Contents

Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama and Śaurasenī
Satya Ranjan Banerjee

A Primer of Śaurasenī
Richard Schmidt

101

125
JAIN JOURNAL

Vol. XXX No.4 April 1996

SATKHAṆḌĀGAMA AND SĀURASENĪ

SATYA RANJAN BANERJEE

1 Preamble

The discovery of the Śatkhandaṅgaṇa, Kasāyapaṇḍita, 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 Śatkhandaṅgaṇa and the others mentioned above are in Śauraseni. 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 Māhārāṣṭrī, are also found there side by side with some other forms which are not regular in Māhārāṣṭrī, 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 Śauraseni or Ardhamāgadhī, or Māhārāṣṭrī 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 kṛta has several forms in Prakrit and each form has a distinctive feature with regard to a particular dialect. e.g. kṛta > kaa (Māh.), kaya (Amg), kida (Ś), kaḍa (Mg). These variations are generally found in the respective dialects as enunciated by Prakrit grammarians. In case,
either in an Ardhamāgadhī or Śaurasenī text kada is found, it should neither be regarded as a Śauraseni 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 Śatkhandāgama.

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 Śauraseni, and that also of Mahārāṣṭra is Māhārāṣṭrī. Besides these, some names which are given because of the type of people speaking that language are Paiśācī, Pracyā 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. Sau. 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 Vīkākaraṇa 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. Mgr. or Pāśācāi, 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 Śauraseni are mentioned.

3 Sources of Śauraseni

As far as we know the sources for the features of Śauraseni are the Prakrit grammarians, Sanskrit dramas and some other literature, and the studies of modern Pracīt scholars on Śauraseni. It is a fact worth noting that for the characteristic features of Śauraseni, 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.), Kramadiśvara (13th cent. A.D.), Trivikrama (14th cent. A.D.), Lakṣmīdhara (15th cent. A.D.), Rāmasarmā (16th cent. A.D.) Mārkandeya (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 Śauraseni language can also be gathered from the Sanskrit dramas beginning from Aśvaghoṣa (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 Śauraseni from the analysis of Śauraseni texts or passages. The fact that they have considered the text as a source of the Śauraseni passages is not generally questioned. But the point is how do we know that such and such are the features of Śauraseni? 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 Śauraseni 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 Śauraseni, the passages of Viduṣaka and the ladies of the Sanskrit dramas are considered as Śauraseni. Naturally, the type of Prakrit found in their speeches are generally analysed as the language of Śauraseni. 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 Śauraseni 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 Māhārāṣṭri. Except a few grammarians who have mentioned that they are going to describe the characteristic features of Māhārāṣṭri (atha Māhārāṣṭri), almost all the grammarians have never mentioned that they are describing the features of Māhārāṣṭri, yet we do not see any difference between the features of the Māhārāṣṭri 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 Māhārāṣṭri would be the language of excellence. When that equation is accepted then the features which are not common to Māhārāṣṭri, are considered as dialects, such as, Śauraseni, Māgadhī, Paśāci and others. These dialectal features are also recorded by the Prakrit grammarians under different headings, sometimes, inter alia, in describing Māhārāṣṭri or Prakrit. The name Māhārāṣṭri is not very old. In Bharata’s Nāṭyaśāstra the name Māhārāṣṭri is not found, rather the name Dākṣinātyā was used. Probably in the 3rd A.D. or before that, Mahārāṣtra was regarded as Dākṣinātya, modern Deccan (cf Deccan Queen) rather than Mahārāṣtra. But the name Dākṣinātya was changed perhaps by the time of Daṇḍin (7th c. A.D.) who in his Kavyādarśa (I.33) has mentioned that the poems written in Māhārāṣṭri is the best (mahārāṣṭraśrayāṃ bhāṣāṃ prakṛtaṃ prākṛtaṃ vidūḥ). Perhaps from that time onwards Māhārāṣṭri 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 Śauraseni would be the Prakrit grammarians on the one hand and the modern Western Prakrit scholars, on the other.

While considering the language of the Śatkhanaḍāgama 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 Śauraseni Literature

Before considering the language of the Śatkhanaḍāgama, it will not be out of place here, I suppose, to give a brief survey of the Śauraseni literature considering that the Śatkhanaḍāgama 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 Samavāyaṇīga-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 Devardhīgaṇi 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 Samavāyaṇīga-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 Drśṭīvāda which is, of course, lost. Anyway when in 1939 the Śatkhanaḍāgama 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 Śauraseni, 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 Śatkhanaṅgāma, Kaśyapāhuda, Mahābandha, and others. These are regarded as Digambara Jain 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, Nyāmasāra, Pravacanasāra, Paṅcāstikāya 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. Šau. 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. Šau. was current.

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

It is also believed that the Tiloyaparṇatti 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-Ārādhana 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-kathākoṣa, “close affinities with the Ārdhamāgadhī 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-Ārādhana, 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 Māhārāṣṭri. In the verses it does not differ from the
dialect used generally in Jaina-Prākrit, in the prose it is mingled here and there with peculiarities of Śauraseni (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.) Śaṣṭhāsā-nirmita-Pārśua-jina-stavana and Jinapadma's (1325-1344 A.D) Śaṣṭhāsā-vibhūṣita-Śaṅtinātha-stavana are poems written in six languages of which Śauraseni is one, besides Sanskrit, Māhārāṣṭrī, Māgadhī, Paishāci and Apabhramśa.

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

Beyond these three categories we do not have any direct evidence of Śau. 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 Śau. are, of course, found in the Ins. Pkt., but these features do not mean that those inscriptions are in Śau. The point is that a literature written entirely in Śau. is practically not found after Kundakunda, but for the study of the Śau. lg. some inscriptional and dramatic Pkt.s 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 Śau. and the canonical one. In most of the canonical literature the uniformity of the Śau. 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 Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama, let us see how many of the Śau. characters are preserved in the Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama.

Before discussing any other linguistic problem, it is better to give some of the linguistic features of the Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama to see in which dialect it is written, or whether it is written in Śauraseni or not.
5 The Features of Śauraseni

The characteristic features of Śauraseni as given by Hemacandra and other Prakrit grammarians mentioned above are generally considered as features of Śauraseni. This does not mean that the features which are not found in Prakrit grammars should not be considered at all as features of Śauraseni. Every dialect has some peculiar features which are absent in the others. Most of the features of Māhārāṣṭri 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 Śauraseni as found in the Prakrit grammars of Vararuci, Hemacandra, Puruṣottama and others to see whether these features are found in the Śatīkhaṇḍāgama.

Phonology

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

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

Normally this feature of Śauraseni is found in almost all the Śauraseni passages of the Sanskrit dramas. But there are some supposed Śauraseni 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 Śauraseni passages are mutilated.

It should be noted that the basic difference between Śauraseni and Māhārāṣṭri with regard to this particular point is that this intervocalic -d- in Śauraseni is never elided, whereas in Māhārāṣṭri 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 Śauraseni 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 Māhāraṣṭri Prakrit, Hemacandra has made the sūtra—ṇases-tto-do-du-hi-hino-lukaḥ (Hc.III.8.) and in the yṛtti of this sūtra he has made a remark that ‘dakāra-karaṇaḥ bhāṣāntarārtham’ which simply means that the inclusion of -d- in the sūtra [of Māhāraṣṭri] 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, Saurāsenī. 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 Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama both the elision and retention of intervocalic \(-d\) are found.

\(\textit{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. tāṭhā–tadā (Ś); kathayati–kadvidi (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 Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama 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 *ih> Ved. *idha > Ś. *idha, Cl. *kathayati > Ved.* kadhayati > Ś. kadhedi, > As. 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 Śauraseni dialect has a sort of pan-Indian development even in later inscriptive 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 Mrčchakaṭṭhika 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 Śauraseni is one of the dominant features. At a very later stage there was a controversy with regard to the language of a Prakrit drama Karpūramaṇjarī by name. Let me discuss the problem of this drama in this particular case.

The language of the Karpūramaṇjarī is a controversial one. Some say that it is entirely written in Śauraseni, Rājaśekhara being a man of Śūrasena, it was quite possible for him that his drama should bear the stamp of the Śauraseni language. The other type of scholars thinks that the prose passages of the Karpūramaṇjarī are written in Śauraseni whereas the verses are in Māhārāṣṭri. The main pioneers of this problem are the two scholars—Manmohan Ghosh and Sten Konow. The edition of Sten Konow's Karpūramaṇjarī 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 Śauraseni and the other one is Māhārāṣṭri. Sten Konow has retained the Māhārāṣṭri features in verses and the Śauraseni 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 Śauraseni 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 Karpūramaṇjarī is given in Māhārāṣṭri even though his W manuscript has Śauraseni features as well. e.g. Sten Konow reads bhaddāṃ 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 Śaurasenī. 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 Śaurasenī both in verses and in prose passages. In his opinion, Rājaśekhara must have written the Karpūramaṇjari in Śaurasenī. As a result, he has corrected all the Māhāraṣṭrī features of the verses into Śaurasenī, 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 Karpūramaṇjari all through in Śaurasenī. In this connection we may note that even though Ghosh has a bold step over Sten Konow to make his text full of Śaurasenī, 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 Śaurasenī 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 Māhāraṣṭrī, 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 Māhāraṣṭrī or Śaurasenī the characteristic features of both the languages are maintained throughout. There is no intermixture between Śaurasenī and Māhāraṣṭrī in the same passage.

But the edition of Kundakunda who is supposed to have written in Śaurasenī 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 Śaurasenī. The same confusion is also found in the Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama. 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 $k\varsigma$ in Śaurasenī.

Among the conjuncts the development of Sanskrit $k\varsigma$ seems to be a little peculiar to Śaurasenī. According to Hemacandra (II.3) $k\varsigma$ has three developments in Prakrit: $k\varsigma > kkh; k\varsigma > cch$; and $k\varsigma > jjh$. Among these three developments modern scholars normally think that the development of $k\varsigma$ into $kkh$ is one of characteristic features of Śaurasenī, e.g. $pakṣa > pakkha$. But initially $kkh$ 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 $k\varsigma$ should be $cch$, e.g. $makṣikā > macchiā$ Beng. $māchī$. This development seems to be quite regular in the case of eastern region. And the same word is developed into $kkh$ in the western region, e.g. $makṣikā > makkhiā > mākhī$ in Marāthī. Because $k\varsigma$ develops into $kkh$ in the western region, it is normally suggested that the development of $k\varsigma$ into $kkh$ is normally found in the western region and that into $cch$ in the eastern region. And as a result, $k\varsigma$ changing into $kkh$ must be one of the dominant features of Māhārāṣṭrī rather than Śaurasenī. But Pischel and Woonler think that $k\varsigma > kkh$ is a feature of Śaurasenī. In that case it can be said that Māhārāṣṭrī has borrowed this feature from Śaurasenī.

But the development of $k\varsigma$ into $jjh$ does not seem to be a very regular one, e.g. in the case $ojjhara < Skt. avakṣara$ is a glaring instance of Māhārāṣṭrī. So also $kṣiṇam > jhiṇam$. In the $Kasāyapāhuḍa$ the forms $jhiṇamajhiṇam$ occurs in the passage—$payañže$ $mohaṇijjā$. $vihatti taha $ $ṭṭhidie$ $aṇubhazi$ $ukkassesanukkassam$ $jhiṇamajhiṇam$ $ca$ $ṭṭhidijam$ $vā$ (verse 22). In the $Jayadhaṇaḷaṭikā$ the form $jhiṇam$ 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 $k\varsigma$ into $kkh$ 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 $jjh$) are not found in Śaurasenī, at least, in the Śaurasenī passages of Sanskrit dramas. Whether $kkh$ 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. $kkh$, scholars might have accepted this development of $k\varsigma$ into $kkh$ 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. ccḥ and jjḥ) 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 Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama 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 √bhū has several forms in Prakrit, depending on the dialects. In Māhārāṣṭrī the root √bhū > √hū and then √ho (a gnamated form) to which the personal terminations are added, making it hōi, hosi, homi etc. Though initially bh does not become h as per rules of aspiration in Prakrit, in the case of √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 Śauraseni forms will be bhodi, bhost, and bhomi. These forms of Māhārāṣṭrī and Śauraseni are very regular. In the case of Śauraseni, Hemacandra (IV.269) has optionally accepted hodi, hosī, homī as well. This form i.e. bh>h in Śauraseni is not regular even though we find this usage in literature. There are other two forms of the root √bhū which are also accepted both in Māhārāṣṭrī and Śauraseni, e.g. from Skt. bhavatī we have havāi in Māhārāṣṭrī and bhavadi and havadi (HC. IV. 269) in Śauraseni. There are other forms as given by Hemacandra both in Māh. and Śau. as Māh. huwāi, Śau. hwadi, so also bhuvai in Māh., bhuvadi and huwadi in Śau. To speak frankly the base bhava or bhava or havā or huwā are of later origin than hu or ho. We can call these forms hyper-prakritisation 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 bhava or huwa, bhava or havā used mostly in poetry rather than in prose. Now if a manuscript reads bhuvadi or hwadi, 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 bhava or bhava, huwa and havā, rather than bhodi. The form hodi is, of course, also found there. In the Nīryuktī the forms havāi and bhavai are more frequent than bhuvai and huwai. 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 *Satkhandagama* 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 *Kasayapahuata* the forms *hodi*, *havadi* and *honti* (pl) are found. To me it seems that they are not regular forms in *Sauraseni*.

