

ISSN 0021-4043
A QUARTERLY
ON
JAINOLOGY

VOL. XXX

No. 4 APRIL

1996

Jain Journal



॥ जैन भवन ॥

JAIN BHAWAN PUBLICATION

Contents

ᅒaᅓkhaᅓᅓāgama and Śauraseni <i>Satya Ranjan Banerjee</i>	101
A Primer of Śauraseni <i>Richard Schmidt</i>	125

JAIN JOURNAL

Vol. XXX

No.4 April

1996

ᅒAᅒKHAᅒDĀGAMA AND ŚAURASEᅒĪ

SATYA RANJAN BANERJEE

1 Preamble

The discovery of the *ᅒAᅒkhaᅒdĀgama*, *Kasāyapaᅒᅒa*, *Mahā-bandha* and some other similar works of the Digambara Jaina canonical texts sometime in late thirties and forties is a remarkable contribution to the field of Prakrit studies. These texts are important from the point of view of the Prakrit language. There has been a consensus of opinion that the two groups of Jains have two sets of canonical literatures. For the Śvetāmbara the 45 Āgama texts as current among the community are in Ardhamāgadhī and the Digambara canonical texts as reflected in the *ᅒAᅒkhaᅒdĀgama* and the others mentioned above are in Śaurasenī. Whether this conclusion is true or false is not our concern. The fact is that the languages of both these groups of canonical literature are not exactly the same. There are certain features which are exclusively found in one and rarely in the others. As far as the Śvetāmbara canonical texts are concerned, it is the general belief that they are in Ardhamāgadhī. This does not mean that the Śvetāmbara texts are very near to Māgadhī as the name indicates, i.e. half Māgadhī and half the others, but, in general, the characteristic features of Prakrit, or say Māhārāᅒᅒī, are also found there side by side with some other forms which are not regular in Māhārāᅒᅒī, but are available only in Ardhamāgadhī. But in the case of the Digambara texts again there are certain forms which are not found in Ardhamāgadhī texts, but are found exclusively in the Digambara canonical texts. However, one thing is very certain that whether it is Śaurasenī or Ardhamāgadhī, or Māhārāᅒᅒī or Māgadhī, there are major forms which are very common to all types of Prakrit, except a few phonological or morphological variations which are normally regarded as nothing but dialectal features. For example, the Sanskrit word *kᅒᅒa* has several forms in Prakrit and each form has a distinctive feature with regard to a particular dialect, e.g. *kᅒᅒa* > *kaa* (Māh.), *kaya* (Amg), *kida* (Ś), *kaᅒa* (Mg). These variations are generally found in the respective dialects as enunciated by Prakrit grammarians. In case,

either in an Ardhamāgadhī or Śaurasenī text *kaḍa* is found, it should neither be regarded as a Śaurasenī text, nor should it be treated as a sort of archaic Prakrit, rather it should be regarded as an editorial defect. This type of anomaly in an edited Prakrit text is profusely found, and as a result, we are at a loss to determine the language of a particular text. Let us explain this problem with particular reference to the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*.

2 Prakrit and its dialects

In ancient India the three languages were prominent – Sanskrit, Pali, and Prakrit. Of these three languages, Prakrit is considered as the language of the common people. Without going into controversy about the origin of Prakrit which is either from Skt. or from natural one, it can be said that it was the language which the masses used to speak for their communications. Once it is accepted as a spoken language, it is quite natural then that the same Pkt. should be spoken by different people at different places in a different way, as it is the general nature of a spoken language. Naturally Pkt. was also fused into different dialects used by different people at different places. The names of these languages were given in accordance with the name of the place. As a result Pkt. spoken in the area of Magadha is known as Māgadhī, and that spoken in the area of Śurasena, is Śaurasenī, and that also of Mahārāṣṭra is Māhārāṣṭrī. Besides these, some names which are given because of the type of people speaking that language are Paisācī, Prācyā etc. However, in this way gradually the same language is perhaps divided into some dialects which bear some characteristic features which are peculiar to one dialect, but absent in others, even though some overlappings between the dialects are not uncommon. Naturally some of the features of common Pkt. are found in almost all the Pkt. dialects as recorded by the grammarians. So whatever dialects it might be some common features are bound to be found in almost all the dialects, e.g. Skt. *sakala* > *sayala* in Pkt. and the same form is found in Māh. Śau. and Mg. and also in Amg., even though sometimes *sagala* is also found in Amg. The latter form i.e. *sagala* when it is consistently used in Amg., we can consider it as one of the additional forms of Amg. and in this way some additional characteristic features are generally added to some respective dialects which are supposed to be absent in others. Otherwise, the grammarians could have written several Pkt. grammars for several Pkt. dialects. Of course, we know at a later stage one Ardhamāgadhī *Vyākaraṇa* was written by someone, but this book does not mean that Amg. has something peculiar which cannot be justified by other grammarians. However, in a similar way, I do not know yet any

grammar for Śau. Mg. or Paisācī, except that in modern times some have composed some grammars on each dialect of Pkt. based on the modern outlook of linguistics. When some of the dialects became very prominent either because of their literature or of the political supremacy of a particular language in a particular area, some dialects got a chance in the recorded documents of Indian history. I am at present going to refer to those texts where the Śau. is found as one of the dialects of Pkt. With this background in mind let me proceed to ransack the literature where the features of Śaurasenī are mentioned.

3 Sources of Śaurasenī

As far as we know the sources for the features of Śaurasenī are the Prakrit grammarians, Sanskrit dramas and some other literature, and the studies of modern Prakrit scholars on Śaurasenī. It is a fact worth noting that for the characteristic features of Śaurasenī, we will have to depend primarily on the Prakrit grammarians. These grammarians are Vararuci (5th/6th cent. A.D.), Hemacandra (1088-1172 A.D.), Puruṣottama (13th cent. A.D.), Kramadīśvara (13th cent. A.D.), Trivikrama (14th cent. A.D.), Lakṣmīdhara (15th cent. A.D.), Rāmasarmā (16th cent. A.D.) Mārkaṇḍeya (17th cent. A.D.), and many others. As all these grammarians belong to different times and places, their views are to be analysed and judged from the historical point of view.

The specimens of the Śaurasenī language can also be gathered from the Sanskrit dramas beginning from Aśvaghōṣa (1st cent. A.D.) down to Rājaśekhara (10th cent. A.D.).

The modern Prakrit scholars like Christian Lassen, Cowell, Pischel, Schmidt and many others have generally given the characteristic features of Śaurasenī from the analysis of Śaurasenī texts or passages. The fact that they have considered the text as a source of the Śaurasenī passages is not generally questioned. But the point is how do we know that such and such are the features of Śaurasenī? Here in this very context we should take the help of grammarians. The grammarians, from whatever sources it might be, have given some characteristic features of Śaurasenī and other dialects or subdialects from which we definitely consider the features as genuine. Just as we have some traditions before us, so also the grammarians in those days had some authoritative texts before them. It is in this connection that we take the help of the grammarians for the features of respective dialects.

I think the Western Prakrit scholars have got the clue of this dialect

from the Sanskrit dramaturgical texts. As early as 3rd cent A.D. Bharata had mentioned the names of the languages to be spoken by such and such characters of the Sanskrit dramas. And as the ladies and the Viduṣaka of the Sanskrit dramas will speak Śaurasenī, the passages of Viduṣaka and the ladies of the Sanskrit dramas are considered as Śaurasenī. Naturally, the type of Prakrit found in their speeches are generally analysed as the language of Śaurasenī. These passages, of course, do not go against what the Prakrit grammarians say in their respective treatises. As a result though their studies on the Śaurasenī language is very elaborate, it does not practically overstate the case in point. What I generally mean by this is that though the modern scholars, except, perhaps, Pischel, have not consulted the Prakrit grammarians, but they, on the contrary, follow the Prakrit grammarians indirectly.

It is to be noted that Prakrit is the generic name for common man's language which is obviously different from Sanskrit or other languages at that time. Prakrit grammarians have generally given first the features of Prakrit. This Prakrit is more or less equivalent to Māhārāṣṭrī. Except a few grammarians who have mentioned that they are going to describe the characteristic features of Māhārāṣṭrī (*atha Mahārāṣṭrī*), almost all the grammarians have never mentioned that they are describing the features of Māhārāṣṭrī, yet we do not see any difference between the features of the Māhārāṣṭrī language on the one hand and Prakrit, on the other. As a result we generally come to this conclusion that Prakrit is the common generic name of the language and Māhārāṣṭrī would be the language *par excellence*. When that equation is accepted then the features which are not common to Māhārāṣṭrī, are considered as dialects, such as, Śaurasenī, Māgadhi, Paiśāci and others. These dialectal features are also recorded by the Prakrit grammarians under different headings, sometimes, *inter alia*, in describing Māhārāṣṭrī or Prakrit. The name Māhārāṣṭrī is not very old. In Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* the name Māhārāṣṭrī is not found, rather the name *Dākṣiṇātyā* was used. Probably in the 3rd A.D. or before that, Mahārāṣṭra was regarded as *Dākṣiṇātya*, modern Deccan (of Deccan Queen) rather than Mahārāṣṭra. But the name *Dākṣiṇātya* was changed perhaps by the time of Daṇḍin (7th c. A.D.) who in his *Kāvyaadarśa* (I.33) has mentioned that the poems written in Māhārāṣṭrī is the best (*mahārāṣṭrāśrayāṃ bhāṣāṃ prakṣṭaṃ prakṣṭaṃ viduḥ*). Perhaps from that time onwards Māhārāṣṭrī became popular and got a place in the ancient languages of Prakrit. However, the basic point is that the grammarians have recorded the characteristic features of such and such Prakrit which should not be ignored when we consider the features of subdialects of Prakrit. Naturally our starting point of

getting the features of Śaurasenī would be the Prakrit grammarians on the one hand and the modern Western Prakrit scholars, on the other.

While considering the language of the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* we shall see how many of the features given by the grammarians are found in the text. And as such we shall be discussing whether the texts edited by scholars are on a par with the Prakrit grammarians. Here in this connection a problem is raised which is very fundamental and at the same time important for the language of the texts. The problem is how far the Prakrit grammarians are to be accepted against the manuscript of a particular text. The problem is obviously a difficult one to settle at this stage of our knowledge, yet let me start the problem afresh.

4 Śaurasenī Literature

Before considering the language of the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, it will not be out of place here, I suppose, to give a brief survey of the Śaurasenī literature considering that the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* is written in that language.

The starting point of Prakrit, as it is, at least, historically recorded, is reckoned as the time of Lord Mahāvīra who is supposed to have flourished in the 6th /7th c. B.C. It is said that Mahāvīra preached his doctrine in the then common man's language which was later on known as Ardhamāgadhī. In the *Samavāyāṅga-sūtra* it is said that Mahāvīra preached his doctrine in the then common man's language which was Ardhamāgadhī for the understanding of the masses. As a result, when the doctrines of Mahāvīra were codified by the 5th cent. A.D. by Devardhigaṇi Kṣamā-Śramaṇa at Valabhi, the language as represented in the 45 Āgama texts, is, therefore, considered as Ardhamāgadhī on the basis of the statement found in the *Samavāyāṅga-sūtra*. After the establishment of the two schisms of the Jains, i.e. Śvetāmbara and Digambara, it was found that these 45 Āgamas were only accepted by the Śvetāmbaras, while the Digambaras have doubts about the contents of these texts. To them the codification of Mahāvīra's doctrine is embalmed in the *Drṣṭivāda* which is, of course, lost. Anyway when in 1939 the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* was published, it was immediately reckoned that this text was the text of the Digambara canon. And subsequently some other texts of the Digambara canon were also discovered and published. It was also said by the learned editors that the language of all these Digambara canonical texts was in Śaurasenī, because some of the features of Śau. are found there. It was also decided that in the 1st cent. A.D the

Digambara text was first codified and then was lost, and some of these lost texts are nothing but the present *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, *Kaṣāyapāhuḍa*, *Mahābandha*, and others. These are regarded as Digambara Jaina canonical texts and these texts are the earliest ones which are discovered, of course, very lately.

After these Digambara canonical texts the most important writer of non-canonical text is Kundakunda whose works, such as, *Samayasāra*, *Niyamasāra*, *Pravacanasāra*, *Pañcāstikāya* and so on are in Śaurasenī. And the date of Kundakunda varies from the 1st to the 3rd c. A.D., some even have gone down to 5th c. A.D, but not beyond that. It is not quite certain that in the 1st c. Śau. was predominant or not, but if the Digambara canonical texts were codified in the 1st c. A.D. then it was quite a good guess to suppose that in the 1st c. A.D. Śau. was current.

To the first centuries of the Christian era also belonged Vaṭṭakera and Kārttikeya Svāmī. Vaṭṭakera wrote his *Mulācāra* and *Trivaṛṇācāra* in Prakrit, or say, in Śaurasenī, and so also the *Kaṭṭigeyāṇupekhā* of Kārttikeya Svāmī. According to Pischel (§ 21) these works are written in Jaina Śaurasenī.

It is also believed that the *Tiloyapaṛṇatti* of Yati Vṛṣabhācārya (bet. 6-8 centuries A.D.) is also written in Śaurasenī.

Though the date is not certain, yet it is said that the *Bhagavati-Ārādhanā* of Śivārya containing about 2170 (or 2166) verses, a pretty lengthy text, is also written in Prakrit or say, in Jaina Śaurasenī. "The Prakrit dialect shows", says A.N. Upadhye in his *Bṛhat-kathā-koṣa*, "close affinities with the Ardhamāgadhī canon on the one hand and with the works of Kundakunda etc. on the other; and the commentaries explain certain queer forms as *ārṣa*" (p.55). As regards the date of Śivārya or the *Bhagavati-Ārādhanā*, Upadhye further says that "the Bh. Ā. belongs to the earliest stratum of the Pro-canon of the Digambaras consisting of the works of Vaṭṭakera, Kundakunda etc. It is quite likely that Śivārya might be senior even to Kundakunda, but we have to await further researches." (p. 55).

Besides these books, there are some works where the specimens of Śaurasenī are found. In the 8th century, in the *Samarāicca-kahā* of Haribhadra Sūri (bet. 705 and 775 A.D.) there are some specimens of Śaurasenī. "The "*Samarāicca-kahā* is written in prose with inserted verse passages of varying length (usually in the *Āryā* metre). The language is Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī. In the verses it does not differ from the

dialect used generally in Jaina-Prākṛit, in the prose it is mingled here and there with peculiarities of Śāurasenī (*History of Indian Literature*, Vol-II, p. 525).

At a much later period, there are some works written in many Prakrit dialects. Dharmavardhana's (about 1200 A.D.) *Ṣaḍbhāṣā-nirmīta-Pārśva-jina-stavana* and Jinapadma's (1325-1344 A.D.) *Ṣaḍbhāṣā-vibhūṣita-Śāntinātha-stavana* are poems written in six languages of which Śāurasenī is one, besides Sanskrit, Māhārāṣṭrī, Māgadhī, Paisācī and Apabhraṃśa.

The Śāu. literature that we find next is the Skt. dramas. All the Skt. dramatists have given some passages in Śāu. representing some types of characters according to the Skt. dramaturgy. Beginning from Aśvaghōṣa (1st c. A.D.) or Bhāsa (1st c. A.D.), Śūdraka (2nd c. A.D.), Kālidāsa (5th c. A.D.) and many others have given many Śāu. passages in their respective dramas and these passages are good examples of the Śāu. language and most of the Śāu. features are generally found in these Skt. dramas. These dramas came down upto 10th c. A.D. The only Pkt. drama written in Śāu. is the *Karpūramañjarī* whose language is a controversial one.

Beyond these three categories we do not have any direct evidence of Śāu. literature. But, on the contrary, we find some of the language specimens in some other contexts also. In the Inscriptional Prakrits beginning from Aśoka (3rd cent. B.C) down to the 5th c. A.D. or even later than that, some of the characteristic features of Śāu. are, of course, found in the Ins. Pkt., but these features do not mean that those inscriptions are in Śāu. The point is that a literature written entirely in Śāu. is practically not found after Kundakunda, but for the study of the Śāu. lg. some inscriptional and dramatic Pkts. can be consulted besides Kundakunda and the Digambara canonical literature.

In this connection it should be mentioned that there is a difference between the dramatic Śāu. and the canonical one. In most of the canonical literature the uniformity of the Śāu. lg. is not maintained. As a result, those irregularities are considered as archaic forms and naturally they justify them by calling them the oldest specimens of canonical language. Anyway for my present study this much is sufficient to say that before considering the language of the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, let us see how many of the Śāu. characters are preserved in the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*.

Before discussing any other linguistic problem, it is better to give some of the linguistic features of the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* to see in which dialect it is written, or whether it is written in Śāurasenī or not.

5 The Features of Śaurasenī

The characteristic features of Śaurasenī as given by Hemacandra and other Prakrit grammarians mentioned above are generally considered as features of Śaurasenī. This does not mean that the features which are not found in Prakrit grammars should not be considered at all as features of Śaurasenī. Every dialect has some peculiar features which are absent in the others. Most of the features of Māhārāṣṭrī or Prakrit being common to all types of Prakrit dialects, will also be considered as features of that dialect. Whether such and such features are features of such and such dialects depends solely on the basis of Prakrit grammars. As a result, the Prakrit grammarians have only described those features which are very distinctive in a particular dialect. Here in this dissertation I will discuss the features of Śaurasenī as found in the Prakrit grammars of Vararuci, Hemacandra, Puruṣottama and others to see whether these features are found in the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*.

Phonology

(i) Intervocalic *-t-* changes into *-d-*.

All the Prakrit grammarians have said that the intervocalic non-conjunct *-t-* becomes *-d-* in Śaurasenī; in other words, medially *d* is allowed in Śaurasenī, e.g. *tataḥ* > *tado* (Ś), *yataḥ* > *jado* (Ś); *tātaḥ* > *tādo* (Ś). In this way examples can be multiplied.

Normally this feature of Śaurasenī is found in almost all the Śaurasenī passages of the Sanskrit dramas. But there are some supposed Śaurasenī texts where this rule is violated, i.e. instead of *tado* we also come across *tao*, and this type of example is a disturbing one for which the Śaurasenī passages are mutilated.

It should be noted that the basic difference between Śaurasenī and Māhārāṣṭrī with regard to this particular point is that this intervocalic *-d-* in Śaurasenī is never elided, whereas in Māhārāṣṭrī it is generally elided. The elision of intervocalic *-d-* in Śau. should generally be regarded as wrong editing. In most of the cases this type of wrong editing has forced scholars to believe that even in Śaurasenī this intervocalic *-d-* is often elided. That this intervocalic *-d-* is never elided has some evidence also from the grammarian Hemacandra. While describing the ablative declensional endings of the Māhārāṣṭrī Prakrit, Hemacandra has made the sūtra—*niases-tto-do-du-hi-hintolukaḥ* (Hc.III.8.) and in the *vṛtti* of this sūtra he has made a remark that '*dakāra-karaṇaṃ bhāṣāntarārtham*' which simply means that the inclusion of *-d-* in the sūtra [of Māhārāṣṭrī] is to indicate that

this *-d-* is retained in some dialects [say, in Śaurasenī]. And this simple instance of Hemacandra is sufficient enough to prove that wherever in any sūtra of Hemacandra we come across a rule of intervocalic *-d-*, that *-d-* must not be elided in a dialect, say, Saurasenī. In all these cases the evidence of manuscripts is not a strong proof to accept the reading in Śaurasenī with the elision of *-d-*. So if any text is full of this type of readings (where this type of elision is found) that text should be considered as erroneous, because this is against the principle of grammar or linguistics.

In the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* both the elision and retention of intervocalic *-d-* are found.

ii) Intervocalic *-th-*, *-dh-* changing into *-dh-*.

In a similar way another phonological feature which is strong enough to make Śaurasenī distinct from the others, is the sound *dh*. In Śaurasenī, the intervocalic *-dh-* is retained. This is not elided, nor is it reduced to *-h-* as is done in the case of Māhārāṣṭrī. Not only that, even the *-th-* is changed to *-dh-* in Śaurasenī cf. *tāthā* > *tadhā* (Ś); *kathayati* > *kadhedi* (Ś) and so on.

This rule of Śaurasenī is very often violated. In most of the editions of Śaurasenī texts, if not all, this sort of confusion is regularly found. In this regard scholars are divided into two : one group of scholars thinks that the retention of *-dh-* or *-th-* > *-dh-* is not as such a very distinctive feature of Śaurasenī. To them *-dh-* and *-h-* are mutually interchangeable. As a result in most of the texts where Śaurasenī passages are found this type of interchanges between *-dh-* and *-h-* are also found. The other group is of opinion that the retention of *-dh-* and the change of *-th-* into *-dh-* are distinctive features of Śaurasenī, and as such, this should be retained in the text. As a result, this group of scholars wants to correct the Śaurasenī passages where *-h-* is retained by changing it into *-dh-*.

