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I

Long after the passing away of Jina Mahāvīra, under the chairmanship of Devarddhi Gani Ksamāśramāna, the Jaina spiritual leaders of the Northern Church met at Valabhi (Saurāstrā, Gujarat State) in A. D. 503/516 and collated the earlier two versions, the one fixed at the Mathurā Synod and the other at Valabhi 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 Anahillapattana (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 Digambara holyman, in a doctrinal debate at this assembly in A. D. 1125. The incident was delineated in the play, the Mudrita-Kumudacandra by Yaśaścandra, 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 Siddhahemāsabdānuśāsana, (2) the Abhidhānacintāmaṇi, (3) the Deśināmamālā, (4) the Kavyānuśāsana, (5) the Chandonuśāsana, (6) the Pramāṇamāṃśā (incompletely available), (7) the Sanskrit Dvīśrāyama-hākāavya, (8) the Prakrit Dvīśrāyama-mahākāvyya or the Kumārapālacarita, (9) the Trīśaṭṭi-śalakāpurusa-carita, (10) the Mahāvīra-carita and the pariśīṣṭa-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-sarvajñā—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 Kavyānuśāsana is a compilation and exhibits hardly any originality. It borrows wholesale from the Kavyāmāṃśā of Rājaśekhara, the Kavyaprakāśa, the Dhvanyāloka, and from Abhinavagupta’s works!" 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 Kavyānuśāsana, 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 Kavyānuśāsana, tried to follow and promulgate the Kāśmīra School in poetics, so as to push back the Mālava-school of Bhoja³.

---

² P. V. Kane, Introduction, p. 9; R. C. Parikh, Introduction, p. 10.
³ T. S. Nandi, Introduction, p. 11.
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 Jayasimha 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-Hemaśabdānusāsana, a Sanskrit-Prakrit grammar. In Merutungacārya's Prabandha-cintāmaṇi (A. D. 1305), there is the third canto called "Siddharāja prabandha," in which this grammar is eulogized in fulsome terms:

प्रातः संस्कृतम् प्राणिनिग्रापितं कलानकोष वृद्धा
भाषार्थः कदू शाकुराकापञ्चं बुद्धिः चान्त्रिण किम्
कः कण्ठभ्रमणांमित्वाभस्मातात्मान-पौर्ण
बुध्वते यदि तत्वद्विशमयूः; श्रीसिद्धेंहोकण;

Thus, by penning the Siddha-Hemaśabdānusāsana, Hemacandra had endeavoured to smear the Astādhyāyi of Pāṇini as also the Sarvasvatī-kanthābharaṇa 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 Kālāpakā 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-Hemaśabdānusāsana. In it he removed the Vaidika portion of the Astādhyāyi and replaced it with the grammar of the Prakrits such as Māgadhi, Śauraseni, Pāścāti, Mahārāṣṭri, Ārśa (Arhamāgadhi 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-Hemaśabdānusāsana: It contains grammar of both Sanskrit and Prakrits. He had also written shorter and longer (स्त्रु and वृहत्) commentaries on this grammar. In addition, he had written a third commentary called the sabda-mahārṇava or the Brāhmanyāsa, today available only in fragments. (ii) the Unāḍi-sūtra: This, too,
was composed by Hemacandra with explanatory notes. (iii) the Dhātupāṭha, with svopajña vyrtti, (iv) the Liṅgānuśāsana, and (v) the Gaṇapāṭha were also written by him. Thus we may say that he has given a Paṇcāngi or five-faced vyākaraṇa. No less noteworthy are his lexicons, namely (i) the Abhidhana-cintāmaṇi, (2) the Anekhārthakośa, (3) the Nighaṇṭu concerning herbs, (4) the Desināmanāla, and (5) the two Dvārakāya Kāvyas. These were composed, not unlike the Bhaṭṭī-kāvyas, 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 vyrtti, the appendices, the lexicons and the lakṣaṇakāvyas. In this way he scored over the writers of the Cānḍra of Candragaumi (5th cent.), the Jainendra of Pujjapāda Devanandi, (c. A. D. 650), the śabdasāstra of Śaṅkaṭāyana, (c. A. D. 850), and the Bhoja-vyākaraṇa (c. A. D. 1030-1050) ascribed to Parmāra Bhoja of Dhāra.

