

KALIKĀLA-SARVAJÑA ĀCĀRYA HEMACANDRA : A RE-APPRAISAL

Vasantkumar M. Bhatt

I

Long after the passing away of Jina Mahāvīra, under the chairmanship of Devarddhi Gaṇi Kṣamāśramaṇa, the Jaina spiritual leaders of the Northern Church met at Valabhī (Saurāṣṭra, Gujarat State) in A. D. 503/516 and collated the earlier two versions, the one fixed at the Mathurā Synod and the other at Valabhī Synod 1, both around the middle of the fourth century A. D. The present version of the Jaina āgamas was then committed to writing. Six centuries after that event, king Siddharāja Jayasimha of the Caulukya dynasty (A. D. 1096-1142) ruled in Gujarat at Aṇahillapattana (North Gujarat, District Banasakamtha). In his assembly, learned discourses were also held besides the usual political transactions. It is on record that Devasūri, the Śvetāmbara pontiff, defeated the Naiyāyika Kumudacandra, a Digāmbara holyman, in a doctrinal debate at this assembly in A. D. 1125. The incident was delineated in the play, the *Mudrita-Kumudacandra* by Yaśāścandra, which is believed to be closer in time to the event.

A very important chapter in the history of the literary activities in Gujarat was added when Hemacandra graced the assembly of Siddharāja Jayasimha. In those days Hemacandra led the intellectual arena by producing a large number of works, all single-handed. A list of his learned productions will attest to the vast canvas, sweep, and importance of his writings. He had, for instance penned (1) the *Siddhahemaśabdānuśāsana*, (2) the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi*, (3) the *Deśināmamālā*, (4) the *Kāvyaṇuśāsana*, (5) the *Chandonuśāsana*, (6) the *Pramāṇamīmāṃsā* (incompletely available), (7) the Sanskrit *Dvyāśraya-mahākāvya*, (8) the Prakrit *Dvyāśraya-mahākāvya* or the *Kumārāpālacarita*, (9) the *Triṣaṣṭi-śālākāpuruṣa-carita*, (10) the *Mahāvīra-carita* and the *pariśiṣṭa-parva*, (11) the *Yogaśāstra*, and (12) five hymns including the *Vitarāga-stotra*. Thus he wrote on grammar, kośa-class of dictionary, poetics, metrics, epistemology, logic, philosophy, as also on biographical, and the *kathā* and *stotra* (narrative and hymnal) literature. So, he was given the honorific title Kalikāla-sarvajña—the Omniscient of the Iron Age by later Śvetāmbara Jaina writers.

However, in our own times, when his contribution was evaluated, P. V. Kane wrote : “The *Kāvyaṇuśāsana* is a compilation and exhibits hardly any originality. It borrows wholesale from the *Kāvyaṇuśāsana* of Rājasekhara, the *Kāvyaaprakāśa*, the *Dhvanyāloka*, and from Abhinavagupta’s works¹.” But, on the opposite side, R. C. Parikh, who wrote on the cultural history of Gujarat in the introductory volume to his critical edition of the *Kāvyaṇuśāsana*, observes that Gujarat entered into competition with Mālavā not only in the political arena, but also in the spheres of learning and art².

T. S. Nandi has suggested that Hemacandra, in his *Kāvyaṇuśāsana*, tried to follow and promulgate the Kāśmīra School in poetics, so as to push back the Mālava-school of Bhoja³.

