ANDREA DROCCO
(Università degli Studi di Torino)

Eternal Sanskrit and the meaning of the tripartite Prakrit terminology tatsama, tadbhava and deśī. *

The majority of scholars have used the well-known traditional classification of Prakrit words in *tatsama*, *tadbhava*, *deśī* in the context of historical linguistics. Therefore they have the tendency to identify *tadbhava* words with words inherited from Old-Indo-Aryan by Middle-Indo-Aryan and/or New-Indo-Aryan and *deśī* words with non-Indo-Aryan element in Indo-Aryan. The aim of this contribution is to explain that they are not completely correct through the study of the meaning of the term *deśī* according to ancient Indian grammarians, in particular according to Hemacandra in his *deśī-kośa*, the *Deśīnāmamālā*. From the analysis of the typology of words covered by the definition of *deśīśabda* provided by this author, it is possible to assert that *deśī* words are not all non-Indo-Aryan. Hemacandra wanted to teach Prakrits on the basis of knowledge of Sanskrit. Thus, with his Prakrit grammar, the *Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana*, he offers a set of rules to "convert" Sanskrit into Prakrits, whereas for all Prakrit neologisms he offers his *Deśīnāmamālā*.

1. Even if early Jains and Buddhists used Middle-Indo-Aryan (MIA) languages to draw up their canonical texts and even if starting from the reign of Aśoka Maurya we have a vast amount of inscriptional records in MIA, it is possible to find the first grammatical descriptions of Prakrits, as these languages are sometimes known, only from the beginning of the first millennium and in a particular kind of works, that is Sanskrit works on poetics (Scharfe 1977: 191). According to these works Prakrits had to be learnt through formal instructions, and thus manuals of Prakrit grammar were periodically composed (Bhayani 1988c: 155)[1].

Regarding the vocabulary of Prakrits, Sanskrit works on poetics and

Prakrit grammars made a three-fold classification of the words of the dialects that they described (Pischel 1965: 7):

i) *saṃskṛtasama*, or *tatsama*, 'the same as Sanskrit' or 'the same as that',

ii) *saṃskṛtabhava*, or *tadbhava*, 'of the nature of Sanskrit' or 'of the nature of that', and,

iii) *deśī*, *deśaja*, 'country-born', i.e. 'local'.

Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*, in chapter XVII, gives us, perhaps, the oldest pieces of Prakrit grammar dealing, in the first fragment, with phonemic rules for the conversion of Sanskrit words into Prakrits (Pischel 1965: 40-41; Nitti-Dolci 1972: 61; Scharfe 1977: 191). From the sources already available it is possible to say that Bharata is the first to divide Prakrit words into three classes, but the terms employed are slightly different from those given above[2]. In fact, the earliest mention of the subdivision of Prakrit words in *tatsama*, *tadbhava* and *deśī* seems to be in Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa* (Kahrs 1992: 227; Pollock 2006: 93, 93 note n. 46)[3], that is nearly in the end of VIIth century[4].

2. What is the meaning of the tripartite Prakrit terminology in *tatsama*, *tadbhava* and *deśī*? Although it is not easy to answer this question, because there is not general consensus, also in the indigenous context, the prevailing interpretation of the term *tadbhava*, for example, among modern scholars is that of "derived from Sanskrit"[5]. This sense, as Kahrs (1992: 255-227) and other authors pointed out (e.g. Masica 1991: 65-67), has been interpreted from a Western framework and thus the process of "derivation" of Prakrit *tadbhava* words from Sanskrit has

---

[2] *trividhaṃ tac ca vijñeyaṃ nāṭyayoge samāsataḥ /*
samānaśabdaṃ vibhraṣṭaṃ deśīgatam athāpi ca // Nāṭyaśāstra 17.3 (ed. K. L. Joshi 1984).

[3] *saṃskṛtaṃ nāma daivī vāg anvākhyātā maharṣibhiḥ /*
tadbhavas tatsamo deśīty anekaḥ prākṛtakramaḥ // Kāvyādarśa 1.33 (ed. O. Böhtlingk 1890).