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 *Sau*. We have come to this conclusion on the basis of the fact that these forms are also available in Mg. *Sau*. 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 *vḥu* which becomes *bhva* (*bhuvon bhavah* IV. 269) in *Sau*., it appears that if that is not the dominant feature of *Sau*., 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 *Sau*. form of the root *vḥū* would be *bhov* with usual suffixes. As in the *Satkhandagama* as well as its *Dhavalā* the occurrence of the form *bhov*, *bhodi* etc. is found side by side with *ho*, *hodi*, the *Satkhandagama* and *Dhavalā* have also the features of *Sauraseni*.

That in the initial position *Sau*. retains the sound *bh* is also proved by the fact that the words *bhavat* and *bhagawat* also become *bhavam* and *bhagavam* in *Sau* ( *bhavad-bhagavatoḥ* IV. 265) where Hemacandra has not suggested any other alternative forms with *havam* as in the case with the root *vḥū*. So all these points lead us to this conclusion that in *Sau*. the retention of initial *bh*, particularly in the root *vḥū*, 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 *Sau*. *ry* is optionally changed to *yy*, and naturally the usual change of *ry* to *jj* is also found in *Sau*. e.g. *ārya* > *āyya*, also *ajja*, *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 Śau. 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 Śau. So it seems that this character of Śau., 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. Śau. \( ajja \), and Mg. \( ayya \). Though Hemacandra has given this rule in the case of Śau. 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 Śau. 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 \( jja \) (<\( r j \)). e.g. \( ārya> ajja; kārya> kajja \). The same form is also found in Śau. 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 Śau. unless we accept that it is a loan from Mg.

In the Śau. 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 Śauraseni.

In the commentary on the \( Śaṭkhaṇḍa-gama \) 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, Śau. has not got as such any peculiarity except in the abl. sg. of \( a- \) base. In this particular case the retention of \( a \) is normally found, i.e. from Skt. \( narā \) we have \( narādu \) or \( narādo \), while \( narāu \) and \( narāo \) will be in Māh. This peculiarity can be justified by the general rule that in Śau. the intervocalic -\( d- \) is retained. And hence Hemacandra has made a sūtra of the abl. sg. as \( niṣes tto do du hi hinto lukāh \)(III. 8) where in his vr̥tti he has said \( dakāra-kaṇām \)
bhāṣāntarārtham and by bhāṣā he, of course, primarily means Sau.
and perhaps secondarily Mg. where also the same form occurs.

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

(vii) Vocative in ā or am.

But in the case of Skt. words ending in -n, in Sau. this -n- becomes
optionally -ā in the voc. sg. (Hc. IV. 263), e.g. Skt. bho kaṅcukin>Śau.
bho kaṅcuṭā; bho sukhīn>Śau. bho suḥṭā; this one seems to be a
special rule for Sau. in voc. sg. of words ending in -n. In other case n
is dropped in the words ending in -n e.g. Skt. bho tapasvi >Śau. bho
tavalī; so also bho manassī. This means that the general Māh. form
of voc. sg. of words ending in -n is used in Ģau. 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
Śāṭkhaṇḍāgama, 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 Sau. (Hc.IV.264), e.g. Skt. bho rājan>Śau.
bho rāyaṁ, similarly bho vijāyavarman >Śau. bho viyāvamman; 
sukarman >sukammam. In a similar way we have examples in
literature like bho bhagavan kusumāyudha> bho bhayavam
kusumāyuha; and so also bhayavaṁ tīṭhāṁ pavatteha.

In all these examples the words ending in -an> -am in the voc. do
not seem to be a very peculiar feature of Sau., even though
grammarians admit that bhagavan could have been equally bhaava
also. This shows the influence of Māh. on Sau. However, as far as the
Śāṭkhaṇḍāgama 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 Sau. e.g. tā jāva pavisāmi; tā
alam edinā māneṇa and so on.

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

(ix) Future in -ssi.

Apart from this, the grammarians (Hc. IV. 275) say that in Sau.
the ending -ssi is added in the future tense instead of -hi as in the
case of Māh. eg. bhavissiṇi, karissiṇi and gacchissiṇi.
It is a fact worth noting that according to Hemacandra (III. 167) the -ssa is used in Māh. and this is an extension to Sau. which shows that the other forms of Māh. is not possible in Sau. If this statement of Hemacandra is correct we can say that the special rule -ssi for Sau. must be compulsory and peculiar to the Sau. language.

We could not find any example of the future form of Sau. with this -ssi in the Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama.

(x) The formation of gerundial suffix -ktvā

In the formation of the gerundial suffix, Sauraseni has again some peculiarities which are different from others. According to the grammarians (Hc.IV.271) the gerundial suffix in Sauraseni, is -iya, and -dūna. Of these two the suffix-dūna is pure Sauraseni, 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 Sau. as well, e.g. √bhū > bhava, bhodūna, and havia, hodūna, so also path > paḍhidiṇa, paḍhia; √ram > randūna, ramia. A glance at these examples will reveal the fact that as Sau. retains -d-intervocally the forms with -dūna should be a recognised one for Sau. while the others are Māh. or Pkt. in general. There could be another formation of gerundial form both in Sau. and Māh. This form is nothing but the assimilation as -tvā > -ttā. This shows that the gerundial forms with -d is more important for Sau. 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 √kr and √gam we have some special forms (Hc. IV. 272) besides the suffixes mentioned above. From √kr we have karidiṇa and karī, gacchidiṇa/gamidiṇa, and gacchīa/gamīa. Besides these forms we have another suffix with -ua. So we have from √kr > kaḍua and from √gam> gaḍua. The Pkt. grammarians have called all these forms a special case in Sau. To my mind it appears that kaḍua and gaḍua are forms of Mg. √kr+kta> kaḍa and √gam+-kta > gaḍa. So also √mr+-kta > maḍa. (Vara XI.15) And these forms are not used in Sau. Naturally it appears that the gerundial suffix -ua is added to these Mg. forms of √kr, √gam, and √mr. So it appears to me that the Sau. forms of these kaḍua and gaḍua are nothing but transferred to Sau. from Mg. and just as we have kaḍua in Mg. and Sau., so also kāṭa or kariṇa in Māh.

So if a text contains the forms kaḍua and gaḍua there is no reason to consider them as special case of Sau. 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 kāḍuṇa and gaduṇa are found in the Mg. passages, whereas in pure Śau. text kariduṇa, gamiduṇa or gacsiduṇa are found.

In the case of the Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama the form does not occur in the sūtra of the text. But in the commentary Dhavalā the forms used are with -diṇa 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.

idānimo dāṇīṁ (IV. 277).

In Śau. the word idānim (now) > dāṇīṁ, e.g. anantara-karaṇīyaṁ dāṇīṁ ānavedu ayyo.

These examples of this sūtra can be found only in the case of dramas. It is difficult to get an example of dāṇīṁ in the Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama 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 Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama.

ṇaṁ narwarthe (IV. 283).

In Śau. ṇaṁ is used in the sense of nanu i.e in the sense of doubt or question etc., e.g. ṇaṁ aphalodayā, ṇaṁ ayyamissehiṁ puḍhamanaṁ yyeva āṇattam, ṇaṁ bhavaṁ me aggado caladi.

The examples given by Hemacandra are from the Skt. dramas mainly from the Abhijñāna-sakuntalam and Mrčchakāṭikān.

It is a fact worth noting that in Jaina canonical literature, particularly in the prose portion, this ṇaṁ is used as a sort of emphatic, eg. jayā ṇaṁ, tayā ṇaṁ, etc. But in the Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama, particularly in the main sūtras of the text, this ṇaṁ 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.

*haṅje cetyāhvāne* (IV. 281).

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

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

*himāṇaha viṣmaya-nūvede* (IV. 282)

In Śau. the word *himāṇaha* is used in order to indicate a surprise or dejection. e.g. *himāṇaha jivanta-vačchā me jaṇati* (in surprise); *himāṇaha patissantā hage edeṇa niyābhidhīno duvva vasidena* (in dejection).

*ammahe harṣe* (IV. 284)

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

*hī hī vidūṣakasya* (IV. 285)

In Śau. in order to indicate the delight of the Vidūṣaka the particle *hīhī* is used, e.g. *hīhī bho sampannā manoradhā piyā-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 *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama*.

In the end we may say that the above analysis has given us this impression that whether the language of the *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama* is Sauraseni 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 *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama*: “The present work (i.e. *Śaṭkhaṇḍāgama*) 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 Dhāvalā. But about the time of Vīrsena the tables had turned against Prakrit, and Sanskrit had got the upperhand as revealed by the present portion of Dhāvalā as well as its contemporary literature."

"The Prakrit of the sūtras, the Gāthās as well as of the commentary, is Šauraseni 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 Šauraseni 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 Šakuntalā which he has corrected in accordance with the rules of Hemacandra. This is greatly seen in the 6th act of the Šakuntalā particularly in the Māgadhī passages of the fisherman. As the manuscripts of that passage is corrupt and not inconformity 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 *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* and other similar Prakrit texts like *Kasāyapāhuḍa, Mahābandha, Tiloyapanṇatti*, Kundakunda’s works and so on. In the *Kasāyapāhuḍa*, 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 Śauraseni 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. kāyavā, Skt. nikṣitavyā> Ś. nikkhiyavā, and as far as Śauraseni is concerned, these forms are not regular, they should be corrected as kādavā and nikkhidavā.

The reading arihantānaṁ is a puzzling one. It has three readings: arahantānaṁ, arihantānaṁ and aruhantānaṁ. In the Hāṭigumpha Inscription of Khāravela at Udayagiri Hill in Bhubaneswar belonging to the second or first century B.C., the reading arahantānaṁ (nāmo arahantānaṁ nāmo savā-sidhānaṁ) is found. This is, perhaps, the earliest written document where the reading arahantānaṁ is available. Then the reading arīha- was developed in Prakrit from Sanskrit arha (cf. Hemacandra, rha-ṣrī-ṛṣ-ṛtsna-kriyā-dīṣṭyāsvit, II. 104). So also we have the reading arihantānaṁ (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 - arahantānaṁ and arihantānaṁ are found. For example, in the Śāṭkhanaḍāgama edited by Hirala Jain, the reading arihantānaṁ is accepted, but in the Somasundara-carita of Nayanandi (samvat 1100) edited by the same scholar, Hiralal Jain (1970, Vaiśāli), the reading of the namokkārama-mantra is arahantānaṁ 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 arahantānaṁ is found, but in the duḥā (58) the reading is nāmo-arthantānaṁ (parameśṭhi paṃcaka ‘nāmo-arthantānaṁ’ 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 arthantānaṁ and aruhantānaṁ are variants. Again in duḥā (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. (śeṣāṃ Prākritavat Hc. IV.286, śeṣāṃ Māhāraṣṭrīvat, 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 describ lg 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), pāṇama (Māh.), and pṓnma (Āṃg). Of these 3 forms, both
historically and linguistically, the form *paduma* originated first. And from *paduma* the Māh. word *paśma* 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 *paśma* is Māh. because of the loss of intervocalic d-. In the case of *pōmma* 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 > paśma > pōmma* (by euphonic combination of a + u). Psychologically in the formation of this word 2 things are operating: first, the form *paśma* has influenced the word in making it *paū* 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.
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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 Hoefer 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 Māhāraṣṭrī and Māgadhī 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. 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.


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 Māhārāṣṭrī also, as in Śaurāsenī, while *indicates agreement with Māgadhī. M. and Mg. are abbreviations for Māhārāṣṭrī (the language of Mahārāṣṭra, the Marhatta country of today) resp. for Māgadhī, the language of Magadha, Ś for Śaurāsenī. 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 (*naiya=nīvā). Forms which do not have any supplement (Ś, M or Mg.) are Śaurāsenī; where several examples from one dialect are given, these are separated by commas, while a semicolon separates dialects. Thus nāgadā, M nāga (nāgatā); necchadi etc., means that nāgadā the Śaurāsenī form, nāga is that of Māhārāṣṭrī; necchadi is then again Śaurāsenī.