The historical data provided by Prabhācandra of Rājagaccha in the *Prabhāvaka-carita* (A. D. 1277) reveals that, perhaps the task of carrying Gujarat in lead in the intellectual arena, was handed over to Hemacandra by Siddharāja. Manuscripts from Kāśmīra as also from other parts of the country were then made available to Hemacandra. What is more, after defeating the Paramāra potentate Yaśovarmā of Mālava, the library of Dhārā (which included the manuscripts of Bhoja's works), was brought to Gujarat. Siddharāja Jayasīrṃha looked at the collection of works from Mālava through green eyes of jealousy and asked Hemacandra to compose a new grammar that would bring prestige to Gujarat. The result was the *Siddha-Hema-śabdānuśāsana*, a Sanskrit-Prakrit grammar⁴. In Merutuṅgācārya's *Prabandha-cintāmaṇi* (A. D. 1305), there is the third canto called "Siddharāja prabandha," in which this grammar is eulogized in fulsome terms :

भ्रातः संवृणु पाणिनिप्रलपितं कातन्त्रकन्था वृथा
मा कार्षीः कटु शाकटयनवचः क्षुद्रेण चान्द्रेण किम् ।
कः कण्ठाभरणादिभिर्बर्तयत्यात्मानमन्यैरपि
श्रूयन्ते यदि तावदर्धमधुराः श्रीसिद्धहेमोक्तयः⁵ ॥

Thus, by penning the *Siddha-Hema-śabdānuśāsana*, Hemacandra had endeavoured to smear the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini as also the *Sarasvatī-kanthābharana* of Bhoja besides other grammars composed between the two in time.

On the evidence of verses from the *Prabhāvaka-carita*, in the times of Hemacandra, the *Kālāpaka vyākaraṇa* was much in vogue and the Brahmins did not teach the Pāṇinian system of grammar to non-brahmins as it was a *Vedāṅga*. Thus, for the benefit of the people at large, Hemacandra composed his *Siddha-Hema-śabdānuśāsana*⁶. In it he removed the Vaidika portion of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and replaced it with the grammar of the Prakrits such as Māgadhi, Śaurasenī, Paisācī, Mahārāṣṭri, Ārṣa (Ardhamāgadhi of the Jaina canon), Apabhraṃśa etc. Thus Hemacandra provided intellectual leadership not only to Gujarat but also to the whole of India of his times. The Vaidika *mantras* were used only in the context of Yajña-rituals, but the Prakrit dialects that were spoken in different parts of the country, and the literary compositions that were written in Prakrits, were duly recognised by Hemacandra. As a result, he thought it useful to add grammar of these Prakrits which was perhaps the need / demand of the time. Thus he gave the first clear and positive evidence of his intellectual leanings.

III

As noted in the foregoing section, Hemacandra wrote on different subjects. But this paper attempts to highlight and evaluate his genius in the field of grammar alone. His all-encompassing study of language becomes clear by looking into his following works :
(i) the *Siddha-Hema-śabdānuśāsana* :- It contains grammar of both Sanskrit and Prakrits. He had also written shorter and longer (लघु and बृहत्) commentaries on this grammar. In addition, he had written a third commentary called the *śabda-mahārṇava* or the *Brhannyāsa*, today available only in fragments. (ii) the *Unādi-sūtra* : This, too,

was composed by Hemacandra with explanatory notes. (iii) the *Dhātupāṭha*, with *svopajña vṛtti*, (iv) the *Lingānuśāsana*, and (v) the *Gaṇapāṭha* were also written by him. Thus we may say that he has given a Pañcāṅgi or fivefaced *vyākaraṇa*. No less noteworthy are his lexicons, namely (i) the *Abhidhāna-cintāmaṇi*, (2) the *Anekārthakośa*, (3) the *Nighaṇṭu* concerning herbs, (4) the *Deśināmamālā*, and (5) the two *Dvyāśraya Kāvya*s. These were composed, not unlike the *Bhaṭṭi-kāvya*, to illustrate the *sūtras* from his own grammar. Thus he has provided an all-embracing study of Sanskrit and Prakrits by writing the *sūtras*, the *vṛtti*, the appendices, the lexicons and the *lakṣaṇakāvya*. In this way he scored over the writers of the *Cāndra* of Candragauṁi (5th cent.), the *Jainendra* of Pūjyapāda Devanandī, (c. A. D. 650), the *śabdaśāstra* of Śākaṭāyana, (c. A. D. 850), and the *Bhoja-vyākaraṇa* (c. A. D. 1030-1050) ascribed to Parmāra Bhoja of Dhārā.

