with verbs of motion (ex. 12), these forms of agreement agree, as it were: the *same* participant is marked by agreement on the copula and the participle. In the majority of cases, however, they disagree. This includes other passive constructions of transitive verbs (exx. 7, 8, and 9), where the participle shows gender-number agreement with the *patient* while the copula shows person-number agreement with the *agent*.[21] It also includes constructions that I have been characterizing as "impersonal" (*bhāvē prayōgaḥ*), where the participle's gender and number (neuter singular) does not agree with anything else in the sentence, and the copula expresses person-number agreement with the agent (exx. 1, 5, and 6).

I am inclined to say that *mhi* agrees with the "subject," that is, the principal argument of the verb, in all cases. But this would entail that some passive constructions are "really" passive, in that the subject is the patient, while others are only "apparently" passive, in that the subject is the agent, despite the participial verb's agreement with a patient. The latter analysis would connect Kōūhala's Prakrit to modern Indic languages like Hindi, where the past tense, derived from past passive participles, is only "apparently" passive, since it alternates with true passive constructions: *maĩnē kiyā hai* "I did," parallel to Sanskrit *mayā kṛtam* "It was done by me," alternates with *vō kiyā gayā hai*, "It was done." But it is nevertheless difficult to find adequate measures of whether such a change has taken place in Kōūhala's Prakrit and to assess the degree to which it has. To avoid this question, I would suggest grouping the

---

21. I must note, however, that all of the examples concerned exhibit the form *amhi*, resulting in my view from either *aṁ mhi*, i.e., a neuter singular participle (exx. 7 and 8) or *ā mhi*, i.e., a masculine plural participle (ex. 9); there are no examples of *o mhi*, and while a skeptical reader might think that *amhi* is a fixed form (see p. 290 for some contrary evidence), this suggestion would at least resolve the question of double-marking.

various forms to which *mhi* corresponds—nominative agents and patients, and instrumental agents—together as "core arguments" of a verb. We can then make the following generalization: (a) *mhi* is a generic marker of the first person singular, as *si* is for the second person singular, and (b) is employed to satisfy a constraint requiring "core arguments" of a verb to be marked, where (c) such an argument has not already been expressed by a first person pronoun. Regarding (a), we can mention an observation made long ago by Ludwig Alsdorf, who saw that forms of the copula in the *Vasudēvahīṇḍī* were very often used with participial verbs. He noted that they "could have come to be regarded as equivalents of the nominatives of the personal pronouns" (1936: 326), such that *mi* (Kōūhala's *mhi*) provided the same expression of a first person subject as *ahaṁ*. Regarding (c), we saw that pronouns and *mhi* are not used together and appear to be used under rather different pragmatic conditions (p. 281 above). What still requires motivation is condition (b). As noted above, the participles that supply the principal verbal forms of the past tense in Prakrit are not marked for person. If the third person is unmarked, as I assume it is, then listeners would try to find a third person argument for the past tense forms they encounter; in other words, past tense forms are third person unless marked otherwise. This leads to the following constraint:

> (18)   A first or second person participant who is a core argument of a verb must be expressed.

If context provides sufficient evidence for listeners to identify the core argument of a verb as first or second person, then this constraint might be violated. But in general a person marker must be present somewhere in the sentence, either in the form of a pronoun (*bhaṇiaṁ ca maē*, *ṇē bhaṇiaṁ*) or in the form of a person-marking clitic (*bhaṇiamhi*); one rarely encounters *bhaṇiaṁ* on its own in *Līlāvaī* in the meaning "I said."[22]

Finally, I will mention one possible exception to the use of *mhi* as a person-marking clitic.