In the works of Kundakunda and even in the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* this phenomenon is found. And naturally scholars do not categorically say that this is not possible in Śaurasenī. Though it is difficult to remove this sort of traditional belief, scholastic approach should be free from any kind of dogma.

If we look at the problem historically we can say that this retention of *-dh-* and the change of *-h-* or *-th-* into *-dh-* is definitely a distinctive feature in Śaurasenī. The country Śurasena was situated in the midland (Madhyapradeśa) which is regarded as modern Mathura. In

this particular area the Vedic language had great influence and in Vedic language *-dh-* is retained in many places where in classical Sanskrit *-h-* is found, e.g. classical *itha* > Ved. *idha* > Ś. *idha*, Cl. *kathayati* > Ved.* *kadhayati* > Ś. *kadhedi*, > Aś *kadhati* and so on. Though this retention of *-dh-* in an intervocalic position in Aśokan inscriptions situated at different places is not uniform in this particular feature, we can only assume that this Vedic feature which was retained in Śaurasenī dialect has a sort of pan-Indian development even in later inscriptional Prakrits. This intervocalic *-dh-* is also found in many inscriptions other than those situated very near to Mathura. And in the early Sanskrit dramas, particularly in the *Mṛcchakaṭīka* and *Bhāṣa*, this feature is prominent. Obviously, the later the Sanskrit dramas the better the preservation of this feature. This short survey of the retention of *-dh-* in ancient Śurasena land is sufficient to say that the retention of intervocalic *-dh-* in Śaurasenī is one of the dominant features. At a very later stage there was a controversy with regard to the language of a Prakrit drama *Karpūramañjarī* by name. Let me discuss the problem of this drama in this particular case.

The language of the *Karpūramañjarī* is a controversial one. Some say that it is entirely written in Śaurasenī, Rājaśekhara being a man of Śūrasena, it was quite possible for him that his drama should bear the stamp of the Śaurasenī language. The other type of scholars thinks that the prose passages of the *Karpūramañjarī* are written in Śaurasenī whereas the verses are in Māhārāṣṭrī. The main pioneers of this problem are the two scholars—Manmohan Ghosh and Sten Konow. The edition of Sten Konow's *Karpūramañjarī* was published in 1902 in the Harvard Oriental Series. Though the edition is excellent, full of copious variant readings, his edition bears two types of language, one is Śaurasenī and the other one is Māhārāṣṭrī. Sten Konow has retained the Māhārāṣṭrī features in verses and the Śaurasenī features in prose passages, sometimes against the evidence of the manuscripts. Sten Konow has consulted several manuscripts, about 10, of which W manuscript represents the Śaurasenī features even in verses. Sten Konow has not accepted them in the main body of the text, e.g. the very first verse of the *Karpūramañjarī* is given in Māhārāṣṭrī even though his W manuscript has Śaurasenī features as well. e.g. Sten Konow reads *bhaddam hou* where W manuscript has *bhodu* and Y manuscript has *hodu*. Though *hodu* is a hyper-prakritisation, the *bhodu* reading is supported by the Prakrit grammarians. S. Konow has not accepted that, but he has given these variants in the footnotes. This has been done throughout his text. The loss of intervocalic *-t-* is found in the verses where it should be *-d-* according to the

prescription of Śāurasenī. This edition had some influence for a long time till the appearance of Manmohan Ghosh's edition in 1938 published by the University of Calcutta.

Ghosh, on the contrary, has given the features of Śāurasenī both in verses and in prose passages. In his opinion, Rājaśekhara must have written the *Karpūramañjarī* in Śāurasenī. As a result, he has corrected all the Māhārāṣṭrī features of the verses into Śāurasenī, of course, in the support of new manuscript designated by him as A which he thinks is akin to Sten Konow's W. On the strength of these two supporting statements, Ghosh has edited the *Karpūramañjarī* all through in Śāurasenī. In this connection we may note that even though Ghosh has a bold step over Sten Konow to make his text full of Śāurasenī, he could not maintain his gusto till the end. Almost in the 4th act and in part of the 3rd, he could not maintain the Śāurasenī features even in the verses. Whether Ghosh's unique manuscript was mutilated at the end or whether the manuscript is incomplete for this incongruity, is not easy to ascertain at this moment, particularly when Ghosh himself is not explicit in this regard. Be that as it may, one main point of difference between the two may be that Sten Konow was perhaps goaded by the influence of Sanskrit dramaturgy which says that the songs in Prakrit should be in Māhārāṣṭrī, the idea which Sten Konow might have extended to the verses as well. Whatever may be the reason between the two, it is pretty certain that scholars who follow either edition will be guided by the reading of that edition, and therefore, there cannot be any reconciliation among the scholars. But one thing is sure that whether it is Māhārāṣṭrī or Śāurasenī the characteristic features of both the languages are maintained throughout. There is no intermixture between Śāurasenī and Māhārāṣṭrī in the same passage.

But the edition of Kundakunda who is supposed to have written in Śāurasenī is not uniform as far as the editions are concerned. Both *-dh-* and *-h-* are found in any one of the editions of Kundakunda; and not only this, even in the same verse this *-dh-* and *-h-* are interchanged, even though the manuscripts do not always support it. As a result, what happens scholars who are not familiar with the Prakrit grammars or even the linguistic principles maintain that both are found or possible in Śāurasenī. The same confusion is also found in the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*. I do not know whether the manuscript contains this confusion or the editor himself is responsible for this confusion. In either case, in my opinion, it should be rectified or corrected in accordance with the rules of grammar or linguistics.

(iii) Treatment of *kṣ* in Śaurasenī.

Among the conjuncts the development of Sanskrit *kṣ* seems to be a little peculiar to Śaurasenī. According to Hemacandra (II.3) *kṣ* has three developments in Prakrit : *kṣ* > *kḥh*; *kṣ* > *cch*; and *kṣ* > *jḥh*. Among these three developments modern scholars normally think that the development of *kṣ* into *kḥh* is one of characteristic features of Śaurasenī, e.g. *paḥṣa* > *paḥḥa*. But initially *kḥh* is not doubled, e.g. *kṣamā* > *khamā*.

But as far as the other developments are concerned they are generally sporadic. There is hardly any definite line of demarcation where *kṣ* should be *cch*, e.g. *maḥṣikā* > *macchīā* > Beng. *māchi*. This development seems to be quite regular in the case of eastern region. And the same word is developed into *kḥh* in the western region, e.g. *maḥṣikā* > *maḥḥīā* > *mākhī* in Marāṭhī. Because *kṣ* develops into *kḥh* in the western region, it is normally suggested that the development of *kṣ* into *kḥh* is normally found in the western region and that into *cch* in the eastern region. And as a result, *kṣ* changing into *kḥh* must be one of the dominant features of Māhārāṣṭrī rather than Śaurasenī. But Pischel and Woolner think that *kṣ* > *kḥh* is a feature of Śaurasenī. In that case it can be said that Māhārāṣṭrī has borrowed this feature from Śaurasenī.

But the development of *kṣ* into *jḥh* does not seem to be a very regular one, e.g. in the case *oḥḥhara* < Skt. *avakṣara* is a glaring instance of Māhārāṣṭrī. So also *kṣiṇam* > *jhīṇam*. In the *Kasāyapāhuḍa* the forms *jhīṇamajhīṇam* occurs in the passage—*payadīe moharījā. vihatti taha ṭṭhidīe aṇubhāge ukkassamaṇukkassam jhīṇamajhīṇam ca ṭṭhidiyam vā* (verse 22). In the *Jayadhavalāṭikā* the form *jhīṇam* is not explained. This development is mostly found in the Māhārāṣṭrī dialect. In fact the examples of this development are not very many.

Coming back to the development of *kṣ* into *kḥh* we can say that this development is equally found both in Māhārāṣṭrī and Śaurasenī, with this exception that Māhārāṣṭrī's other two developments (*cch* and *jḥh*) are not found in Śaurasenī, at least, in the Śaurasenī passages of Sanskrit dramas. Whether *kḥh* was a regular development either in Śaurasenī or in Māhārāṣṭrī is a matter of speculation. Supposing this development is in either language, we can say that one has borrowed this development from the other, and as in most of the cases Śaurasenī passages have only one development, i.e. *kḥh*, scholars might have accepted this development of *kṣ* into *kḥh* as a feature of Śaurasenī. So, Śaurasenī, being in the midland, has influenced both

Māhārāṣṭrī on the one hand and Māgadhī on the other. We also find *kkh* in Māgadhī.

To sum up from the above discussions, we can say that *kkh* is the normal development of *kṣ*, while the other two developments (i.e. *cch* and *jjh*) are sporadic and are also confined to Māhārāṣṭrī only. In the case of Māgadhī either is possible, though *kkh* is the dominant one.

Coming back to the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* it is found that this book has only *kkh* and not the other one.

(iv) The retention of *bh* in the root *bhū* in Śaurasenī.

The root $\sqrt{bhū}$ has several forms in Prakrit, depending on the dialects. In Māhārāṣṭrī the root $\sqrt{bhū} > \sqrt{hū}$ and then \sqrt{ho} (a gunated form) to which the personal terminations are added, making it *hoi*, *hosi*, *homi* etc. Though initially *bh* does not become *h* as per rules of aspiration in Prakrit, in the case of $\sqrt{bhū}$ it is an exception. But in Śaurasenī this *bh* of the original Sanskrit root is not changed into *h* as in Māhārāṣṭrī. So the Śaurasenī forms will be *bhodi*, *bhosi*, and *bhomi*. These forms of Māhārāṣṭrī and Śaurasenī are very regular. In the case of Śaurasenī, Hemacandra (IV.269) has optionally accepted *hodi*, *hosi*, *homi* as well. This form i.e. *bh>h* in Śaurasenī is not regular even though we find this usage in literature. There are other two forms of the root $\sqrt{bhū}$ which are also accepted both in Māhārāṣṭrī and Śaurasenī, e.g. from Skt. *bhavati* we have *havaī* in Māhārāṣṭrī and *bhavadi* and *havadi* (HC. IV. 269) in Śaurasenī. There are other forms as given by Hemacandra both in Māh. and Śau. as Māh. *huvaī*, Śau. *huvadi*, so also *bhuvaī* in Māh., *bhuvadi* and *huvadi* in Śau. To speak frankly the base *bhava* or *bhuva* or *hava* and *huva* are of later origin than *hu* or *ho*. We can call these forms hyper-prakritisations directly from Sanskrit, or in other words, it is Sanskrit based form in Prakrit. The reasons of the development of these forms are not known to us, except that they are developed out of metrical necessity, and so we find these *bhuva* or *huva*, *bhava* or *hava* used mostly in poetry rather than in prose. Now if a manuscript reads *bhuvadi* or *huvadi*, *bhavadi* or *havadi* and its corresponding manuscript reading is *bhodi* or *hodi*, I personally prefer the latter readings to the earlier ones, provided it does not disturb the metrical necessity.

In Kundakunda's works we come across more *bhuva* or *bhava*, *huva* and *hava*, rather than *bhodi*. The form *hodi* is, of course, also found there. In the *Niryukti* the forms *havaī* and *bhavaī* are more frequent than *bhuvaī* and *huvaī*. To my mind it appears that these

forms are not very much regular in Pkt. they are the later tendencies and these have crept into the manuscripts by the copyists who were perhaps influenced by their knowledge of Sanskrit as it is done today.

In Skt. dramas, of course, the form *bhodi* is more frequent than *hodi*, even though they are more or less used side by side.

In the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* we do not come across very often *bhodi* or *hodi*, but in the commentary, the form *bhodi* is more conspicuous than the form *hodi*. However, unless a statistical account is made we are not sure whether *bhodi* supersedes the *hodi*. In the *Kasāyapāhuḍa* the forms *hodi*, *havadi* and *hoṃti* (pl) are found. To me it seems that they are not regular forms in Śaurasenī.

Here perhaps a comment on the forms of *hodi*, *bhuvadi*, *havadi* is necessary. The inclusion of these forms by Hemacandra seems to be historical rather than a genuine characteristic feature of Śau. We have come to this conclusion on the basis of the fact that these forms are also available in Mg. Śau. being a language in the midland, it has perhaps influenced Mg. as well. While, on the contrary, these forms have come down to us from the influence of Māh. as well. As Hemacandra has made a special sūtra for the root $\sqrt{bhū}$ which becomes *bhu* (*bhuvo bhoh* IV. 269) in Śau., it appears that if that is not the dominant feature of Śau., Hemacandra could not have made this sūtra at all. The optional forms based on *hu* is in a sense a loan from Māh. However, my main intention of mentioning this is to emphasize this point that the genuine Śau. form of the root $\sqrt{bhū}$ would be *bho* with usual suffixes. As in the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* as well as its *Dhavalā* the occurrence of the form *bho*, *bhodi* etc. is found side by side with *ho*, *hodi*, the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* and *Dhavalā* have also the features of Śaurasenī.

That in the initial position Śau. retains the sound *bh* is also proved by the fact that the words *bhavat* and *bhagavat* also become *bhavaṃ* and *bhagavaṃ* in Śau (*bhavad-bhagavatoḥ*, IV. 265) where Hemacandra has not suggested any other alternative forms with *havaṃ* as in the case with the root $\sqrt{bhū}$. So all these points lead us to this conclusion that in Śau. the retention of initial *bh*, particularly in the root $\sqrt{bhū}$, is more logical and historical than the other forms with *hu* or *ho*.

(v) Changes of *ry* to *yy*

According to Hemacandra (IV.266), in Śau. *ry* is optionally changed to *yy*, and naturally the usual change of *ry* to *jj* is also found in Śau. e.g. *ārya* > *ayya*, also *aḥja*, *kārya* > *kayya*, *kajja*, *sūrya* > *suyya*, *sujja*.

A careful perusal of all these examples will immediately reveal the fact that the change of *ry* to *yy* cannot be a pure Śāu. form. As *j* is changed into *y* in Mg. (Hc. IV. 292) and therefore *ry* is also assimilated to *yy* in Mg. whereas the change of *y* into *j* is found in Māh. as well as in Śāu. So it seems that this character of Śāu., i.e. *ry* changing into *yy* is a loan from Mg., because that is one of the dominant characters of Mg. So Sanskrit *ārya* > Māh. Śāu. *ajja*, and Mg. *ayya*. Though Hemacandra has given this rule in the case of Śāu. this is in fact a Mg. rule as is known by his sūtra (Hc. IV. 292). The picture is given below :

In Pkt., or for that matter in Māh, the initial *y* is changed into palatal *j* (Hc. I. 245) e.g. *yadi* > Pkt. *jai*; *yama* > *jama* and so on. But when it is in the middle position this *ya* is generally elided in Māh. (Hc. I. 177) and is again replaced by *ya-śruti*. (Hc. I. 180), e.g. *samaya* > *samaa* > *samaya*.

Apparently it seems that perhaps medially *-ya-* is not elided; but that is not the case. In Śāu. also the same form occurs. But in Mg. this *-ya-* is not as such elided, but is retained. This is mostly evident in the case of conjuncts. In conjuncts *ry* is normally assimilated to *jj* (<* *rj*). e.g. *ārya* > *ajja*; *kārya* > *kajja*. The same form is also found in Śāu. But in Mg. as there is no *j*, it is assimilated to *yy*, e.g. *ārya* > *ayya*; *kārya* > *kayya*. Naturally there is no scope of *ry* > *yy* in Śāu. unless we accept that it is a loan from Mg.

In the Śāu. passages of Skt. drama the assimilated form *jj* of *ry* is found. Whereas in the Mg. passages *yy* is found. In the works of Kundakunda the form *jj* is found, and the form *yy* should be regarded as badly edited texts in Śaurasenī.

In the commentary on the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* the forms are mostly found with *jj* and not really with *yy*, unless it is mistakenly incorporated into the text.

Morphology

(vi) Declension — ablative singular in *du/do*.

In the case of declension, Śāu. has not got as such any peculiarity except in the abl. sg. of *a-* base. In this particular case the retention of *ā* is normally found, i.e. from Skt. *narāt* we have *narādu* or *narādo*, while *narāu* and *narāo* will be in Māh. This peculiarity can be justified by the general rule that in Śāu. the intervocalic *-d-* is retained. And hence Hemacandra has made a sūtra of the abl. sg. as *ñases tto do du hi hinto lukaḥ* (III. 8) where in his *vṛtti* he has said *dakāra-karaṇaṇ*

bhāṣāntarārtham and by *bhāṣā* he, of course, primarily means Śau. and perhaps secondarily Mg. where also the same form occurs.

However, this feature as such occurs in the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* and is in general governed by the general rule that the intervocalic *-t->-d-* in Śaurasenī.

(vii) Vocative in ā or aṃ.

But in the case of Skt. words ending in *-n*, in Śau. this *-n* becomes optionally *-ā* in the voc. sg. (Hc. IV. 263), e.g. Skt. *bho kañcukin* > Śau. *bho kañcuiā*; *bho sukhin* > Śau. *bho suhiā*; this one seems to be a special rule for Śau. in voc. sg. of words ending in *-n*. In other case *n* is dropped in the words ending in *-n* e.g. Skt. *bho tapasvī* > Śau. *bho tavassi*; so also *bho maṇassi*. This means that the general Māh. form of voc. sg. of words ending in *-n* is used in Śau. but the present rule ending in *-ā* in the voc. sg. is a special rule for Śau.

There is no example of this type of rule in the main body of the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, because there is no such scope in the work. But in the case of words ending in *-n* or *a-* base the *anusvāra* takes place in place of *-n* in the voc. in Śau. (Hc.IV.264), e.g. Skt. *bho rājan* > Śau. *bho rāyaṃ*, similarly *bho vijayavarman* > Śau. *bho viayavammaṃ*; *sukarman* > *sukammaṃ*. In a similar way we have examples in literature like *bho bhagavan kusumāyudha* > *bho bhayavaṃ kusumāyuha*; and so also *bhayavaṃ titthaṃ pavatteha*.

In all these examples the words ending in *-an* > *aṃ* in the voc. do not seem to be a very peculiar feature of Śau., even though grammarians admit that *bhagavan* could have been equally *bhaava* also. This shows the influence of Māh. on Śau. However, as far as the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* is concerned there is no such example in the work.

(viii) Pronominal declension — *tasmāt* > *tā*.

In the pronominal declension according to the grammarians (Hc.IV.278) the Skt. form *tasmāt* > *tā* in Śau. e.g. *tā jāva pavisāmi*; *tā alaṃ ediṇā māṇeṇa* and so on.

In the sūtra of the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* the form *tā* from *tasmāt* is not met with.

(ix) Future in *-ssi*.

Apart from this, the grammarians (Hc. IV. 275) say that in Śau. the ending *-ssi* is added in the future tense instead of *-hi* as in the case of Māh. eg. *bhavissidi*, *karissidi* and *gacchissidi*.

It is a fact worth noting that according to Hemacandra (III. 167) the *-ssa* is used in Māh. and this is an extension to Śau. which shows that the other forms of Māh. is not possible in Śau. If this statement of Hemacandra is correct we can say that the special rule *-ssi* for Śau. must be compulsory and peculiar to the Śau. language.

We could not find any example of the future form of Śau. with this *-ssi* in the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*.

(x) The formation of gerundial suffix-*ktvā*

In the formation of the gerundial suffix, Śaurasenī has again some peculiarities which are different from others. According to the grammarians (Hc.IV.271) the gerundial suffix in Śaurasenī, is *-iya*, and *-dūṇa*. Of these two the suffix *-dūṇa* is pure Śaurasenī, while the suffix *-iya* is a loan from Māh. As the suffix *-iya* does not contain any *-d*, it is possible that it could be used in Śau. as well, e.g. $\sqrt{bhū} > bhavia, bhodūṇa$, and $havia, hodūṇa$, so also $paṭh > paḍhidūṇa, paḍhia$; $\sqrt{ram} > randūṇa, ramia$. A glance at these examples will reveal the fact that as Śau. retains *-d*-intervocally the forms with *-dūṇa* should be a recognised one for Śau. while the others are Māh. or Pkt. in general. There could be another formation of gerundial form both in Śau. and Māh. This form is nothing but the assimilation as *-tvā > -tā*. This shows that the gerundial forms with *-d* is more important for Śau. than the other forms. So the roots mentioned above have other forms as well, say *bhottā, hottā, paḍhittā* and *rantā*.