IV

I will now attempt to evaluate Hemacandra as a grammarian, his approach towards language, and as a structuralist with a particular style of marshalling his material.

That he removed the Vedic grammar from his scheme is not because he was a Jain but the truth was that the Vedic language was employed only in the ritual ceremonies and the teaching of its derivation had become obsolete in his times. On the other hand, a large variety of Prakrits were still used in literary circles who composed in people's language. Thus, by replacing the Vedic portion by the Prakrit portion, he has shown the awareness of the need of the hour, maturity of intellect, and consequently a right and realistic approach. It must be noted that, even though he removed the Vedic grammar from his scheme, he had paid due attention to the derivation of *taddhita*-words used in the Vedic context : e.g.

- (i) कठदिभ्यो वेदे लुप् । सि. हे. श. ६-३-१८३ कठः । चरकाः ।
- (ii) तित्तिखितन्तुखाण्डिकोखाद् ईयण् । ६-३-१८४ तैत्तिरीयाः । वास्तन्तवीयाः ।
- (iii) आथर्वणिकादण् इकलुक् च । ६-३-१६७ आथर्वणिक - आथर्वणः ।

Thus did he demonstrate a sensible orientation toward the problem : as a result, his works may be studied not only by the Jainas but also by the Brahmins. Had he neglected the *taddhita* formations having Vedic context, his grammar would have been of limited scope and sectarian in outlook.

We notice that, in the post-Pāṇinian era, there is a sea-change in the use of written Sanskrit, both in literary compositions⁷ and in the purāṇic context. It is a narrow-minded approach to call such a usage as 'a-Pāṇinīya' and therefore 'a-sādhū' or faulty. The *lakṣaṇa*-theory should be in conformity with the *lakṣya*, i.e. written literature. That language comes first and grammar follows is a universal axiom. Thus it is a rare intellectual effort on his part to promote and accept such usages as are, so to say, un-Pāṇinian, i.e. falling out of Pāṇini's discipline. This, in point of fact, is a commendable happening.

V

However, his originality in laying down new grammatical and śāstric works has to be