[4] For a discussion on the use of the different terms concerning the threefold division of Prakrit words that, as Pollock says, "[…] emerge as a cornerstone of Indian philological thought […]" (2006: 93), see Kahrs (1992), but also Pischel (1965: 7). On the different conceptual scheme of the categories used to organize difference among the Prakrits in Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* see Pollock (2006: 107-108).

[5] See, for example, Nitti-Dolci (1972: viii), Macdonell (1893: *sub voce*) in his *Sanskrit-English dictionary*, Scharfe (1977: 186) and, recently, Pollock (2006: 108, 368-369, 401). Pischel's translation of the term *tadbhava* is "originated from that" (1965: 7, Subhadra Jha's English translation from the original German), whereas Beames (1872-79: 11) and Kellogg (1893: 42) translated this term with "of the nature of it".

been understood as a process of "historical derivation" and explained as it will imply the concept of "change through time". Thus, in modern times, the terminology aforementioned has been used also in the context of Indo-Aryan (IA) historical linguistics. Perhaps it is for this reason that some authors like Beames (1872-79: 13-17) and Hoernle (1880: XXXVIII-XXXIX) distinguished between what they called "early/old" *tadbhava(s)*, calling the latter *semi-tatsama(s)*. We can suppose that the use of "early" and "old" made by these authors is another proof of the historical approach used discussing on the tripartite classification of Prakrit words. Moreover, probably starting from this approach, the entire tripartite terminology, originally made by ancient Indian grammarians for only Prakrit words, is used also discussing on modern IA languages (Masica 1991: 65). For example Kellogg in his *A grammar of the Hindi language* says that "The word Tadbhava […] denotes […] all corrupted Sanskrit words, which, by the addition, loss, or change of certain letters, have come to appear in Hindi in a form more or less modified, and often greatly disguised" (1893: 42) (cfr. also Chatterji 1926: 189-192; Hoernle 1880: XXXVIII-XL; Grierson 1927: 127-128; Caracchi 2002: 21; Tiwari 1960: xliv-xlv).

3. What about *deśī*? Western and Indian scholars who have previously examined the problem of this category of words have expressed very different views, and thus there prevails a considerable amount of confusion regarding the nature and the character of this term (Tagare 1948: 7; Shriyan 1969: 9). At the moment we can say that starting from the aforesaid historical approach the majority of these scholars have the tendency to identify *tadbhava* words with words inherited from Old-Indo-Aryan (OIA) by MIA and/or New-Indo-Aryan (NIA) languages and *deśī* words with words borrowed from non-IA languages by MIA and NIA languages (e.g. Chatterji 1983)[6]. It is not

---

[6] Chatterji speaks of "Words borrowed from the non-Aryan languages of India […] (the *deśī* element in MIA)" (1983: 102). Norman says that the third component part of the structure of MIA includes those forms which are to be regarded as innovations; these, according to the same author, "fall into two classes: (a) […], and (b) those forms which have no affinity with anything else in OIA or MIA, and must therefore be regarded as borrowings from a known or unknown non-IA source. These constitute the so-called *deśī* forms" (1992b: 115). Cfr. also Bryant who says "[…] the traditional grammarians of India […] had noted the distinction between the Sanskrit words and the non-sanskritic *deśya* ones, thus alerting […] linguists to the possibility of a non-Indo-Aryan family of languages in the subcontinent" (1999: 61).

easy to understand the different phases through which these two kinds of identifications have been made. However it seems that, in the majority of cases, the term Sanskrit, present in the term *saṁskṛtabhava* and implicit in the term *tadbhava*, has been understood as not only classical Sanskrit, but also Vedic[7] and/or the whole OIA stage of the history of IA languages, including in this way old popular IA languages[8], of which we have only some evidence, for example, in the Vedic and MIA texts still available (Burrow 1955: 45-47; Emeneau 1966; Witzel 1989; Norman 1992a: 225-243, 1992b: 115-125). Similarly the term Prakrit has been used to mean the whole MIA stage[9]. So, if a Prakrit *tadbhava* word is a MIA word derived from Sanskrit and, moreover, Sanskrit is equal to OIA, it is a natural consequence that a Prakrit *deśī* word is a MIA word not derived from OIA, i.e. a non-IA word. This is truer if all those MIA words created or built up with roots and affixes derived from OIA are also included in the category of *tadbhava* (as done by Chatterji 1983: 101). So we can understand why Chatterji in his *Indo-Aryan and Hindi* clearly said "The *deśī* element in MIA is another absorbing and frequently baffling topic. A good many *deśī* words are just inherited Aryan words in MIA […]" (1960: 97).