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 Jaina 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) कल्पितो वेदद्वे लोपे। सि. दे. श। ६-३६८३ जन्ता। चरका।
(ii) विराजितात्मनांसुविद्याधिकोऽविद्य। ६-३।३६४५ तैत्तिरिया। वापनन्तवी।
(iii) आध्यात्मिकसादन इन्द्रतुकः । ६-३।३६५६ आध्यात्मिक - आध्यात्मिक।

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 compositions and in the purānic context. It is a narrow-minded approach to call such a usage as 'a-Pāṇinīya' and therefore 'a-sādhu' 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-Pāṇinīan, 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, Kanāda 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, Pāṇgala, or Kanāda, śūtras of the subjects they dealt with existed or not. This indeed is a pertinent point he had raised. Now, these lorels 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 evaluated. 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 लु (Lū) etc., with reference to भू - Bhū - and derive forms such as भूति etc. by suffixes such as त्व etc., substituted as आदेशाः. Or, we may straight away place the suffix ति to भू (root) and derive भूति. In either case, ‘भूति’ remains ‘भूति’! There can be two different methods of deriving forms or word-formation but the output, namely भूति, is to remain the same! Thus, whether we study Cāndra, or Bhoga, or Haima-vyākarana, भूति - भूति - भूति - भूति! I are to remain as they are the same. Because of this Bhaṭṭoju says: तैयाप्रियस्यवस्त्र्य उपयो अन्वयविधितः; (कैवद्यक्तपूर्वशिकार स्झनिनय-६७) i.e. for attaining upeya—the goal— upāyas i.e. methods can be different. 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-Sabdānusāsana e.g., while dealing with nominal formation, he has taken the 21 case-terminations as basic morphemes and has presented the ailo-morphemes in consonance with the structure of a given basic noun. To put it in a technical jargon, we may say that he has explained the nominal formations by the device, namely “a particular आदेशा takes shape in place on a particular sthānin”. On the other hand, the 18 terminations (9 Parasmaipada + 9 Atmanepada) that are attached to a verb are taken as basic morphemes and has not explained the ailo-morphemes that take shape later. What is surprising, Hemacandra has placed in all 180 terminations expressing ten tenses and moods as basic morphemes. As against this, Pāṇini had used an identical device of Sthānyā-deśa-bhāva in the formation of nouns and verbs (=Subanta and tīhanta). 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 Kārakas 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-saṃskāra-paṭa has been followed by Pāṇini. In Hemacandra's grammar, such single and detached forms as रमः, काँडः, 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 निस्स औयू, विव स्वस्थत्वम् । १-४-४ and तह-हरस्तिस्या । १-४-५ come first and then कियोहुः कारकम् । २-२-९ नान्न: प्रथमक्किन्ये । २-२-११ etc. follow. It thus becomes clear that Hemacandra has not promoted the natural vākya-saṃskāra-paṭa or sentence-level and has promulgated the pada-saṃskāra-paṭa which is not a natural phenomenon.

Third, one who studies Pāṇinian system of grammar has to study the vārttikas and the Bhāṣyottī-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 (sūtrapātha) is sufficient. However Hemacandra has not freed his sūtrapātha 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 rearrangement of prakriyā-grantha. But Hemacandra has failed to provide this, e.g. in the 7th chapter, 4th pada of the Siddhahemāsabdānuśāsana, he has provided meta-rules e.g.