properly evaluated, because works in those directions by Pāṇini, Gautama, Kaṇāda etc. were for certain available. What is then, Hemacandra's original contribution ? He himself has answered this question. He inquires as to whether even prior to Pāṇini, Piṅgala, or Kaṇāda, *sūtras* of the subjects they dealt with existed or not. This indeed is a pertinent point he had raised. Now, these lores of grammar, logic, philosophy etc. apparently are beginningless. Who has brought forth expansion or contraction in what field and how ? Only on the basis of a critical consideration of such a query the originality of a particular author may be evaluated⁸. Again, the nouns and verbs used in a given language have got to be identical and fixed. We may, for instance, resort to 'La'-kāras such as लट् (Lat) etc., with reference to √भू - *Bhū* - and derive forms such as भवति etc. by suffixes such as तिप् etc., substituted as *ādeśas*. Or, we may straight away place the suffix ति to √भू (root) and derive भवति । In either case, 'भवति' remains 'भवति' ! There can be two different methods of deriving forms or word-formation but the output, namely भवति, is to remain the same ! Thus, whether we study *Cāndra*, or *Bhoja*, or *Haima-vyākaraṇa*, रमः - रमौ - रमाः । and भवति - भवतः - भवन्ति । are to remain as they are the same. Because of this Bhaṭṭoji says : उपेयप्रतिपत्त्यर्था उपाया अव्यवस्थिताः (वैयाकरणभूषणसारे स्फोटनिर्णयः-६७) i.e. for attaining *upeya*—the goal—*upāyas* i.e. methods can be different⁹. We cannot insist on just one methodology. Thus any number of new 'a-Pāṇinian' grammar were welcome. The thrust of examining could be only the process with which a particular grammarian derives a particular form. Is it that he uses the same procedure in deriving both a nominal form and a verbal form ? At least one would expect similarity in style with any structuralist. Viewed from this angle, I may say that Hemacandra has not stuck to identical methodology in his *Siddha-Hema-Śabdānuśāsana* e.g., while dealing with nominal formation, he has taken the 21 case-terminations as basic morphemes and has presented the allo-morphemes in consonance with the structure of a given basic noun¹⁰. To put it in a technical jargon, we may say that he has explained the nominal formations by the device, namely "a particular *ādeśa* takes shape in place on a particular *sthānin*". On the other hand, the 18 terminations (9 *Parasmaipada* + 9 *Ātmanepada*) that are attached to a verb are taken as basic morphemes and has not explained the allo-morphemes that take shape later. What is surprising, Hemacandra has placed in all 180 terminations expressing ten tenses and moods as basic morphemes¹¹. As against this, Pāṇini had used an identical device of *Sthānyā-deśa-bhāva* in the formation of nouns and verbs (= *Subanta* and *tiṅanta*). So it can be said that, while Pāṇini has been able to observe structural identity, Hemacandra had not, which, from a purely intellectual point of view, sounds less appealing. Of course, one may explain away this deficiency by suggesting that the factor of simplification was involved here. But then the question remains as to why was this simplification not attempted by Hemacandra with reference to nominal formations. This question then, remains unanswered.

VI

In Pāṇini's scheme, the statement of various *Kāraṅkas* proceeds and prescription of

vibhakti-affixes follows. Then is described how the whole thing is represented at the surface level phonologically. Again, any nominal formation has to be explained with reference to some verb only. Thus, Pāṇini has given a grammar of sentence-level; i.e. the *vākya-saṁskāra-pakṣa* has been followed by Pāṇini. In Hemacandra's grammar, such single and detached forms as रामः, काष्ठैः, are to be derived without verbal context and therefore without consideration of the sentence level. This is absolutely illogical. In Hemacandra's grammar the *sūtras* such as भिसः ऐस् । सि. हे. श. १-४-२, एद् बहुस्पोसि । १-४-४ and टा-ङसोरिन्-स्यौ । १-४-५ come first and then क्रियाहेतुः कारकम् । २-२-१ नाम्नः प्रथमैकद्विबहौ । २-२-३१ etc. follow. It thus becomes clear that Hemacandra has not promoted the natural *vākya-saṁskāra-pakṣa* or sentence-level and has promulgated the *pada-saṁskāra-pakṣa* which is not a natural phenomenon.

Third, one who studies Pāṇinīan system of grammar has to study the *vārttikas* and the *Bhāṣyestī-vacanas* separately, and has to harmonize them all. But Hemacandra has taken those *vārttikas* and has placed the same as *sūtras* in his work. So, for a student of the *Siddha-Hema-śabdānuśāsana*, only the study of *sūtras* (*sūtrapāṭha*) is sufficient. However Hemacandra has not freed his *sūtrapāṭha* from the requirements of a *prakriyā-grantha*.

If a grammarian attempts a new grammar with a view on simplification, then he has to lay down grammar which follows topics methodically without the necessity of the re-arrangement of *prakriyā-grantha*. But Hemacandra has failed to provide this, e.g. in the 7th chapter, 4th pada of the *Siddhahemaśabdānuśāsana*, he has provided meta-rules e.g.

- (i) पञ्चम्या निर्दिष्टे परस्य । सि. हे. श. ७-४-१०४
- (ii) षष्ठ्याऽन्त्यस्य । ७-४-१०६
- (iii) सप्तम्या पूर्वस्य । ७-४-१०५
- (iv) परः । ७-४-११८
- (v) स्पर्धे । ७-४-११९ etc.