If this is the position of the majority of modern scholars, we could now ask what is the meaning of the tripartite terminology, and in particular of the term *deśī*, according to ancient Indian grammarians.

4. Two of the basic and most important sources of our knowledge concerning the Prakrit words specified by the classification in *tatsama*, *tadbhava* and *deśī*, and thus of the *deśī* element in Prakrit vocabulary, are the Prakrit grammar and the *Deśīnāmamālā* both by the jaina monk and polymath Hemacandra Sūri (Bhayani 1988a: 3-9, 1988b: 104-105; Pischel 1965: 47-50; Shriyan 1969: 26) who lived in Gujarāt under the Cālukya king Jayasiṁha-Siddharāja between the XIth and XIIth century

---

[7] On the usage of some scholars of the name "Sanskrit" also for various forms of Vedic see Thieme (1994) and Wezler (1996: 346, note n. 73). Not all scholars agree with this usage, for example Mayrhofer (1986-). Cfr. also Aklujkar (1996: 70, note n. 18).

[8] See, for example, the following statements of Chatterji: "The great fact of the presence of Sanskrit or OIA […]" (1983: 99), "We generally have our main or basic references to OIA or Sanskrit […]" (*idem*), "Taking Sanskrit as being loosely the equivalent of OIA, […]" (*idem*).

[9] Chatterji says "Thus words like *deva*, […] might be as much an inherited element in Prakrit or MIA […]" (1983: 98). Cfr. also Norman (1990: 64, 67, 1996: 92).

(Scharfe 1977: 193; Vogel 1979: 335-336; Pischel 1965: 47)[10]. The Prakrit grammar of Hemacandra constitutes the eighth section of his grammar *Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana*[11] whereof the first seven sections are devoted to the Sanskrit language (Nitti-Dolci 1972: chapter 5; Scharfe 1977: 169; Pischel 1965: 47-48). The *Deśīnāmamālā*, instead, is only one of the four *koṣa(s)*, dictionaries, written by this author. The other three are: (i) the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇināmamāla* and (ii) the *Anekārthasaṃgraha* dealing with Sanskrit synonyms and Sanskrit homonyms respectively, and, finally, (iii) the *Nighaṇṭuśeṣa* on botanical terms (Vogel 1979: 336-345).

4.1 Hemacandra's *Deśīnāmamālā* was first brought to public notice by Bühler (1873: 17-21) in the second number of *Indian Antiquary* and published, for the first time, by Pischel (1880), then by Banerjee (1931), and in a revised edition of Pischel's one by Ramanujaswamy (1938)[12]. The text is divided into eight *varga(s)* (chapters) and each *varga* is subdivided into many paragraphs. Each paragraph is once more subdivided into two parts regarding *ekārtha* words, words with only one meaning, and *anekārtha* words, words with more than one meaning. All the material collected by Hemacandra amounts to about 4000 words.

Considering what we have said about how modern scholars, Western and Indian, interpreted the meaning of the tripartite terminology and in particular the meaning of the terms *tadbhava* and *deśī*, it is perfectly natural that the same scholars have accused Hemacandra of including many *tadbhava* words in *Deśīnāmamālā* through ignorance, because in this lexicon it is possible to find words that are clearly of OIA origin. For example Bühler (1879: 12-13) and Pischel (1965: 48) say that this author has mistaken *tadbhava(s)* and *tatsama(s)* for *deśī* forms. Chatterji (1926: 191) says that the *Deśīnāmamālā* has scores of "*tadbhavas deśī* words". Similar opinions are made by other scholars

---

[10] On the life of Hemacandra see Bühler 1889 (English translation from the original German by Patel 1936).