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.

praktih sanskritam; tatra bhava prakrtam ucyate.

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

Richard Schmidt.

PHONOLOGY

[7] 1. Śaurāsenī, the language of Śurasena with its capital at Mathurā, has the sound repertory of Sanskrit, lacking, however, in r, ř, l, ai, au, simple n, and further y, ś, ș 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 s and q into š, and instead of r there stands l throughout].

r becomes a for ex. in tana (tṇa), M. ghaa, kaa (gṛta, kṛta); most frequently becomes i; *ghida, *kida, 0kīsa, *giddha, 0diṭhi, 0siōla, 0hiīa (gṛta kṛta, krśa, grddhra, drṣṭi, śṛgāla, hṛdaya); particularly after labials it becomes u: nihuda M. nīhua (nībhṛta); nīvuda, M. nīvua (nīvṛta); pucchadi, M. pucchail, Mg. puṣcadi, (pṛcchati); 0munāla (mṇāla); mudaṅga, M. muıṅga Mg. mṛdaṅga (mṛdaṅga); uttanta (urttanta). Similarly before the suffix ka in jāmdua, M. jāmāu (jāmārkā); bhādua (bhṛārkā).

Initial r becomes either rī as in 0riddhi (ṛddhi), 0rīkka (ṛkṣa), risi [Mg. līśi] (rśi) beside isi: mahesi, 0rāesi (mahārṣi rājarṣi) or u: udu, M. u (ṛtu); ujjū (ṛju).
[r] correspondingly changes into i or ü, however, illustrative example is lacking.

*ai becomes ili: *kilitta (klipta).

*ai is changed to e: *Erāvaṇa (Airāvana), *tella (talla), *vejja (vaidyja), not to aë (Pischel § 61) as in M. daïcca (daitya).

*au becomes o, very seldom aë in M.: *Kośta (Kauśika), orasa (aurasa); *osaha (ausadhha), komudi (kaumudi); Kośambi (Kauśāṃbi), *jövana (jauvana), *döbballa (dauverbala); pora, M. païra, Mg. pola (paura)

[8] n always is changed to ñ: *ña (na), *naña (nayana). It remains unchanged in consonant groups like nt, nd: pēkkhantu (prekṣantām), cando (candraḥ).

*y falls out in intervocalic position: *hīa (hrdaya), *chāa (chāyā), *piya (priya)

ś and ş become s: *kesa, *pusu, *sisra, *esa, *sesa (çeṣa, paṣu, śiṣṭra, esa, sesa)

In Mg. as already stated ś and s become š, š by itself is retained: kešeu (keṣeu), salila (salila), sahaśsa (sahasra); see however § 8!

*ah becomes o: *aggado (agnraṭa), ráo (rāgha), niio (niyogha).

In Mg. in the Nom. sing. there is e for it: eše puliše (eso(es)a)puruşaḥ.--The treatment of āh iḥ etc. as much as of medial ṣ 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, paścat).

2. The rest of the vowels and diphthongs become, in general, retained. a a become (indeed only apparently) ē in *ētha=atra, corresponding to the Vedic itthā and in *mēṭa (mātrā); u appears as a in maūlida, M. maūlīla; u as i in *purisa², Mg. puṭśa (purusa); u as o in pōkkhara (puṣkara), Mg. poskalīṇi (puṣkārini) *mōtī (muktā).

A part of or final vowels sometimes appears before in between the parts of a consonant group: *sineha (sneha); radana, M. raṇa, Mg. ladana (ratnā); pekkha, Mg. pēśka (preṣṣya); kilamandi, M. kilamai (klāmyati); *kilanta (klānta); Mg. kośṇa (koṣṇa); *coria (caurya); *āmarīsa, Mg. āmalīsa (āmarṣa); tuvaradi, M. tuvarāti, Mg. tuvaladi (tvarate); dvāra, Mg. dvāla (dvāra); *dve (due).

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.
anuvāra], ॐvi [after vowels] for āpi; ॐdānīṃ (idānīṃ). At the beginning of the sentence avi resp. stands idānīṃ.

aṇa becomes e in verb forms as in ṇeduḥ (nayatu); M. kaheī, Mg. kadhēti (kathayati); — ava becomes o : odaradi [9] (avatarati); M. oāra (avatāra); Mg. oḍala (avatara), ॐnomālīṇa (navamālīkā); *bhodi M. hoi (bhavati).

A long vowel in a closed syllable becomes shortened: ॐkauva (kāvya); ॐgimha (grīśma); maṃsa (māṃsa); also in cases like ॐputtānām (putrānām), ॐmālāṃ (māḷām) ॐsahīṃ (sakhiṃ). Just as e and o before double consonants — jēvva, jōvāna (eva, yauvana) — as also before kkhu (=khalu) and tīt (=tīti); for ex. asamaēkkhu (asamaye khalu), mahatō [Mg. mahantē] kkhu (mahāntaḥ khalu), bamaṇo tī (brahmaṇa tī). Besides, there is khu after anuvāra and kkhu after a short vowel: mā khu (mā khalu), kīṃ khu, M. taṃ khu (tat khalu); na kkhu (na khalu). In M. after all vowels khu becomes hu: na hu, mā hu, ko hu; but Mg. śe kkhu (sa khalu), āaā khu (āgata khalu). — tī also stands after short and long vowels: esa tī (esa tī), duḥה tī (duḥītā tī), Kandappakeli tī (Kandarpakeli tī); tī stands after anuvāra: kīṃ tī (kīṃ tī). Like that in M.

eva after short vowels and e, o (which then become shortened) becomes jjeva or jēvva, Mg. yyēvva; other long vowels remain retained; jēvva or jeva stands after anuvāra: for ex. ajjassa jēvva (āryasya eva); idha jeva (iha eva), muhē jjeva (mukhe eva), idō jēvva (ito eva); tadhā jeva (tathā eva), devi jeva (devi eva), taṃ jēvva [jeva] (tam eva). — Mg. mama yyēvva (mama eva), damśaantē yyēvva (dārsayaṇto [=dārsayaṇṇa eva), diśantī yēvva (dṛṣyamaṇāṇa).

3. Sandhi Rules. In compositions similar vowels as in Sanskrit become contracted; so a ā + a ā become ॐā, i, i + i i become ॐi; u ū+u ū become ē, whereby before consonant group or double consonants there must happen shortening: jammantare (jāmnantāre). -- a ā + a a dissimilar vowel gives rise, as in Sanskrit the guṇa of the second vowel: ॐmahesi from mahā + ist (=mahāṛṣ). One takes note of cases like M. gāinda (gajendra), nārinda; Mg. nālinda (narendra); 'mahinda (mahendra), niluppale (nilotpala) ॐmahūsava (mahotsava)

i i ū ū remain unchanged before a dissimilar vowel as a Rule[10]: santiudaa (śāntyudaka), Uvvasiakkhara (Urvaśyākṣara), M. rattiandhāa (ṛātryandhaka).

Uditta-vowels i.e. such as remain left after the fall of consonants, do not admit of any further change: jai (yadi), not je; ॐgaa (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: ०नत्ती. Mg. ०नस्ति (nāstī); ०नहात्म (nāham); ०नगात् (nāgatā); ०नेच्छदि. Mg. ०नेच्छाति (nechati). Mark mamvari (mampari), M. sahasāgassā (gatasya).

Ending n and m become anusvāra: ०भवाम् (bhavāṁ), ०लम् (iṣyaṁ); m can, however make a saṃdhī with the following vowel, when metri causa short syllable is requisite. Cf. S. 27, jēttiam thantaraṁ tēttiam imāṇaṁ.

4. Initial consonants remain (exceptions, naturally are n y ś s) unchanged; only in a compound they are mostly treated as mediials with the exception of the initials of verbal roots after prefixes with final vowels which are often retained: ajjahtu (aryaputraḥ), but ākṣaṇḍo (ākaṃṭaḥ); M. bhāmc-rāula (bhramaraka), ārṇa (ākṛṇa).

Note that ०adha iṁ (atha kim), ०ciṁ ṛṣa (kṛṣṇa punar) etc., further dāva (tāvat) and de (te) after vowels and anusvāra: ciṣṭha dāva; Mg. ciṣṭha dāva (tīṣṭha tāvat); ०evam dāva (evaṁ tāvat); suṣṭhun de (suṣṭhu te), sādarm de (svāgataṁ te); Mg. tado de (tatas te), ēvvam de (evaṁ te).

5. Medial consonants. k, g, c, j, d, y fall out intervocally: ०loka, anurāga, nārāga, ०ga, ०maṇ, ०vīo (loka, anurāga, nārāga, gaja, madana, vīyoga); ī ṛ: kaḍāra (kaṭaka); t d: gada (gata), in M. it falls out: rāna (rajata); p and b become v: pāvena (pāpena), M. āvā (ātapa);

०kalevara (kalebara), ०kavala (kabala), ०savara (sabara); Mg. śivīla (śibra).

kh, gh, dh, ph, bh become h: ०muḥa (mukha), ०meha (megha), ०mahu (madhu), ०mūtyāhala (muktāphala), [1] ०ahīna (abhīna); ०, th become resp. dh, dh: kaḍhiṇa (kaṭhina), Mammadha (Mamatha), 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 ppiya. Permitted groups are: 1) double consonants: ०ratta (rakta); 2) a consonant + its aspirate: ०kappala (kaṭphala); 3) nasal + the consonants of the corresponding class: ०accanta (atyanta); 4) the groups ०nh, mh, lh: ०cinha (cīhna), ०banhaṇa (brāhmaṇa), ०palhata (prahlasta). In Mg. is yet found (partly doubtful) the group yjh, śk [?], śk [?], śc, śṛ [?], śth [?], śth [?], sk, skh, st, st, sp, sp, hk (consequently jhūmūliya+k): niyjhala (nirjhara), śuṣka beside śuska (suṣka),

4. becomes j: jadhā, M. jaha (yathā); in Mg. it is retained: yadhā.
5. Mg. keeps ś, and changes ś, s into ś.
dhanuśkhaṇḍa beside dhanuṣ (dhanus), puścadi (pṛcchati), kaśṭa [?] (kaṣṭa), kośṭhāgāla [?] (koṣṭhāgāra), haṣṭa [?] (haṣṭa), iṣṭhī [?] (iṣṭhī = strīkā), maskali (maskarīn), paskhaladi (praskhalatī), kaṇṭa (kaṇṭa), hasti (haṣṭin), śaṣpa (śaṣpa), niṣphala (niṣphala), pāḥka (pakṣa) cp. §81 !

kt becomes tt : ratta (rakta); kth becomes tth : riththa (rīktha); kp>pp : vappadi, M. vappai (vākpati); gh>ddh : 5uddha (dugdha); gb>bbh : 5pabhāra (prāgbhāra); 5k>kk : chakka (ṣatīka); 5c>cc : chaccaraṇa (ṣaṭcaraṇa); 5t>t : chattala (ṣaṭtala); tp>pp : chappaa (satpada); 5p>pph : kapphala (katphala); 5g>gg : chuggunaa (ṣadgunaka); 5d>jj : sajj (ṣadja); 5d>d : chaddisim (ṣaddīsam); 5d>bbh : chabbhau (ṣadbhau); 5d>vu : chawisam (ṣaṭvīsaṭatī); tk>kk : M. ukkantaḥ (uktanṭhā); balakkāra, M. balakkāla (balāṭkāra); tkh>kk : M. ukkhaa (utkhāta); tp>pp : āulpala (utpala); tph>pph : upphula (utphula); M. upphāla (utphāla); dg>gg : māggara (mudgara); dgh>gg : upgghada, M. upgghā (udghāta); db>bbh : ubbandha (udbandha); M. [12]bubbua (budbuda); db>bbh : ubbha (udbhāta); pt>tt : sutta (supta); bj>jj : khujja (kubja); bd>dd : sadda (ṣabda); bdh>ddh : 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. 5t>ṣ : pasta (paṭṭa), bhaṣṭālikā (bhaṭṭārikā). Stenzler writes in his edition of *Mrchchakāṇḍa* 5t : for ex. bhaṣṭa (bhaṭṭa). According to Pischel (§271) 5t is to be written.