Thus he has placed the *paribhāṣā-sūtra*, i.e. meta-rules concerning how to explain a noun-phrase ending in fifth case or seventh case, at the end, or also rules—as to which *sūtra* is to be taken as more powerful in case of a conflict between two *sūtras*—are also placed at the end of his grammar ! Actually, these explanations should have been in the beginning of a work and not at the end ! Thus as a structuralist his arrangement of the *sūtras*, too, is imperfect.

VII

Hemacandra's originality and his being exceptional, however, are borne out by his adding the Prakrit grammar and writing the *Dvyāśrayakāvya* to illustrate it. But it will be interesting to know Hemacandra's views on whether Prakrit was derived from Sanskrit or was Prakrit the original language at the root of Sanskrit ? He on *sūtra* अथ प्राकृतम् । ८-१-१ writes प्रकृतिः संस्कृतम् । तत्र भवं तत् आगतं प्राकृतम् ? संस्कृतानन्तरं प्राकृतमधिक्रियते ।

Thus for him Sanskrit is the original प्रकृति, language. Prakrit is that which is derived from (the root language) Sanskrit. Some scholars are of the opinion that the Prakrit spoken at popular level as parallel to Vedic Sanskrit was the origin of Sanskrit. But, for a grammarian who attempts a descriptive grammar, it becomes easier to delineate Prakrit by taking Sanskrit as the root language and explaining Prakrit forms by rules of phonological changes in letters. So, Hemacandra's approach seems practical and to the context. One more aspect of Hemacandra's Prakrit-grammar is that it was he who had started for the first time taking notice of differences in forms following differences in meaning. e.g.

- (i) क्षमायां कौ । सि. हे. श. ८-२-१८ (वृत्तिः) कौ पृथिव्यां वर्तमाने क्षमाशब्दे संयुक्तस्य छो भवति । 'छमा' पृथिवी ॥ काविति किम् ? 'खमा' क्षान्तिः ।
- (ii) क्षण उत्सवे । सि. हे. श. ८-२-२० (वृत्तिः) क्षणशब्दे उत्सवाभिधायिनि संयुक्तस्य छो भवति । छणो ॥ उत्सव इति किम् - खणो ।
- (iii) चतुर्थ्याः षष्ठी । सि. हे. श. ८-३-१३१ (वृत्तिः) चतुर्थ्याः स्थाने षष्ठी भवति । मुणिसस । नमो देवस्य ॥
- (iv) तादर्थ्यङेर्वा । सि. हे. श. ८-३-१३२ (वृत्तिः) तादर्थ्यविहितस्य ङेश्चतुर्थ्येकवचनस्य स्थाने षष्ठी वा भवति ॥ देवस्स । देवाय ॥

Here the Sanskrit word (क्षमा) *kṣamā* has two types of modifications in Prakrit e.g. *chamā* (छमा) and *khamā* (खमा) : but there is difference in connotation. Same is the case with *kṣaṇa* (क्षण), which becomes *chana* (छण) and *khaṇa* (खण) in Prakrit with two different meanings. Vararuci, in his *Prākṛtaprakāśa*, does not take note of such cases. Here it is noted that, in Prakrit, the sixth (possessive) case is used for fourth (dative) case. But Hemacandra is the first to pass a note that only the fourth case ending takes the shape of the sixth case ending which denotes a recipient, and the fourth case ending which denotes *tādarthya* continues as the fourth case ending in Prakrit. Thus, also, as a Prakrit grammarian, Hemacandra is very watchful and clear in his treatment which is the result of his vast acquaintance of Prakrit literature. His equipment as a grammarian, thus is highly laudable.