> (19)   *siṭṭhaṁ ca maē amba**mhi** ajja malaāalammi **ramiāō*** [. . .]
> "Mother," I said, "**we were playing** on Mount Malaya today [. . .]." (461)

Here *mhi* cannot be a marker of the first person singular, since the participal verb, *ramiāō*, has plural marking. I take it to refer to the agent ("X played"), since there is nothing else in the nominative plural with which it might agree if it referred to the patient ("X was played with"). This strongly suggests that *mhi* represents *amhi*, that is, the first person plural pronoun in the nominative case, which is usually *amhē* in Prakrit. Although *amhi* is not attested as a first person plural pronoun, or even taught by the Prakrit grammarians in this sense, it is easily derived by shortening from the standard nominative pronoun *amhē*, as we saw previously (ex. 2). This interpretation is corroborated by Kōūhala's frequent use of the pronoun *tumhi* 'you (pl.)', rather than *tumhē*, as a nominative case form.[23]

INSTRUMENTAL SUBJECTS

So far we have been discussing cases where person-marking is achieved by means of a clitic *mhi*, attached to a participial verb. In some examples that clitic refers to an argument that, were it to be expressed, would be in the nominative case; in others the argument it expresses would be in the instrumental case. We speculated that this was linked to the

---

22. The two counterexamples I have found, where the agent of speaking is first person but not marked, are v. 42, in the context of a conversation between the poet (speaking in the first person) and his wife, and v. 651, where Kuvalaāvalī says a prayer to herself before tying a noose around her neck.

23. See, e.g., v. 1208 *tā sāhippaü kē tumhi* "so tell me: who are you?"

asymmetries of case- and person-marking in Prakrit's verbal system, which exhibits split ergativity. What about the use of personal pronouns? Do we see a similar overlap in the form and function of nominative and instrumental pronouns?

Before answering this question, we can put it in some broader historical context. It is well known that some Indic languages have generalized the instrumental form of several personal pronouns, i.e., they use these forms in contexts where we would expect a "direct" or nominative case (e.g., equational sentences, agents of present-tense verbs, agents of intransitive verbs in the past tense, etc.). Several languages have a direct form of the first person singular pronoun that derives from the Sanskrit instrumental form *mayā*: these include *maï* of Middle Bengali (Chatterji 1926: §539, p. 809), *maĩ* of Hindi and Punjabi (Oberlies 2005: 17; Jules Bloch 1965: 188), *me* of Romani (Beníšek 2020: 31), and probably *mī* of Marathi (Jules Bloch 1965: 188; 1970 [1914]: 221). Similarly the second person singular *tuï* of Middle Bengali, used as a nominative, is in origin an instrumental form (Chatterji 1926: §548, p. 817).

In the plural Turner (1962–66: 43) noted "a tendency in the mod[ern] stage for the successors of **asmē* [i.e., *amhē*, AO] to be replaced by the inst[rumental]." As examples of this phenomenon he cites Romani *ame* 'we' from *amhēhi*; similarly Romani *tume* 'you (pl.)' from *tumhēhi*. (Beníšek [2020: 32] affirms their derivation from instrumental forms rather than the nominatives *amhē* and *tumhē*.)

This development would appear to be widespread, although it is not always perfectly clear. Chatterji (1926: §539, p. 810) notes that the first person forms *amhē*, *āhmē*, and *ahmē* appear in the Old Bengali *Caryā*s, where they are used for both the instrumental and nominative; he also notes that **amhi*, the expected reflex of the nominative *amhē*, does not occur in the *Caryā*s. He concludes (1926: §540, p. 810) that "the *ē* form would seem to represent the Late MIA. instrumental [. . .]; and the *i* form, the original nominative [. . .]. But already from before OB. times, there was a confusion between them, with the result that *ē* practically ousted the *i* in OB. and MB [. . .]." The same would appear to apply to the Old Bengali form *tumhē* (1926: §550, pp. 818–19), that is, it is an instrumental form in origin, used for both the instrumental and nominative.