**Nasal + consonant** remains preserved : 5saṁhalā (ṣrīkhalā), 5maṇjari, 5kaṇṭha, 5kaṇḍa, 5anta, 5jambī. But it is written 5dīṃvuhā (dīṃmukhā), 5pāṇti (paṇkti), 5vinyha (Vindhyā), 5sanjīvā (sandhyā), because in these cases the original nasal comes out of its class.—ñj in Mg. becomes 5nī : ariñali (arijali), Dhanarñāaa (Dhanarñaya).

n, n assimilate themselves with the foregoing consonants : M. rugga (rugga), 5aggi (agni), 5uvviga (udvigna), 5savatti (sapatni).—jñ>ñ [Mg. 5nī : avānī (avajñā), initially 5pāṇā (praṇā), 5naveđi (aṇapayati), kn>pp : Ruppini (Rukmiṇī); gm>gg : jugga (jugma).—ātman has N. sg. 5appā, otherwise the stem runs 5attā,—nn>mn : 5janna (janma); mn>mr : Pajjṛṇṇa (Pradyumna).

7. **Groups with semivowels.**

   a) kp>kk : Cāṇaka (Cāṇaka); khy>kkh : 5sōkkha (saukhyā); gy>gg : jögga (yogya); cy>cc : vuccadi (ucyate); M. muccaī (mucyate); jy>jyujjadi, M. juyai (jujujate); 5t>ṭt : nattaa (nātyaka), M. tuttai (trutyati); 5dy>dd : kuḍḍa (kuḍya); dhy>ddh : 5addha (aḍhya); ŭr>rn : 5pūṇa (pūnya);

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.
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Mg. šahitaṇḍa (saḥitaṇḍa) beside abamhaṇṇa (abrāhmāṇya), puṇṇa (punya); ty>cc: 0°accanta (atyanta); thy>ch: 0°nevaccha (nepathya); dp>jj, in Mg. yu>uṭṭja (vaidya), but Mg. ayya (adya); dhv>jjh, Mg. yu>uṭṭja 0°wajja (upādhya), Mg. mayyharṇa (madhyāhna); nṛ>ṛṇ : 0°aṛṇa (anya); py>[13] pp : kuppadi, M. kuppai (kupyatih), bhv>bhb : M. abbhantara (abhyantarā); abbhuvāṛṇa (abhyupapannā); my>ṛṃ : kilamadi, M. kilamaī (klāmyati); yu>ṛjj : 0°śćeja (śayyā); ry>ṛjj : 0°ajja, but Mg. ayya (ārya); ṭv>ṛl : 0°mulla (mūlya); ṭv>u : M. kava (kāva); ṭhodava (bhavita).b

b) ṭv>ṛ-kk : takkemi (tarkayāmi), M. akka (arka); ṭṛ>ṛkk : 0°cakka (cakara); ṭṛh>kkh : mukkha (mūrkhā), ṭṛg>ṛg : 0°ṛngama (nirgama), ṭṛg>ṛg : agga (aggra), M. (g)gaha (graha), ṭṛg>ṛgh : 0°diggāja (dirghikā), M. nīgghīna (nirghīṇa); ṭṛh>ṛgh : vāggha (vīghra), M. agghā (āgrātri); ṭṛ>cc : kucca (kūra), M. accā (arcā); ṭṛh>cc : mučča (mūṛchā); ṭṛh>cc : samucchida (samuccrīta); ṭṛj>ṛj : Mg. yu>u ṭuyjana (durjana), M. Ajjuna, but Mg. Ayyuṇa (Arjuna); ṭṛj>ṛjj : 0°vajja (vajra); ṭṛj>ṛjjh : Mg. yu>u 0°nijjhara, M. nījyhalā; ṭṛn>ṛṇ : 0°kṛṣṇa (kṛṣṇa), ṭṛt and tr>ṛt : 0°kṛti (kṛtī), 0°kalatta (kalatra); ṭṛn>ṛth : 0°attha (artha), but in Mg. st : tista (tirtha); ṭṛd and ṭṛ>ṛddb : 0°ddudīṇa (durdīna), 0°bhadda (bhadrā); ṭṛh and dh>ṛddb : 0°addha (ardha), 0°giddha (grdhrā); ṭṛp and pr>ṛp : 0°dappa (darpā), 0°appia (apria); ṭṛb and br>ṛbb : nibbandha (nirbandha), M. dōbballa (daurbalya); abbamhaṇṇa (abrāhmāṇya), M. (b) bhamha (brāhmāṇa); ṭṛh and bh>ṛbb : dubbhejja (durbhyedya), M. gabbha (garbha); paribbhamadi, M. 0°ma (paribhramati); ṭṛm and m>ṛṛm : dummarussa (durmanusya), M. dhamma (dharma); 0°Dummakkha (Dūmrākṣa); ṭṛ>ṛll : 0°dullaha (durlabha); ṭp and v>ṛṛv : 0°puvva (purva) 0°parivuvāja (parivrājaka).

c) ṭk and ṭk>ṛkk : 0°vakkala (vakkala), vikkava (viklaba); ṭg>ṛg : 0°phagguna (phālguna); ṭp and ṭp [14]pp : 0°kappa (kalpa), ṭpivapa (viplava); ṭp>ṛpp : guppha (gulpha); ṭb>ṛbb : kibbisa (kilbisa); ṭbb>ṛbb : pagabhbdhi (pragabhdtte); ṭmb and m>ṛmm : 0°gumma (gulma), M. vomma (valmika); ṭm>ṛmecha (mleccha); ṭv>ṛll : gallakka (galvarka), M. pallala (palvala).

d) ṭv>ṛ-kk : pakka or 0°pikka (pakva); ṭy>ṛjj : paṭjalalī, M. 0°la (prajvalati); ṭv>ṛṇ : Karṇa (Karṇa), M. kṛṇa (kṛṇa); ṭv>ṛt : 0°satta (sattva), Mg. cattali (catvārī); ṭv>ṛddb : 0°dīnu (dviguna), or ṭv, particularly with ud : for ex. 0°uvigga (udvigna); ṭv>ṛddb : uddhattha (uddhwastra), but ṭsajjhasa (sādhuasarṇa); nṛ>ṛṇ : arṇesāṇa (anvesāṇa), M. marṇantala

8. ṭr in tth is apparent only in adverbs in tra and its compounds: aṃnaththa (anyatra), attabhavam (atrabhava), M. kattha (kutra); 0°jattha (yatra), 0°tattha (tatra), tattha bhavam (tatrabhava); M. savvattha (sarvatra). Cp. Pischel § 293.— Sometimes it undergoes cerebralisation : for ex. bhaṣṭa (bhartā, "lord", but 0°bhātta "husband"; 0°vṛtta, M. vaṭṭai (vartata); 0°vicchaṭṭha (vicchardha), vaṭṭai, M. vaṭṭhai (vartkate).
(manvantara). Take note evam ṇedaṁ (evam nu etat), "kīṁ ṇedaṁ (kīṁ nu etat).

8. Groups with sibilants

a) śc>cch, unchanged in Mg. "accharia, accharia, Mg. aścalia (āscarya); if an ś stands at the end of the members of a compound then śc is changed cc : ṛiccalā [but Mg. ṛiscalā (ṛiscalā); duccarida, M. duccarita (duścarita); tavacaraṇa (tapācaraṇa).—śc>cch: M. ṛicchallia (ṛischallita); śr>ṛḥ : paṛha (praśna), M. aṛhaï (aśnāti), śm>ṛmh: Kamhi, M. Kamhāra (Kaśmira); in Mg. unchanged; raśmi becomes rassī; initially śm>m : ṇmasāna, Mg. maśāna (maśāna).—śy, śr, śt, śv>ss, Mg. śs : avassāṃ (avaśyam); Mg. vinaśādū (vinaśyatu); missa, Mg. mīśa, M. mīsa (mśra); (s)sahāṇī (śāghaniyā); Vissaṇvasu, Mg. Vissāvaśu (Viśvāvasu).

b) śk and śk>kkh : pōkkhara (pūṣkara), M. vikkhambha (viṣkambha), the aspiration can, however, also be left : Kīkṣindha (Kīkṣindha), Kākukara (duṣkara). In Mg. śk is changed to sk, śk to skh:

śuska (śuska), dhanuskhaṇḍa (dhamuś),—śc>cch or kk : ṇacchi (akṣi) but also akkhī; ṇrechha beside ṇrīkhha (ṛkṣa); (k)khatta (kṣatriya), sīkkhī, M. sīkkhī (śīkṣīta), ṇadākhīna (dakṣīṇa). [15] kṣaṇa “twin-
kling of eye” becomes ṇkaṇa, in the sense of a festival ṇcchāna. In Mg. kṣ-sk : laskaca (raḵsasaḥ), daske (dakṣaḥ).

—kṣ and kṣ>ṛḥ, mh resp. : tiṇha (beside ṇtīkhha (tiṃṣa), ṇpaṃmala (pakṣmala). lakṣmi always becomes lacchī. śt and st>ṛḥ : diṛṭi (ṛṣṭi), anuṣṭhū (suṣṭhu).

Mg. changes śt and st into st : kaṣṭa (kaṣṭa), susṭu (suṣṭhu).—śṛ>ṛḥ, Mg. sn : ṇuṇha (uṇa), Mg. Viṣṇu (Viṣṇu); śp and śph>ṛph Mg. śp resp. śph : ṇuppha (puṣpa), Mg. śaspa (paṣpa); ṇuppha, Mg. ṇuṣphala (uṣphala), bāspa “tear” becomes ṇbāha, in the sense of “smoke, vapour” bāppha.—śm>ṁ : ṇgimha (grīṃḍa); śy and śv>ss, Mg. śs : ṇmanussa, Mg. maṇuṣsa (maṇusya); parissada (pariṣvajate).

c) sk and skh>kkh : ṇ(k)khambha (skambha), ṇparikkhalaṇta

9. In M. a single s possibly with the lengthening of the foregoing vowel : nāsai (naṣyati), vesā (veṣyā); Ś. has vesajana and veṣāḥ=veṣyājana.

10. A single s with lengthening for ex. an niṣasadi, M. niṣasai, Mg. niṣasady (niṣvasati, niṣvasitu).

11. According to Namisādhu (in Rudraṭa, Kāvyālaṃkāra II, 12) śk, skh resp. so ṇuṣke (uṣkai), dhanuṣkhaṇḍa (dhanuś).

12. Hemacandra and Namisādhu reduce this to prekṣ and ācakṣ (pēkṣi, acakṣadī = prekṣate, ācaṣte and instructs besides the passage of kṣ (intially) to ṇaḥ : laḥkāse, ṇaḥka (raḵsah, pakṣa).


15. According to Namisādhu śp and śph.
(pariskhalan); in Mg. it is retained\(^{16}\): maskali (maskarin), paskhalati (praskhalati), and in compounds usually the aspiration remains: tirakkāra (tiraskāra), M. ūmakka (namaskāra).—st and sth>tth sometimes ʈhː : ०aṭṭhi (asti), ०avathā (avasthā), however ०aṭṭhi (asti); uṭṭhehi beside utthehi, utthedu (uttiṣṭha, uttiṣṭhatu), M. ṭhia, thia, Ś. ʈhida, thida; utthida, M. ūṭṭhia, utthia (sthīta, utthīta); patthīda, M. patthia (prasthīta); ०ṭhāna, M. has also ʈhā (stāna), ṭhidī, thidī, M. ṭhi, thī (sthi). In Mg. st is preserved\(^{17}\) and sth>st: hasti (hastin), uvaṣṭa (upasaṭhīta).—ts>cch, Mg. śc : ०vacchala, Mg. vaścala (vaṭsala); or it becomes [as also originally t+s]>ss, resp. s with lengthening of the foregoing vowel, so in compositions when t stands at the end of a syllable; usūvedi (ut-śrāpayati); āsasida, M. āsasia (ut-śvasita); paṭjussa (paryuṭsuka), samuṣa (samutsuka), ०uṣava (utsava), ०mahuṣava (mahotsava), vasantaṃava (vasantotsava); Mg. āsasādu (ut-śvasatu). sn>śn in case the group is not separated by a semivowel: ०ṇāda, M. ṣṇā (ṣṇāt)\(^{18}\); sp and sp>ph, in Mg. they are preserved: Bhihappadi (Brhspati), papphradi, M. ०ra (prashurat), Mg. Buhaspad, spulhunti (Brhspati, spuranti)\(^{19}\). Very frequent is ०phaṃsa (sparśa); loss of aspiration : ०paroppara (paraspara), M. avaroppara (aparapara).—ps>cch: accharā (apsaraḥ), juguccedi, M. juucač’ai (jugupsya)ti; sm>ṁh: ०amhe (asmhe); the pronominal ending smin becomes ०ssīm, Mg. ०ssīm : edassīm, M. eassīm, Mg. edaśśīm (estassmin).—sy, sr, ss>ś, Mg. ०ś: ०rahasa (rahasya), Mg. taśśa (taśya); ०saḥsas, Mg. ०saḥśśa (saḥsara); tavasstī, Mg. tavasṣī (tapasvin), M. Sarassai (Sarasvati).


h, ḍh, ṭh>ś [Mg. ś] or, with extension of the foregoing vowel, s [Mg. s]: cāduṣsāla (catuḥśāla), Dussanta, Mg. Duṣṣanta (Duḥṣmanta), cāduṣsamudda (catuḥsamudra), Mg. ०niṣsalī (niḥṣta); M. niṣaṅka (niḥsaṅka); ṭiṣaḥa beside ०niṣsaḥa (niṣsaḥa).

h, ṭn, ṭn, ṭn>ṛḥ, ṭm, ṭn : ०avarāṇa (aparāṇa), ०gṛṇhāṇa (gṛṇhāṇi); ०cīṇa (śīna); ०bāṁhara (brāhmaṇa); ०palhatta (prahlasta).