(i) प्रविष्टे हिष्टेवः । सत्य । स. ३-५-१०५
(ii) प्रविष्टेनस्तथः । ३-४-१०६
(iii) सात्त्व वृत्तवः । ३-४-१०६
(iv) सत्य । ३-१-१०६
(v) सात्त्व । ३-५-१०६ 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 Dvyaśrayakāvyā 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 प्रकृतम् । ४-१-१ writes प्रकृतिः संस्कृतम् । तत्र भवं तत अगतं प्राकृतम् । संस्कृतगतं तं प्राकृतमथिकितव्र ।
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) क्षणयां कौ | सिद्धे, श्री 8-२-१८ (वृत्तिः) कौ पृथिवीं वर्तमाने क्षणसब्ज संयुक्तस्य छो भवति | 'खमा' पृथिवी || कालितिक किम्? 'खमा' कालितिक: ||

(ii) क्षण उत्सवे | सिद्धे, श्री 8-२-२० (वृत्तिः) क्षणसब्ज उत्सवाभिप्रायतिः संयुक्तस्य छो भवति | खम। || उत्सव
इति किम् - खम।

(iii) चुंबणेष्व पद्धे | सिद्धे, श्री 8-२-१३१ (वृत्तिः) चुंबणेष्व: स्थाने पद्धे भवति | मुणिस्तिः नमो देवस्य ||

(iv) ठाण्डक्षेक्षरे | सिद्धे, श्री 8-२-१३२ (वृत्तिः) ताल्लुकविहितस्य के श्लोकस्य कविहितस्य स्थाने पद्धे वा भवति ||

देवस्य || देयाय ||

Here the Sanskrit word (क्षण) kṣamā has two types of modifications in Prakrit e.g. chāma (भङ्ग) and khāma (खभम) : but there is difference in connotation. Same is the case with kṣana (क्षण), which becomes chana (उइ) and khana (खभा) in Prakrit with two different meanings. Vararuci, in his Prākṛtāprakāśa, 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 Pañcarā Gaṇḍavā, he has also given lexicons and the Lakṣaṇa-kāvyas. He gave sāstric recognition to such un-Pāṇini’s 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 vākyasamāskāra-pakṣa. He has given a grammar which is based on the pada-samāskāra-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 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 Jagadishchandra Jain commemorative number of the Nirgrantha.


2. Actually, even earlier, from the time of the Bhīmadeva I, keen rivalry between Gujarāt and Mālava, had started and rulers Bhima 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 Gurjarādeśa where their literary and dialectical talents were put to test. See: Kāvyānūsāsana, Vol. II. “Introduction” Rasikāl C. Parikh, Bombay 1938, p. ccxlii - ccxliii.

3. “अनुमानकृती तु: व्यवरं” were Mammata’s words, which were replaced by Hemacandra, by सतानुसारिणी “a more positive approach. This brings him closer to earlier poeticians. But, even with this unconfirmation, 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 Gujarāt through his Kāvyānūsāsana, the Alankāracūtāmaṇi, and the Viveka commentaries, and thus almost routed the Mālava tradition of Bhoja from Gujarāt. Vide Bhārattyā Śāhitya Śāstra ni Vidyaparamparādo (Gujaratī), Ahmedabad 1984, p. 51.