I suspect that the same account may hold for the forms *tumhe* and *amhe* in Old Western Rajasthani. Of the two forms, at least *tumhe* is used as an instrumental, and in those cases Tessitori (1913–15: §87) derives it from *tumhēhi*. But it is also used as a nominative-accusative form. In those cases Tessitori derives it from *tumhē*. The final vowel of the Middle Indic form *tumhē* ought to have been shortened in Old Western Rajasthani. Tessitori suggests that this resulted in both *tumhe* (the final *e* representing a short vowel) and *tumhi*, both of which are attested. I don't know whether and how often the length of the final vowel can be determined from metrical considerations, but *prima facie* I would guess that *tumhe* is, at least in some cases, an instrumental form used as a nominative-accusative. Regarding the first person plural, Tessitori notes (§84) the forms *amhe* and *amhi* in the nominative-accusative, the final *e* of the former "being commonly considered as short." He considers these to be orthographic variants, but I wonder, again, whether we have two historically distinct forms, *amhi* from *amhē* and *amhe* from *amhēhi*.

Finally I will mention Marathi. Jules Bloch (1970 [1914]: §208) takes the nominative forms *āhmī* and *tuhmī* back to *amhē* and *tumhē*. I am no expert in Marathi historical phonology, but this seems very unlikely given the shortening and disappearance of final vowels (§37), and Bloch even cites these forms as exceptions to the rule (§39). More likely they should be derived from *amhēhi(ṁ)* and *tumhēhi(ṁ)*, which Bloch gives as the source for the Marathi instrumental forms *āhmīṁ* and *tuhmīṁ* (§209).

Going back further in time, the nominative-accusative and instrumental forms of the pronouns were still *formally* distinct in Apabhramsha. In the first person plural, for instance, all of the instrumental forms have *hi* or *hĩ*, and none of the nominative-accusative forms do (de Clercq 2010: §61–62). This does not mean, however, that they were completely distinct from a *functional* perspective. Bubeník (1998: 95) noted that Svayambhū, a ninth-century Apabhramsha poet, "sometimes overuses the Acc[usative]/Instr[umental] form of the 2nd Pers *pai(ṁ)*," that is, uses a form that is historically instrumental (*païṁ < tvayā*) as the subject of an intransitive verb, which should normally be a nominative (*tuhuṁ*). He gives the following example:

(20) **païṁ jīvēvahu** *aṭṭha je vāsara*
You will live eight more years. (5.16.4)

I found several further instances in Svayambhū's *Paümacariu*:[24]

(21) **tumhahĩ bhaṇahu** *cāru*
You are saying something pleasing. (5.84.22.1, vol. 3, p. 239)
(22) **amhahĩ** *sayala vi* **galiyāhimāṇa**
All of **us** have been **humbled**. (5.88.3.9, vol. 3, p. 270)
(23) **tumhehĩ** *puṇu sayalaĩ* **aï-samattha**
By contrast, all of **you** are **quite capable**. (5.86.8.6, vol. 3, p. 243)
(24) **ḍajjhaho tumhehĩ**
May you burn. (5.88.1.1, vol. 3, p. 269)

Going back even further, to Prakrit, the use of instrumental forms in place of nominatives has hardly been noticed at all. It is missing, for instance, from Sukumar Sen's detailed "Historical Syntax," where he notes "[t]he agentive or subjective instrumental" only "in passive construction" (1953: §28). There is, of course, no direct line of development from Prakrit to Apabhramsha to the modern vernaculars, and the fact that historically instrumental forms supply the nominatives (direct cases) of several modern languages should not necessarily lead us to expect instrumentals to be used as nominatives in Prakrit. Nevertheless, that seems to be exactly what we see in Kōūhala's *Līlāvaī*. The forms involved are the first and second person plural of the personal pronouns, for which we would normally expect *amhē/tumhē* in the nominative, and *amhēhi(ṁ)/tumhēhi(ṁ)* in the instrumental. (Of alternative stem forms of the second person plural, *tubbh-* does not occur at all in *Līlāvaī*, and *tujjh-* only in the genitive or stem form *tujjha*.) Here are two examples in which the instrumental forms are used, as expected, to mark the agent of a transitive verb in the past tense:

(25) *tattha* **amhēhi** [. . .] **diṭṭhō** [. . .] *gaṇāhivaī*
There **we saw** Gaṇēśa. (806)
(26) *kattha imō* [. . .] **laddhō** [. . .] **tumhēhĩ** *ia-varaṅguliō*
Where did you get this ring? (1049)