ḥṣ, ṭḥ, ṭḥ>ṛḥ, ṭṃ, ṭḥ : ०sajjha, Mg. ०śayja (ṣahya); ṭṃ>ṭḥ : gabbhara (gaṇvara); but ०jīhā, Mg. ṛḥā (jīvā).

10. Transition of denticles to cerebrals: matṭā (matṛṭkā), ०vuddha (urdha), ०tālauṇa (tālauṇa), ०gaṇthī (granthi), Mg. gaṇṭhiśceda (granthiccheda). Cp. also the remark in § 7, b.

\(^{16}\) According to Namisādhū ṣk and ṣkh.

\(^{17}\) According to Namisādhū st>śt.

\(^{18}\) For Mg. there run manuscript forms ṣṇāmi (snāmi), ṣṇāde (snāta).

\(^{19}\) After Namisādhū ṣp and ṣph.
For groups of more than two consonants the same rules are valid:

: ॐmaccha, Mg. maśca (matsya), ॐaggha (arghya). Only two consonants written, even when three are required there; for ex. satta not satṭa
(from sattva).—yōtsnā>ॐjōṅhā.

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

punā “again” becomes ॐpuna, in the sense of “but, however” ॐuṇa.
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), ॐtirantar (ntṛ),
ॐpunārutta (punarutka), against antakkarana (antahkarana), antaggada
(antargata), puṇārṇava (punarnava). It is to be noted ॐanteura, anteuriā
(antahpura, antahpūrīkā).
v is represented by ॐvia/iva, ॐvuccadi (ucyate); however ॐutta (uktta);

MORPHOLOGY

A. Noun

11. The consonantal declension is wholly upto the rest sporadically for ex. M. viivā (vipādā), disić disi (dīsi dīsi), Mg. niśi (niśi)—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 i (with feminines) resp. —The dual has been lost and was replaced (with noun and verb)
by the plural. The dative were paraphrased with ॐattham (artham) and
ॐnimittam (nimittam); in M. it often happens with a stems : maraṇāa,
hāsā, varāa and so forth (maraṇāya, hāsāya, vanāya).

a) Masculine and Neuters in a : putta (putra), phala : Sing. N.
 vbox; Mg. putte; A. vbox; I. vbox; [D.M., Mg. puttā] Abl.
 vbox; G. vbox; L. vbox; [18] V. vbox; —Plur. N. vbox; A.
 vbox; I. vbox; puttehiṃ; G. vbox; puttānāṃ; L. vbox; puttesunī; V. = N27.

---

20. M. puttā; metri causa also the ending aū : sīsāu (sīrśāt), and not rarely also forms in ā : vasā (vasāt), balā (balāt), or also in hi : mūlāhi (mūlāt), seldom with hiṃto : hāśhāṃto (hṛdayāt).
21. Mg. puttaśa; besides the ending ha ॐsalīhā (sarīrasya)
22. M. also with mni : jōvaṃmni (yauvane); Mg. also in hinī : kulahiṃ (kule),
in verses also with mni : kūvamni (kūpe).
23. Also often with lengthened final sounds : ॐputū; Mg. also uses the N. as
(V.: bhāve, ceḍe, lāute (bhāva, ceṭa, rajaputra).
24. M. has also sometimes forms in ā : guṇā, dosā (guṇān, dosān).
25. M. much ofteren without nasal.
26. In M. puttesuṣ is prevalent; Mg. puttesuṃ.
27. For Mg. the ending ho is also permitted : puttāho.
The neuter is just so, only N.A. Sing. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{phala} \), Plur. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{phalai} \) [Mārkandeya for S. also permits phala as well], metrically M. has also phalā, phalāi.

b) **Feminine in ā**: mālā (mālā). Sing. N. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{mālā} \). A. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{māla} \); I. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{mālāe} \); Plur. N. A.V. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{mālā} \); [Abl. M. mālahiṇṭo] G. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{māla} \); L. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{mālasu} \).

12. **Masculine and neuter in i and u**: aggi (agnī), dahi (dadhī) : Sing.N. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{aggi} \); A. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{aggim}; \ I. \ (\text{o})^\circ \text{aggihnā}. [Abl. aggiḍo] G. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{aggi} \); L. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{aggimm}; \ V. \ (\text{o})^\circ \text{aggi} \). Plur. N. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{aggi} \); L. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{aggi} \); I. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{agghin} \)\( \text{I} \) [Abl. M. agghinṭo] G. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{agghin} \); L. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{aggisu} \).

Just so the neuter, but N. A. Sing. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{dahim} \). Plur. dahīṃ.

**Example for Masculine in ā**: vāu (vāyu), Sing. N. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{vāu} \); A. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{vāun}; \ I. \ (\text{o})^\circ \text{vāunā}. [Abl. vāudo] G. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{vāunu} \); L. vāunmi; V. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{vāu} \). Plur. N. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{vāun}; \ vāo \); A. vāuo; I. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{vāuhi} \); G. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{vāuṇā} \); L. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{vāusu} \).

[19] Just so the neuter, only N.A. Sing. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{mahu} \) (madhu), Plur. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{mahū} \).

13. **The feminine in ā and u** are as good as vanished and those with ī and ā have fallen together. These are declined like feminine stems in ār. 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. \( \text{gadī} \), vahū; A. \( \text{gadī}, \ \text{vahū}; \ M. \ (\text{gadjī}, \ \text{vahū}); \ Abl. Sacido (Śacyā), Mg. ṇaśīlo (nagaryā); G.

28. M. has metri causa oftener mālāi.
29. M. mālo.
30. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{halā} \) ("O lady friend") is often in conjunction with the V. of a proper noun : halā Saṁtale, halā Anusū (sakhi Ṣakuntale, sakhi Anusūye).
31. Rarely is N.A. \( \text{o}^\circ \text{mālā}, \ N. \) metri causa mālāu in M.
32. M. has also mālāhi.
33. M. mālaṇa.
34. According to Mārkandeya; in Hultzsch p.716. In M. vahīu (udadhē).
35. M. beside it also aggissa.
36. M. has also aggī.
37. M. also aggīhi.
38. M. aggīna also.
39. M. vahuṣa; Mg. metrically Viśvāvasussa (Viśvāvasoh).
40. M. vāu also.
41. M. also vāuhi.
42. Also M. vāurā; Mg. metrically bāhura (bāhvo).
43. M. gai.
14. **Stems in r**
a) Agentive noun: bhattā “husband”, bhaṭṭā “lord” (bhartṛ), Sing. N. bhattā, bhaṭṭā; A. bhattārāṃ, bhaṭṭārāṃ; I. bhaṭṭinā; G. bhattuṇo, bhaṭṭinō; L. bhātārē; V. bhātā, bhāṭṭā.—Plur. N. bhāṭṭāro.
māṭ has in Sing. N. māḍa, A. māḍaraṃ, G. māde, V. māde.

Of the **stems in e, o**, au there comes here only nau to be considered with N. nāvā and A. nāvāṃ (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. bhavaṃ, bhavā; A. bhaavantāṃ, bhavantaṃ; I. bhaavadā, bhavadā; G. bhaavado, bhavado; V. bhaavanto.—Plur. N.V. bhaavanto.

The rest of the stems: Sing. N. Mascul mahanto karēnto, cītavanto, (mahān, kurvan, cītavān); A. mahantaṃ, jānantaṃ, I. calanteṇa (calatā), bhuttavanteṇa (bhuktavatā); G. cītavantassā (cītavataḥ), mahantassā (mahataḥ), Himavantassā (vataḥ); L. mahante; [V. calanta].—Plur. N. sikkhantā (sīkṣantah); [A. sikkhante

45. Besides the form of is like the I.G.: M. paavie (padavyām), Mg. dhalaṇie (dharavyām), Ś. masānavidhie, (śmaśānavidhīyām).
46. M. metrically tarunī (tarunỳaḥ).
47. M. without nasal as well.
48. Mg. bhattālaṃ
49. M. piā.
50. M. piaraṃ, Mg. pidaraṃ
51. M. piṇā.
52. M. pīruṇo.
53. M. māā.
54. M. māraṃ.
55. M. māe.
56. M. kuranto; Mg. puṣcamde, mahante, colaante (pṛcchan, mahān, corayan).
57. M. Mg. ebengo; note Mg. mālantaṃ=mārayantam.
58. M. piantēna (piyatā); Mg. gaścanteṇa (gacchatā).
59. M. jānantaṇa (jānataḥ); Mg. alinhantassā (arihataḥ).
60. M. most of all forms with mni: ruantanni (rudati); Ḥanumantamnībeside Ḥanumante (Ḥanumati).
61. not recorded in Ś: M. sasanta (svasan), Mg. alihanta (arhaṃ).
62. M. jānanta (jānataḥ), Mg. sasanta (svasanta).
= śikṣataṭa\(^63\); I. ⁰gacchantehiṁ (gacchadbhiḥ)\(^64\); G. pēkkhantāṇaṁ (prekṣamānānaṁ)\(^65\); L. vattantesu (vartamānesu).

The neuter has anomalous N. Sing. M. bhāyantaḥ, Ś. disantaḥ (bhānat, dṛṣyāmanam); but Mg. dahanate (dahat). A. as in the masculine: mahantaṁ (mahat), M. sāntaṁ (sat); likewise in rest of the cases (Plur. N.A. not recorded).

16. **Stems in** n : rāa, Mg. lāa (rājan). Sing. N. ⁰rāā\(^66\); A. ⁰rāāṇaṁ\(^67\); I. ⁰rāṇaṭ\(^68\); G. ⁰rāṇo, ⁰rāṇo\(^69\); V. rāaṇa\(^70\).—Plur. N.A. ⁰rāāṇo\(^71\). The remaining cases are not documented.

At the end of a compound rājan is handled in the following manner: N. māhārāo, A. māhārāam, I. māhārāena, G. māhārāassa (beside Kalinigaranyo), Mg. mahālāaśa; V. māhārāa; Plur. N. māhārāa ātman forms Sing. N. ³attā\(^72\); A. ³attānaṁ (=ātmānakam)\(^73\); I. appaṇa\(^74\); G. ³attano\(^75\); [V.M. ap. yaṇ].

[21] Words ending in varman have vammā or vammo: Vijaavammā, Vijaavammanā (Vijayaavarmā, ⁰varman), Cittavammo (Cittravarmā), Maṅkavammo, ⁰vammassa (Maṅgāṅkavarmā, ⁰varmānaḥ).

The **neuters ending** in- an go usually as those in a : pēmma, nāma (preman, nāman) : Sing. N.A. ⁰pēmmana, ⁰nāmaṇa; I. ⁰pēmmena, ⁰nāmeṇa; [Abl. jammodo=jammaṭah]; G. ⁰pemmassa; L. ⁰pēmme\(^76\).—Plur. I. dāmehiṁ (dāmahbhīḥ); L. kammaṁsu, Mg. kammesu.

17. **Stems ending** in, in, vin : Sing. N. ⁰hatthi, Mg. hasti (hasti); tavassī, Mg. tavassī (tupasvi); A. kaṅcuṇī\(^77\) (kaṅcukināṁ), but elsewhere ploārṇaṁ, uārṇaṁ (priyākārṇaṁ, upakārṇaṁ); I. sāmīna (sūmīnā)\(^78\); G. virohīṇo (virodhaṁ)\(^79\); V. kaṅcū (kaṅcukīṁ).—Plur. N. pakkhiṇo (pākṣiṇaḥ), kaṅcuṇo (kaṅcukināṁ)\(^80\); [I. Mg. vaṇḍiṁ=vaṁḍbhī].—G.M. barahiṇa=bahīṁṇaṁ; Mg. śāmiṇaṁ=svāmīṇaṁ L. sāmiṇa (svāmīṣu)\(^81\). V=N : adhiṇaṁ, Mg. vaṇḍiṇa (=vāsinā, vaṇḍinaḥ).