[11] *Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana (adhyāya 8)*, (ed.) Vaidya, P.L., Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona 1980. (second edition)

[12] Shriyan (1969: 25, note 3) mentions a further edition of the *Deśīnāmamālā*: *Desisadda-saṃgaho*, edited by Becardas Doshi 1948, I part.

like Vaidya (1926-27), Upadhye (1931), Gune (1918: 221) and so on[13]. But to try to understand if these strictures are fair it must be asked "What is a *deśī* word for Indian grammarians?" "How can we decide whether a Prakrit word is classifiable under the *tadbhava* or *deśī* category?" "And can the exact meaning of the term *deśī* help us to understand the background under which the Prakrit grammarians wrote their texts?" At the verses three and four of chapter one of his *Deśīnāmamālā*, Hemacandra explains what he considers to be *deśī* words:

> *je lakkhaṇe ṇa siddhā ṇa pasiddhā sakkayāhihāṇesu* /
> *ṇa ya gauṇalakkhaṇāsattisaṃbhavā te iha ṇibaddhā* //
> *desavisesapasiddhū bhaṇṇamāṇā aṇantayā hunti* /
> *tamhā aṇāipāiapayaṭṭabhāsāvisesao desī* // *Deśīnāmamālā* I, 3-4
> (ed. P. V. Ramanujaswamy 1938)
>
> Those words are included here which are not explained in (my) grammar, not known from the Sanskrit lexicons, nor owe their origin to the power called *gauṇī lakṣaṇā* (i.e. are not common words used in a metaphorical sense). Endless are the forms that are used in the various provincial dialects. Therefore the term *deśī* is (used here) to denote those words only which have been used since immemorial times in Prakrit. (Bühler 1873: 18-19)

As we can see according to Hemacandra a *deśī* word is:
i) a word which is not explained in his grammar *Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana*, that is a word to which it is not possible to apply the rules of origin from Sanskrit explained in his grammar and
ii) a word which, even though it originates in the Sanskrit language by application of rules of his grammar it is not current in Sanskrit lexicons in the same sense of Prakrit and thus is a word which has changed in Prakrit its original Sanskrit meaning, the change not being due to secondary or metaphorical use[14].

---

[13] On others views of modern scholars about Hemacandra's *Deśīnāmamālā* see Shriyan (1969: 28-31).
[14] In India the various schools of philosophy, including those of Sanskrit grammarians and rhetoricians, devoted much thought to the problems of the various aspects of meaning. Indian thinkers have classified the meaning (*artha*) of a word in three distinct categories: 1) *abhidhā* "significative power or primary meaning of a word"; 2) *lakṣaṇā* "the use of a word to denote a

In addition, in verse four Hemacandra says explicitly that in his work he includes those *deśī* words used in standard Prakrit literature and not all those words that are used in the various provincial dialects[15].

Thus if we consider the typology of the words covered by Hemacandra's definition of *deśīśabda*, it is possible to assert that the terms *deśī*, or *deśaja*, with their literal meaning of "born in the country", have been used by this author, with reference to literary Prakrits, to collect in his *Deśīnāmamālā*, first of all, i) words which can be related to words found in Sanskrit (with the same meaning), but only by postulating phonetic changes not described in his Prakrit grammar, then, ii) words which differ only in meaning from Prakrit words whose relation with correspondent Sanskrit words, according to him, is unquestioned, and which presumably represent some semantic change, and, finally, iii) any kind of word which cannot be traced back to a Sanskrit one. In this manner we are now in a better position to understand why Pischel (1965: 7-8) said that in the category of *deśī* words "the Indians include very heterogeneous elements" (cfr. also Shriyan 1969: 44; Norman 1990: 64-65). In fact, regarding particularly the last kind of words just mentioned, it must be assumed that in this category are included not only loan words from non-IA and foreign languages and inherited words which happened to descend from OIA dialects other than the one on which Sanskrit was based (Burrow 1955; Emeneau 1966; Masica 1991: 67; Norman 1992b), but also all those words that we can call pure neologisms (Norman 1990, 1992b),