Conclusion

Hemacandra, as a grammarian, shows considerable originality. Precisely because of this, along with the *Pañcāṅgī Vyākaraṇa*, he has also given lexicons and the *Lakṣaṇa-kāvyas*. He gave śāstric recognition to such un-Pāṇinian usages that followed Pāṇini's era, and thus has sanctioned the growth and development in the field of language. He has left out Vedic grammar in consideration of the practical reasons. These are his scintillating achievements. On the other hand, he is not up to the standard as a structuralist and does not seem to abide by the outlook of the *vākya-saṁskāra-pakṣa*. He has given a grammar which is based on the *pada-saṁskāra-pakṣa*. He has not maintained identical approach in the case of both verbal and nominal forms which can be both simplification as well as a structural failure. Even with this limitation, his achievements are great enough to proclaim him as कलिकालसर्वज्ञ—the Omniscient of the Iron Age.

ANNOTATIONS :

* The paper originally was read at the National Seminar on "Intellectual leaders in Sanskrit, Prakrit and Pali" (27-29 March, 1996), organized by the Department of Sanskrit, University of Poona, Pune. Since unpublished, with some revisions, it has been given for the Jagadishcandra Jain commemorative number of the *Nirgrantha*.

1. *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, Delhi 1961, pp. 288-289.
2. Actually, even earlier, from the time of the Bhīmadeva 1, keen rivalry between Gujarat and Mālava, had started and rulers Bhīma and Bhoja were not only political but also keenly intellectual. The poets and dialecticians from different parts of India used to visit this capital of Gurajara-deśa where their literary and dialectical talents were put to test. See : *Kāvyaṇuśāsana*, Vol. II, "Introduction" Rasiklal C. Parikh, Bombay 1938, p. ccxlii - ccxliii.
3. "अनलङ्कृती पुनः क्वापि" were Mammata's words, which were replaced by Hemacandra, by सालङ्कारै च a more positive approach. This brings him closer to earlier poeticists. But, even with this unconfirmity, Hemacandra was a great exponent of the Dhvani-School and followed Mammata at every step. He saw to it that the Ānanda-Abhinava based Kāśmīra tradition in poetics took roots in Gujarat through his *Kāvyaṇuśāsana*, the *Alankāracūḍāmaṇi*, and the *Viveka* commentaries, and thus almost routed the Mālava tradition of Bhoja from Gujarat. Vide *Bhāratiya Sāhitya Śāstra ni Vicāraparamparāo* (Gujarātī), Ahmedabad 1984, p. 51.
4. किमेतदिति पप्रच्छ स्वाम्यपीति व्यजिज्ञपत् ।
भोजव्याकरणं ह्येतच्छब्दशास्त्रं प्रवर्तते ॥७५॥
भूपालोऽथावदत् किं नास्मत्कोशे शास्त्रपद्धतिः ।
विद्वान्कोऽपि कथं नास्ति देशे विश्वेऽपि गूजरे ॥७९॥
सर्वे संभूय विद्वांसो हेमचन्द्रं व्यलोकयन् ।
महाभक्त्या च राजासावभ्यर्थ्य प्रार्थितः प्रभुः ॥८०॥
शब्दव्युत्पत्तिकृच्छ्रास्त्रं निर्मायास्मान्मनोरथम् ।
पूरयस्व महर्षे त्वं विना त्वमत्र कः प्रभुः ॥८१॥
-द्रष्टव्यम् : चन्द्रप्रभसूत्रिणीतं प्रभावकचरितम्, सं. हिरानन्द शर्मा (प्रथमो भागः), मुंबई १९०९, पृ. ३००.
5. मेरुतुङ्गाचार्यकृतः प्रबन्धचिन्तामणिः, सं. रामचन्द्रो दीनानाथ शास्त्री, मुंबई १८८८, पृ. १४८.
6. संक्षिप्तश्च प्रवृत्तोऽयं समयेऽस्मिन् कलापकः ।
लक्षणं तत्र निष्पत्तिः शब्दानां नास्ति तादृशी ॥८२॥
पाणिनेर्लक्षणं वेदस्यांगमित्यत्र च द्विजाः ।
अवलेपादसूयन्ति कोऽर्थस्तैरुन्मनायितैः ॥८३॥
यशो मम तव ख्यातिः पुण्यं च मुनिनायक ।
विश्वलोकोपकाराय कुरु व्याकरणं नवम् ॥८४॥
इत्याकर्ण्यभ्यधात् सूरिर्हेमचन्द्रः सुधीनिधिः ।
कार्येषु नः किलोक्तिर्वः स्मरणायैव केवलम् ॥८५॥