4. किमेतहि प्रसून स्वाम्यपियति व्यक्ति:।

5. प्रकृति: होतनिक्ष्यायां प्रावति: ॥

6. यद्रापि कथा: शास्त्रपियति:।

7. विद्वानकोषि: कथा: शास्त्रपियति:।

8. सतानुसारिणी च व्यवरं:।

9. त्यस्मात् भाषायां स्वाम्यस्वरूपम्:।

10. पुराणम्: तदो विनास त्वम्:।

11. प्रश्नम्: च च: व्यवरं शास्त्रपियति:।

12. सतानुसारिणी: स्वाम्यपियति:।

13. तद्रापि कथा:।

14. तद्रापि कथा:।

15. तद्रापि कथा:।

16. तद्रापि कथा:।

17. तद्रापि कथा:।

18. तद्रापि कथा:।

19. तद्रापि कथा:।

20. तद्रापि कथा:।

21. तद्रापि कथा:।

22. तद्रापि कथा:।

23. तद्रापि कथा:।

24. तद्रापि कथा:।

25. तद्रापि कथा:।

26. तद्रापि कथा:।

27. तद्रापि कथा:।

28. तद्रापि कथा:।

29. तद्रापि कथा:।

30. तद्रापि कथा:।

31. तद्रापि कथा:।

32. तद्रापि कथा:।

33. तद्रापि कथा:।

34. तद्रापि कथा:।

35. तद्रापि कथा:।

36. तद्रापि कथा:।

37. तद्रापि कथा:।

38. तद्रापि कथा:।

39. तद्रापि कथा:।

40. तद्रापि कथा:।

41. तद्रापि कथा:।

42. तद्रापि कथा:।

43. तद्रापि कथा:।

44. तद्रापि कथा:।

45. तद्रापि कथा:।

46. तद्रापि कथा:।

47. तद्रापि कथा:।

48. तद्रापि कथा:।

49. तद्रापि कथा:।

50. तद्रापि कथा:।

51. तद्रापि कथा:।

52. तद्रापि कथा:।

53. तद्रापि कथा:।

54. तद्रापि कथा:।

55. तद्रापि कथा:।

56. तद्रापि कथा:।

57. तद्रापि कथा:।

58. तद्रापि कथा:।

59. तद्रापि कथा:।

60. तद्रापि कथा:।

61. तद्रापि कथा:।

62. तद्रापि कथा:।

63. तद्रापि कथा:।

64. तद्रापि कथा:।

65. तद्रापि कथा:।

66. तद्रापि कथा:।

67. तद्रापि कथा:।

68. तद्रापि कथा:।

69. तद्रापि कथा:।

70. तद्रापि कथा:।

71. तद्रापि कथा:।

72. तद्रापि कथा:।

73. तद्रापि कथा:।

74. तद्रापि कथा:।

75. तद्रापि कथा:।

76. तद्रापि कथा:।

77. तद्रापि कथा:।

78. तद्रापि कथा:।

79. तद्रापि कथा:।

80. तद्रापि कथा:।

81. तद्रापि कथा:।

82. तद्रापि कथा:।

83. तद्रापि कथा:।

84. तद्रापि कथा:।

85. तद्रापि कथा:।

86. तद्रापि कथा:।

87. तद्रापि कथा:।

88. तद्रापि कथा:।

89. तद्रापि कथा:।

90. तद्रापि कथा:।

91. तद्रापि कथा:।

92. तद्रापि कथा:।

93. तद्रापि कथा:।

94. तद्रापि कथा:।

95. तद्रापि कथा:।

96. तद्रापि कथा:।

97. तद्रापि कथा:।

98. तद्रापि कथा:।

99. तद्रापि कथा:।

100. तद्रापि कथा:।
श्रीहेम्सुद्देश्या वस्तुलोकाम् व्याकरणांजनम्।
शाल्य चक्षुर्वतश्रीमतिवादेशार्यमहतम् ॥ १७६ ॥
---दशम् : प्रमाणकल्पग्नितम् (पृ. ३००-३०२)

7. देखे : द्वितीया च दस्ते हेम. स. २-२-१९४

(पवृत्तिः) शक्तिशाली युक्ता द्वितीया पश्चात् च स्यात्।

8. ननु यदि पवदीयानाथानि जैनसिद्धां-सूत्राणि ताई भवतः पूर्व कानि किमीपानि वा सान्याससि ति?

9. देखे : उपेदप्रतिपदायं उपाया अवधिवस्था--ते तथा व्याकरणमेव व्याकरणादेशपि न द्रस्तिः, देशभेदेन तिथिवेदविदिति

10. स्वासुदेशसुद्देशसुद्देशसुद्देशसुद्देशसंस्कृतभेदानाथानि शास्त्राय: यथा कथा प्रथमावि: ॥-सिद्ध. हेम. शि. १-२-१९६

11. चर्चणमाबः सिद्ध तस्त् आदि, सिद्ध थुः सिद्ध वश्च दस्ते आदि अन्येः, सै अथवा भवे। पूर्व कानि किमीपानि वा सान्याससि ति?