referent other than its normal one, but somehow related to it", that is "secondary significative function of a word"; 3) *vyañjana* "the capacity to suggest a meaning other than its literal meaning" (cfr. Kunjunni Raja 1977: 17-94, 229-273, 275-315, respectively). As we can see, in Hemacandra's definition of *deśīśabda* it is mentioned a specific kind of *lakṣaṇā*, that is *gauṇī lakṣaṇā*. In fact, the Indian authors who have studied the theories of meaning enumerated, in different manner from one another, various kinds of *lakṣaṇā*, classifiable, particularly, in two groups: i) *gauṇī vṛtti* or *gauṇī lakṣaṇā* and ii) *śuddhā* (pure) *lakṣaṇā* (cfr. Kunjunni Raja 1977: 240). With regards to these groups Kunjunni Raja (1977: 241) says "[…] if the relation is one of similarity, the transfer is qualitative (*gauṇī*); if it is any other relation such as that of cause and effect, owner and owned, measure and measured, part and whole, etc., it is pure *lakṣaṇā* […]". For a discussion on the different species of *lakṣaṇā* see Kunjunni Raja (1977: 256-257), whereas on *gauṇī lakṣaṇā* (or *gauṇī vṛtti*) see Kunjunni Raja (1977: 242-245).

¹⁵ In fact, according to Hemacandra:
vācaspater api matir na prabhavati divyayugasahasreṇa /
deśeṣu ye prasiddhāstāñ śabdān sarvattaḥ samuccetum // *Deśīnāmamālā* I, 4, *vṛtti* (ed. P. V. Ramanujaswamy 1938). For a discussion on this point see Pollock (2006: 403-405).

generally complex, coined by putting together *deśī* and Sanskrit elements or which, although built up with elements regarded separately as pure *tadbhava(s)*, never existed as such in Sanskrit, probably because they were created in Prakrits without following the rules of the *Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana* (Bühler 1879: 11-12)[16]. Thus we can notice that according to Hemacandra, *deśī* words are not all non-IA and this is true also because the terms *deśī*, *deśaja* have never been related to only non-IA languages by ancient Indian authors who instead spoke about *saṃskṛta*, *prākṛta*, *bhāṣā*, *vibhāṣā*, *apabhraṃśa* and *deśabhāṣā* (Grierson 1913, 1918; Pischel 1965: 1-3). Although it is not possible to talk at length here about the exact mening of the last five terms, since the Indian grammarians differ from one another (Pischel 1965: 1), it seems that the lists of languages cited in the categories of *vibhāṣā* and *deśabhāṣā* include especially if not only, but this is still to be proved, IA languages[17].

5. So, from the analysis of Hemacandra's *Deśīnāmamālā* regarding the nature of the tripartite terminology, in particular of the category of *deśī* words, we have further proof that the classification of Prakrit words in *tatsama*, *tadbhava* and *deśī* must not be read in historical terms. Following a suggestion made recently by some authors, for example Masica (1991: 65), the aforesaid descriptive terminology proposes in fact a comparison between the lexicons of two different varieties one of which is raised as a point of reference[18]. But what does this consideration mean?

For example, we can postulate that the classification in *tatsama* or *tadbhava* of a specific Prakrit word does not mean that this word has

---

[16] For some examples, with related analysis, of *deśya* words, their typology or their possible manners of classification see Vaidya (1926-27), Shriyan (1969), Norman (1990), Bhayani (1988b, 1988c, 1998e, 1998f) and Drocco (2000, 2006).

[17] See, for example, the list of languages under the category of *vibhāṣā* mentioned in Mārkaṇḍeya's *Prākṛtasarvasva* and discussed by Grierson (1913, 1918). See also the names of some of the famous eighteen *deśabhāṣā* mentioned in Śāradātanaya's *Bhāvaprakāśana* (cfr. Pollock 2006: 95, 299) or discussed and exemplified by the *Mānasollāsa* (cfr. Bhayani 1993b; Pollock 2006: 300-301), the great royal encyclopedia composed by King Someśvara in northern Karnataka in the first half of the XIIth century. It is possible to find some information about sixteen *deśabhāṣā* cited by name in Uddyottana Sūri's *Kuvalayamālā* and examined in part by Master (1950, 1951) and Upadhye (1965).