But in the case of \sqrt{kr} and \sqrt{gam} we have some special forms (Hc. IV. 272) besides the suffixes mentioned above. From \sqrt{kr} we have *karidūṇa* and *karia, gaḥchidūṇa/gamidūṇa*, and *gaḥchia/gamia*. Besides these forms we have another suffix with *-ua*. So we have from $\sqrt{kr} > kaḍua$ and from $\sqrt{gam} > gaḍua$. The Pkt. grammarians have called all these forms a special case in Śau. To my mind it appears that *kaḍua* and *gaḍua* are forms of Mg. as Mg. $\sqrt{kr} + kta > kaḍa$ and $\sqrt{gam} + kta > gaḍa$. So also $\sqrt{mr} + kta > maḍa$. (Vara XI.15) And these forms are not used in Śau. Naturally it appears that the gerundial suffix *-ua* is added to these Mg. forms of \sqrt{kr} , \sqrt{gam} , and \sqrt{mr} . So it appears to me that the Śau. forms of these *kaḍua* and *gaḍua* are nothing but transferred to Śau. from Mg. and just as we have *kaḍua* in Mg. and Śau., so also *kāūṇa* or *kariūṇa* in Māh.

So if a text contains the forms *kaḍua* and *gaḍua* there is no reason to consider them as special case of Śau. We could say only this much, as it does not disturb the language, there is no harm in accepting or removing these forms at the time of collation of manuscripts. In most

of the Sanskrit dramas the forms *kaḍua* and *gaḍua* are found in the Mg. passages, whereas in pure Śau. text *karidūna*, *gamidūna* or *gacchidūna* are found.

In the case of the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* the form does not occur in the sūtra of the text. But in the commentary *Dhavalā* the forms used are with *-dūna* rather than with *-ia*. However, if the forms with *da* is found, it is, of course, a Śau. dialect, but other than this should be regarded as common forms of Pkt.

(xi) Indeclinables

In some indeclinables Śau. has some peculiarities. We are giving these peculiarities on the basis of Hemacandra. e.g.

idānīmo dāṇiṃ (IV. 277).

In Śau. the word *idānīm* (now) > *dāṇiṃ*, e.g. *aṇantara-karaṇīyaṃ dāṇiṃ āṇavedu ayyo*.

These examples of this sūtra can be found only in the case of dramas. It is difficult to get an example of *dāṇiṃ* in the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* as it is a philosophical text.

evārthe yyeva (IV. 280).

In the sense of *eva* meaning 'indeed', 'in reality' the particle *eva* > *yyeva* in Śau. eg. *mama yyeva bambhaṇassa, so yyeva eso*.

These examples of this sūtra can also be found in Skt. dramas rather than in the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*.

ṇaṃ nanvarthe (IV. 283).

In Śau. *ṇaṃ* is used in the sense of *nanu* i.e in the sense of doubt or question etc., e.g. *ṇaṃ aphaḷodayā, ṇaṃ ayyamiṣṣehiṃ puḍhamāṃ yyeva āṇattarṃ, ṇaṃ bhavaṃ me aggado caladi*.

The examples given by Hemacandra are from the Skt. dramas mainly from the *Abhijñāna-śakuntalam* and *Mṛcchakaṭīkam*.

It is a fact worth noting that in Jaina canonical literature, particularly in the prose portion, this *ṇaṃ* is used as a sort of emphatic, eg. *jayā ṇaṃ, tayā ṇaṃ*, etc. But in the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, particularly in the main sūtras of the text, this *ṇaṃ* is not used, but in the commentary *Dhavalā* it is found profusely.

(xii) Interjections.

In the case of interjections there are some words which are peculiar

to Śau. Hemacandra in his Pkt. grammar has mentioned some of them. e.g.

hañje cetᅒyāhvāne (IV. 281).

In Śau. (as used in the Skt. dramas) *hañje* is used in calling a maid-servant (*cetᅒi*). e.g. *hañje cadurike*.

As it is generally used in Skt. dramas, its usage in the *ᅒAᅒkhaᅒdĀgama* is not as such possible.

hīmāᅒahe vismaya-nirvede (IV. 282)

In Śau. the word *hīmāᅒahe* is used in order to indicate a surprise or dejection. e.g. *hīmāᅒahe jivanta-vacchā me jaᅒaᅒi* (in surprise); *hīmāᅒahe palissantā hage edeᅒa niyabidhᅒo duvva vasideᅒa* (in dejection).

ammahe harᅒe (IV. 284)

In Śau. the word *ammahe* is used in the sense of delight. e.g. *ammahe eāe summilāe supaliᅒaᅒhido bhavaᅒ*.

hī hī vidūᅒakasya (IV. 285)

In Śau. in order to indicate the delight of the Vidūᅒaka the particle *hīhī* is used, e.g. *hīhī bho sampanᅒā manoradhā piᅒa-vayassassa*.

In these two above cases it is seen that the examples of these two sūtras can only be found in the Skt. dramas. Naturally it is difficult to get any example of these sūtras from the *ᅒAᅒkhaᅒdĀgama*.

In the end we may say that the above analysis has given us this impression that whether the language of the *ᅒAᅒkhaᅒdĀgama* is Saurasenī or not, it is mixed up with other Prakrit dialects, and this is also said by Hiralal Jain in the Introduction to his edition of the *ᅒAᅒkhaᅒdĀgama*: "The present work (i.e. *ᅒAᅒkhaᅒdĀgama*) consists of the original sūtras, the commentary of Virasena called *Dhavalā* and the various quotations given by the commentator from writings of his predecessors. The language of the sūtras is Prakrit and so also of the most of the quoted Gāthās. The prose of Virasena is Prakrit alternating with Sanskrit. In the present portion Sanskrit predominates, being three times as much as Prakrit. This condition of the whole text clearly reflects the comparative position of Prakrit and Sanskrit in the Digambara Jain literature of the south. The most ancient literature was all in Prakrit as shown by the sūtras and their first reputed commentary *Parikarma* as well as all the other works of Kundakunda,

and also by the preponderance of Prakrit verses quoted in the *Dhavalā*. But about the time of Virsenā the tables had turned against Prakrit, and Sanskrit had got the upperhand as revealed by the present portion of *Dhavalā* as well as its contemporary literature."

"The Prakrit of the sūtras, the Gāthās as well as of the commentary, is Śaurasenī influenced by the older Ardhamāgadhī on the one hand, and the Māhārāṣṭrī on the other; and this is exactly the nature of the language called Jain Śaurasenī by Dr Pischel and subsequent writers. It is, however, only a very small fraction of the whole text that has now been edited critically so far as was possible with the available material."

6 Manuscript vs Prakrit grammarians

It is at this point a controversy is raised with regard to the problem of manuscript vs Prakrit grammarians. From the time the Europeans started editing Prakrit texts, this question got its prominence. As far as I know T. Bloch in his *Vararuci und Hemacandra* (Gütersloh, 1893), was the first scholar who raised this question while discussing some of the readings of the sūtras of Vararuci and Hemacandra. In his opinion the reading of the manuscript should be given priority despite the fact that it goes sometimes against the grammarians. He further says that there has always been a historicity in the different manuscripts of the same book which might reflect earlier usage of a particular reading preserved fairly in a chronological order. Naturally he has given priority to certain readings of Vararuci which he thinks are older specimens of the language than Hemacandra. Pischel, on the other hand, is of different opinion. In his book *Grammatik der Prakrit Sprachen* (Stuttgart, 1900, § 42) he has attached much more value to the grammarians than the manuscripts. He has not ignored the readings of manuscripts, but what he says is that the manuscripts should be corrected, if necessary, in accordance with the rules of Prakrit grammar. The glaring instance of his theory is the Pkt passages of Kalidāsa's *Śakuntalā* which he has corrected in accordance with the rules of Hemacandra. This is greatly seen in the 6th act of the *Śakuntalā* particularly in the Māgadhī passages of the fisherman. As the manuscripts of that passage is corrupt and not in conformity with the rules of Prakrit grammar, he has corrected them in accordance with the rules of Hemacandra's Prakrit grammar. In short, Pischel has not totally ignored the manuscripts, but his emphasis is on the correctness of the text. At a much later time E.B. Clark in his article *Māgadhī and Ardhamāgadhī* published in the JAOS, 44, 1924, pp. 81-121, has reiterated this problem. But he could not find out any

ways and means by which a solution could be found. However, the problem has been going on. And again almost after a century I have discussed the problem anew. In one of my articles *Prakrit Textual Criticism* published in *Jain Journal*, January, No. 3 1988, pp.87-97, what is noted there is being summarised here for the benefit of the readers.

“The basic problem is whether the grammarians or the manuscripts are to be followed. It is not easy to answer this question, particularly when most of the scholars think that any kind of linguistic phenomenon is possible in Prakrit. Perhaps, under the tacit influence of this so-called idea, some of the Prakrit forms have been incorporated in some editions which sometimes baffle and betray some of the basic notions of the Prakrit language including dialects as enunciated by Prakrit grammarians. It is true that Prakrit grammarians are not very old, and most of the authors belonged to a time when the Prakrit language was almost stereotyped like Sanskrit. As a result, the Prakrit features as embalmed and treasured up by the grammarians vary from author to author, except a few general forms which are common to all; the variations are such that it is difficult to follow any particular reading from the manuscripts. The copyists are not always learned, more so, they may not have any knowledge or a very limited knowledge of the language, and hence every possibility of making mistakes. The phonetics of the language is not always regular. Sometimes the copyists add something to the manuscripts to improve upon the text”.

“It is my personal feeling that some sorts of *emendations* are necessary to edit a Prakrit text—if the manuscripts of a particular text do not help us much.” It goes without saying that the original readings of the text must be recorded as variants in the foot-notes. “It is, indeed, very difficult to form direct cut and dried principles for this purpose, unless we base our arguments on some principles by which grammarians are involved in the matter.”

The main reason for which I have discussed the problem here is to say that if the readings of a Prakrit text do not always conform to the rules of grammar as laid down by the Prakrit grammarians, it is then very difficult for us to follow any definite rules for a particular Prakrit text. Moreover, most of the Prakrit texts, if I am permitted to say so, are corrupt from the point of view of grammatical rules. More so when it is a question of Prakrit dialect. So is the case with the language of the *ᅒAᅒkhaᅒdĀgama* and other similar Prakrit texts like *Kasāyapāhuᅒa*, *Mahābandha*, *Tiloyapaᅒᅒattī*, Kundakunda’s works and so on. In the *Kasāyapāhuᅒa*, the Sanskrit word *prathamārdhasya*

has two Prakrit forms as *paḍhamaddhassa* and *paḍhamatthe* in a few pages gap. Which one is to be considered as the Śaurasenī form? The *paḍhamatthe* can be derived from *prathamārthe*, but it has a different reading *paḍhamaddhe*. What I want to emphasize is that sometimes in the edited texts we might often get a wrong or irregular form of a language, e.g. Skt. *kartavyā* > Ś. *kāyavvā*, Skt. *nikṣitavyā* > Ś. *nikkhiyavvā*, and as far as Śaurasenī is concerned, these forms are not regular, they should be corrected as *kādavvā* and *nikkhidavvā*.

The reading *arihantāṇaṃ* is a puzzling one. It has three readings; *arahantāṇaṃ*, *arihantāṇaṃ* and *aruhantāṇaṃ*. In the Hātigumphā Inscription of Khāravela at Udayagiri Hill in Bhubaneshwar belonging to the second or first century B.C., the reading *arahantāṇaṃ* (*namo arahaṃtāṇaṃ namo sava-sidhāṇaṃ*) is found. This is, perhaps, the earliest written document where the reading *arahantāṇaṃ* is available. Then the reading *ariha-* was developed in Prakrit from Sanskrit *arha* (cf. Hemacandra, *rha-śrī-hrī-kṛtsna-kriyā-diṣṭyāsvit*, II. 104). So also we have the reading *arihantāṇaṃ* (gen. pl); and this reading is mostly found in almost all the Jaina texts, canonical and non-canonical. Then, in course of time, before Hemacandra (1088-1172 A.D.), the reading *aruha-* was also developed (cf. Hemacandra, *uccārhati*, II, 111). I have seen this reading in the foot-note of the recently published text of *Bhagavati-joḍa* (1981) by the Jain Vishva Bhārati Institute. Thus far is all right as far as the development of the Sanskrit word *arha* in Prakrit is concerned.

But the difficulty is—in some texts published by the same Institute or edited by the same scholar, the two readings - *arahantāṇaṃ* and *arihantāṇaṃ* are found. For example, in the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* edited by Hiralal Jain the reading *arihantāṇaṃ* is accepted, but in the *Somasundara-carīu* of Nayanandī (samvat 1100) edited by the same scholar, Hiralal Jain (1970, Vaiśālī), the reading of the *namokkāra-mantra* is *arahantāṇaṃ* and not the other one. It has no variant in the foot-notes. If we consider his reading as correct, then we can say that the *arahanta-* reading was also prevalent in the samvat 1100. In the *Bhagavati-joḍa* of Jayācārya, published by the Jain Vishva Bhārati (1st edn 1981) we have two readings side by side. In the Prakrit *namokkāra-mantra*, the reading *arahantāṇaṃ* is found, but in the *dūhā* (58) the reading is *namo-arihantāṇaṃ* (*parameṣṭhī paṃcaka 'namo-arihantāṇaṃ' āda*). In the foot-note of this verse, the editor has mentioned that according to the *vṛttikāra*, there are various forms of *arahanta* of which *arihantāṇaṃ* and *aruhantāṇaṃ* are variants. Again in *dūhā* (61) the reading *arahantā* is given. What I want to emphasize from all these discussions is that before editing a Prakrit text, a

conscious editor should formulate some editorial disciplines, so that there could be a consistent and coherent readings of a Prakrit text, no matter what the manuscripts say.

7 Conclusion

From the above survey it appears that some of the features of Pkt. are restricted to Śau. This means that the rest of the features of the language are to be collected from Māh. or Pkt. in general. Hence, all the grammarians have said that the rest of the features of Śau. are to be collected from Pkt. in general. (*śeṣaṃ Prākṛtavat* Hc. IV.286, *śeṣaṃ Māhārāṣṭrivat*, Vara XII.32). Naturally some of the features are common to both Māh. and Śau. It is in this connection we see some of the lapses in the Śau. lg. and it is in this connection we have some misunderstandings in describing the characteristic features of Śau. Hence we find confusions between *t* and *d*, between *h* and *dh*, and between Māh. and Mg. where the influence of both the languages is possible on Śau. The corruption in the manuscripts is another reason which also puzzles us in order to determine the features of Śau. As the grammarians have restricted some features exclusively to Śau. it should be our duty to adhere to those rules which are exclusively meant for Śau.; the other features being the same with Māh. we have no alternative to relying on the grammarians. In this particular case manuscript may not be a dependable source for detecting the features of Śau. As most of the scholars do not pay much attention to the fact that the Śau. lg. has some distinctive features which are basically the retention of intervocalic *d* and *dh*, and at least, these 2 features are exclusively meant for Śau. even though manuscripts sometimes betray this conception. If we could have got the autographed manuscript of the author we could have thought of this matter in a different way. As the copying of the manuscripts has been handed down to us from generation to generation the reliability of the lg. is vitiated rather than copying correctly the manuscript from the other. This fact should not be ignored when a Pkt. text is edited from manuscripts. By this process, perhaps, somebody might say that this means the mutilation of the manuscript, but it should be considered at the same time that the wrong representation of the lg. does not lead us to the correct understanding of the text. Grammarians normally register some facts of the lg. which the writers of a particular book is supposed to know. When the lg. is current and spoken there might be some words which are not included in the books of grammar, but those can be judged from the linguistic point of view, whether that sort of form is possible or not, e.g. the Skt. word *padma* has at least 3 forms in Pkt. *paduma* (Śau), *paūma* (Māh.), and *pōmma* (Amg). Of these 3 forms, both

historically and linguistically, the form *paduma* originated first. And from *paduma* the Māh. word *paüma* comes, because in Māh. the intervocalic *-d-* can be elided, but not in Śau. and hence *paduma* is Śau. because of the retention of intervocalic *-d-*, and *paüma* is Māh. because of the loss of intervocalic *d-*. In the case of *põmma* which is mainly found in the Amg. text the form is an assimilation of *-d* to *m*, again following the sūtra of the grammarians (cf. Hc. II. 77). That is to say, *padma* > *paümma* > *põmma* (by euphonic combination of *a + u*). Psychologically in the formation of this word 2 things are operating : first, the form *paüma* has influenced the word in making it *paü* and secondly, the assimilation of *dm* occurs. These 2 processes occur simultaneously and as it is not a regular form and at the same time used in the Amg. text, the word is regarded as *ārṣa* (something like irregular) and hence Amg. (because it is found in the Amg. text). This process should be taken into consideration when we see that some words are irregularly formed.

The main point of my emphasis is that although overlappings or lapses are possible in lg., particularly in Pkt., this must be corrected as far as possible with the help of grammar and linguistics. This is the case particularly when we think of a text written in Śau. It is the editorial discipline that makes the text a better representation than mere adhering to the blind allegiance to manuscript copying. If this distinction is not maintained, then there cannot be any features of any lg. at all. There would not be any conception of dialects in Pkt.

Arbeits India

Export House Recognised by Govt of India

Proprietor - Sanjit Bothra

8/1 Middleton Road
5th Floor Room No.4
Calcutta - 700 071

Phone : 296256/8730/1029

Telex : 021 2333 ARBI IN

Fax No. : 0091-33290 174

A PRIMER OF ŚĀURASENĪ

with a comparison between
Māhārāṣṭrī and Māgadhī
For use in readings for lectures

compiled
by
Richard Schmidt

Translated into English from Original German
by
Pranabesh Sinha Ray

Hannover 1924
Orient-Bookseller Heinz Lefaire

Preface

[3] I am not alone to feel the want of a handy manual of Śaurasenī by far the most important of prose dialects of the Indian drama. Who would ever base the works (surely for their period very valuable) of Hoefler or Lassen?. Or who would have the courage to guide his hearers through the primeval forest of Pischel's grammar ? Even a specialist, who is, indeed, accustomed to all sorts of fares sees himself, in all respects, in this stupendously diligent and fundamental work to which he is constrained to pay heed confess that Pischel's treatise is nearly not to be perused. The overwhelming fullness of materials in sheer discriminationless types squeezed into 400 pages and more makes the hunt for a single form agonising: the book is a typographical Hydra which is repelled by the head definitively notwithstanding the index prepared by Wickremasinghe.¹

Now, it is self-evident that the advanced student will soon need to be acquainted with one or the other of the dramas and if he at all entertain any serious endeavour he must rest contented with reading the Prakrit portions merely with the help of their *chāyās* but will be also expected to be led into the understanding of the dialects *per se* as well. The present manual would serve that purpose. I have drawn up and worded it in such a cryptic, concise manner, and as its title [4] gives out the principal stress has been placed upon Śaurasenī. Of the other dialects occurring in Indian dramas we have Māhārāṣṭrī and Māgadhi considering that habitually *Śakuntalā* will be studied, at least, by its chief divergencies.

For those who would like to make an intensive study of the Prakrit-speeches I am giving here a list of the most important and pertinent works:

1. *Bhāratīyanāṭyaśāstra* ed. Kāvya-mālā No. 42. (XVII, 6-23).
2. Cowell, *The Prākṛita-Prakāśa*: or, The Prākṛit Grammar of Vararuci, with the Commentary (Manoramā) of Bhāmaha. Second Issue. London 1868. (1. Ausgabe Hertford 1854).
3. Hemacandra's *Grammatik der Prākṛitsprachen*, herausgegeben, übersetzt und erläutert von Richard Pischel. I Teil Halle 1877. II. Teil Halle 1880.
4. *The Pāyalachchhī Nāmamālā*, a Prakrit Kosha by Dhanapāla. Edited with critical notes, an introduction and a glossary by Georg Bühler. Göttingen, 1878.

1. With this naturally a contradiction does not arise, if I say, that Pischel with his grammar has produced a really fundamental work, on which my modest Handbook thoroughly rests.