श्रीहेमसूरयोऽप्यत्रालोक्य व्याकरणत्रयम् ।

शास्त्रं चकुर्वन् श्रीमत्सिद्धहेमाख्यमन्दुतम् ॥८६

—द्रष्टव्यम् : प्रभावकचरितम् (पृ. ३००-३०२)

7. See : ऋते द्वितीया च । सि. हे. श. २-२-११४

(लघुवृत्तिः) ऋतेशब्देन युक्ताद् द्वितीया पञ्चमी च स्यात् ।

ऋते धर्म धर्मात् कुतः सुखम् ॥-सिद्धहेमशब्दानुशासनम्, सं. मुनि हिमांशुविजयः, आणन्दजी कल्याणजी पेढी प्रकाशितम्, अहमदाबाद १९५० A. D. (पृ. ८६).

8. ननु यदि भवदीयानीमानि जैनसिद्धान्तसूत्राणि तर्हि भवतः पूर्वं कानि किमीयानि वा तान्यासन्निति ? अत्यल्पमिदमन्वयुङ्क्थाः । पाणिनि-पिङ्गल-कणादा-क्षपादादिभ्योऽपि पूर्वं कानि किमीयानि वा व्याकरणादिसूत्राणीत्येतदपि पर्यनुयुङ्क्ष्व ! अनादय एवेता विद्याः संक्षेपविस्तरविवक्षया नवनवीभवन्ति तत्तत्कर्तृकाश्चोच्यन्ते ॥-द्रष्टव्या : प्रमाणमीमांसा, सं. पण्डित सुखलालजी, प्रकाशन : सिंघी जैन ग्रन्थमाला, अहमदाबाद १९३९ A. D. (पृ. १).

9. See : उपेयप्रतिपत्त्यर्था उपाया अव्यवस्थिताः-इति न्यायेन व्याकरणभेदेन स्थानिभेदेऽपि न क्षतिः, देशभेदेन लिपिभेदवदिति दिक् ॥-परमलघुमञ्जूषा, चौखम्बा संस्कृत सीरीज़, वाराणसी १९७४ A. D. (पृ. ५).

10. स्यौजसमौशसृष्टाभ्यांभिसृडेभ्यांभ्यसृडसिभ्यांभ्यसृडसोसामृड्योससुपां त्रयी त्रयो प्रथमादिः ।-सि. हे. श. १-१-१८

-डेङस्योर्याऽऽतौ । १-४-६ (डे > य, रामाय)

-सवदिः स्मैमातौ । १-४-७ (डे > स्मै, सर्वस्मै)

-आपो डितां यैयास्यास् । १-४-१७ (डे > यै, मालायै) etc.

11. वर्तमाना तिव् तस् अन्ति, सिव् थस् थ, मिव् वस् मस्, ते आते

अन्ते, से आथे ध्वे, ए वहे महे ॥ सि. हे. श. ३-३-६

ह्यस्तनी दिव् ताम् अन्, सिव् तम् त, अम्ब्व व म, त आताम् अन्त,

थास् आथाम् ध्वम्, इ वहि महि ॥ सि. हे. श. ३-३-९

परोक्षा णव् अतुस् उस्, थव् अथुस् अ, णव् व म,

ए आते इरे, से आथे ध्वे, ए वहे महे ॥ सि. हे. श. ३-३-१२.