[18] For the last remarks, see also Bubenik (1998: 22).

been borrowed or inherited respectively from Sanskrit in diachronic terms. It is possible that this specific word, if we want to study its history, is a pure new word in a Prakrit text, maybe borrowed from a non-IA language or created as a neologism being thus a *deśī* word*,* but then used also in Sanskrit in the same form and meaning of that Prakrit text or sometimes made more sanskritic with (hyper-)sanskritization, becoming in this way, as a consequence of its use in Sanskrit, a *tatsama* or *tadbhava* respectively.

In addition if the tripartite terminology proposes a comparison and not a history this means that a specific Prakrit word could be a *deśī* word for one author, but a *tadbhava* or *tatsama* for another one, depending on, for example,

i) the terms of the comparison, i.e. the rules described in the different Prakrit grammars,

ii) the knowledge of the Sanskrit lexicon and/or what must be considered as being part of the Sanskrit lexicon by the different Prakrit grammarians and, closely linked,

iii)the period in which the comparison is made between Sanskrit and Prakrit lexicons.

Regarding the second point we have to keep in mind that according to Hemacandra the words which constitute the Sanskrit lexicon are those discussed in his *Abhidhānacintāmaṇināmamāla*. Therefore a Prakrit word could be a *deśī* word for Hemacandra who died in the second half of the twelfth century, but not for the Prakrit grammarian Trivikrama who lived in the thirteenth century[19], because, as I have just noted, it can be assumed that this very same Prakrit word has been included in a Sanskrit text after Hemacandra's death, thus becoming, but only from that moment, a *tadbhava* or *tatsama*.

6. We can notice that the category of *deśī* words is not only a heterogeneous category, but also a very fluid, dynamic and subjective category (cfr. Upadhye 1931). Surely understanding the nature of it, can help us to understand the background under which the Prakrit grammarians wrote their texts. As I have said at the beginning of this paper Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* provides us with the earliest description of

---

[19] On the date of Trivikrama, see Nitti-Dolci (1972: 187-188).

Prakrit grammar. All the following Sanskrit works on Prakrits are written in a period in which Sanskrit was the language not only of brahmanical liturgical texts, but also of inscriptions (cfr. Salomon 1998) and other kinds of literary texts of the whole South-Asian sub-continent and the use of Sanskrit as a vehicle of literature was gradually true also for Buddhists and Jainas (Dundas 1996; Pollock 1996, 2006: part I). This is a significant point. Actually before this period, as is well-known, different literary forms of MIA languages were the languages of Buddhist and Jaina texts. What we can call Māgadhī, during the Mauryan period, was the administrative language of North India (Norman 1983: 14-15; Deshpande 2008: 187) and the high prestige of Māhārāṣṭrī Prakrit, known afterwards as the best Prakrit and the Prakrit par excellence, was connected to the powerful dynasty of Sātavāhanas (Lienhard 1984: 80-83; Deshpande 1993c: 92, 2008: 187). The fact that during all the first millennium there was a shift from Prakrits to Sanskrit as the language of inscriptions and of the majority of literary works, also of Buddhist and Jainas, and that Prakrit dialects are included in Sanskrit works and explained by Sanskrit works testifies the situation in which Sanskrit and Prakrits coexisted but, in particular, the position of Sanskrit in that period (Houben 1996b; Pollock 1996, 2006; Bubenik 1998: chapter 2, 2001). Following Deshpande (1993b), it might be said that the model by which Prakrit grammars are made, and also the inclusion of Prakrit grammars in Sanskrit works, is typical of the brahmanical mentality. This model, describing Prakrits by means of successive degeneration of Sanskrit, is the result of the fact that, as is common knowledge, Sanskrit grammarians in ancient India believed, taught and grew up in the ideological framework, that the Vedic scriptures and the Sanskrit language are eternal entities (Deshpande 1993b: 53-54, 73-74)[20]. As a consequence of and within this descriptive model Prakrit languages, according to Indian grammarians, have no independent standing and their nature and origin are closely linked to the Sanskrit language. Surely there were some authors, especially jaina