5. Hoernle, *The Prākṛita-Lakṣhaṇam* or Caṇḍa's Grammar of the Ancient (*Ārsha*) Prākṛit. Part I. Text with a critical introduction and indexes, Calcutta 1880.
6. *The Deśināmamālā* of Hemacandra. Part I. Text and critical notes. By R. Pischel. Bombay, 1880.
7. Namisādhu's Kommentar zu Rudraṭa's *Kāvyaśaṅkārā* II, 12 (ed. Kāvyaśaṅkārā No. 2, Bombay, 1886).
8. Kramadīśvara, *Prākṛtapāda* ed. Rājendraśāla Mitra, BT.; neue Ausgabe Kalkutta, 1889.
9. Trivikrama, *Prākṛtavayākaraṇa*. Ed. Granthapradarśanī 1 – Dazu Tukaram Laddu, *Prolegomena zu Trivikrama's Prākṛit-Grammatik*, (Diss.) Halle a.d. S. 1912.
10. *Prākṛitarūpavatāra*. A Prakrit Grammar based on the Vālmikisūtra by Śiṃharāja, Son of Samudrabandhayajvan. Edited by E. Hultsch. London 1909.
11. Mārkaṇḍeya Kavīndra, *Prākṛtasarvasvam*, ed. Bhaṭṭanātha Svāmin (=Granthapradarśanī Heft 34-38, Vizagapatam, [5] Februar-Juni 1912). – Dazu E. Hultsch, Neue Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Śaurasenī, ZDMG 66, p. 709-726.
12. Hofer, Albert, *De Prakṛita dialecto libri duo*, Berolini, 1836.
13. Lassen, Christianus, *Institutiones linguae Pracriticae*, Bonnae ad Rhenum, 1837.
14. Delius, Nicolaus, *Radices Pracriticae*, Bonnae ad Rhenum, 1839.
15. Haag, *Vergleichung des Prakrit mit den Romanischen Sprachen*, Berlin, 1869.
16. Cowell, *A Short Introduction to the Ordinary Prākṛit of the Sanskṛit Dramas*, with a list of common irregular Prākṛit words, London, 1875.
17. Hoernle, A.F. Rud., *A Sketch of the History of Prakrit Philology*. Calcutta Review, October, 1880.
18. Weber, Albrecht. *Das Saptāṭatakam des Hāla* AKM VII, 4. Leipzig, 1881.
19. Rishikesh [Hṛṣīkeśa] Sastri, *A Prakṛita Grammar with English Translation*, Calcutta, 1883.
20. Jacobi, Hermann, *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāshṭrī. Zur Einführung in das Studium des Prākṛit*. Grammatik. Text. Wörterbuch. Leipzig, 1886. [Dazu : Hindu Tales. An English Translation ... by John Jacob Meyer. London, 1909.]
21. Pischel, R., *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*. Straßburg, 1900. (=Grundriß der ind.-ar. Phil. I, 8).

For the examples, it is to be noted that almost always only the actually recorded ones have been admitted, ° above denotes that the concerned word so runs in Māhārāṣṭri also, as in Śaurasenī, while * indicates agreement with Māgadhī. M. and Mg. are abbreviations for Māhārāṣṭri (the language of Mahārāṣṭra, the Marhatta country of today) resp. for Māgadhī, the language of Magadha, Ś for Śaurasenī. When the sign ° will be occasionally used for a marker of abbreviation, it will be always clear from the context, what is meant. The same is valid for * which is sometimes added to Sanskrit forms in order to inform [6] an apparent equivalent form though not the expected one; for ex. *ṇaia* (**ṇayīya*=*nītvā*). Forms which do not have any supplement (Ś, M or Mg.) are Śaurasenī; where several examples from one dialect are given, these are separated by commas, while a semicolon separates dialects. Thus *ṇāgadā*, M *ṇāgaā* (*ṇāgatā*); *ṇecchadi* etc., means that *ṇāgadā* the Śaurasenī form, *ṇāgaā* is that of Māhārāṣṭri; *ṇecchadi* is then again Śaurasenī.

Somewhat more than an elementary knowledge of Sanskrit is presumed. The Indian grammarians also do that -- those who have written on Prakrit which is only reasonable.

prakṛtiḥ saṃskṛtam; tatra bhavaṃ Prākṛtam ucyate.

Münster W., 24, Sept. 1914 (may it be so)

Richard Schmidt.

PHONOLOGY

[7] 1. Śaurasenī, the language of Śurasena with its capital at Mathurā, has the sound repertory of Sanskrit, lacking, however, in *ṛ*, *ṝ*, *ḷ*, *ai*, *au*, simple *n*, and further *y*, *ś*, *ḥ* as also the single voiceless consonants. [Likewise in M, Mg. though Mg. has *y* resp. *yy* at the beginning of words, retains *ś* in resp. changed from *ṣ* and *s* into *ś*, and instead of *r* there stands *l* throughout].

ṛ becomes *a* for ex. in *taṇa* (*tṛṇa*), M. *ghaa*, *kaa* (*ghṛta*, *kṛta*); most frequently becomes *i*; **ghida*, **kida*, **kisa*, **giddha*, °*ditṭhi*, °*siāla*, °*hīaa* (*ghṛta* *kṛta*, *kṛśa*, *grddhra*, *drṣṭi*, *śṛgāla*, *hṛdaya*); particularly after labials it becomes *u* : *ṇihuda* M. *ṇihua* (*ṇibhṛta*); *ṇivvuda*, M. *ṇivvua* (*nirvṛta*); *pucchadi*, M. *pucchai*, Mg. *puścadi*, (*prcchati*); °*muṇāla* (*mṛṇāla*); *mudaṅga*, M. *muiṅga* Mg. *midaṅga* (*mṛdaṅga*); *vuttanta* (*vṛttānta*). Similarly before the suffix *ka* in *jāmādua*, M. *jāmāua* (*jāmātrka*); *bhādua* (*bhrātrka*).

Initial *ṛ* becomes either *ri* as in °*riddhi* (*ṛddhi*), °*rikkha* (*ṛkṣa*), *risi* [Mg. *liśi*] (*ṛṣi*) beside *isi* : *mahesi*, °*rāeśi* (*maharṣi* *rājarṣi*) or *u* : *udu*, M. *uu* (*ṛtu*); *ujju* (*ṛju*).

[r̄ correspondingly changes into ī or ū, however, illustrative example is lacking]

l̄ becomes ili : °kilitta (kl̄pta).

ai is changed to e : °Erāvaṇa (Airāvaṇa), °*tella' (taila), °vējja (vaidya), not to āi (Pischel § 61) as in M. daicca (daitya).

au becomes o, very seldom aū in M. : °Kosia (Kauśika), orasa (aurasa); °osaha (auśadha), komudī, M. komui (kaumudī); Kosambī (Kauśāmbī), °jōvvaṇa' (yauvana), °āḍbballa (daurbalya); pora, M. paūra, Mg. pola (paura)

[8] n always is changed to ṇ : °ṇa (na), °ṇaṇa (nayana). It remains unchanged in consonant groups like nt, nd : pēkkhantu (prekṣantām), cando (candraḥ).

y falls out in intervocalic position : °hīaa (hṛdaya), °chāā (chāyā), °pia (priya)

ś and ṣ become s : °kesa, °pusu, °sisira, °esa, °sesa (keśa, paśu, śisira, eṣa, śeṣa)

In Mg. as already stated ṣ and s become ś, ś by itself is retained: keśeśu (keśeṣu), śalila (salila), śahaśśa (sahasra); see however § 8 !

aḥ becomes o : °aggado (agrataḥ), rāo (rāgaḥ), ṇīoo (niyogaḥ).

In Mg. in the Nom. sing. there is e for it : eṣe puliśe (eṣo[eṣa]puruṣaḥ).-- The treatment of āḥ iḥ etc. as much as of medial ḥ see § 9 as in accidence.

In the final position only the vowels and anusvāra are permitted (but cf. § 3 at end); therefore end-consonants fall out : °tāva, pacchā [Mg. paścā and paścādo] (tāvat, paścāt).

2. The rest of the vowels and diphthongs become, in general, retained. a ā become (indeed only apparently) ě in °ēttha=atra, corresponding to the Vedic itthā and in °mētta (mātrā); u appears as a in maūlida, M. maūlia (mukulita); u as i in °purisa², Mg. puliśa (puruṣa); u as o in pōkkhara (puṣkara), Mg. poskaliṇī (puṣkariṇī) °mōttā (muktā).

A part of or final vowels sometimes appears before in between the parts of a consonant group : °siṇeha (sneha); radaṇa, M. raṇa, Mg. ladaṇa (ratnā); pēkkhia, Mg. pēskia (prekṣya); kilammadi, M. kilammai (klāmyati); °kilanta (klānta); Mg. kośiṇa (koṣṇa); °coria (caurya); °āmarisa, Mg. āmalīśa (āmarṣa); tuvaradi, M. tuvari, Mg. tuvaladi (tvarate); duvāra, Mg. duvāla (dvāra); °duve (dve).

An initial vowel falls out particularly in enclitics : *pi [after

1. Doubling of the consonant, as is often found also elsewhere (cf. Pischel § 90)
2. According to Mārkaṇḍeya ix, 9, this form for Ś. is false and should run as purusa.

anusvāra], °vi [after vowels] for *api*; °*dāṇiṃ* (*idāṇim*). At the beginning of the sentence *avi* resp. stands *idāṇiṃ*.

aya becomes *e* in verb forms as in *ṇedu*³ (*ṇayatu*); M. *kahei*, Mg. *kadhedi* (*kathayati*); — *ava* becomes *o* : *odaradi* [9] (*avatarati*); M. *oāra* (*avatāra*); Mg. *odala* (*avatara*), °*nomāliā* (*navamālikā*); **bhodī* M. *hoi* (*bhavati*).

A long vowel in a closed syllable becomes shortened : °*kavva* (*kāvya*); °*gimha* (*grīṣma*); *maṃsa* (*māṃsa*); also in cases like °*puttāṇaṃ* (*putrāṇām*), °*mālaṃ* (*mālām*) °*sahiṃ* (*sakhim*). Just as *e* and *o* before double consonants — *jēvva*, *jōvvaṇa* (*eva*, *yauvana*) — as also before *kkhu* (=khalu) and *tti*(=iti); for ex. *asamaē kkhū* (*asamaye khalu*), *mahantō* [Mg. *mahantē*] *kkhū* (*mahāntaḥ khalu*), *bamhaṇō tti* (*brāhmaṇa iti*). Besides, there is *khu* after *anusvāra* and **kkhu* after a short vowel: *mā khu* (*mā khalu*), *kiṃ khu*, M. *taṃ khu* (*tat khalu*); *ṇa kkhū* (*na khalu*). In M. after all vowels *khu* becomes *hu* : *na hu*, *mā hu*, *ko hu*; but Mg. *śē kkhū* (*sa khalu*), *āadā khu* (*āgatā khalu*). — *tti* also stands after short and long vowels : *esa tti* (*eṣā iti*), *duhida tti* (*duhitā iti*), *Kandappakeli tti* (*Kandarpakeli iti*); *ti* stands after *anusvāra* : *kiṃ ti* (*kim iti*). Like that in M.

eva after short vowels and *e*, *o* (which then become shortened) becomes *jjeva* or *jjēvva*, Mg. *yyēvva*; other long vowels remain retained; *jēvva* or *jeva* stands after *ansusvāra* : for ex. *ajjassa jjēvva* (*āryasya eva*); *idha jjeva* (*idha eva*), *muhē jjeva* (*mukhe eva*), *idō jjēvva* (*ito eva*); *tadhā jeva* (*tathā eva*), *devī jeva* (*devī eva*), *taṃ jēvva* [*jeva*] (*tam eva*). -- Mg. *mama yyēvva* (*mama eva*), *darṣaantē yyēvva* (*darśayanto [=darśayann] eva*), *dīsanti yēvva* (*drīṣyamānaiva*).

3. Sandhi Rules. In compositions similar vowels as in Sanskrit become contracted; so *a ā + a ā* become °*ā*, *i ī + i ī* become °*ī*; *u ū + u ū* become *ū*, whereby before consonant group or double consonants there must happen shortening : *jammantare* (*janmāntare*). -- *a ā + a* dissimilar vowel gives rise, as in Sanskrit the *guṇa* of the second vowel : °*mahesi* from *mahā + isi* (=maharṣi). One takes note of cases like M. *gaīnda* (*gajendra*), *ṇarīnda*; Mg. *ṇalīnda* (*narendra*); **mahīnda* (*mahendra*), *ṇiluppale* (*nilotpala*) °*mahūsava* (*mahotsava*)

i ī u ū remain unchanged before a dissimilar vowel as a Rule[10]: *santiudaa* (*śāntyudaka*), *Uvvasīakkhara* (*Urvaśyakṣara*), M. *rattīandhaa* (*rātryandhaka*).

Udṛtta-vowels i.e. such as remain left after the fall of consonants, do not admit of any further change : *jaī* (*yadi*), not *je*; °*gaa* (*gaja*), not *gā!*

Inside of sentences the final and the initial vowels usually remain

3. But *jaadu* (*jayatu*): see § 26. 1. paragraph.

unchanged, only the negative *ṇa* (*na*) is an exception: °*ṇatthi*. Mg. *ṇasti* (*nāsti*); °*ṇāhaṃ* (*nāham*); *ṇāgadā*, M. *ṇāgaā* (*nāgatā*); *ṇēcchadi*, M. *ṇēcchāi*, Mg. *ṇēcjadi* (*necchati*). Mark *mamovari* (*mamopari*), M. *sahasāgaassa* (°*gatasya*).

Ending *n* and *m* become *anusvāra* : °*bhavaṃ* (*bhavān*), °*iaṃ* (*iyam*); *m* can, however make a *saṃdhi* with the following vowel, when *metri causa* short syllable is requisite. Cf. S. 27, *jēttiam ihantaraṃ tēttiam imāṇaṃ*

4. **Initial consonants** remain (exceptions, naturally are *n y^ʳ ś ṣ*) unchanged; only in a compound they are mostly treated as medials with the exception of the initials of verbal roots after prefixes with final vowels which are often retained : *ajjāutto* (*āryaputraḥ*), but *ākaraṇido* (*ākaraṇitaḥ*); M. *bhama-raūla* (*bhramarakula*), *āiṇṇa* (*ākirṇa*). Note that °*adha iṃ* (*atha kim*), °*ciṃ uṇa* (*kiṃ punar*) etc., further *dāva* (*tāvat*) and *de* (*te*) after vowels and *anusvāra* : *ciṭṭha dāva*; Mg. *ciṣṭha dāva* (*tiṣṭha tāvat*); °*ēvaṃ dāva* (*evaṃ tāvat*); *suṭṭhu de* (*ṣuṣṭhu te*), *sāadaṃ de* (*svāgataṃ te*); Mg. *tado de* (*tatas te*), *ēvvaṃ de* (*evaṃ te*).

5. **Medial consonants**. *k, g, c, j, d, y* fall out intervocally : °*loa*, *aṇurāa*, *ṇārāa*, °*gaa*, °*maṇa*, °*vioa* (*loka*, *anurāga*, *nārāca*, *gaja*, *madana*, *vijoga*); *ṭḍ*: *kaḍaa* (*kaṭaka*); *ṭḍ*: *gadā* (*gatā*), in M. it falls out : *raaa* (*rajata*); *p* and *b* become *v*: *pāveṇa* (*pāpena*), M. *āava* (*ātapa*); °*kalevara* (*kalebara*), °*kavala* (*kabala*), °*savara* (*śabara*); Mg. *śivila* (*śibira*).

kh, gh, dh, ph, bh become *h*: °*muha* (*mukha*), °*meha* (*megha*), °*mahu* (*madhu*), °*muttāhala* (*muktāphala*), [11]°*ahiṇava* (*abhinava*); *ṭh, th* become resp. *ḍh, dh* : *kaḍhiṇa* (*kaṭhina*), *Mammadha* (*Mammatha*), but M. *Vammaha* (so also Mg. in the verses with initial changes).

6. **Consonantal groups** are separated by means of a participating vowels (see § 2) or it is assimilated (customarily) the first consonant with the second. Thereby there appears initially barring quite a handful of exceptions [for ex. *mhi* = *asmī*], only a single consonant : *pia* (*priya*), and not *ppia*. Permitted groups are : 1) double consonants : °*ratta* (*rakta*); 2) a consonant + its aspirate : °*kapphala* (*kaṭphala*); 3) nasal + the consonants of the corresponding class : °*accanta* (*atyanta*); 4) the groups *ṇh, mh, lh* : °*ciṇha* (*cihna*), °*bamaṇa* (*brāhmaṇa*), °*palhatta* (*prahlata*). In Mg. is yet found (partly doubtful) the group *yyh, śk* [?], *śkh* [?], *śc, śṭ* [?], *śṭh* [?], *śth* [?], *sk, skh, sṭ, st, sp, sph, ḥk* (consequently *jihvāmūliya+k*): *ṇiyyhala* (*nirjhara*), *śuśka* beside *śuska* (*śuśka*),

4. becomes *j* : *jadhā*, M. *jaha* (*yathā*); in Mg. it is retained : *yadhā*.

5. Mg. keeps *ś*, and changes *ṣ, s* into *ś*.

dhaṇuśkhaṇḍa beside *dhanus*^o (*dhanus*^o), *puścadi* (*pr̥cchati*), *kaṣṭa* [ʔ] (*kaṣṭa*), *koṣṭhāgāla* [ʔ] (*koṣṭhāgāra*), *haṣṭa* [ʔ] (*hasta*), *īsthiā* [ʔ] (*itthiā* = *strīkā*), *maṣkali* (*maskarin*), *paskhaladi* (*praskhalati*), *kaṣṭa* (*kaṣṭa*), *hasti* (*hastin*), *śaspa* (*śaṣpa*), *ṇisphala* (*niṣphala*), *paḥka* (*paḥka*) cp. §81 !

kt becomes *tt* : *ratta* (*rakta*); *kth* becomes *tth* : *rittha* (*riktha*); *kp>pp* : *vappadi*, M. *vappai* (*vākp̄pati*); *gdh>ddh*: ^o*duddha* (*dugdha*); *gbh>bbh*: ^o*pabbhāra* (*prāgbhāra*); *ṭk>kk*: *chakka* (*ṣaṭka*); *ṭc>cc* : *chaccaraṇa* (*ṣaṭcaraṇa*); *ṭt>tt*: *chattala* (*ṣaṭtala*); *ṭp>pp*: ^o*chappaa* (*ṣaṭpada*); *ṭph>pph*: ^o*kapphala* (*kaṭphala*); *ḍg>gg*: ^o*chagguṇaa* (*ṣaḍguṇaka*); *ḍj>jj*: *sajja* (*ṣaḍja*); [*ḍd>dd*: *chaddisim* (*ṣaḍdisam*)]; *ḍbh>bbh*: *chabbhua* (*ṣaḍbhujā*); [*ḍv>vv* : *chavvisam* (*ṣaḍviṣati*)]; *tk>kk*: M. *ukkaṇṭhā* (*utkaṇṭhā*); *balakkāra*, Mg. *balakkāla* (*balātkāra*); *tkh>kkh* : M. *ukkhaa*⁶ (*utkhāta*); *tp>pp*: *uppala* (*utpala*); *ṭph>pph* : ^o*upphulla* (*utphulla*); Mg. *upphāla* (*utphāla*); *dg>gg* : ^o*mōggara* (*mudgara*); *dgh>ggh*: *ugghāda*, M. *ugghāa* (*udghāta*); *db>bb*: *ubbandhia* (*udbandhya*); M. [12] *bubbua* (*budbuda*); *dbh>bbh*: ^o*ubbhaḍa* (*udbhaḍa*); *p>tt* : ^o*sutta* (*supta*); *bj>jj* : ^o*khujja*⁷ (*kubja*); *bd>dd* : ^o*sadda* (*śabda*); *bdh>ddh* : ^o*laddha* (*labdha*).

Double consonants mostly remain unchanged when it is the question of a final sound of the same class, for ex. *datta* in personal names. In Mg. *ṭṭ>ṣṭ* : *paṣṭa* (*paṭṭa*), *bhaṣṭālikā* (*bhaṭṭārikā*). Stenzler writes in his edition of *Mṛcchakaṭikā* ṣṭ : for ex. *bhaṣṭaka* (*bhaṭṭaka*). According to Pischel (§ 271) ṣṭ is to be written.

Nasal + consonant remains preserved : ^o*sañhalā* (*śṛñkhalā*), ^o*mañjari*, ^o*kañṭha*, ^o*khaṇḍa*, ^o*anta*, ^o*jambū*. But it is written ^o*diṇmuha* (*dīṇmukha*), ^o*paṇṭi* (*pañṭi*), ^o*Viñjha* (*Vindhya*), ^o*sañjhā* (*sandhyā*), because in these cases the original nasal comes out of its class. — *ñj* in Mg. becomes *ññ* : *aññali* (*añjali*), *Dhaññañña* (*Dhanañjaya*).

ṇ, *n* assimilate themselves with the foregoing consonants : M. *rugga* (*ruṅga*); ^o*aggi* (*agni*), ^o*uvviggā* (*udvigna*), ^o*savattī* (*sapatnī*). — *jñ>ṇñ* [Mg. *ññ* : *avaññā* (*avajñā*), initially *ṇ* : ^o*paññā* (*prajñā*), ^o*añavedi* (*añjapayati*), *km>pp* : *Ruppīṇi* (*Rukmiṇi*); *gm>gg*: ^o*jugga* (*yugma*). — *ātman* has N. sg. ^o*appā*, otherwise the stem runs ^o*attā*, — *nm>mm*: ^o*jamma* (*janma*); *mr>ṇr*: *Pajjuṇṇa* (*Pradyumna*).