---

63. Mg. urṇamante (unnamate).
64. Mg. paviṣantehiṁ (praviṣadbhiḥ).
65. M. also without nasal : cintantāna (cintayatam); Mg. alīhantāṇaṁ (arhatām).
66. Mg. lāa.
67. Mg. lāaṇaṁ.
68. Mg. laṅṅa.
69. Mg. laṅṅo and laṅṅo.
70. Mg. laṅṅa.
71. Mg. laṅṅo.
72. M. appaṇa.
73. M. appaṇaṁ.
74. M. also appaṇaṇa.
75. M. appaṇo besides attaṇo; Mg. also attaṇaṇa; M. yet also has the forms appaṇo, attaṇo (=ātmā), G. appaṇaṇa, L. appaṇe; Plur. N. appā (ātmānaḥ).
76. M. also pēmmammī Plur. N. pēmmāṇa, G. pēmmāṇaṇa.
77. M. hatthiṁ (hastinam).
78. Mg. śāmiṇa, M. sāṣiṇa (sāṣiṇā).
79. M. sāṣiṇo, Mg. śāṃṭiṇa.
80. M. phaṇiṇo, saṅkīṇa etc. (phaṇināṁ, saṅkināṁ).
81. M. panaṣi (panaṣiṣu).
18. Stems ending in as. N. Purūrava (vās); A. Purūervasam; I. Purūravena; G. Purūervasassa; L. Purūervas. The inflection is customarily after the a-declension; N.M. vīmaṇo (vīmanāḥ); neuter N.M. dummanāṇaḥ (durmanah); A. neuter uṛam, jasam, nahaṃ, sīram (uraha, yaśaḥ, nabhaḥ, sīraḥ); I. M. vacchena (vakṣasā); aśirena (śirasā); M. manena (manasā); G. tamassa, rajassa (tamasah, raisah); L.M. ure beside urami (urasi), ṇaha and nahami (nabhasi), sere, mane (śiras, manasi), sarami (saras), Ṣ. sotte (srotasi).—Plur. N.M. sarā (saraṃsi); I.M. sarehi, sirehi and srehiṃ (sarobhiḥ, śirobhīḥ); G.M. sarāṇa (sarasāṃ).—Feminine forms are: N.M. vīmaṇa uva(vīmana eva), Ś. pājussuamanāṇa (paryuṣutsukamanāḥ); AM vīmaṇa; I. taggadamanāṇa=tadgatamanaskayā; M. vīmanāi (metrically for vīmanāṇe); Plur. N.M. gauvaño-gauvayaskāḥ; A. sumanāo=sumanasah; L.M. vīmanāhiṃ, [22] maṅgalamānaḥ; G.M. gauvaana, (gauvayaskānāṃ).—apsaras runs: N. accharā, Plur. N. accharāo, I. accharāhiṃ.

19. Stems ending in is, us. Apart from the rest like Āuso (Āyuṣaḥ) they figure vocalical: N. dihāi (dirghāyuḥ), neuter M. havin, dhārman (haviḥ, dhanuḥ); A. dihāṃ (dirghāyuṣam), dhārman (dhanuḥ); I. dihāūṇa (dirghāyuṣa).”

B. Comparison

20. The suffixes are the same as in Sanskrit: mahattara, Mg. mahattala, M. tikkaara (tikṣaṇatara); piadama, M. piama (priyatama); kanīsa (kanīsi); kanīththa (kanīṣṭha); bhūo (bhūyas) beside baḥudara (ḍara); jēṭṭha (jyeṣṭha). Sometimes the positive stays in the sense of the comparative: tattva v... pia ti (tuatto ṣpi... priya iti), “himself dearer than thou”; M. ovaṇāhi vi lahuṃ (avapanāṇaḥ api laghukam) “quicker than the plunge”.

82. Similarly in Mg. śamaśasidamanāṇa = samāsvastamanāḥ.
83. Mg. śilasi (śirasā).
84. Mg. maṇam (manas).
85. Abl. M. sirāhi (śirasā).
86. Besides (of the extended stems) dihāuso, M. adīharāuso (adīrghāyuḥ; dihara stands for *diraha=dirga, Pischel § 354).
87. L.M. dhāruhe (dhanaṇaḥ). āsis forms the *stem āsis=whence I. āsīsa, Plur. āsīsāhim—and āsisā: A. āsisaṃ, G. āsīsa, Plur. āsīsnāṃ. The stem vāc is extended to vācā and therefore runs: N.M. vāā; A.M. vāāṃ. I. vāāe, also M. vāā; G. Mg. vāāe; L.M. vāā; Plur. N.M. vāā and vāāo; L.M. vāāsu.
C. Pronoun

21. The pronoun of the first and second person.

Singular

N. ⁰ahaṁ⁸⁸
A. ⁰maṁ⁸⁹
I. ⁰mae⁹⁰
Abl. matto, mamādo⁹¹
G. ⁰mama, ⁰maha, ⁰me⁹²
L. maï⁹³
⁰tumaṁ⁸⁴
⁰, te, de
⁰tae, ⁰tue⁹⁵
tatto⁹⁶
⁰tuha ⁰[te], ⁰de⁹⁷
tai, tul⁹⁸

[23] Plural

N. ⁰amhe⁹⁹
A. ⁰no¹⁰⁰
I. ⁰amhehim¹⁰¹
Abl.
G. ⁰amhāṇaṁ¹⁰², ṇo
L. amhesu
⁰tumhe¹⁰³
tumhe
tumhehim¹⁰⁴
⁰tumhāṇam, ⁰vo¹⁰⁵

22. Third person pronoun

Singular

Masculine

N. ⁰so¹⁰⁶
⁰sā

Feminine

neuter

⁰taṁ

88. Mg. hage, hagge; M. Mg. sometimes haṁ after vowels.
89. M. also mamaṁ, Mg. mamā.
90. Mg. also seldom maï and me.
92. M. rarely mama; otherwise yet mahaṁ, majha(ṇ).
93. M. mamammi.
94. M. also taṁ and rarely tum.
95. M. taï, tuo, tumae, tumāe, tumāi, tume also.
96. M. tumāhi (mto), tumāo; Ś. also twatto.
97. M. also tuham, tujhāṁ, tumhaṁ, 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. re, also amha; Mg. asme; Ś. amhe also.
101. M. also amhehi; Mg. asmēhiṁ.
102. Mg. asmāṇam; M. also amha(ṇ) and 'mha.
103. Mg. better more rightly tusme or tuyhe.
104. M. tumhehi.
105. M. ofner tumha.
106. Mg. śe.
A. \(^*\)ta\(\text{m}\)
I. \(^*\)tena\(^{107}\)
G. \(^*\)tassa, se\(^{108}\)
L. tassim\(^{109}\)

\(\text{Plural}\)
Masculine Feminine neuter
N. \(^*\)te (de)\(^{112}\)
A. \(^*\)te (de)
I. \(^*\)tehin\(^{113}\)
G. \(^*\)tana\(\text{m}\)\(^{114}\)
L. tesisu\(^{115}\)

\[^{[24]}\text{The stem } etad \text{ on the whole runs likewise :}\]

\(\text{Singular}\)
Masculine Feminine Neuter
N. \(^*\)eso\(^{116}\)
A. \(^*\)edam\(^{117}\)
I. \(^*\)edena\(^{118}\)
G. edassa\(^{119}\)
L. edassim\(^{120}\)

Plural edao\(^{123}\) edaim\(^{124}\)
A.
I. edehim\(^{125}\)
G. eda\(\text{m}\)\(^{126}\)
L. edesu\(\text{m}\)\(^{128}\)

23. The \textit{relative} is almost entirely treated like \textit{tad}; for Mg. it is to be noted that \(y\) is kept maintained. N. \(^*\)jo, \(^*\)jä, \(^*\)jam. A. \(^*\)jam\(^{129}\); I. \(^*\)jena\(^{30}\).

\(\text{107. Abl. } ^{0}\text{tado(adverbial is used) and } ^{0}\text{tä.}\)
\(\text{108. Mg. } \text{ta\(\text{ša}, \text{täha and } \text{še.}\)}\)
\(\text{109. M. tammi, Mg. tassim.}\)
\(\text{110. M. tie, tia.}\)
\(\text{111. M. tissä, tie, tia.}\)
\(\text{112. } ^{*}\text{de after all other pronouns : } ^{*}\text{ede de.}\)
\(\text{113. M. tehi resp. tahi.}\)
\(\text{114. M. also täna.}\)
\(\text{115. S. also tesum.}\)
\(\text{116. Mg. eše. S. frequently, Mg. seldom eša.}\)
\(\text{117. M. eam.}\)
\(\text{118. M. eena; Š. Mg. much oftener edinä.}\)
\(\text{119. M. eassa, Mg. edassäs and edäha.}\)
\(\text{120. M. eassin, eammi; Mg. edassim.}\)
\(\text{121. M. eša.}\)
\(\text{122. M. ee.}\)
\(\text{123. M. eäo.}\)
\(\text{124. M. eäi.}\)
\(\text{125. M. eehim(\(\text{m}\)).}\)
\(\text{126. eënä.}\)
\(\text{127. M. eañä(\(\text{m}\)).}\)
\(\text{128. M. eesum(\(\text{m}\)).}\)
\(\text{129. Mg. has yad isçaše (yadicchase).}\)
\(\text{130. M. also jena.}\)
jāe, jēṇa; G. jassā, jāe, jassā; L. jassāṃ. Plur. N. jē, jāṁ; G. jāṇaṃ.

The interrogative: Sing. N. ko, kā, kīṃ; A. kāṃ, kīṃ; I. keṇa, kāe, kēṇa; G. kassā, kāe, kassā; Abl. kīsa; L. kassīṃ, Plur. N. ke, kāo, kāṁ.

The following forms belong to the stems ida and ima:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. aam</td>
<td>iam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. imaṃ</td>
<td>imaṃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. imāña</td>
<td>imāe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl. imādo</td>
<td>'imādo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. imassa</td>
<td>imāe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. imassīṃ</td>
<td>imassīṃ(l)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. 0ime</td>
<td>imeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. ime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. imehīṃ</td>
<td>imehīṃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. imāṇaṃ</td>
<td>0imāṇaṃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. imesu(m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sporadic forms are M. eṇa, assa (asya), assīṃ (asīṃ); anena (anena); amūṃ (A. neuter.), amūṇā, amī (Plur. N. Masc.); eṇaṃ (A. Masc. and Fem.) and eṇaṃ (A. Masc; Fem. and Neut.)

The pronominal adjectives run like tad or etad. M. parāhīṃto (parasmā); anyasīṃ (anyasīṃ), anī (anīṃ), savvāṇaṃ (sarvāṇāṃ) M. anīṇaṃ (anīṇāṃ).

131. Mg. yaśsa and gāha.
132. M. jīa, jīe, jissā.
133. M. has also I. jehi and L. jesuṃ.
134. Mg. kāha.
135. M. kīe.
136. Mg. kīsa.
137. M. kamūṃ. Mg. kāssīṃ, kahīṃ, kattha where, whither, where.
138. S. also kā.
139. In M. only once documented; lacking in Mg.
140. Only in Ś.
141. Mg. only imaṃ.
142. M. imaṇa.
143. M. imiē, imīa.
144. Mg. imāsā.
145. M. imē, imīa.
146. M. imamūṃ, Mg. imassīṃ.
147. M. also imā, imīu.
148. M. imēhi.
149. M. imāna.
150. M. imesu.
D. The Numerals

24. Cardinals: 1. 0'ēkkā (eka) : 0'ēkko, 0'ēkkā, 0'ēkkā̄, I. 0'ēkkeṇa, G. Mg. ēkkāha, L. ēkkassim (Mg. ēkkassim, M. ēkkammī); Plur. N. 0'ēkke,—0'anēa (aneka), anēasō (anekāsah).

2. N.A. 0'duve151, I. duvehīm, G. duveṇaṃ, L. duvesu.

3. N.A. Masc. and Fem. tao (taryah) Neutr. 0'tiṇi (tiṇi); [G. 0'tiṇam] L.M. tīsu(ṇa), metrically tisu.

4. N. cattāro, Fem. catasso! [should be cadasso]; Neutr. 0'cattārī, Mg. cattāli; G. ['caduṇaṃ], M. caṇhaṃ.— In compounds: M. caurāṇa (caturāṇa), caudāsā (caturdāsan); Ś. cadussālā (catuṣālāka); M. caumhā (caturmukha), cōḍḍaha (caturdāsa).

[26] 5. paṇca, I.M. paṇchehīm.

6. cha. In compounds: 0'cchāguna(ṇa) (saḍguna[kal]), M. chappā (ṣatpada), 0'cchāṃśā (sammāsika), Ś. chaccaraṇa (saṭcaraṇa).