In some cases, however, the exact same form is used where we would expect a nominative. Consider the following examples:

---

24. The page references are to the edition of Bhayani (1953–60), but I found these examples by searching the electronic text that Eva de Clercq has prepared (http://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil/2_prakrt/spaucaru.htm). I have left out a few cases that were not totally clear to me, but it is notable that all of these cases occur at the very end of the *Paümacariu*. It has been established that the *Paümacariu* was composed in several phases, and Svayambhū's son Tribhuvana helped to revise and complete it (Bhayani 1953–60: 41–47). I would hypothesize that the use of the instrumental for the nominative is a license that Tribhuvana, but not Svayambhū, felt he could take.

(27) *tā* **tumhēhi** [. . .] ***acchaha*** *muhutta-mettaṁ*
      So **you stay** for just a moment. (264)

(28) *sō sumuhuttō jattha a puṇō vi* **tumhēhi dīsihiha**
      That will be a great moment when **you are seen** again. (513)

(29) *kiṁ* **tumhēhi** *ṇa* **āṇaha** *jaha bhaṇiaṁ puvvapurisēhiṁ*
      Don't **you know** what earlier generations have said? (883)

In all of these examples Upadhye avoids the difficulty by either reading *tumhē vi* or *tumhē hi*.[25] These are all of the examples where a finite verb agrees in *person* and *number* with a subject expressed by an instrumental case form.

In a number of other examples it is an adjectival predicate that agrees with such a subject, and in these cases the concord is adjectival (gender-number) rather than personal (person-number), as in the Apabhramsha examples 22–23. In all cases Upadhye prints *amhē hi* or *tumhē hi*.[26]

(30) *etth'* **amhēhi** [. . .] ***dupavvaïā***
      We are **poor renunciants** here. (210)

(31) *ajj'* **amhēhi kaatthā** [. . .] *tumammi saccaviē*
      Today **we** are **fulfilled** by seeing you. (1161)

(32) *tass'* **amhēhi** [. . .] ***dhūāo*** *jāāō*
      We are the two **daughters** he had. (803)

(33) **amhēhiṁ** *pi ṇa* **bhaddā** [. . .]
      I'm not so **nice,** either [. . .]. (917)

The last example is important, because the metrically guaranteed final *anusvāra* of *amhēhiṁ* prevents us from understanding it as simply a variant of either *amhē hi* (with the particle *hi*) or *amhē vi* (with the particle *vi*), which both the tradition of manuscript B and Upadhye have tried to do in many of the above examples.[27] The use of *pi* afterwards is another reason for excluding the interpretation *amhēhi = amhē vi*.

Here, finally, are some examples where *amhēhi* or *tumhēhi* supplies the subject to a past participle:[28]

---

25. Upadhye prints *tumhē hi* in 264. The reading of B here, *tumhettha*, may be an attempt to resolve the syntactic difficulty; several of the following examples indicate that the tradition of B is inclined toward "correcting" forms such as *tumhēhi*. In 513 Upadhye prints *tumhē vi*, but puts *tumhē hi* in a footnote and translates *yūyaṁ hi drakṣyadhvē*. In 883 he also prints *tumhē hi*, but says in a footnote that "P would read *tumhēhi*." (I don't know on what basis he says this; Upadhye accessed this manuscript through a transcript, but does not mention interword spacing, either in the original manuscript or in the transcript.) The commentary in B translates it simply as *yūyaṁ*.

26. The commentary in B translates *amhēhi* as *vayam* in 210. In 1161 Upadhye read *amhēhiṁ* with J, which is corroborated by N (*aṁhēṁhiṁ*). B reads *amhēyi*, which may stand for *amhē vi*, an attempt to correct the text. In his notes (p. 381) Upadhye notes that the reading of P, *ajjamhēha*, "may stand for *ajja + amhē + iha*." In 803 *amhēhi* is read by J and N, against P's *amhē u*.