7. Groups with semivowels.

a) *ky>kk* : *Cāṇakka* (*Cāṇakya*); *khy>kkh*: ^o*sōkkha* (*saukhyā*); *gy>gg*: ^o*jōgga* (*yogyā*); *cy>cc*: *vuccadi* (*ucyate*); M. *muccai* (*mucyate*); *jy>jj*: *jujjadi*, M. *jujjai* (*yujiyate*); *ṭy>ṭṭ* : *naṭṭaa* (*nāṭyaka*), M. *tuṭṭai* (*truṭyati*); *ḍy>ḍḍ* : ^o*kuḍḍa* (*kuḍya*); *ḍhy>ḍḍh* : ^o*aḍḍha* (*āḍhya*); *ṇy>ṇṇ* : ^o*puṇṇa* (*puṇya*);

6. With shortening of long *ā*, when the accent rests on the first syllable.

7. Aspiration (for non-aspirate sounds in Sanskrit) is often found in Prakrit.

Mg. śahilaraṇṇa (sahiraṇya) beside abamhaṇṇa (abrāhmaṇya), puṇṇa (puraṇya); ty>cc: °accanta (atyanta); thy>cch: °nevaccha (nepathya); dy>jj, in Mg. yy: vējja (vaīdya), but Mg. ayya (adya); dhy>jjh, Mg. yyh: °uwajjhāa (upādhyāya), Mg. mayyhaṇṇa (madhyāhna); ny>ṇṇ : °aṇṇa (anya); py>[13] pp : kuppadi, M. kuppai (kupyati), bhy>bbh : M. abbhantara (abhyantara); °abbhuvavaṇṇa (abhyupapanna); my>mm : kilammadi, M. kilammai (klāmyati); yy>jj : °sējjā (śayyā); ry>jj : °ajja, but Mg. ayya (ārya); ly>ll : °mulla (mūlya); vy>vv : M. kavva (kāvyā); °hodavva (bhavitavya).

b) rk>kk : takkemi (tarkayāmi), M. akka (arka); kr>kk : °cakka (cakra); rkh>kkh : °mukkhā (mūrkha); rg>gg : °ṇiggama (nīrgama); gr>gg : agga (agra), M. (g)gaha (graha); rgh>ggh : °digghīā (dīrghikā), M. ṇiggahā (nīrghā); ghr>ggh : vaggā (vyāghra), M. agghāi (āghrāti); rc>cc : kucca (kūrca), M. accā (arcā); rch>cch : mucchā (mūrchā); chr>cch : samucchāda (samucchrīta); rj>jj; Mg. yy : dujjaṇa (durjana), M. Ajjāṇa, but Mg. Ayyāṇa (Arjuna); jr>jj : °vajja (vajra); rjh>jjh; Mg. yyh : °ṇijjhara, Mg. ṇiyyhala); ṇṇ>ṇṇ : °kaṇṇa (karṇa), rt and tr>tt : °kitti (kīrti), °kalatta (kalatra); rth>tth : °atthā (artha), but in Mg. st : tista (tīrtha); rd and dr>dd : °duddiṇa (durdina), °bhadda (bhadrā); rdh and dhr>ddh : °addha (ardha), °giddha (gīrdhra); rp and pr>pp : °dappa (darpa), °appia (apriya); rb and br>bb : ṇibbandha (nīrbandha), M. dōbballa (daurbalya); abbamhaṇṇa (abrāhmaṇya), Mg. (b)bamhaṇa (brāhmaṇa); rbh and bhr>bbh : dubbhējja (durbhedyā), M. gabbha (garbha); paribbhamadi, M. °maī (paribhramati); rm and mr>mm : dummaṇussa (durmanuṣya), M. dhamma (dharmā); °Dhummakkha (Dhūmrākṣa); rl>ll : °dullaha (durlabha); rv and vr>vv : °puvva (pūrva) °parivvājja (parivrājaka).

c) lk and kl>kk : °vakkala (valkala), viikkava (viklaba); lg>gg : °phaggaṇa (phālguna); lp and pl> [14]pp : °kappa (kalpa), °vip̄pava (vip̄lava); lph>pph : guppha (gulpha); lb>bb : kibbisa (kilbīsa); lbh>bbh : pagabbhadi (pragalbhate); lm and ml>mm : °gumma (gulma), M. vammīa (valmīka); (m)mēccha (mleccha); lv>ll : gallakka (galvarka), M. pallala (palvala).

d) kv>kk : pakka or °pikka (pakva); jv>jj : pajjaladi, M. °lai (prajvalati); ṇv>ṇṇ : Kaṇṇa (Kaṇva), M. kiṇṇa (kiṇva); tv>tt : °satta (sattva), Mg. cattāli (catvāri); dv>dd : °(d)diṇṇa (dvīgūṇa), or vv, particularly with ud : for ex. °uvvīgga (udvīgna); dhv>ddh : uddhattha (uddhvasta), but °sajjhasa (sādhvasa); nv>ṇṇ : aṇṇesaṇṇā (anveṣaṇṇā), Mg. maṇṇantala

8. tr in tth is apparent only in adverbs in tra and its compounds: aṇṇattha (anyatra), atthabhavaṇṇa (atrabhavaṇṇa), M. kattha (kuttra); °jattha (yatra), °tattha (tatra), tattha bhavaṇṇa (tatrabhavaṇṇa); M. savvattha (sarvatra). Cp. Pischel § 293.— Sometimes it undergoes cerebralisation : for ex. bhattā (bhartā, “lord”, but °bhattā “husband”; °vaṭṭadi, M. vaṭṭai (vartate); °vicchadda (viccharda), vadḍhadi, M. vadḍhai (vardhate).

(*manvantara*). Take note *evaṃ nedaṃ* (*evaṃ nu etat*), **kiṃ nedaṃ* (*kiṃ nu etat*).

8. Groups with sibilants

a) śc>cch, unchanged in Mg. **accharia*, *accharīa*, Mg. *aścalia* (*āścarya*); if an ś stands at the end of the members of a compound then śc is changed cc : **ñiccala* [but Mg. *ñiścala*] (*niścala*); *duccarida*, M. *duccaria* (*duścarita*); *tavaccaraṇa* (*tapaścaraṇa*).—śch>cch: M. *ñicchallia* (*niśchallita*); śr>ṛh : *paṛha* (*praśna*), M. *aṛhaī* (*aśnāti*), śm>mh: *Kamhīra*, M. *Kamhāra* (*Kaśmīra*); in Mg. unchanged; *raśmi* becomes *rassi*; initially śm>m : **masāṇa*, Mg. *maśāṇa* (*śmaśāna*).—śy, śr, śt, śv>ss⁹, Mg. śś : *avassaṃ* (*avaśyam*); Mg. *viṇaśśadu* (*viṇaśyatū*); *missa*, Mg. *miśsa*, M. *mīsa* (*mīśra*); (*s*)*sāhaṇīā* (*ślāghaṇīyā*); *Vissāvasu*, Mg. *Viśśāvaśu* (*Viśvāvasu*).¹⁰

b) śk and śkh>usually kkh : *pōkkhara* (*puṣkara*), M. *vikkhambha* (*viṣkambha*), the aspiration can, however, also be left : **Kikkindha* (*Kiṣkindha*), **dukkara* (*duṣkara*). In Mg. śk is changed to sk, śkh to skh¹¹ : *śuska* (*śuśka*), *dhaṇuśkhaṇḍa* (*dhamuś*⁰),—kṣ>cch or kkh : **acchi* (*akṣi*) but also *akkhi*; **riccha* beside **rikkha* (*ṛkṣa*); (*k*)*khattia* (*kṣatriya*), *sikkhida*, M. *sikkhīa* (*śikṣita*), **dakkhīna* (*dakṣiṇa*). [15] *kṣaṇa* “twinkling of eye” becomes **khaṇa*, in the sense of a festival *°(c)chaṇa*. In Mg. kṣ>sk : *laskaśe* (*rākṣasaḥ*), *daske* (*dakṣaḥ*).¹²—kṣṇ and kṣm>ṛh, mh resp. : *tṛṇa* [beside **tikkhā*] (*tikṣṇa*), **pamhala* (*paḥśmala*). *lakṣmī* always becomes *lacchī*. śṭ and śṭh>ṭṭh : **diṭṭhi* (*drṣṭi*), **suṭṭhu* (*suṣṭhu*). Mg. changes śṭ and śṭh into sṭ¹³ : *kaṣṭa* (*kaṣṭa*), *suṣṭu* (*suṣṭhu*).—śṛ>ṛh, Mg. sṛ : **uṛha* (*uṣṇa*), Mg. *Viṣṇu*¹⁴ (*Viṣṇu*); śp and śph>pph Mg. sp resp. sph¹⁵ : **puppha* (*puṣpa*), Mg. *śaspa* (*śaspa*); **ṇippphala*, Mg. *ṇisphala* (*niṣphala*), *bāśpa* “tear” becomes **bāha*, in the sense of “smoke, vapour” *bappha*.—śm>mh : **gimha* (*griśma*); śy and śv>ss, Mg. śś : **manussa*, Mg. *maṇuśśa* (*maṇuśya*); *parissaadi* (*pariśvajate*).

c) sk and skh>kkh : *°(k)khambha* (*skambha*), *°parikkhalanta*

9. In M. a single s possibly with the lengthening of the foregoing vowel : *ṇāsai* (*naśyati*), *vesā* (*veśyā*); Ś. has *vesajana* and *vēśā*⁰=*veśyājana*.
10. A single s with lengthening for ex. an *ṇisasadi*, M. *ṇisasaī*, Mg. *ṇiśasādu* (*ṇiṣvasitti*, *ṇiṣvasitū*).
11. According to Namisādhu (in Rudraṭa, *Kāvyaśāstra* II, 12) śk, śkh resp. so *śuśke* (*śuśka*), *dhaṇuśkhaṇḍa* (*dhamuś*⁰).
12. Hemacandra and Namisādhu reduce this to *prekṣ* and *ācakṣ* (*pēkadi*, *amacakadi* = *prekṣate*, *ācakṣte* and instructs besides the passage of *kṣ* (initially) to *ḥk* : *lahkaśe*, *paḥka* (*rākṣasaḥ*, *paḥka*).
13. Namisādhu writes śṭ and śṭh resp: *kaṣṭa*, *kōṣṭhāgāra* (*kaṣṭa*, *koṣṭhāgāra*).
14. Namisādhu teaches *Viṣṇu*.
15. According to Namisādhu śp and śph.

(*pariskhalan*); in Mg. it is retained¹⁶ : *maskali* (*maskarin*), *paskhaladi* (*praskhalati*), and in compounds usually the aspiration remains : *tirakkāra* (*tiraskāra*), M. *ṇamakkāra* (*namaskāra*).—*st* and *sth*>*tth* sometimes *ṭṭh* : °*atthi* (*asti*), °*avatthā* (*avasthā*), however °*aṭṭhi* (*asthi*); *uṭṭhehi* beside *utthehi*, *utthedu* (*uttiṣṭha*, *uttiṣṭhatu*), M. *ṭhia*, *thia*, Ś. *ṭhida*, *thida*; *utthida*, M. *uṭṭhia*, *utthia* (*sthita*, *utthita*); *patthida*, M. *patthia* (*prasthita*); °*ṭhāṇa*, M. has also *thāṇa* (*sthāna*), *ṭhidi*, *thidi*, M. *ṭhii*, *thii* (*sthitī*). In Mg. *st* is preserved¹⁷ and *sth*>*st*: *hasti* (*hastin*), *wastida* (*upasthita*).—*ts*>*cch*, Mg. *śc* : °*vacchala*, Mg. *vaścala* (*vatsala*); or it becomes [as also originally *t+ś*]>*ss*, resp. *s* with lengthening of the foregoing vowel, so in compositions when *t* stands at the end of a syllable; *ussāvedi* (*ut-śrāpayati*); *ūasida*, M. *ūasīa* (*ut-śvasita*); *pajjussua* (*paryutsuka*), *samūsua* (*samutsuka*), °*ūsava* (*utsava*), °*mahūsava* (*mahotsava*), *vasantūsava* (*vasantotsava*); Mg. *ūśāśadu* (*ut-śvasatu*). *sn*>[16] *ṇh* in case the group is not separated by a semivowel: °*ṇhāda*, M. *ṇhā* (*snāta*)¹⁸; *sp* and *sph*>*pph*, in Mg. they are preserved : *Bihapphadi* (*Bṛhaspati*), *papphuradi*, M. °*rai* (*prasphurati*), Mg. *Buhaspadi*, *sphulanti* (*Bṛhaspati*, *spuranti*)¹⁹. Very frequent is °*phaṃsa* (*sparśa*); loss of aspiration : °*parōppara* (*paraspara*), M. *avarōppara* (*aparaspāra*).—*ps*>*cch*: *accharā* (*apsarāḥ*), *jugucchedi*, M. *juucchai* (*jugups[ya]ti*); *sm*>*mḥ*: °*amhe* (*asme*); the pronominal ending *smiṇ* becomes °*ssim*, Mg. *śsim* : *edassim*, M. *eassim*, Mg. *edaśsim* (*estasmīṇ*).—*sy*, *sr*, *sv*>*ss*, -Mg. *śś* : °*rahassa* (*rahasya*), Mg. *taśśa* (*tasya*); °*sahassa*, Mg. *śahaśśa* (*sahasra*); *tavassi*, Mg. *tavaśśi* (*tapasvīṇ*), M. *Sarassai* (*Sarasvatī*).

9. *ḥk*, *ḥkh*, *ḥp*, *ḥph*>*kk*, *kch*, *pp*, *pph* : *antakkarāṇa* (*antaḥkaraṇa*), °*dukkha*, (*duḥkha*), *antappāda* (*antaḥpāta*).

ḥs, *ḥṣ*, *ḥs*>*ss* [Mg. *śś*] or, with extension of the foregoing vowel, *s* [Mg. *ś*]: *cadussāla* (*catuḥśāla*), *Dussanta*, Mg. *Duśśanta* (*Duḥsmanta*), *cadussamudda* (*catuḥsamudra*), Mg. *niśśalida* (*niḥsṛta*); M. *ṇisaṅka* (*niḥsaṅka*); °*ṇisaha* beside °*ṇissaha* (*niḥsaha*).

hṛ, *hn*, *hm*, *hb*>*ṇh*, *mḥ*, *lh* : °*avarāṇha* (*aparāḥṇa*), °*gēṇhadi* (*grṇhāti*); °*ciṇha* (*ciḥna*); °*bamhaṇa* (*brāhmaṇa*); °*palhatta* (*prahlasta*).

hy>*jjh*, Mg. *yh* : °*sajjha*, Mg. *śayha* (*sahya*); *hv*>*bbh* : *gabbhara* (*gahvara*); but °*jihā*, Mg. *yihā* (*jihvā*).

10. **Transition of dentals to cerebrals** : *maṭṭiā* (*mṛttikā*), °*vuḍḍha* (*vṛddha*), °*tālaverṇa* (*tālavṛnta*), °*gaṇṭhi* (*granthi*), Mg. *gaṇṭhiścedaa* (*granthicchedaka*). Cp. also the remark in § 7, b.

16. According to Namisādhu *śk* and *śkh*.

17. According to Namisādhu *st*>*št*.

18. For Mg. there run manuscript forms *ṇhāmi* (*snāmi*), *ṇhāde* (*snātaḥ*).

19. After Namisādhu *śp* and *śph*.

For groups of more than two consonants the same rules are valid : °*maccha*, Mg. *maśca* (*matsya*), °*aggha* (*arghya*). Only two consonants written, even when three are required there; for ex. *satta* not *sattta* (from *sattva*).—*jyotsnā*>°*jōrhā*.

[17] *ca* “and” after *anusvāra* only, besides shortened to *a* in all the dialects.

punar “again” becomes °*puṇo*, in the sense of “but, however” °*uṇa*. *y* in Mg. before *eva* is indicated before a short or a shortend vowel doubled : *mama yyeva*, *idō yyeva* (*mamaiva*, *ita eva*).

r is preserved in cases like *durāgada* (*durāgata*), °*nirantara* (*nī°*), °*puṇarutta* (*punarukta*), against *antakkarāṇa* (*antaḥkarāṇa*), *antaggada* (*antargata*), *puṇarṇava* (*punarṇava*). It is to be noted °*anteura*, *anteuriā* (*antaḥpura*, *antaḥpurikā*).

v is represented by °*via*(*iva*), °*vuccadi* (*ucyate*); however °*utta* (*ukta*);

MORPHOLOGY

A. Noun

11. The consonantal declension is wholly upto the rest sporadically for ex. M. *vivaā* (*vipadā*), *disi disi* (*dīsi dīsi*), Mg. *ṛiṣi* (*niṣi*)—has been lost. The consonantal stems cast off the final consonants and now were handled vocalic ones or oftener the stem was extended through *a* (for masculines and neuters), through *ā* or *ī* (with feminines) resp. —The dual has been lost and was replaced (with noun and verb) by the plural). The dative were paraphrased with °*atthaṃ* (*artham*) and °*nimittaṃ* (*nimittam*); in M. it often happens with *a* stems : *marañāa*, *hāsāa*, *vañāa* and so forth (*marañāya*, *hāsāya*, *vañāya*).

a) **Masculine and neuters in *a*** : *putta* (*putra*), *phala* : Sing. N. °*putto*, Mg. *putte*; A. °*puttaṃ*; I. °*putteṇa* [D.M., Mg. *puttāa*] Abl. °*puttādo*²⁰; G. °*puttassa*²¹; L. °*putte*²²; [18] V. °*putta*²³.—Plur. N. °*puttā*; A. °*putte*²⁴; I. °*puttehiṃ*; G. °*puttāṇaṃ*²⁵; L. °*puttesuṃ*²⁶; V. = N²⁷.

-
20. M. *puttāo*; *metri causa* also the ending *āu* : *sisāu* (*śiṣāṭ*), and not rarely also forms in *ā* : *vasā* (*vaśāṭ*), *balā* (*balāṭ*), or also in *hi* : *mūlāhi* (*mūlāṭ*), seldom with *hiṃto* : *hiaāhiṃto* (*hṛdayāṭ*).
21. Mg. *puttaśśa*; besides the ending *ha* °*śalīlāha* (*śarīrasya*)
22. M. also with *mni* : *jōvvaṇammī* (*yauvane*); Mg. also in *hiṃ* : *kulahiṃ* (*kule*), in verses also with *mni* : *kūvammi* (*kūpe*).
23. Also often with lengthened final sounds : °*puttā*; Mg. also uses the N. as V.: *bhāve*, *ceḍe*, *lāutte* (*bhāva*, *ceṭa*, *raja Putra*).
24. M. has also sometimes forms in *ā* : *guṇā*, *dosā* (*guṇān*, *doṣān*).
25. M. much oftener without nasal.
26. In M. *puttesu* is prevalent; Mg. *putteśuṃ*.
27. For Mg. the ending *ho* is also permitted : *puttāho*.

The neuter is just so, only N.A. Sing. °*phalaṃ*, Plur. °*phalāṃ* [Mārkaṇḍeya for Ś. also permits *phalāṃ* as well], metrically M. has also *phalāi*, *phalāi*.

b) **Feminine in ā** : *mālā* (*mālā*). Sing. N. °*mālā*. A. °*mālaṃ*; I. °*mālāe*²⁸, Abl. °*mālādo*, °*malāe*²⁹; G.L. °*mālāe*; V. *māle*³⁰. Plur. N. A.V. °*mālāo*³¹; I. °*mālāhiṃ*³²; [Abl. M. *mālāhiṃto*] G. °*mālāṇaṃ*³³; L. °*mālāsu(ṃ)*.

12. **Masculine and neuter in i and u**: *aggi* (*agni*), *dahi* (*dadhi*) : Sing. N. °*aggi*³⁴; A. °*aggiṃ*; I. °*aggiṇā*. [Abl. *aggido*]³⁵; G. °*aggiṇo*; L. °*aggimmi*; V. °*aggi-* plur N. °*aggiṇo*, °*aggiṇo*³⁶ A. °*aggiṇo*; I. °*aggihiṃ*³⁷ [Abl. M. *aggihiṃto*] G. °*aggiṇaṃ*³⁸; L. °*aggiṣu(ṃ)*.

Just so the neuter, but N. A. Sing. °*dahiṃ*, Plur. *dahīṃ*.

Example for Masculine in i : *vāu* (*vāyu*), Sing. N. °*vāū*; A. °*vāuṃ*; I. °*vāuṇā*; [Abl. *vāudo*]; G. °*vāuṇo*³⁹; L. *vāummi*; V. °*vāu*. Plu. N. °*vāuṇo*, *vāao*⁴⁰; A. *vāuṇo*; I. °*vāūhiṃ*⁴¹; G. °*vāūnaṃ*⁴²; L. °*vāūsū(ṃ)*.

[19] Just so the neuter, only N.A. Sing. °*mahu(ṃ)* (*madhu*), Plur. °*mahūṃ*.