7. 0'satta, Mg. satta.—[8. aṭṭha; 9. ṇava:] 10. dasa, Mg. daśa, M. dasa or dha; I.M. dasahi, Mg. daśehīm; G. Mg. daśeṇaṃ; L.M. dasasu.—11. M. eāraha; 12. M. bāraha; 13. M. teraḥa; 14. M. cōṛdāha, caudāsa; 60. saṭṭhi; 100. sada, M. saa, Mg. sada; 1000. 0'sahassa, Mg. sahaśa; 100000. Mg. lākaṃ (lakṣam).

Ordinals: 1. 0'paṭhama; 2. 0'dudia, M. duia; 3. tadia, M. taia; 4. 0'cudutha, M. cauitha; 5. 0'paṇcama; 6. 0'cchaṭṭha152; 7. 0'sattama; 8. aṭṭhama; [9. ṇavama;] 10. M. dasama.

E. Verb

25. The verb has lost very many forms, the α-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 0'vṛt: vaṭṭa - (varta) : Sing. 1. 0'vaṭṭāmi153, 2. vaṭṭasi154, 3. 0'vaṭṭadī155; Plur. 1. 0'vaṭṭamo, 2. 0'vaṭṭadha156, 3. vaṭṭanti. Middle : 1. Sing. vaṭṭe [2. vaṭṭase157.

151. M. frequently N.A. do for all the three genders and also at the beginning of the compound: domuḥa (dvimukha), certainly for it often du : duṇa (dviguna). There form the neuter 0'donī which is also combined with Masc. and Fem: I. M. dohi(ṇī), G.M. dōha(ṇī), Ś. [Mg.] daṇṇam; L.M. doṣūṇa.

152. Feminine 0'pancamī, 0'chaṭṭhi; the rest in ā.

153. M. has sometimes i instead of ā: jāṇīmi (jāṇīmi), bhāṇīmo (bhāṇāmaḥ).

154. Mg. has naturally śi instead of st: gaścaṣi (gacchasi).

155. M. vaṭṭai.

156. M. vaṭṭaha.

157. M. lajjaśe, jāṇase (jāṇeṣe).
3. vaṭṭade 158. 3. Plur. vaṭṭante]. For the first Sing. frequent examples are ॐ jāne and ॐ na āne (jāne resp. na jāne) just as ॐ marne (manyē); sporadically lahe (labhe), icche 159.—vardhatē naturally becomes vaddhadi (M. vaddhāi), vadhāmahe vaddhāmō, prekshādhe viśkhēdha 160, nayatha nedha.


c) **Imperative**: 2. Person ॐ karesu (kuru), ānesu (ānaya), ॐ bhūjjasu (bhūndhāi), kadhesu (kathaya); Mg. lahkaša (rakṣa), āgašeśu (agaccha), desu (dehi), dhālesu (dhāraya).—Middle forms like viśkhassa (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: ॐ bhaṇa (beside ॐ bhaṇāhi), gaccha, Mg. gaśca; pēkka, Mg. pēcha, Mg. pesa (prekṣva); ॐ hasa, Mg. haśa (hasa).—With long finals there comes in hi: ॐ karehi. Mg. kalehi (kuru); mantehi (mantra), kadhehi (kathaya), sīdhilehi (śīthilaya), jālehi (jivālaya); Mg. mālehi (māraya), ghōsehi (ghosaya); ॐ hohi (bhava)

The 3. Sing. ends in 'du, M. u: 'bhodhu, M. hou (bhavatu); pasidatu (prasidatu), kadhedu (kathayatu); Mg. muṇcadu, ṇiṣidat (muṇcatu, niṣidatu); M. maraū, deu, paatṭai (maratu, dayatu, pravartat, i.e. mriyatām, dadat, pravartatām).

The 1. Plur. has mha ending: gacchamha, uvasisamha, uvasappamha viśkhama, karēmha, ṇivedēmha, kilēmha, hômha (gachchāma, upauśāma, upasarpāma, prekṣāmahai, karavāma, nivedayāma, krīdāma, bhavāma); M. abbhathēmha, (abhyarthāyama); Mg. arṇēsamha, pīvamha, palāsamha, kalēmha (anveṣayāma, pibāma, palāyāmahai, karavāma).

2. Plur. parittādha [Mg. pali], samassasadha, avānedha, hodha (paritrājadhvam, samāsvasita, apanayata, bhavata); M. namaha, raṅgeha, raḥa (namatha, raṅjayata, racayata); Mg. oṣaladha (apasarata), sūndha (śrūnta), māledha (mārayata).

3. Plur pasidantu [Mg. paśī], pēkkhantu, hōntu (prasidantu, prekṣantām, bhavantu); M. nandantu, vīlīantu (nandantu, vīlīkantu).

d) Of the **Imperfect** only ॐ āsti, āsi (āsit), however, used for all persons and (numbers) has been kept.

---

158. M. pēcchae (prekṣate), palambae (pralambate).
159. Mg. gāe (gāyām).
160. Mg. pēskadhā.
161. M. kuppējja (kupreyam).
162. M. jivejja (jīvet), dharejja (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. jaaija(i)jat(i); jaadu\(^{163}\), (jayatu); those in i change aya into e by Sansprasāraṇa: parṇediti, M. parṇeti (parṇayatī), and analogously also the 1. Person: avaṅmenti (apanayāmi), M. āṅmenti (ānayāmi); 'ṇēmha (nayāma), nedha (nayata). However, beside these we have nedu (nayatu) parṇaaddu (l'nayatu), M. ṇaa (nayati), Mg. naante (nayan really nayanto).

bhū forms the Optative after Sanskrit *bhaveam, *bhave, pahave (bhavayam, bhavet, prabhavet); besides bhavidavam\(^{164}\), *bhavidum, 'bhavia (bhavitavam, bhavitum, bhūtvā) and Mg. bhavāmi, M. hava (hava), 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 huvanta (bhavanti) and huvia (bhaveya), Mg. in huvia (bhūt). As a rule usually we say homi, hosī, 'bhodi\(^{65}\), hōnti; Imper homi, 'bhodi\(^{66}\), hōma, 'hodha, hōntu\(^{67}\), 'hodavva (bhavitavā), bhūda, M. hūa (bhūta), Mg. pahūda (prabhūta).

Roots ending in r, ṛ form the stem of the present with ara; besides frequently in e: dharāmi (dhriye), pasaradi\(^{168}\), Mg. pasalaśi (prasaratī, prasarasi); aṇusaramha (anusarāma), maradi\(^{169}\) (mriyate), Mg. malāmi\(^{70}\) (mriyē); uvarha, uvarhantu, avaharadi, odaradi, odaramha, odaria\(^{71}\) (upahara, upaharantu, apaharati, avatarati, avatārāma, avatīrya); Mg. halāmi, haladi (harāmi, harati), odala (avatara); M. dharemi, dharaī, dharei, dharenī, osarai, osari\(^{72}\) (dhriye, dhriyate, dhriyante, apasaratī, apasṛtya)—smṛ builds ṣumarāmi, sumaresi\(^{73}\), sumaredi, sumarehi and sumaresu, sumaredha, sumarida [Mg. sumalida] (smarāmi, smarasi, smarati, smara, smarata, smṛta).

Roots in ai: gāami, gāadi, gāadha (gāyāmi, gāyati, gāyatha); M. gāanti, uggāanti (gāyante, udgāyanti); Mg. gaze [29] gādam (gāye,

---

163. jedu is wrongly attested, even if used often; likewise Mg. yedu.
164. In addition to it bhavidavatā (l'tavyatā).
165. M. hoī.
166. M. hōu.
167. M. havantu.
168. M. pasaraī
169. M. maraī.
170. Mg. however maledu, malēnti (mriyatām, mriyante).
171. Mg. odalaī.
172. Mg. osalā.
173. In a lesser way attested sumarasi. Mg. sumalāmi, sumalesi, sumaledi; Imper. sumala and sumalehi.
27. Second Conjugation: a) The roots of the 2nd class infringes in the 1st. conjugation: M. ruāmi, ruasi, ruai, rua (rodìmi, rōdiśt roditī, roda); Ś. rodasi, roadi, roanti, roda [Mg. loda], roidūm (rodiśt, rodatī, rudantī, roda, rodītum); Mg. metrically luadi (roditī).—śvas forms niśasadi [M. niśasai], visasaśi, samassaśa, samassasadu (nīśvasiti, viśvasi, samāśvasat). Mg. saśadi, saṃasāśadu etc. (śvasiti, samāsaśvasat).—cās forms acakkha (ācakṣva), Mg. acaskadi (acacṣte); M. niacchaī (*nicakṣati=nicaṣṭe); han has padihaṇāmi (pratthamani, vihaṇanti (vighnati); M. haṇaś, nihaṇanti (hanti, nighnanti), Mg. āhaṇedha (āhata).—as has 1. 0mhi, Mg. smi [30] 2. 0si, Mg. śi, 3. 0atthi, Mg. astī; Plur. 1. 0mha [M. also mho], Mg. sma; 2. M. ttha, 3. M. santi, Mg. šanti.74

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. da builds *de mi, des i, ded i [M. de], *dehi [M. also desu, Mg. dešu], dedu [M. de], Mg. dedha [M. deha] (dadāmi, *si, *ti, dehi, dadātu, datta).— Forms from dhā : M. saddahimo (śraddadhāmaḥ); Ś. aruṣaṃdhemi, dhedha (anuṣaṃdadhāmi, dhaththa, M. saṃdheti (saṃdadhāti), saṃdhenti (saṃdadhati).—bhi forms (from the stem bhai) *bhāami, (Mg. bhāāśi), bhāadi (bibhemī, bhīheşi, bibheti).

c) Forms from the fifth class like avaciṇomi, avaciṇumo (ācinomi, ācinumāḥ) are unsure against avaciṇamha (ācinuma) and uccīnedi (ānotī). M. has, for ex. samuccīnaī, vicinanti (ācinoti, ācinvanti), but also ucei, uccēnti, ucceu (uccinoti, ācinvanti, ācinotu); Mg. saṃcehi (saṃcinu).—Likewise from śru there are unsure suṇu, Mg. śruṇu (śṛṇu) and Mg. suṇudha (śṛṇuta). We should read suṇa175, as in S. Mg. roots follow the 9. class: suṇāmi176, suṇādi177, suṇāmo, suṇāhi, suṇādu178, suṇamha, suṇadhā179, suṇantu180 (śṛṇomi, *ti, śṛṇumah, śṛṇu, śṛṇotu, śṛṇuma, śṛṇatha, śṛṇvantu). Beside it there occur forms from e-stems, as suṇemī, suṇedi, suṇēmha (śṛṇomi, *ti, śṛṇuma). M. builds from the a-stems: suṇāi, suṇīmo, suṇānti, suṇasu, suṇahā (śṛṇoti, śṛṇumah, śṛṇvanti, śṛṇu, śṛṇuta).

prāp goes with the 1st class: M. pāvasī, pāvai (S. pāvedi); *pāvanti M. pāva (S. pāvhi), pāvaū (prāpnoṣi, *ti, prāpnuvanti, prāpnuhi, prāpnotu).—śak has sakkanaomi or sakkunomi (sakromi); Mārkeṇḍeya IX, 131 teaches sakkvādi and sakkadi.

d) The seventh class has the nasal also in the weak forms M. chīndāi, bhāṅjai, bhīndāi (chinatti, bhanakti, bhīnatti); *bhūnjasu (bhūņksva); paunjadhā (prauṇkthā), rundhedi (ruṇatsi); *bhīndia (bhīttvā), bhāṅjia (bhaktvā).


175. In Mg. according to Pischel § 503 suṇa is a Sanskritism for suṇa.

176. Mg. suṇāmi.

177. Mg. suṇadi.

178. Mg. suṇadu.

179. Mg. suṇādha and suṇēdha.

180. Mg. suṇantu.

181. Mg. karemi.

182. Mg. kaleśi, M. also kunasi.

183. Mg. kaledi, M. karei and also kunai.

184. M. also kunānti.

185. Mg. kalehi.

186. M. also kuṇa, kuṇasu.

187. M. kuṇaū.

188. Mg. kalēmha.

189. Kaleda.
f) Ninth class: jñā loses the initial after prefixes and ṇa(na) and forms jañāśi\textsuperscript{190}, jañāḍi\textsuperscript{191}, jañāmo\textsuperscript{192}, ṝja(na)\textsuperscript{193} and jañāhi (jānāsi, ḍtī, jānimāh, jāṇīhi); ṝnādi, viṁnādi, ānvādi, ṛdu, ṇa ṍṇadha\textsuperscript{194} (ājānāti, vijānāti, ājñāpayati, ṛtu, na ājānīṭha).

kṛi also has the present stem kiṇa and forms ṝkkīṇasi, ṝkṛṇa[ṛ], kṛṇita, vikṛṇāti. — grh forms gṛṇhasi, gṛṇhadi[M. gṛṇhai], gṛṇhanti, gṛṇha, gṛṇhadu[M. gṛṇhai], gṛṇhadha, gṛṇhatu (gṛṇāsi, ṛti, gṛṇhanti, gṛṇhāna, gṛṇhitu, gṛṇhita, gṛṇhantu). — bandh forms bandhām, bandhasti and bandhesei, bandhedi[M. bandhai], bandhanti [M. also bandhēnti], bandhashu (bandhṇami, ṛstī, avabādhnāti, badhnanti, badhāna)— bhar forms bhaṇāsi and bhaṇesi[M. bhaṇēśi], bhāṇādi, bhāṇādha, bhāṇa and bhāṇāhi, bhaṇei; bhaṇādu (bhaṇasi, ṛti, ṛtha, bhaṇa, bhaṇatu).

g) Forms of the Imperfect (apart from ṛāsi, ṛsi = ṛsī), the Aorist and the Perfect are lacking.