27. Upadhye was particularly perplexed by 917. As he said in his notes (p. 374): "This *gāhā* presents some syntactical difficulty; the com. *amhēhiṁ pi = vayam ēva*. Taking *amhēhiṁ* as Inst. pl., we may expect *bhaddā = bhaddaṁ*."

28. In 435 Upadhye and I read *amhēhi* with J and P, although B's *amhē vi* is supported by N. In his notes (p. 538) Upadhye says: "*amhē . . . kaha vi alayaṁ hipattāō* [= *abhiprāptāḥ*]." Perhaps realizing that *hipatta* or *ahipatta* is almost never used in Prakrit (neither are mentioned in the *Pāia-sadda-mahaṇṇavō* [Sheth 1986]), he follows this up with: "Either *hi* is an expletive, or an interjection of 'hurry,' if we do not want to take *hipattāō = abhiprāptāḥ*." The commentary of B simply says *vayaṁ* [. . .] *prāptā(ḥ)*. In 1162 Upadhye notes (p. 381) that "[t]he reading *amhē vi* is more convenient," although it is read only by B; N reads *amhēhiṁ*, in agreement with P.

(34) *alaaṁ* [. . .] *kahavi* **amhēhi pattāō**
   We finally **reached** Alakā. (435)

(35) *ecciraālaṁ ēvaṁvihē vi* **amhēhi** *iha bhavāaaṇē asahāā* **parivasiā**
   For so long **we have lived** alone in this temple to Śiva. (1162)

(36) **tumhēhi** *mi* **parisuḍhiā**
   you, too, must be **tired** (1209)

This last example, like ex. 33 above, shows that *tumhēhi* cannot simply stand for *tumhē vi*, since the inclusive particle *vi* is already present here in the form *mi*.[29] Here, near the end of the text, Upadhye finally asks (p. 382): "Is it that *tumhēhi* is used here for *tumhē* and *amhēhi* for *amhē* at 1162?" The examples given above show that he was right. The insight apparently came too late for it to be systematically reflected in his edition and notes. I sympathize: having finally thought about the use of *mhi* in *Līlāvaī*, I had to introduce a number of changes in the proofs of my own edition, and have even changed my mind since then about how the form should be printed.[30] Nevertheless, the credit must go to A. N. Upadhye, to whom Prakrit philology in general owes so much, for discovering this rare usage in the Prakrit of *Līlāvaī*.

In Kōūhala's Prakrit the first person plural pronoun has an enclitic form, *ṇē*, which can be used in the sense of the instrumental, dative, or genitive (exactly parallel to *naḥ* in Sanskrit). As it turns out, this form, too, can be used as a subject pronoun, agreeing with a predicate adjective in the nominative:

(37) *mahāṇumaī-tavōvaṇaṁ jēṇa* **ṇē ṇīā**
   By whom **we were led** to Mahānumatī's ashram. (1149)

(38) *dūraaraṁ* **ṇīā ṇē** *sukaï-pariṇaiē*
   How far **have we been taken** by the ripening of our good *karma*! (1222)

Have instrumental forms of personal pronouns thus replaced nominative forms as subjects in Kōūhala's Prakrit? Upadhye (and I) have read the inherited nominative forms, *amhē* and *tumhē*, in a number of passages, but I have a number of doubts. First, these nominative subjects are used less frequently than instrumental subjects (6/4 for *amhēhi/amhē* and 4/4 for *tumhēhi/tumhē*). Second, *every single instance* of *amhē*, and two out of the four instances of *tumhē*, are followed by the particle *vi* in Upadhye's text; in three of these cases (vv. 591, 900, and 1041), manuscript N actually reads *amhēhi* or *tumhēhi*, and the context does not seem to warrant the inclusive particle in any of these passages. We should also include the new pronouns, *amhi* and *tumhi*, which appear to be formed from *amhē* and *tumhē* respectively. But in the one instance where *amhi* occurs, it expresses the agent of a passive verb (ex. 2). *Tumhi* is used for *tumhē* three times (vv. 558, 1059, 1208), but twice it is actually used where we would expect *tumhēhi*:

(39) *eāi mi ramaṇīāĩ jāĩ* **bhaṇiāĩ tumhi** *puṇaruttaṁ*
   All these pleasing things **you said** again and again. (860)

(40) *suiraṁ* **ṇipīḍiō tumhi** [. . .] *hatthō*
   You squeezed my hand for a long time. (710)

Even admitting several textual gray areas, it seems relatively clear that for Kōūhala the instrumental of *amhē* and *tumhē* is well on its way to replacing the nominative. This is, however, clearly not the case for the corresponding singular pronouns. I have not noted

---

29. N and B avoid the difficulty by reading *tumhē vi hu* (N) or *tumhē vi ya* (B) at 1209.
30. I have printed *aṁmhi* throughout in my edition, although I now think (p. 279) that it should be read *amhi*.

any instances at all of the instrumental forms *maē* or *taē* used where one would expect the singular nominatives *ahaṁ* and *tumaṁ* (or *taṁ si*; see p. 282 above) of the first and second person respectively.[31] This may not be accidental: in the plural, but not in the singular, the instrumental and nominative forms are formed from the same stem, but have different metrical values. This means that, for instance, *amhē*, *amhēhi*, and *amhēhiṁ* (with the optional *anusvāra*) can function as metrically conditioned alternatives, which happen to be similar to each other, while the same cannot be said of *maē* and *ahaṁ*, or *taē* and *tumaṁ*.

We have thus seen a relatively pervasive use, in certain grammatical categories, of "instrumental subjects" where we might have expected nominative forms, and similarly a use of reflexes of the nominative pronoun where we might have expected an instrumental agent. I myself would not categorize such uses under the older philological rubric of "confusion" of cases (see on this point Jamison 2000: 65–66). Rather, Kōūhala's language, like all language, is in flux. In earlier Sanskrit and Prakrit there were arguably no "instrumental subjects": the instrumental case, when it did express an agent, was limited to passive and impersonal constructions, where the agent was not a core argument of the verb. This all changed with the loss of a conjugated past tense and the development of split ergativity: in the past tense instrumental agents were probably increasingly felt to be core arguments of the verb, much like nominative agents in the present tense. These underlying similarities in the argument structure of verbs, despite differences in their morphosyntactic realization, are probably implicated in the use of *mhi* for both "nominative agents" and "instrumental agents," as well as "nominative patients." And they are also probably implicated in the use of historically instrumental forms as grammatical subjects. Much later, in the stage of the language represented by Hindi, the distinction between nominative subjects and instrumental subjects was reinstated by marking the latter with the ergative postposition *nē*. (Note that I am certainly not claiming any direct link between Prakrit and Hindi, but only comparing the way in which they have developed inherited structures.)

These syntactic features of *Līlāvaī* are unexpected, from the perspective of Sanskrit and earlier Prakrit, but I am confident that they can be found in other texts. For example, in reading Haribhadra's *Dhuttakkhāṇaṁ* (*Rogue Stories*), I came across the following examples (5.32 and 5.81 in Krümpelmann's 2000 edition):

(41) *sahassacchō **āgarisō mi***
     I attracted Indra.
(42) *amhē **abhisandhiyā tumē***
     You have beaten us.

In ex. 41 *mi* might be interpreted at *mhi*, i.e., "by me," although the use of *mē* earlier in the verse raises the possibility that *mi* is simply a variant of the particle *vi*. In ex. 42 *tumē* clearly expresses the agent of the verb *abhisandhiyā*, which, being passive in form, should require an instrumental agent. But this interpretation is complicated by a similar expression, *aïsandhiyā tumē amhaṁ*, in a preceding passage (5.77): here, too, *tumē* is clearly the agent of the verb, but the patient, *amhaṁ*, appears to be expressed in the genitive case, which raises the possibility that the past participle *aïsandhiyā* expresses the agent rather than the patient.