13. **The feminine in i and u** are as good as vanished and those with *ī* and *ū* have fallen together. These are declined like feminine stems in *ā*.. Full-fledged paradigm here (as elsewhere) are not to be envisaged, consequently therefore the individual cases of various stems will be given *gadi*, *vahū*, (*gati*, *vadhū*) : Sing. N. °*gadī*⁴³, °*vahū*; A. °*gadiṃ*, °*vahuṃ*; I. °*gadīe*⁴⁴; Abl. *Sacido* (*Śacyāḥ*), Mg. *ṇaalido* (*nagaryāḥ*); G.

28. M. has *metri causa* oftener *mālāi*.

29. M. *mālāo*.

30. °*halā* ("O lady friend" is often in conjunction with the V. of a proper noun : *halā Saūntale*, *halā Aṇusūe* (*sakhi Śakuntale*, *sakhi Anusūye*).

31. Rarely is N.A. °*mālā*, N. *metri causa mālāu* in M.

32. M. has also *mālāhi*.

33. M. *mālāṇa*.

34. According to Mārkaṇḍeya; in Hultzsck p.716. In M. *vahūu* (*udadheḥ*).

35. M. beside it also *aggissa*.

36. M. has also *aggi*.

37. M. also *aggihi*.

38. M. *aggiṇa* also.

39. M. *vāussa*; Mg. metrically: *Viśśāvaśśā* (*Viśvāvasoh*).

40. M. *vāū* also.

41. M. also *vāūhi*.

42. Also M. *vāūṇa*; Mg. metrically *bāhuṇa* (*bāhvoh*).

43. M. *gaī*.

44. M. *gaie*. Note Ś *diṭṭhiā* (*diṣṭyā*). M. metrically *deviā* (*devyā*).

**gadīe*, °*vahūe*; L. *rattimmi* (*rātrau*)⁴⁵; V. °*sahi* (*sakhi*).—Plur. N. A.V. : **gadio*, °*vahūo*⁴⁶; I. °*sahihim*⁴⁷ (*sakhibhis*); G. °*kāminīṇaṃ*; L. *deviṣuṃ*.

14. **Stems in ṛ a)** Agentive noun : *bhattā* “husband”, *bhaṭṭā* “lord” (*bharṭṛ*), Sing. N. °*bhattā*, *bhaṭṭā*; A. °*bhattāraṃ*⁴⁸, *bhaṭṭāraṃ*; I. *bhaṭṭīṇā*; G. °*bhattuṇo*, *bhaṭṭiṇo*; L. *bhattāre*; V. °*bhattā*, *bhaṭṭā*.—Plur. N. *bhattāro*.

b) Relation words *pidu* (*pitṛ*). Sing. N. °*pidā*⁴⁹; A. *pidaram*⁵⁰; I. °*piduṇā*⁵¹; G. °*piduṇo*⁵². Plur. A. *pidaro*.

māṭṛ has in Sing N. °*mādā*⁵³, A. *mādaraṃ*⁵⁴, G. *madāe*, V. *māde*⁵⁵.

Of the **stems in e, o, au** there comes here only *nau* to be considered with N. *ṇāvā* and A. *nāvam* (both are Ś forms).

15. **The stems in at, mat, and vat** cross over to the *a*-declension with the employment of the strong stems, ending also in *anta*, *manta* and *vanta*, excepting *bhagavat* and *bhavat* [20] “thou” in Ś. Mg. which go in the following way : Sing. N. °*bhaavaṃ*, *bhavaṃ*; A. *bhaavantaṃ*, *bhavantaṃ*; I. *bhaavadā*, *bhavadā*; G. °*bhaavado*, *bhavado*; V. *bhaavaṃ*.—Plur. N.V. *bhaavanto*.

The rest of the stems : Sing. N. Mascul *mahanto karēnto*⁵⁶, *cittavanto*, (*mahān*, *kurvan*, *cittavān*); A. *mahantaṃ*, *jāṇantaṃ*⁵⁷, I. *calanteṇa* (*calatā*), *bhuttavanteṇa* (*bhuktavatā*)⁵⁸; G. *cintaantassa* (*cintayataḥ*), *mahantassa* (*mahataḥ*), *Himavantassa* (*°vataḥ*)⁵⁹; L. *mahante*⁶⁰; [V. *calanta*]⁶¹.—Plur. N. *sikkhantā* (*śikṣantaḥ*)⁶²; [A. *sikkhante*

45. Besides the form ° is like the I.G.: M. *paavīe* (*padavyām*), Mg. *dhalaṇīe* (*dharanyām*), Ś. *masāṇavidhīe*, (*śmasānavithyām*).

46. M. metrically *taruṇiu* (*taruṇyaḥ*).

47. M. without nasal as well.

48. Mg. *bhattālaṃ*

49. M. *piā*.

50. M. *piaraṃ*, Mg. *pidalaṃ*

51. M. *piuṇā*.

52. M. *piuṇo*.

53. M. *māā*.

54. M. *māaraṃ*.

55. M. *māe*.

56. M. *kuṇanto*; Mg. *puścaṃde*, *mahante*, *colaante* (*ṛcchan*, *mahān*, *corayan*).

57. M. Mg. *ebenso*; note Mg. *mālantaṃ*=*mārayantam*.

58. M. *pianteṇa* (*piatā*); Mg. *gaścanteṇa* (*gacchatā*).

59. M. *jāṇantassa* (*jānataḥ*); Mg. *alihantaśśa* (*arhataḥ*).

60. M. most of all forms with *mmi* : *ruantammi* (*rudati*); *Haṇumantammi* beside *Haṇūmante* (*Haṇūmatī*).

61. not recorded in Ś : M. *sasanta* (*śvasan*), Mg. *alihanta* (*arhan*).

62. M. *jāṇantā* (*jānantaḥ*), Mg. *śasantā* (*śvasantaḥ*).

= śikṣata]⁶³; I. °gacchantehiṃ (gacchadbhīḥ)⁶⁴; G. pēkkhantāṇaṃ (prekṣamāṇānām)⁶⁵; L. vaṭṭantesu (vartamāneṣu).

The neuter has anomalous N. Sing. M. *bhaṇantaṃ*, Ś. *disantaṃ* (*bhaṇat*, *dṛśyamānam*); but Mg. *dahante* (*dahat*). A. as in the masculine : *mahantaṃ* (*mahat*), M. *santaṃ* (*sat*); likewise in rest of the cases (Plur. N.A. not recorded).

16. **Stems in n** : *rāa*, Mg. *lāa* (*rājan*). Sing. N. °*rāā*⁶⁶; A. °*rāāṇaṃ*⁶⁷; I. °*raṇṇā*⁶⁸; G. °*raṇṇo*, °*rāiṇo*⁶⁹; V. *rāaṃ*⁷⁰.—Plur. N.A. °*rāāṇo*⁷¹. The remaining cases are not documented.

At the end of a compound *rājan* is handled in the following manner : N. *mahārāo*, A. *mahārāaṃ*, I. *mahārāeṇa*, G. *mahārāassa* (beside *Kalīngaraṇṇo*), Mg. *mahālāśśa*; V. *mahārāa*; Plur. N. *mahārāā*

ātman forms Sing. N. °*attā*⁷²; A. °*attāṇaṃ* (= *ātmānakam*)⁷³; I. *appaṇā*⁷⁴; G. °*attaṇo*⁷⁵; [V.M. *apaṇaṃ*].

[21] Words ending in *varman* have *vammā* or *vammo* : *Vijaavammā*, *Vijaavammaṃ* (*Vijayavarmā*, °*varman*), *Cittavammo* (*Citravarmā*), *Miaṅkavammo*, °*vammassa* (*Mṛgāṅkavarmā*, °*varmaṇaḥ*).

The **neuters ending in-** an go usually as those in *a* : *pēmma*, *nāma* (*preman*, °*nāmaṇ*) : Sing. N.A. °*pēmmaṃ*, °*nāmaṃ*; I. °*pēmmeṇa*, °*nāmeṇa*; [Abl. *jammado*=*janmataḥ*]; G. °*pemmassa*; L. °*pēmme*⁷⁶.—Plur. I. *dāmehiṃ* (*dāmabhīḥ*); L. *kammesu*, Mg. *kammeṣu*.

17. **Stems ending in in, min, vin** : Sing. N. °*hatthī*, Mg. *hastī* (*hastī*); *tavassī*, Mg. *tavaṣṣī* (*tapasvī*); A. *kañcuiṃ*⁷⁷ (*kañcukinaṃ*), but elsewhere *piāriṇaṃ*, *uaāriṇaṃ* (*priyakāriṇaṃ*, *upakāriṇaṃ*); I. *sāmiṇā* (*svāminā*)⁷⁸; G. *virohiṇo* (*virodhinaḥ*)⁷⁹; V. *kañcui* (*kañcukin*).—Plur. N. *pakchiṇo* (*pakṣinaḥ*), *kañcuiṇo* (*kañcukinaḥ*)⁸⁰; [I. Mg. *vaṇḍiḥiṃ*=*vandibhīḥ*—G.M. *barahiṇa*=*barhiṇām*; Mg. *śāmiṇaṃ*=*svāminām*] L. *sāmisu* (*svāmiṣu*)⁸¹. V=N : *adhivāsiṇo*, Mg. *vaṇḍiṇo* (°*vāsinaḥ*, *vandinaḥ*).

63. M. *uṇṇamante* (*unnamataḥ*).

64. Mg. *paviśantehiṃ* (*praviśadbhīḥ*).

65. M. also without nasal : *cintantāna* (*cintayatam*); Mg. *alihantāṇaṃ* (*arhatām*).

66. Mg. *lāā*.

67. Mg. *lāāṇaṃ*.

68. Mg. *laññā*.

69. Mg. *lañño* and *lāiṇo*.

70. Mg. *lāaṃ*.

71. Mg. *lāāṇo*.

72. M. *appā*.

73. M. *appaṇaṃ*.

74. M. also *appaṇeṇa*.

75. M. *appaṇo* beside *attaṇo*; Mg. also *attaṇaśśa*. M. yet also has the forms *appaṇo*, *attaṇo* (*ātmā*). G. *appaṇaassa*, L. *appaṇe*; Plur. N. *appā* (*ātmānaḥ*).

76. M. also *pēmamma* Plur. N. *pēmṇāiṃ*, G. *pēmṇāṇaṃ*.

77. M. *hatthiṃ* (*hastinaṃ*).

78. Mg. *sāmiṇā*. M. *sasiṇā* (*śaśinā*).

79. M. *sasiṇo*, Mg. *sāmiṇo*.

80. M. *phaṇiṇo*, *sañkiṇo* etc. (*phaṇinaḥ*, *sañkinaḥ*).

81. M. *paṇāisu* (*praṇayitsu*).

18. **Stems ending in as.** N. *Purūravā* (^ovās)⁸²; A. *Purūravasaṃ*; I. *Purūraveṇa*; G. *Purūravassa*; L. *Purūravast*⁸³. The inflection is customarily after the *a*-declension; N.M. *viṃaṇo* (*viṃanāḥ*), **neuter** N.M. *dummaṇaṃ* (*durmanaḥ*); A. **neuter** *uraṃ, jasaṃ, ṇahaṃ, siraṃ* (*uraḥ, yaśaḥ, nabhaḥ, śiraḥ*)⁸⁴; I. M. *vaccheṇa* (*vakṣasā*); ^o*sireṇa* (*śirasā*); M. *maṇena* (*manasā*)⁸⁵; G. *tamassa, rajassa* (*tamaśaḥ, rajaśaḥ*); L.M. *ure* beside *urammi* (*urasi*), *ṇahe* and *ṇhammi* (*nabhasi*), *sire*, *maṇe* (*śirasi, manasi*), *sarammi* (*sarasi*), Ś. *sōtte* (*srotasi*).—Plur. N.M. *sarā* (*sarāṃsi*); I.M. *sarehi, sirehi* and *sirehiṃ* (*sarobhīḥ, śirobhīḥ*); G.M. *sarāṇa* (*sarasām*).—**Feminine forms** are : N.M. *viṃaṇa vva* (*viṃanā eva*), Ś. *pajjussuamaṇā* (*paryutsukamaṇāḥ*); AM *viṃaṇaṃ*; I. *taggadamaṇāe*=*tadgatamanaskayā*; M. *viṃanāi* (metrically for *viṃanāe*); Plur. N.M. *gaavaāo*=*gatavayaskāḥ*; A. *sumaṇāo*=*sumanasah*; LM. *viṃaṇāhiṃ*, [22] *maṅgalamaṇāhi*; G.M. *gaavaāṇa*, (*gatavayaskānām*).—*apsaras* runs : N. *accharā*, Plur. N. *accharāo*, I. *accharāhiṃ*.

19. **Stems ending in is, us.** Apart from the rest like *Āuso* (*Āyuśaḥ*) they figure vocalical : N. *dihāu*⁸⁶ (*dīrghāyuh*), **neuter** M. *haviṃ, dhaṇuṃ* (*haviḥ, dhanuḥ*); A. *dihāuṃ* (*dīrghāyuśaṃ*), ^o*dhaṇuṃ* (*dhanuḥ*); I. *dihāuṇā* (*dīrghāyuśā*)⁸⁷.

B. Comparison

20. The suffixes are the same as in Sanskrit : *mahattara*, Mg. *mahattala*, M. *tikkhaara* (*tikṣṇatara*); *piadama*, M. *piaama* (*priyatama*); *kaṇiāsī* (*kaṇiyasī*), *kaṇiṭṭha* (*kaṇiṣṭha*); *bhūo* (*bhūyas*) beside *bahudara* (^o*tara*); *jēṭṭha* (*jyeṣṭha*). Sometimes the positive stays in the sense of the comparative : *tatto vi... pia tti* (*tvatto* ^o*pi ... priya iti*), “himself dearer than thou”; M. *ovaṇāhi vi lahuaṃ* (*avapatanād api laghukam*) “quicker than the plunge”.

82. Similarly in Mg. *śamaśśāsīdamaṇā* = *samāsvastamaṇāḥ*.

83. Mg. *śilaśī* (*śirasi*).

84. Mg. *maṇaṃ* (*manas*).

85. Abl. M. *sirāhi* (*śirasah*).

86. Besides (of the extended stems) *dihāuso*, M. *adiharāuso* (*adīrghāyuh*; *dihara* stands for **dīraha*=*dīrgha*, Pischel § 354).

87. L.M. *dhaṇuḥ* (*dhanuṣi*). *āsī* forms the stem *āsīsā*=whence I. *āsīsāe*, Plur. *āsīsāhiṃ*—and *āsīsā* : A. *āsīsaṃ*, G. *āsīsāe*, Plur. *āsīsāṇaṃ*. The stem *vāc* is extended to *vācā* and therefore runs : N.M. *vāā*; A. M. *vāaṃ*. I. ^o*vāāe*, also M. *vāāi*; G. Mg. *vāāe*; L.M. *vāāi*; Plur. N.M. *vāā* and *vāāo*; L.M. *vāāsu*.

C. Pronoun

21. The pronoun of the first and second person.

Singular

N. °ahaṇṭ ⁸⁸	°tumaṇṭ ⁸⁴
A. °maṇṭ ⁸⁹	°°, te, de
I. °mae ⁹⁰	°tae, °tue ⁹⁵
Abl. matto, mamādo ⁹¹	tatto ⁹⁶
G. °mama, °maha, °me ⁹²	°tuha °[te], °de ⁹⁷
L. mai ⁹³	°tai, tuf ⁹⁸

[23]

Plural

N. °amhe ⁹⁹	°tumhe ¹⁰³
A. ṇo ¹⁰⁰	tumhe
I. °amhehiṇṭ ¹⁰¹	tumhehiṇṭ ¹⁰⁴
Abl.	
G. °amhāṇaṇṭ ¹⁰² , ṇo	°tumhāṇam, °vo ¹⁰⁵
L. amhesu	

22. Third person pronoun

	Singular	
Masculine	Feminine	neuter
N. °so ¹⁰⁶	°sā	°taṇ

88. Mg. *hage*, *hagge*; M. Mg. sometimes *haṇ* after vowels.89. M. also *mamaṇ*, Mg. *mamā*.90. Mg. also seldom *mai* and *me*.

91. According to Mārkaṇḍeya ix, 96, by Hultsch p.717.

92. M. rarely *mama*; otherwise yet *mahaṇ*, *majjha(ṇ)*.93. M. *mamammi*.94. M. also *taṇ* and rarely *tum*.95. M. *taī*, *tui*, *tumae*, *tumāe*, *tumāi*, *tume* also.96. M. *tumāhi* (*ṇto*), *tumāo*; Ś. also *tuvatto*.97. M. also *tuhaṇ*, *tujjhaṇ*, *tumhaṇ*, *tumma*, *tu*; Mg. *tava* instead of *tuha*; *te* in Ś. Mg. is apparently false for *de*.98. M. also *tuvi*, *tumammi*, *tume*.99. In Mg. it is better to write *asme*; beside *hage* and in Ś. *vaam* also.100. M. *ṇe*, also *amha*; Mg. *asme*; Ś. *amhe* also.101. M. also *amhehi*; Mg. *asmehiṇ*.102. Mg. *asmāṇam*; M. also *amha(ṇ)* and *'mha*.103. Mg. better more rightly *tusme* or *tuyhe*.104. M. *tumhehi*.105. M. oftner *tumha*.106. Mg. *še*.

A. ^o taṃ	^o taṃ	^o taṃ
I. ^o teṇa ¹⁰⁷	*tāe ¹¹⁰	^o teṇa
G. ^o tassa, se ¹⁰⁸	*tāe ¹¹¹	^o tassa
L. tassim ¹⁰⁹	[tīe, tīa]	tassim
Plural		
Masculine	Feminine	neuter
N. ^o te (de) ¹¹²	^o tāo	^o tāim
A. ^o te (de)	^o tāo	^o tāim
I. ^o tehiṃ ¹¹³	^o tāhiṃ	^o tehiṃ
G. ^o tāṇaṃ ¹¹⁴	^o tāṇaṃ	tāṇaṃ
L. ^o tesu ¹¹⁵	tāsu	^o tesu

[24] The stem *etad* on the whole runs likewise :

Singular		
Masculine	Feminine	Neuter
N. ^o eso ¹¹⁶	esā ¹²¹	*edam
A. *edaṃ ¹¹⁷	*edaṃ	*edam
I. *edeṇa ¹¹⁸	*edāe	
G. edassa ¹¹⁹	*edāe	
L. edassim ¹²⁰	*edāe	
Plural		
N. *ede ¹²²	edāo ¹²³	edāim ¹²⁴
A.		
I. *edehiṃ ¹²⁵		*edehiṃ
G. edāṇaṃ ¹²⁶	edāṇaṃ ¹²⁷	edāṇaṃ
L. edesu(ṃ) ¹²⁸		

23. The **relative** is almost entirely treated like *tad*; for Mg. it is to be noted that *y* is kept maintained. N. ^ojo, ^ojā, ^ojaṃ. A. jaṃ¹²⁹; I. jeṇa¹³⁰,

- | | |
|---|--|
| 107. Abl. ^o tado (adverbial is used) and ^o *tā. | 118. M. eeṇa; Ś. Mg. much oftener eḍiṇā. |
| 108. Mg. taśśa, tāha and śe. | 119. M. eassa, Mg. edaśśa and edāha. |
| 109. M. tammi, Mg. taśśim. | 120. M. eassim, eammī; Mg. edaśśim. |
| 110. M. tīe, tīa. | 121. Mg. eśa. |
| 111. M. tissā, tīe, tīa. | 122. M. ee. |
| 112. *de after all other pronouns : *ede de. | 123. M. eāo. |
| 113. M. tehi resp. tahi. | 124. M. eāi. |
| 114. M. also tāṇa. | 125. M. eehi(ṃ). |
| 115. Ś. also tesuṃ. | 126. eāṇa. |
| 116. Mg. eśe. Ś. frequently, Mg. sel-
dom eśa. | 127. M. eāṇā(ṃ). |
| 117. M. eaṃ. | 128. M. eesu(ṃ). |
| | 129. Mg. has yad iścaśe (yadicchase). |
| | 130. M. also jeṇaṃ. |

jāe, jeṇa; G. *jassa*¹³¹, *jāe*¹³², *jassa*; L. *°jassiṃ*. Plur. N. *°je, jāiṃ*; G. *°jāṇaṃ*¹³³.

The **interrogative** : Sing. N. *°ko, °kā, °kiṃ*; A. *°kaṃ, °kiṃ*; I. *°keṇa, kāe, keṇa*; G. *°kassa*¹³⁴, *kāe*¹³⁵, *kassa*; Abl. *°kīsa*¹³⁶; L. *kassiṃ*¹³⁷, Plur. N. *°ke, kāo*¹³⁸, *kāiṃ*.