**Future**

28. The endings are issaṁ, issasti\textsuperscript{195}, issadī\textsuperscript{196}, issāmo, issadha, issanti, i.e. with the exception of the 1. Sing. as in Sanskrit, the sā is added with the linking vowel i; Mg. has always ēs in place of ss.— bhaaviṣaṁ [Mg. bhaaviśsaṁ\textsuperscript{197}], bhaaviṣṣasi\textsuperscript{198}, [Mg. bhaaviśśaśi]; bhaaviṣadi,[Mg. bhaaviśsadī]\textsuperscript{199}, gamiṣsāmo, bhaaviṣsadha, bhaaviṣsanti\textsuperscript{200} (bhaviṣyāmi, ṛṣiṣasi, ṛti, gamiṣyāmah, bhaṇṭyathā, bhaviṣyanti).

[32] Examples from isolated classes: 1st Class: vismarīśaṁ (vismarīṣyāmi); parharīsadi, Mg. paliḥaṁṣadi (parharīṣyati); marīssasi, Mg. maliḥiṣi, M. aṃumarīhi (marīṣyase, ṛte); gāṭsamaṁ, Mg. gāṭsamaṁ (gāṭsāmi); gamiṣsaṁ, Mg. gamiṣsāmi (gīṣyāmi); M. sāmāgamīṣsai (isṣyati), pāhiti (paḥyantī); citṭhissaṁ, Mg. ciṭṭhissaṁ (sthāṣyāmi); uttṛṭhissāmo (uttṛṭhāṣyāyāmaḥ); pēkkhiṣsām, Mg. pēkkhīśsām, M. pēcchissaṁ (dṛkṣyāmi i.e. prekṣyē); Mg. khāśśaṁ, metrically khāḥiṣ (khāṣyāmi, khāṣyāsi). 6th Class: pucchiśsām Mg. puṣćiśsāṁ (prakṣyāṃ).

---

190. Mg. yānāsi; M. jānīmi (jānāmi), jāṣasi, jāṇase.
191. Mg. yānāḍi, M. jāṇāt.
192. M. jānīmo.
193. M. also jānasu; Mg. yānāhi.
194. M. na āṇasi, āṇai, āṇīmo āṇaha (na ājānāsi, ṛti, ājānimāh, ṛtha).
195. M. thīti.
196. M. thūi.
197. Also huviśsām.
198. Also huviśsadi.
199. Also huviśsadi, Mg. huviśsadi.
200. Also huviśsanti. M (from the stem ho) hōssām, hōhi, hōhāmo, hōhissāmo, hōhitthā, hōhīntī.
muṇcissadi, M. mōcchhiṇi (mokṣyati).—4th Class : kuvissan, M. kuppissan (kopsyāmi); "vivajjissan (vipyati). 10th Class : cintaisadi (cintatāyati); M. gaṇaissan (gaṇayisyāmi); kadhissan beside kadhaissan [Mg. kadhaissan] M. kahissan (kathayisyāmi).—2nd Class : rodissan, M. roissan (rosyāmi); suwissan, M. suwiṣsam (svapsyāmi); daissan, Mg. daiddsam (dāsyāmi, properly speaking dayisyāmi from the stem de).—5th Class : avacchissan (avacesyāmi, suṇissa, M. suṇissan (srosyāmi); pāvissati, M. pāvihisi, Mg. pāvihi (prāpsyasi). The 7th Class is without documentation; from the 8th Class very frequent ṣarissan, Mg. kalissan (kariṣyāmi); karissasi, M. karhiṣi (karisyati); karissadi, M. kalissād (kariṣyati); M. karissama201 (kariṣyamaḥ); karissanti (kariṣyanti). We have beside it karissan, Mg. kalaissan; Mg. kanaissadi; karaissadi, Mg. kalaisadi, M. karehi; karaissanti. —M. yet also builds kāhaṃ, kāhī, kāhi. —9th Class : jāṁissam; M. jāṁhiṣi; jāṁissari; jāṁissamo, Mg. yāṁssano (yāṁsyāmi, yāṁsaya, ṣiti, "syamaḥ").—Mg. kintissan (kresyāmi); kinißadi (kresyati).—gēṇhissan, gēṇhissadi (graḥisyāmi, ṣyati).

Passive

29. To the root resp. in the stem of the present there comes ya (whereby y202) stuck out behind vowels, [33] assimilated with consonants behind, or ia.

In M. ya becomes ija, ia is changed to ijja. —1st Class : *ṇiadi, M. niija (niyate) *bhaviadi, Mg. also huiadi (huijate); sumariadi, M. sumarīja (smaryate); ictiadi, Mg. iscadi (isyate); M. gammai (gamyate), but gamijiadi (gamyate); Ś. gacchadi, but gacchadu (gamyate, ētām); pivadi, M. piyja (pijate); anucitthiadi, *du (anuṣṭhijate, ētām); disadi, Mg. dišadi, M. disai (dṛṣyate).—6th Class : pucchiadi, M. pucchijjai (prṣchajate); muṇciadu (mucyatām), M. muccai (mucyate). 4th and 10th Classes, Causative : M. paṭibujjijjai (pratibudhyate); chedianti, Mg. cheejjantai (chedyante); pobodhiāmi (prabodhye); vinnaviadi (vijñāpyate); M. kahijjai, Mg. kadhijadu (kathyate, ētām).—2nd Class : suvijjai, M. suppajjai (supyate, ētām); *ucchini, M. vuccai (ucyate); *diadi, M. dijja (diyate). 5th Class : M. ciṭṭijjai (ciyate); viciadi (viciyatām); suṇjij, Mg. suṇijjai (ṣryate); sakkiadi, Mg. sakkiadi (sakjate).—7th Class : *chijjati (chidyate); jujjadi, M. jujja (jujyate) in the sense of “to be suited to itself”; on the other hand paṇṣjįjai, *du (prayujjate, ētām).—8th Class : kariadi, *du, Mg. kuliadi, *du, M. kija, kijai (kiyate, kriyatām).—9th Class : jāṇjai[njai], *du (jināyate, ētām); anuggahiadi (anugṛhayatām); M. forms ghēppai, ghēppanti (grḥyate, őnte) from a stem *gṛyṛp.

To the passive there belongs still also another future with forms

201. Metrical for 0mo.
202. Pischel says on p. 369 below ya is cast out : then the form would not be diadi from dā (out of di-ya-di) but must sound didī.
like mucciṣaddi, cījjīṣaddi (*mucyisyaṭe, *chiṣyaṭe), M. bhajjiḥsi (*bhajjiṣyaṣe).

Causative

30. As in Sanskrit the root is upgraded, the aya suffix turns to e, paya becomes ve. kāredi, M. kārei (kārayati); *añavedi (*āñapaṭayati); viṃṇavissaṃ (viṃṇapīṣyāṃ).—ve = paya is also used in roots with other vocals as ā, i, consonants and diphthongs : jīvāvedu (*jīvāpayatu), Mg. palivattāvehi (*parivaṭāpayā); M. ramāvēnti (*ramāpayantili; moāvemi, ोḥi (mocāpāyāmi, *mocāpaya); Mg. lihāvemi (*likhāpayāmi); M. māresi (mārayasi), Ś. māredha [34] (mārayatha), Mg. mālemi, ोhi, ोdu, ोda (mārayāmi, māraya, ोtu, ोta).—With drs M. forms dāvemi, dāvei, dāvēnti (dāsRAYāmi, ोyati, ोyantil, Ś. daṃsem, daṃsaīsṣam (daṃsRAYāmi, daṃsRAYiṣyāmi), Mg. daṃsanta (*daṃsayaṇto = daṃsayaṇ).

Desiderative

31. The formation is like that in Sanskrit : jugucchedi [M. juucchail, juguchanti (jugsatil, ोntil); adjjuuccida, Mg. adjiyuuscida (atijugupsita); cikicchidavva (cikitsitavya); sussuساسṣam (suṣrūṣayṣyāmi); Mg. suṣṣūṣida (suṣrūṣita).

Denominative

32. One way of the formation is directly from the stem : M. dukkhāmi (dukhāmi), dhavalai (dhalvati), kahāmi, kahasti, kahai (kathi, ोsi, ोtil).—The usual formation is that in a (=aya) : M. umhā (umāyati); Ś. kuravaaadi (kuravakāyate); Mg. cilādi (cīrāyati); suhāadi, M. suhāi (sukhāyati). There are onomatopoetic forms frequently like ghumaghumāadi, tharatharedi; finally following the way of causatively formed : saddāvemi (saddāpayāmi), suhāvedi (sukhāpayāmi); Mg. suskāvaiṣsam (suṣkāpayiṣyāmi); M. mailei (*mailayati), biuṇe (dviguṇayati).

Verbal Noun

33(a) Participles. The active present participle is built from the present stems ending in anto [Mg. ante], Feminine anti : jānantil; Mg. puṣcante; M. calanto (jānan, prcchan, calari); pēkkanti, M. apāvantili (*prekstanti, aprāṃnautili).—The present middle and passive participles has the termination māṇa, māṇa : nivattamāṇa, anūniamāṇa (nivartamāṇa, anunyāṇa).—Preterite passive participle has, as in Sanskrit the ta suffix and the na suffix [those in *da resp. become ḍaṇa, whilst M. naturally for [35] ta has a only] : *gahida, M. gahia (grhitā); sumarida, Mg. śumalida (smṛta); puṣchida, M. puṣchia (prṣṭa); *dīṇa (datta), *mukka (mukta from mukna).
b) **Gerund**: *hodava, Ś. also bhavidadva, Mg. also huvidavva (bhavitavya); sodavva[also suridavva], M. soavva (srotavya); *kādavva, M. kāavva (kartavya).— The aniya suffix becomes *aniya, M. anijja : for ex. karaṇia, M. karaṇijja (karaṇiyya); Mg. palihalaṇia (parharaṇiyya).— *kajja, Mg. kaya (kārya); *degjiha, Mg. dugghēyha (=*grhyā, *durgṛhyā).

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, gacchidum beside gamidum and *gantum; pucchidum, Mg. puścidum, M. pucchium (prasūn); kāredum (kārayitum); M. niuvāheum (nirvāhayitum); Mg. śodhāvedum (sodhāpayitum); more rarely being contraried : tādaidum (tādayitum); Mg. māldum (mārayitum); dhāridum, M. dhārium (dhārayitum); māridum, Mg. mālidum (mārayitum). From the second conjugation : suridum, M. sou (srotum); bhūrjidum, M. bhōttum (bhoktum); gēṇhidum, M. gahium (grahitum); *kādum, karidum, M. kau (karitum). Formations throughout corresponding to Sanskrit like jivīdūkāma (jivitu), M. tādīmanā (tādayitmanā).

d) **Absolute**: Apart from *kau and *gau (krtvā, gatvā), there is in Ś. Mg. ya (resp. a) which is the only governing suffix, while that for M. ina is found. A distinction between the simple and the compound verbs is not made. —ṇaīa (*naiya = nītā), but ānīa, avaniya [aniya, apanīya], *bhavia (bhūītā); odaria, Mg. odalia (avatīrya); parharia, Mg. palihalaia (parhṛtya); pēckhia, Mg. pēskia (prekṣya); pawśia, Mg. pawśia (pawśya); gēṇhia (grhitā).—Examples for M. : jeīna (jitvā), hōūna (bhitvā), hasītīna (hasītvā), vihasītīna (vihasya), gaḥūna, ghēttūna, the latter metrically also in Mg. (grhitvā).

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 Māhrāṣṭrī (pp. 36-38) the passages are taken from the Karpūramañjarī edited by Sten konow I.4.15-12.3. And the Specimen for Māgadhi (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]
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