---

31. Incidentally, *Līlāvaī* uses the unusual form *tuaṁ* at least once (v. 512) for the nominative singular of the second person, and ms. N consistently writes this form where the other mss. write *tumaṁ*. It may also bear mention that the plural forms are often used with singular reference. In the first person the variation in number seems to be idiomatic (see *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 1.2.59); in the second person it seems likely to me that it indicates different degrees of intimacy, with *tumhē* being used for strangers and *tumaṁ* for friends. *Līlāvaī* does not provide evidence for the systematic "use of the plural for the singular," which happens in later languages (Schwarzschild 1954: 135–36).

Haribhadra, who probably lived in the eighth century CE, was close in time to Kōūhala, and probably influenced him as well, so we might expect to find further instances of Kōūhala's "peculiar" usages in Haribhadra's Prakrit works.

If I am right in my interpretation of these phenomena, then the particle *hi* does not occur in Kōūhala's Prakrit except in compound particles (*tēṇa hi* and *ṇa hi*). The general lesson is that we should view apparent instances of *hi* in Prakrit with skepticism. Some Prakrit authors do use *hi*, of course, but we should probably see this usage as part of the complex and relatively unstudied phenomenon of "Sanskritisms" in Prakrit (see Jacobi 1908–9).

But to arrive at this lesson, we have had to cut through some untended thickets of Prakrit syntax. Those have revealed certain patterns that, on the one hand, have not been previously noted in Prakrit but, on the other, are not entirely unexpected, given the subsequent development of the Indic languages. One is the repurposing of a form of the copula (*mhi*) as a marker of first person subjects across active, passive, and impersonal constructions, where a distinction is made between nominative and instrumental subjects in Sanskrit. The other is the use of instrumental forms as subjects of nominal sentences and active-voice participial verbs, both of which could only take nominative subjects in Sanskrit. Both phenomena point to the restructuring of the past tense in Middle Indic and, in particular, to the promotion of oblique arguments (in the instrumental case) to core arguments of a verb.

REFERENCES

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y., R. M. W. Dixon, and Masayuki Onishi. 2001. *Non-Canonical Marking of Subjects and Objects*. Typological Studies in Language, vol. 46. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Alsdorf, Ludwig. 1936. The Vasudevahiṇḍi, a Specimen of Archaic Jaina-Māhārāṣṭrī. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* 8.2/3: 319–33. [Rpt. in *Kleine Schriften*, 2nd ed., ed. Albrecht Wezler. Pp. 56–70. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2001.]

Beníšek, Michael. 2020. The Historical Origins of Romani. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Romani Language and Linguistics*, ed. Yaron Matras and Anton Tenser. Pp. 13–48. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bhayani, Harivallabh C., ed. 1953–60. *The Paumacariu of Kavirāja Svayambhūdeva*. Singhi Jain Series, vols. 34–36. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan.

———, ed. 1979. *Saṃkhitta-Taraṃgavaī-kahā: An Early Abridgement of Pādalipta's Taraṃgavaī with Gujarati Translation*. Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology.

Bloch, Jules. 1965. *Indo-Aryan from the Vedas to Modern Times*. Tr. Alfred Master. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve.

———. 1970 [1914]. *The Formation of the Marāṭhī Language*. Tr. D. R. Chanana. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Bloch, Theodor. 1893. *Vararuci und Hemacandra*. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann.

Bubeník, Vít. 1995. Passives and Ergatives in Middle Indo-Aryan. *In Historical Linguistics 1993: Selected Papers from the 11th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, ed. Henning Andersen. Pp. 49–57. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

———. 1998. *A Historical Syntax of Late Middle Indo-Aryan (Apabhraṃśa)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Caturavijaya and Puṇyavijaya. 1983. *Pūjyaśrīsaṅghadāsagaṇi-vācakanirmitaṁ Vasudēvahiṇḍi-prathamakhaṇḍam*. Bhavnagar: Shri Jain Atmanand Sabha.