The following forms belong to the stems *ida* and *ima* :

		Singular	
	Masculine	Singular	Neuter
	N. <i>aam</i> ¹³⁹	<i>iaṃ</i> ¹⁴⁰	<i>°idaṃ</i> ¹⁴¹
	A. <i>°imaṃ</i>	<i>imaṃ</i>	<i>°imaṃ</i>
	I. <i>°imiṇā</i> ¹⁴²	<i>imāe</i> ¹⁴³	<i>°imiṇā</i>
	Abl. <i>°imādo</i>	<i>°imādo</i>	
	G. <i>imassa</i> ¹⁴⁴	<i>imāe</i> ¹⁴⁵	
	L. <i>imassiṃ</i> ¹⁴⁶	<i>imassiṃ(!)</i>	<i>imassiṃ</i>
[25]		Plural	
	Masculine	Feminine	Neuter
	N. <i>°ime</i>	<i>imāo</i> ¹⁴⁷	<i>imāiṃ</i>
	A. <i>ime</i>		
	I. <i>imehiṃ</i> ¹⁴⁸		<i>imehiṃ</i>
	Abl.		
	G. <i>imāṇaṃ</i> ¹⁴⁹	<i>°imāṇaṃ</i>	<i>imāṇaṃ</i>
	L. <i>imesu(ṃ)</i> ¹⁵⁰		

Sporadic forms are M. *eṇa, °assa (asya), °assīṃ (asmin)*; *°aṇeṇa (anena)*; *amuṃ* (A. neuter.), M. *amuṇā, amī* (Plur. N. Masc.); *°eṇaṃ* (A. Masc. and Fem.) and *°ṇaṃ* (A. Masc; Fem. and Neut.)

The pronominal adjectives run like *tad* or *etad*. M. *parāhiṃto (parasmāt)*; *aṇṇassiṃ (anyasmin)*, *aṇṇe (anyān)*, *savvāṇaṃ (sarvāṇāṃ)* M. *aṇṇāṇaṃ (anyānāṃ)*.

-
- | | |
|--|--|
| 131. Mg. <i>yaśśa</i> and <i>gāha</i> . | 140. Only in Ś. |
| 132. M. <i>jīa, jīe, jīssā</i> . | 141. Mg. only <i>imaṃ</i> . |
| 133. M. has also I. <i>jehi</i> and L. <i>jesuṃ</i> . | 142. M. <i>imeṇa</i> . |
| 134. Mg. <i>kāha</i> . | 143. M. <i>imīe, imīa</i> . |
| 135. M. <i>kīe</i> . | 144. Mg. <i>imaśśa</i> . |
| 136. Mg. <i>kīsa</i> . | 145. M. <i>imīe, imīa</i> . |
| 137. M. <i>kammi</i> , Mg. <i>kaśśīṃ</i> ^{0*} <i>kahiṃ</i> , ^{0*} <i>kattha</i> whereto, whither, where. | 146. M. <i>imammi</i> , Mg. <i>imaśśīṃ</i> . |
| 138. Ś. also <i>kā</i> . | 147. M. also <i>imā, imīu</i> . |
| 139. In M. only once documented; lacking in Mg. | 148. M. <i>imehi</i> . |
| | 149. M. <i>imāṇa</i> . |
| | 150. M. <i>imesu</i> . |

D. The Numerals

24. Cardinals : 1. °*ēkka* (*eka*) : °*ēkko*, °*ēkkā*, °*ēkkaṃ*, I. °*ēkkeṇa*, G. Mg. *ēkkāha*, L. *ēkkassiṃ* (Mg. *ēkkaśsiṃ*, M. *ēkkammi*); Plur. N. °*ēkke*.—°*aṇea* (*aṇeka*), *aṇeaso* (*anekaśah*).

2. N.A. °*duve*¹⁵¹, I. *duvehiṃ*, G. *duveṇaṃ*, L. *duvesu*.

3. N.A. Masc. and Fem. *tao* (*trayaḥ*) Neutr. °*tīṇi* (*trīṇi*); [G. °*tīṇaṃ*;] L.M. *tīsu(ṇ)*, metrically *tīsu*.

4. N. *cattāro*, Fem. *catasso!* [should be *cadasso*]; Neutr. °*cattāri*, Mg. *cattāli*; G. [°*caduṇṇaṃ*], M. *caūṇhaṃ*.— In compounds : M. *caūrāṇaṇa* (*caturānana*), *caūddisaṇ* (*caturdiśam*); Ś. *cadussālaa* (*catuśśālaka*); M. *caūmuha* (*caturmukha*), *cōddaha* (*caturdaśa*).

[26] 5. *pañca*, I.M. *pañcehiṃ*.

6. *cha*. In compounds : °*chagguṇa(a)* (*ṣaḍgūṇa[ka]*), M. *chappaa* (*ṣaṭpada*), °*chaṇṇmāsia* (*ṣaṇṇmāsika*), Ś. *chaccaraṇa* (*ṣaṭcaraṇa*).

7. °*satta*, Mg. *śatta*.— [8. *aṭṭha*; 9. *ṇava*;] 10. *dasa*, Mg. *daśa*, M. *dasa* or *daha*; I.M. *dasahi*, Mg. *daśehiṃ*; G. Mg. *daśāṇaṃ*; L.M. *dasasu*.— 11. M. *eāraha*; 12. M. *bāraha*; 13. M. *teraha*; 14. M. *cōddaha*, *caūddasa*; 60. *saṭṭhi*; 100. *sada*, M. *saa*, Mg. *śada*; 1000. °*sahassa*, Mg. *śahaśśa*; 100000. Mg. *laśkaṃ* (*lakṣam*).

Ordinals : 1. °*paḍhama*; 2. °*dudia*, M. *duīa*; 3. *tadia*, M. *taīa*; 4. °*caduttha*, M. *caūttha*; 5. °*pañcama*; 6. °*chaṭṭha*¹⁵²; 7. °*sattama*; 8. *aṭṭhama*; [9. *ṇavama*;] 10. M. *dasama*.

E. Verb

25. The verb has lost very many forms, the *a*-stems there preponderate; the middle is narrowed down to the 1. Sing Present, apart from the participle and from sporadic forms; the dual is totally disappeared.

a) Example for the indicative of the 1st class √*vrt* : *vaṭṭa* - (*varta*) : Sing. 1. °*vaṭṭāmi*¹⁵³, 2. *vaṭṭasi*¹⁵⁴, 3. °*vaṭṭadi*¹⁵⁵; Plur. 1. °*vaṭṭāmo*, 2. °*vaṭṭadha*¹⁵⁶, 3. *vaṭṭanti*. Middle : 1. Sing. *vaṭṭe* [2. *vaṭṭase*¹⁵⁷,

151. M. frequently N.A. do for all the three genders and also at the beginning of the compound : *domuha* (*dvimukha*), certainly for it oftener *du* : *duṇṇa* (*dvigūṇa*). There form the neuter °*doṇṇi* which is also combined with Masc. and Fem; I. M. *dohi(ṇ)*, G.M. *dōṇha(ṇ)*, Ś. [Mg.] *daṇṇaṃ*; L.M. *dosu(ṇ)*.

152. Feminine °*pañcamī*, °*chaṭṭhī*; the rest in *ā*.

153. M. has sometimes *i* instead of *ā* : *jāṇimī* (*jānāmi*), *bhaṇimo* (*bhaṇāmaḥ*).

154. Mg. has naturally *śi* instead of *si* : *gaścaśi* (*gacchasi*).

155. M. *vaṭṭai*.

156. M. *vaṭṭaha*.

157. M. *laḷjase*, *jāṇase* (*jāṇise*).

3. *vaṭṭade*¹⁵⁸; 3. Plur. *vaṭṭante*]. For the first Sing. frequent examples are °*jāne* and °*na āne* (*jāne* resp. *na jāne*) just as °*maṇṇe* (*manyē*); sporadically *lahe* (*labhe*), *icche*¹⁵⁹.—*vardhate* naturally becomes *vaḍḍhadi* (M. *vaḍḍhai*), *vardhāmahe vaḍḍhāmo*, *prekṣadhve pēkkhadha*¹⁶⁰, *nayatha ṇedha*.

b) **Optative** : 1. *bhaveam* and *bhave*, *pahave*, *laheam* and *lahe*, *jīveam* (*bhaveyam*, *prabhaveyam*, *labheyam*, *jīveyam*)¹⁶¹; 2. M. *hasējjahi*, *karējjāsu* and *kuṇṇijjāsu galijjāsu* (*haseḥ*, *kuryāḥ*, [27] *galeḥ*)— 3. °*bhave*, *purae*, *uddhare* (*bhavet*, *pūrayet*, *uddharet*)¹⁶².— 3. Plur. *bhave* (*bhaveyuh*). Notice M. *hōjja* (*bhūyāt*).

c) **Imperative** : 2. Person °*karesu* (*kuru*), *āṇesu* (*ānaya*), °*bhuñjasu* (*bhuñgdhi*), *kadhesu* (*kathaya*); Mg. *laḥkaṣu* (*rakṣa*), *āgaśceṣu* (*agaccha*), *desu* (*dehi*), *dhāleṣu* (*dhāraya*).— Middle forms like *pēkkhassa* (*prekṣasva*) are to be considered as Sanskritisms and to be emended.

Present stems with a short final, as a rule are formed as in Sanskrit : °*bhaṇa* (beside °*bhaṇāhi*), *gaccha*, Mg. *gaśca*; *pēkkha*, M. *pēccha*, Mg. *peska* (*prekṣasva*); °*hasa*, Mg. *haśa* (*hasa*).—With long finals there comes in *hi* : °*karehi*, Mg. *kalehi* (*kuru*); *manthehi* (*mantraya*), *kadhehi* (*kathaya*), *siḍhilehi* (*śiṭhilaya*), *jālehi* (*jvālaya*); Mg. *mālehi* (*māraya*), *ghoṣehi* (*ghoṣaya*); °*hohi* (*bhava*)

The 3. Sing. ends in °*du*, M. *u* : °*bhodu*, M. *hou* (*bhavatu*); *paśidadu* (*prasidatu*), *kadhedu* (*kathayatu*); Mg. *muñcadu*, *niśidadu* (*muñcatu*, *niśidatu*); M. *marau*, *deu*, *paatṭau* (*maratu*, *dayatu*, *pravartatu*, i.e. *mriyatām*, *dadātu*, *pravartatām*).

The 1. Plur. has *mha* ending : *gacchamha*, *uvavisamha*, *wasappamha pēkkhamha*, *karēmha*, °*nivedēmha*, °*kilēmha*, *hōmha* (*gacchāma*, *upaviśāma*, *upasarpāma*, *prekṣāmahai*, *karavāma*, *nivedayāma*, *krīdāma*, *bhavāma*); M. *abbhatthēmha*, (*abhyarthayāma*); Mg. *aṇṇesamha*, *pivamha*, *palāamha*, *kalēmha* (*anveṣayāma*, *pibāma*, *palāyāmahai*, *karavāma*).

2. Plur. *parittāadha* [Mg. *palī*^o], *samassasadha*, *avaṇedha*, *hodha* (*paritrāyadhvam*, *samāśvasita*, *apanayata*, *bhavata*); M. *ṇamaha*, *rañjeha*, *raeha* (*namatha*, *rañjayata*, *racayata*); Mg. *ośaladha* (*apasarata*), *śuṇādha* (*śṛṇuta*), *māledha* (*mārayata*).

3. Plur. *paśidantu* [Mg. *paśī*^o], *pēkkhantu*, *hōntu* (*prasidantu*, *prekṣantām*, *bhavantu*); M. *ṇandantu*, *vilihantu* (*nandantu*, *vilikhantu*).

d) Of the **Imperfect** only °*āsi*, *āsī* (*āsīt*), however, used for all persons and (numbers) has been kept.

158. M. *pēcchae* (*prekṣate*), *palambae* (*pralambate*).

159. Mg. *gāe* (*gāyāmī*).

160. Mg. *pēskadha*.

161. M. *kuppējja* (*kupyeyam*).

162. M. *jīvējjā* ! (*jīvet*), *dharejjā* (*dhriyeta*), *viharējja* (*viharet*); Mg. *mūse* (*mūset*), *khayye* (**khādyet* = *khādet*).

Remarks on the isolated classes

26. Verbs of the first class in *i, u* are as in [28] Sanskrit : *jaadi, M. jaai(jayati); jaadu*¹⁶³, (*jayatu*); those in *i* change *aya* into *e* by Samprasāraṇa : *pariṇedi, M. parinet (pariṇayati)*, and analogously also the 1. Person : *avaṇemi (apanayāmi), M. āṇemi (ānayāmi); ṇēmha (nayāma), ṇedha (nayata)*. However, beside these we have *ṇedu (nayatu) pariṇaadu (ṇayatu), M. ṇaai (nayati), Mg. ṇaante (nayan really nayanto)*.

bhū forms the Optative after Sanskrit **bhaveam, *bhave, pahave (bhaveyam, bhavet, prabhavet)*; besides *bhavidavvaṇi*¹⁶⁴, **bhaviduṇ, *bhavia (bhavitavyam, bhavitum, bhūtvā)* and Mg. *bhavāmi, M. hava (bhava), havanti (bhavanti)*. In combination with prefixes the stem is *bhava (M. hava)* predominating : *aṇubhavanto (anubhavan), aṇubhavida (anubhūta) M. aṇuhavai (anubhavati)*. M. shows the stem *huva* in *huvanti (bhavanti)* and *huviā (bhaveya)*, Mg. in *huvīadi (bhūyate)*. As a rule usually we say *homi, hosi, *bhodi*¹⁶⁵, ⁰*hōnti*; Imper *hohi, *bhodu*¹⁶⁶, *hōmha, *hodha, hōntu*¹⁶⁷; **hodavva (bhavitavya), bhūda, M. hūa (bhūta), Mg. pahūda (prabhūta)*.

Roots ending in *ṛ, ṝ* form the stem of the present with *ara*; besides frequently in *e* : *dharāmi (dhriye), pasaradi*¹⁶⁸, Mg. *paśalaśi (prasaratī, prasarasī); aṇusaramha (anusarāma), maradi*¹⁶⁹ (*mriyate*), Mg. *malāmi*¹⁷⁰ (*mriye*); *wahara, wahaṇantu, avahaṇadi, oḍaradi, oḍaramha, oḍaria*¹⁷¹ (*upahara, upahaṇantu, apahaṇati, avahaṇati, avahaṇāma, avatiṛya*); Mg. *halāmi, haladi (harāmi, harati), oḍala (avataṛa)*; M. *dharemi, dharaī, dhareī, dhareṇti, osaraī, osaria*¹⁷² (*dhriye, dhriyate, dhriyante, apasaratī, apasṛtya*)—*smṛ* builds ⁰*sumarāmi, sumaresi*¹⁷³, *sumaredi, sumarehi* and *sumaresu, sumaredha, sumarida* [Mg. *śumalida*] (*smarāmi, smarasi, smarati, smara, smarata, smṛta*).

Roots in ai : *gāmi, gādi, gāadha (gāyāmi, gāyati, gāyatha)*; M. *gāanti, uggāanti (gāyanti, udgāyanti)*; Mg. *gāe* [29] *gāidaṇ (gāye,*

163. *jedu* is wrongly attested, even if used often; likewise Mg. *yedu*.

164. In addition to it *bhavidavvadā (ṇtavyatā)*.

165. M. *hoi*.

166. M. *hou*.

167. M. *havantu*.

168. M. *pasaraī*

169. M. *marai*.

170. Mg. however *maledu, malēnti (mriyatām, mriyante)*.

171. Mg. *oḍalia*.

172. Mg. *ośalia*.

173. In a lesser way attested *sumarasi*. Mg. *śumalāmi, śumaleśi, śumaledi*; Imper. *śumala* and *śumalehi*.

*gāyitam=gītam).—parittāadi, parittāasu, parittāadu [Mg. palittāadu], parittāadha [Mg. pali^o] (paritrāyate, ^otrāyasva, ^otrāyatām, ^otrāyadhvam).—ñijjhāadi, M. ñijjhāai (nirdhyāyati); parimilāadi (parimlāyati).

kram contains a short vowel : ñikkamāmi, ñikkamadi [M. ñikkamai and ñikkhamai, Mg. ñiskamadī], ñikkama [Mg. ñiskama], nikkamamha (niṣkrāmāmi, ^okrāmati, ^okrāma, ^okrāmāma).

ruh becomes a compound verb after the inflected 6th class : āruhadī [M. āruhai], āruha [Mg. āluha], āruhadu [Mg. āluhadu] (ārohati, āroha, ārohatu).

sthā as the stem for the present has ciṭṭha [Mg. ciṣṭha] and forms from it : ciṭṭhāmi, ciṭṭhadi [M. ciṭṭhai, Mg. ciṣṭhadī], ciṭṭha, (tiṣṭhāmi, tiṣṭhati, tiṣṭha); M. ciṭṭhaū (tiṣṭhatu). With the ud prefix we get the forms 'uṭṭhehi beside utthehi (uttiṣṭha), utthedu, Mg. uṭṭhedu (uttiṣṭhatu).

muc has in Ś. Mg. a nasal, it can be lacking in M. : muñcadi, 'muñca, 'muñcadu, M. muai and muñcāi, mua, muasu (muñcati, muñca). By the side also the e - stem ^omuñcesi, muñcedi, muñcedha, muñcehi (muñcasi, muñcati, muñcatha, muñca).

The verbs of the tenth class, which mostly counter acts aya in e the causatives and the denominatives seldom has aa for that and indeed so usually before consonant groups : M. kahei, Mg. kadhedi (kathayati), Ś. kadhehi (kathaya), kadhedu (kathayatu); cintemi, cintemo (cintayāmi, ^omas), but cintaanto (cintayan); pavesehi [Mg. paveśehī] (paveśaya) beside pavesāmi (paveśayāmi); ciraadi (cirayati), viraaāmi (viracayāmi).

27. Second Conjugation : a) The roots of the 2nd class infringes in the 1st. conjugation : M. ruāmi, ruasi, ruai, rua (rodimi, rodiṣi roditi, roda); Ś. rodasi, roadi, roanti, roda [Mg. loda], rodidum (rodiṣi, rodati, rudanti, roda, roditum); Mg. metrically luadi (roditi).—śvas forms ñīsasadi [M. ñīsasai], viśasāmi, samassasa, samassasadu (ñīśvasiti, viśvaśimi, samāśvasatu), Mg. śāsadi, śamaśśasadu etc. (śvasiti, samāśvasatu).—caṣ forms ācakkha (ācaṣva), Mg. ācaskadi (ācaṣṭe); M. ñiacchāi (*ñicacṣati=nicacṣṭe); han has paḍihaṇāmi (pratihanmi), vihaṇanti (vighnati); M. haṇai, ñihaṇanti (hanti, nighnanti), Mg. āhaṇedha (āhata).—as has 1. ^omhi, Mg. smi [30] 2. ^osi, Mg. śi, 3. ^oatthi, Mg. asti; Plur. 1. ^omha [M. also mho], Mg. sma; 2. M. ttha, 3. M. santi, Mg. śanti¹⁷⁴

174. The 2. and 3. Plur. is rare, atthi is used for all persons of the Sing. and Plur.

b) The third class forms are retained only sparingly. *dā* builds **demi*, *desi*, *dedi* [M. *deḥ*], **dehi* [M. also *desu*, Mg. *deṣu*], *dedu* [M. *deu*], Mg. *dedha* [M. *deha*] (*dadāmi*, **si*, **ti*, *dehi*, *dadātu*, *datta*).—Forms from *dhā* : M. *saddahimo* (*śraddadhmaḥ*); Ś. *aṇusaṃdhemi*, **dhedha* (*anusamḍadhāmi*, **dhattha*, M. *saṃdhei* (*saṃdadhāti*), *saṃdhēnti* (*saṃdadhati*).—*bhi* forms (from the stem *bhai*) **bhāāmi*, (Mg. *bhāāsi*), *bhāadi* (*bibhemi*, *bibheṣi*, *bibheti*).

c) Forms from the fifth class like *avaciṇomi*, *avaciṇumo* (**cinomi*, **cinumaḥ*) are unsure against *avaciṇamha* (**cinuma*) and *uccīṇedi* (**noti*). M. has, for ex. *samucciṇāi*, *viciṇanti* (**cinoti*, **cinvanti*), but also *uccei*, *uccēnti*, *ucceu* (*uccinoti*, **cinvanti*, **cinotu*); Mg. *śaṃcehi* (*saṃcinu*).—Likewise from *śru* there are unsure *suṇu*, Mg. *śuṇu* (*śṛṇu*) and Mg. *śuṇudha* (*śṛṇuta*). We should read *suṇa*¹⁷⁵, as in Ś. Mg. roots follow the 9. class: *suṇāmi*¹⁷⁶, *suṇādi*¹⁷⁷, *suṇāmo*, *suṇāhi*, *suṇādu*¹⁷⁸, *suṇamha*, *suṇadha*¹⁷⁹, *suṇantu*¹⁸⁰ (*śṛṇomi*, **ti*, *śṛṇumaḥ*, *śṛṇu*, *śṛṇotu*, *śṛṇuma*, *śṛṇutha*, *śṛṇvantu*). Beside it there occur forms from *e*-stems, as *suṇemi*, *suṇedi*, *suṇēmha* (*śṛṇomi*, **ti*, *śṛṇuma*). M. builds from the *a*-stems: *suṇāi*, *suṇimo*, *suṇanti*, *suṇasu*, *suṇaha* (*śṛṇoti*, *śṛṇumaḥ*, *śṛṇvanti*, *śṛṇu*, *śṛṇuta*).

prāp goes with the 1st class: M. *pāvasi*, *pāvai* [Ś. *pāvedi*]; **pāvanti* M. *pāva* [Ś. *pāvehi*], *pāvai* (*prāpnoṣi*, **ti*, *prāpnuvanti*, *prāpnuhi*, *prāpnotu*).—*śak* has *sakkaṇomi* or *sakkuṇomi* (*śaknomi*); Mārkeṇḍeya IX, 131 teaches *sakkuṇadi* and *sakkadi*.

d) The seventh class has the nasal also in the weak forms M. *chindaī*, *bhaṇjāi*, *bhindaī* (*chinatti*, *bhanakti*, *bhinatti*); **bhuṇjasu* (*bhuṇkṣva*); *paūṇjadha* (*prayuṅktha*), *rundhedi* (*ruṇatsi*); **bhinda* (*bhittvā*), *bhaṇjta* (*bhaktvā*).