Chatterji, Suniti Kumar. 1926. *The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language*. Calcutta: Calcutta Univ. Press.

de Clercq, Eva. 2010. *The Apabhraṃśa of Svayambhūdeva's Paümacariu*. Mumbai: Hindi Granth Karyalay.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Dunkel, George E. 2014. *Lexicon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominal-stämme*. 2 vols. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Hock, Hans Henrich. 1986. "P-Oriented" Constructions in Sanskrit. In *South Asian Languages: Structure, Convergence and Diglossia*, ed. Bh. Krishnamurti. Pp. 15–26. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Jacobi, Hermann. 1895. G*aina Sûtras*, Part II: *The Uttarâdhyayana Sûtra, The Sûtrak*ritâṅga *Sûtra*. Sacred Books of the East, vol. 45. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

———. 1908–9. Ueber das Prakrit in der Erzählungs-Litteratur der Jainas. *Rivista degli studi orientali* 2: 231–36.

Jamison, Stephanie W. 2000. Lurching towards Ergativity: Expressions of Agency in the Niya Documents. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 63: 64–80.

———. 2009. Sociolinguistic Remarks on the Indo-Iranian *-ka*-Suffix: A Marker of Colloquial Register. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 52: 311–29.

Klaiman, M. H. 1978. Arguments against a Passive Origin of the IA Ergative. In *Papers from the Fourteenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society,* ed. Donka Farkas, Wesley M. Jacobsen, and Karol W. Todrys. Pp. 204–16. Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.

Krümpelmann, Kornelius. 2000. *Das Dhuttakkhāṇa: Eine jinistische Satire*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Masica, Colin. 1991. *The Indo-Aryan Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Oberlies, Thomas. 2003. *A Grammar of Epic Sanskrit*. Indian Philology and South Asian Studies, vol. 5. Berlin: W. de Gruyter.

———. 2005. *A Historical Grammar of Hindi*. Graz: Leykam.

Ollett, Andrew. 2017. *Language of the Snakes: Prakrit and Sanskrit in the Language Order of Premodern India*. Oakland: Univ. of California Press.

———, ed. and tr. 2021. *Kouhala: Lilavai*. Murty Classical Library of India, vol. 29. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.

Pischel, Richard, ed. 1877. *Hemacandra's Grammatik der Prâkṛitsprachen (Siddhahemacandram Adhyâya VIII)*. Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.

———. 1981 [1900]. *A Grammar of the Prākrit Languages*, 2nd ed. Tr. S. Jhā. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Schwarzschild, Louisa. A. 1954. The Possessive Adjectives of Late Prakrit. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*: 127–136. [Rpt. in *Collected Articles of L. A. Schwarzschild on Indo-Aryan, 1953–1979*, ed. Royce Wiles. Pp. 12–21. Canberra: Australian National University, 1991.]

Sen, Sukumar. 1953. Historical Syntax of Middle Indo-Aryan. *Indian Linguistics* 13: 355–473.

Sheth, H. P. 1986. *Pāia-sadda-mahaṇṇavo*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Slaje, Walter. 1992. Kuḍakas Samanvayadiś und die Folgeliteratur: Materalien zu einer vergessen lokalen Tradition der einheimischen indischen Grammatik (Miscellanea zu den Wiener Sanskrit-Handschriten 2). *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 36: 105–26.

Tessitori, Luigi Pio. 1913–15. Notes on the Grammar of Old Western Rajasthani, with Special Reference to Apabhramça and to Gujarati and Marwari. *Indian Antiquary* 43–45.

Turner, Ralph Lilley. 1962–66. *A Comparative Dictionary of Indo-Aryan Languages*. London: Oxford Univ. Press.

Upadhye, A. N., ed. 1949. *Līlāvaī: A Romantic Kāvya in Māhārāṣṭrī Prākrit of Koūhala with the Sanskrit Vṛtti of a Jaina Author*. Singhi Jain Series, vol. 31. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan. [2nd ed. 1966.]

Vijayajinēndrasūri, ed. 1989. *Niryukti-Saṅgrahaḥ*. Shantipuri: Śrī Harṣapuṣpāmṛta Jaina Granthamālā.

Weber, Albrecht, ed. 1881. *Das Saptaçatakam des Hâla*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.