[31] (e) The root *kṛ* belonging to the eighth class forms **karemi*¹⁸¹, **karesi*¹⁸², *karedi*¹⁸³, *karemo*, **karēnti*¹⁸⁴, **karehi*¹⁸⁵, **karesu*¹⁸⁶, *karedu*¹⁸⁷, *karēmhi*¹⁸⁸, *karedha*¹⁸⁹ (*karomi*, **si*, **ti*, *kurmaḥ* *kurvanti*, *kuru*, *karotu*, *karavāma*, *kuruta*).

175. In Mg. according to Pischel § 503 *śunu* is a Sanskritism for *śuṇa*.

176. Mg. *śuṇāmi*.

177. Mg. *śuṇādi*.

178. Mg. *śuṇādu*.

179. Mg. *śuṇādha* and *śuṇedha*.

180. Mg. *śuṇantu*.

181. Mg. *kalemi*.

182. Mg. *kaleśi*, M. also *kunasi*.

183. Mg. *kaledi*, M. *karei* and also *kuṇāi*.

184. M. also *kuṇanti*.

185. Mg. *kalehi*.

186. M. also *kuṇa*, *kuṇasu*.

187. M. *kuṇāi*.

188. Mg. *kalēmha*.

189. *kaledha*.

f) Ninth class : *jñā* loses the initial after prefixes and *ṇa(na)* and forms *jāṇāsi*¹⁹⁰, *jāṇādi*¹⁹¹, *jāṇāmo*¹⁹², *°jāṇa*¹⁹³ and *jāṇāhi* (*jānāsi*, *°ti*, *jānīmaḥ*, *jānīhi*); **āṇādi*, **viāṇādi*, *āṇavedi*, *°du*, *ṇa āṇadha*¹⁹⁴ (*ājānāti*, *vijānāti*, *ājñāpayati*, *°tu*, *na ājānītha*).

krī also has the present stem *kiṇa* and forms *ṛikkīṇasi*, *kiṇadha*, M. *vikkīṇai* (*niṣkīṇāsi*, *krīṇīta*, *vīkrīṇāti*).—*grh* forms *gēṇhasi*, **gēṇhadi* [M. *gēṇhai*], *°gēṇhanti*, **°gēṇha*, **gēṇhadu* [M. *gēṇhaū*], *gēṇhadha*, *gēṇhantu* (*grhṇāsi*, *°ti*, *grhṇanti*, *grhāṇa*, *grhṇīta*, *grhṇīta*, *grhṇantu*).—*bandh* forms *bandhāmi*, *bandhasi* and *bandhesi*, *bandhedi* [M. *bandhai*], *°bandhanti* [M. also *bandhēnti*], M. *bandhasu* (*bandhnāmi*, *°si*, *avabadhnāti*, *badhnanti*, *badhāna*)—*bhaṇ* forms *bhaṇāsi* and *bhaṇesi* [Mg. *bhaṇesi*], **bhaṇādi*, **bhaṇādha*, **bhaṇa* and **bhaṇāhi*, *bhaṇehi*; *bhaṇādu* (*bhaṇasi*, *°ti*, *°tha*, *bhaṇa*, *bhaṇatu*).

g) Forms of the Imperfect (apart from *°āsi*, *āsī* = *āsīt*), the Aorist and the Perfect are lacking.

Future

28. The endings are *issaṃ*, *issasi*¹⁹⁵, *issadi*¹⁹⁶, *issāmo*, *issadha*, *issanti*, i.e. with the exception of the 1. Sing. as in Sanskrit, the *sya* is added with the linking vowel *i*; Mg. has always *śś* in place of *ss*.—*bhavissaṃ* [Mg. *bhaviśśaṃ*¹⁹⁷], *bhavissasi*¹⁹⁸, [Mg. *bhaviśśāsi*]; *bhavissadi*, [Mg. *bhaviśśadi*]¹⁹⁹; *gamissāmo*, *bhaṇissadha*, *bhavissantī*²⁰⁰ (*bhaviṣyāmi*, *°syasi*, *°ti*, *gamiṣyāmaḥ*, *bhaṇiṣyatha*, *bhaviṣyanti*).

[32] Examples from isolated classes : 1st Class : *viṣumarissaṃ* (*viṣumarīṣyāmi*); *pariharissaḍi*, Mg. *palihaliśśadi* (*parihariṣyati*); *marissasi*, Mg. *malīhiṣi*, M. *aṇumarīhi* (*marīṣyase*, *°te*); *gāissaṃ*, Mg. *gāiśśaṃ* (*gāsyāmi*); *gamissaṃ*, Mg. *gamiśśaṃ* (*iṣyāmi*); M. *samāgamissai* (*iṣyati*), *pāhinti* (*paṣyanti*); *ciṭṭhissaṃ*, Mg. *ciṣṭhiśśaṃ* (*sthāsyāmi*); *uṭṭhissāmo* (*utsthāsyāmaḥ*); *pēkkhissaṃ*, Mg. *pēkkhiśśaṃ*, M. *pēcchissam* (*drakṣyāmi* i.e. *prekṣīṣye*); Mg. *khāiśśaṃ*, metrically *khāhiṣi* (*khāsyāmi*, *khāsyasi*). 6th Class : *pucchissaṃ* Mg. *puściśśaṃ* (*prakṣyāmi*);

190. Mg. *yāṇāśi*; M. *jāṇīmi* (*jānāmi*), *jāṇasi*, *jāṇase*.

191. Mg. *yāṇādi*, M. *jāṇai*.

192. M. *jāṇīmo*.

193. M. also *jāṇasu*; Mg. *yāṇāhi*.

194. M. *ṇa āṇasi*, *āṇai*, *āṇīmo āṇaha* (*na ājānāsi*, *°ti*, *ājānīmaḥ*, *°tha*).

195. M. *ihisi*.

196. M. *ihī*.

197. Also *huviśśam*.

198. Also *huviśśasi*.

199. Also *huviśśadi*, Mg. *huviśśadi*.

200. Also *huviśśanti*. M (from the stem *ho*) *hōssaṃ*, *hohī*, *hohāmo*, *hohissāmo*, *hohitthā*, *hohinti*.

muñcissadi, M. *möcchihii* (*mokṣyati*).—4th Class : *kuviṣṣaṃ*, M. *kuppissam* (*kopsyāmi*); *°vivaḷjissam* (*vipatsyāmi*). 10th Class : *cintaissadi* (*cintayisyati*); Mg. *gaṇaiṣṣam* (*gaṇayisyāmi*); *kadhissam* beside *kadhaissam* [Mg. *kadhaiṣṣam*] M. *kahissam* (*kathayisyāmi*).—2nd Class : *rodissam*, M. *roissam* (*rotsyāmi*); *suviṣṣam*, Mg. *śuviṣṣam* (*svapsyāmi*); *daissam*, Mg. *daiṣṣam* (*dāsyāmi*, properly speaking *dayisyāmi* from the stem *de*).—5th Class : *avacḷhissam* (*avaceṣyāmi*, *suṇissam*, Mg. *śuṇiṣṣam* (*śroṣyāmi*); *pāvissasi*, M. *pāvihisi*, Mg. *pāvihisi* (*prāpsyasi*). The 7th Class is without documentation; from the 8th Class very frequent *°karissam*, Mg. *kaliṣṣam* (*karisyāmi*); *karissasi*, M. *karihisi* (*karisyasi*); *karissadi*, Mg. *kaliṣṣadi* (*karisyati*); M. *karissāma*²⁰¹ (*karisyāmah*); *karissanti* (*karisyanti*). We have beside it *karaissam*, Mg. *kalaiṣṣam*; Mg. *kalaiṣṣaṣi*; *karaissadi*, Mg. *kalaiṣṣadi*, M. *karehii*; *karaissanti*.—M. yet also builds *kāham*, *kāhisi*, *kāhii*.—9th Class : *°jāniṣṣam*; M. *jānihisi*; *jāniṣṣadi*; *jāniṣṣāmo*, Mg. *yāniṣṣāmo* (*jñāsyāmi*, *jñāsyasi*, *°ti*, *°syāmah*).—Mg. *kīniṣṣam* (*kreṣyāmi*); *kīniṣṣadi* (*kreṣyati*).—*gēṇhissam*, *gēṇhissadi* (*grahisyāmi*, *°ṣyati*).

Passive

29. To the root resp. in the stem of the present there comes *ya* (whereby *y*²⁰²) stuck out behind vowels, [33] assimilated with consonants behind, or *ia*.

In M. *ya* becomes *jja*, *ia* is changed to *ijja*.—1st Class : **ñiadi*, M. *ñijjāi* (*nīyate*) **bhaviadi*, Mg. also *huviadi* (*bhūyate*); *sumariadi*, M. *sumarijjāi* (*smariyate*); *icchiadi*, Mg. *iṣciadi* (*iṣyate*); M. *gammai* (*gamyate*), but *gamijjanti* (*gamyante*); Ś. *gacchiadi*, but *gamīadu* (*gamyate*, *°tām*); *piviadi*, M. *pijjāi* (*piyate*); *aṇucitṭhiadi*, *°du* (*anuṣṭhiyate*, *°tām*); *disadi*, Mg. *diṣadi*, M. *disāi* (*drīyate*).—6th Class : *pucchiadi*, M. *pucchijjāi* (*prcchyate*); *muñciadu* (*mucyatām*), M. *muccāi* (*mucyate*). 4th and 10th Classes, Causative : M. *paḍibujjhijjāi* (*pratibudhyate*); *chedianti*, M. *chejjanti* (*chedyante*); *pobodhiāmi* (*prabodhye*); *viṇṇaviadi* (*viṇṇāpyate*); M. *kahijjāi*, Mg. *kadhīadu* (*kathyate*, *°tām*).—2nd Class : *suviadi*, M. *suppau* (*supyate*, *°tām*); **vuccadi*, M. *vuccāi* (*ucyate*); **diadi*, M. *dijjāi* (*diyate*). 5th Class : M. *ciñijjāi* (*ciyate*); *viciadu* (*viciyatām*); *suṇiadi*, Mg. *śuṇiadi*, M. *suṇijjāi* (*śruyate*); *sakkīadi*, Mg. *śakkīadi* (*śakyate*).—7th Class: *°chijjanti* (*chidyante*); *jujjadi*, M. *jujjāi* (*yujjyate*) in the sense of “to be suited to itself”; on the other hand *paññijjāi*, *°du* (*prayujyate*, *°tām*).—8th Class : *kariadi*, *°du*, Mg. *kuliadi*, *°du*, M. *kirāi*, *kirāu* (*kriyate*, *kriyatām*).—9th Class : *jāniadi* [*ñajjāi*], *°du* (*jñāyate*, *°tām*); *aṇuggahīadu* (*anugrhyatām*); M. forms *ghēppāi*, *ghēppanti* (*grhyate*, *°nte*) from a stem **ghr̥p*.

To the passive there belongs still also another future with forms

201. Metrical for *°mo*.

202. Pischel says on p. 369 below *ya* is cast out : then the form would not be *diadi* from *dā* (out of *dī-ya-di*) but must sound *dīdi*.

like *muccissadi*, *chijjissadi* (**mucyiṣyate*, **chidyṣyate*), *M. bhajjihisi* (**bhajyiṣyase*).

Causative

30. As in Sanskrit the root is upgraded, the *aya* suffix turns to *e*, *paya* becomes *ve*. *kāredi*, *M. kārei* (*kārayati*); **āṇavedi* (*ājñapayati*); *viṇṇavissam* (*viññapiṣyāmi*).—*ve* = *paya* is also used in roots with other vocals as *ā, i, ī*, consonants and diphthongs : *jivāvedu* (**jivāpayatu*), *Mg. palivattāvehi* (**parivartāpaya*); *M. ramāvēnti* (**ramāpayanti*); *moāvemi*, *°hi* (*mocāpayāmi*, **mocāpaya*); *Mg. lihāvemi* (**likhāpayāmi*); *M. māresi* (*mārayasi*), *Ś. māredha* [34] (*mārayatha*), *Mg. mālemi*, *°hi*, *°du*, *°dha* (*mārayāmi*, *māraya*, *°tu*, *°ta*).—With *ḍṛś* *M.* forms *dāvemi*, *dāvei*, *dāvēnti* (*darśayāmi*, *°yati*, *°yanti*), *Ś. daṃsemi*, *daṃsaissam* (*darśayāmi*, *darśayiṣyāmi*), *Mg. daṃsaante* (**darśayanto* = *darśayan*).

Desiderative

31. The formation is like that in Sanskrit : *juguchedi* [*M. juucchaī*], *juguchanti* (*jugupsati*, *°nti*); *adijuucchida*, *Mg. adiyuūścida* (*atijugupsita*); *cikicchidavva* (*cikitsitavya*); *sussūsaissam* (*śuśrūṣayiṣyāmi*); *Mg. śuśūsīda* (*śuśrūṣita*).

Denominative

32. One way of the formation is directly from the stem : *M. dukkhāmi* (*duḥkhāmi*), *dhavalai* (*dhavalati*), *kahāmi*, *kahasi*, *kahai* (*kathāmi*, *°si*, *°ti*).—The usual formation is that in *a* (= *aya*) : *M. umhāi* (*uṣmāyati*); *Ś. kuravaāadi* (*kurabakāyate*); *Mg. cilāadi* (*cirāyati*); *suhāadi*, *M. suhāai* (*sukhāyati*). There are onomatopoeic forms frequently like *ghumaghumāadi*, *tharatharedi*; finally following the way of causatively formed : *saddāvemi* (*śabdāpayāmi*), *suhāvedi* (*sukhāpayāmi*); *Mg. śuskāvaīśsam* (*śuṣkāpayiṣyāmi*); *M. mailei* (**mailayati*), *biṇṇei* (*dviguṇayati*).

Verbal Noun

33(a) **Participles.** The active present participle is built from the present stems ending in *anto* [*Mg. ante*], Feminine *antī* : *jāṇanto*; *Mg. puścante*; *M. calanto* (*jānan*, *prcchan*, *calan*); *pēkkhantī*, *M. apāvanti* (**prekṣanti*, *aprāpnuvanti*).—The present middle and passive participles has the termination *māṇa*, *māṇā* : *ñivattamāṇā*, *aṇuṇīamāṇā* (*nivartamānā*, *anunīyamānā*).—Preterite passive participle has, as in Sanskrit the *ta* suffix and the *na* suffix [those in **da* resp. become *°ṇa*, whilst *M.* naturally for [35] *ta* has *a* only] : **gahida*, *M. gahia* (*gṛhīta*); *sumarida*, *Mg. śumalida* (*smṛta*); *pucchida*, *M. pucchia* (*prṣṭa*); *°diṇṇa* (*datta*), *°mukka* (*mukta* from *mukna*).

b) **Gerund** : **hodavva*, Ś. also *bhavidavva*, Mg. also *huvidavva* (*bhavitavya*); *sodavva* [also *suṇidavva*], M. *soavva* (*śrotavya*); **kādavva*, M. *kāavva* (*kartavya*).— The *aniya* suffix becomes **aṇia*, M. *aṇijja* : for ex. *kaṇāia*, M. *kaṇāijja* (*kaṇāiṇya*); Mg. *palihalaṇia* (*pariharaṇiṇya*).— °*kajja*, Mg. *kayya* (*kārya*); °*gējjha*, Mg. *duggḥēyha* (= **gṛhya*, **durgṛhya*).

c) **Infinitive** : The Ś. Mg. suffix *duṃ*, M. *uṃ* often occurs with the pure stem or the stem of the present with the linking vowel *i* : for example, *gacchiduṃ* beside *gamiduṃ* and °*gantūṃ*; *pucchiduṃ*, Mg. *puściduṃ*, M. *pucchiuṃ* (*praṣṭuṃ*); *kāreduṃ* (*kārayituṃ*); M. *ṇivvāheuṃ* (*nirvāhayituṃ*); Mg. *śodhāveduṃ* (*śodhāpayituṃ*); more rarely being contraried : *tāḍaīduṃ* (*tāḍayituṃ*); Mg. *mālaīduṃ* (*mārayituṃ*); *dhāriḍuṃ*, M. *dhāriūṃ* (*dhārayituṃ*); *māriḍuṃ*, Mg. *māliḍuṃ* (*mārayituṃ*). From the second conjugation : *suṇiduṃ*, M. *souṃ* (*śrotuṃ*); *bhuṇjīduṃ*, M. *bhōttuṃ* (*bhoktuṃ*); *gēṇhīduṃ*, M. *gahīuṃ* (*grahītuṃ*); **kāduṃ*, *karīduṃ*, M. *kāuṃ* (*kartuṃ*). Formations throughout corresponding to Sanskrit like *jivīdukāma* (*jivitu*⁰), M. *tāḍiṃmanā* (*tāḍayitumanā*).

d) **Absolutive**. Apart from **kadua* and **gadua* (*kṛtvā*, *gatvā*), there is in Ś. Mg. *ya* (resp. *a*) which is the only governing suffix, while that for M. *ūṇa* is found. A distinction between the simple and the compound verbs is not made.—*ṇaīa* (**nayīya* = *nītvā*), but *āṇia*, *avaṇia* (*āniya*, *apanīya*), **bhavia* (*bhūtvā*); *odaria*, Mg. *odalīa* (*avatīrya*); *pariharia*, Mg. *palihaliā* (*parihṛtya*); *pēkkhia*, Mg. *pēskīa* (*prekṣya*); *paviśia*, Mg. *paviśīa* (*praviśya*); *gēṇhia* (*gṛhītvā*).—Examples for M. : *jeṭṭūṇa* (*jītvā*), *houṇa* (*bhūtvā*), *hasiṭūṇa* (*hasītvā*), *vihasiṭūṇa* (*vihasya*), *gaḥiṭūṇa*, *ghēttūṇa*, the latter metrically also in Mg. (*gṛhītvā*).

N.B. : The grammatical discussions are made till the end of page 35. From the pages 36 to 43 the specimens from some texts are given. For the Specimens of Śauraseni and Māhārāṣṭri (pp. 36-38) the passages are taken from the *Karpūramañjarī* edited by Sten konow I.4.15-12.3. And the Specimen for Māgadhī (pp. 38-43) is given from the *Śakuntalā* edited by Richard Pischel, S 113-116. All the Prakrit texts are accompanied with Sanskrit rendering. [Editor]

Summer 1996

Registered with the Registrar
of Newspapers for India
Under No. R. N. 12121/66.

BHILAI ENGINEERING CORPORATION LTD.

**Industrial Area, Post Box No. 31
Bhilai 490 001, Madhya Pradesh**

Telephones : 355417/356447/355358

Fax Numbers : 0788 355527/355427

Telex Numbers : 0771-214/245/204

**Manufacturers Erectors of Equipments
for
Coal Mining, Steel Plant, Power Plant, Cement Plant
and
Manufacturers of Sulpheric and Super Phosphate
Fertilizers**

Regional Offices

**13 Masjid Moth, Local Shopping Centre
New Delhi 110 048**

Telephones : 6445815 6445819 6434987 6414390

Fax Number : 011 6445819

**4B Little Russel Street, 2nd Floor
Calcutta-700 071**

Telephones : 242 7606 / 3372

Fax Number : 033-2427061

**31 Makers Chambers III
3rd Floor, Nariman Point, Bombay 400 023**

Telephones : 231724 2043647 244208 2873789

Telex Number : 0118 4054

Fax Number : 022 287 3611

By the courtesy of Antarctica Graphic Limited