---

[20] Aklujkar (1996) explains the processes and developments which probably helped the continuation of Sanskrit as a dominant language from the composition of the Veda to the composition of the early texts of systematic philosophy and *kāvya*. In particular he tries to understand the different steps through which has been created a continuity between Sanskrit, on the one hand, and the Veda language and/or the Language Principle, on the other. Cfr. also Deshpande (1993b).

authors, like the Śvetāmbara Jain Namisādhu[21] or the poet Vākpati[22] (VIIIth century A.D.) that saw Prakrit as the language from which Sanskrit is derived. However, it is important to point out that the notion of Sanskrit to be the *prakṛti*, that is the "base", of Prakrit is adopted by the majority of Prakrit grammarians (Pischel 1965: 1; Kahrs 1992: 228-236), also by Hemacandra, a Jaina monk, who explicitly says, at the beginning of his Prakrit grammar that *prakṛtiḥ saṃskṛtam / tatra bhavaṁ tata āgataṁ va prākṛtam [...]* (*Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana* I, 1; ed. P. L. Vaidya 1980) "Sanskrit is the base; what originates in it or comes from it is base-derived"[23]. It is possible that, on the basis of this principle, Prakrit, as Deshpande (1993b: 73) adds, could be studied only in relation to the eternal Sanskrit and for this reason Prakrit grammarians taught Prakrit starting from Sanskrit. But, even if Deshpande says that "[…] the underpinnings of the terminology are not purely the practical necessity of teaching languages" (1993b: 74), it is possible to assume that Prakrit grammarians taught Prakrit starting from Sanskrit, that is, considering their purpose of teaching Prakrit, from the previous/expected knowledge of Sanskrit (cfr. Nitti-Dolci 1972: viii). In fact it seems that, using Prakrit grammars and *deśīkoṣa(s)*, the tripartite classification was useful to the indian authors of the first millennium to write in Prakrits, but also to understand old Prakrit works. By the application of the "converting rules" as those explained in Prakrit grammars, a specific Sanskrit word, perhaps the only one known by the author (Dundas 1996: 148, note n. 9; Pollock 2006: 104-105, 105, note n. 69) and, according to the philosophy of Sanskrit grammar (Deshpande 1993b: 73; Granoff 1991: 17; Houben 1996b: 186, note n.

---

[21] *prākṛteti / sakalajagajjantūnāṃ vyākaraṇādibhir anāhitasaṃskāraḥ sahajo vacanavyāpāraḥ prakṛtiḥ / tatra bhavaṃ saiva vā prākṛtam / 'ārisavayaṇe siddham devāṇaṃ addhamāgahā bāṇī' ityādivacanād vā prāk pūrvaṃ kṛtaṃ prākkṛtaṃ bālamahilādisubodhaṃ sakalabhāṣānibandhanabhūtaṃ vacanam ucyate / meghanirmuktajalam ivaikarūpam / tad eva ca deśaviśeṣāt saṃskārakaraṇāc ca samāsāditaviśeṣaṃ sat saṃskṛtādyuttaravibhedān āpnoti / ata eva śāstrakṛtā prākṛtam ādau nirdiṣṭaṃ tad anu saṃskṛtādīni //* Namisādhu on Rudraṭa's *Kāvyālaṃkāra* 2.12 (ed. Durgāprasāda and Paraba 1886).

[22] *sayalāo imaṃ vāyā visanti etto ya ṇenti vāyāo enti samuddaṃ ciya ṇenti sāyarāocciya jalāiṃ / Gauḍavaho* 93 (ed. Suru, N. G. 1975)

[23] A useful collection of sources, with related analysis, on the different interpretation of the meaning of the term *prākṛta*, as regard to (a kind of) language, in ancient Indian tradition is presented by Pischel (1965: 1, 16-17) and Kahrs (1992: 227-236). Cfr. also Dundas (1996), Houben (1996b), Granoff (1991) and Pollock (2006: 91, note n. 38).

32, 192, note n. 40; Dundas 1996: 143; Pollock 2006: 102-103, 365), the only one that is able to convey meaning directly, was transformed into a Prakrit word. For all Prakrit neologisms, not attested in Sanskrit as prakritisms, there were *deśī-kośa(s)*, like *Deśīnāmamālā*[24]. In this context it is interesting to point out that even if in the *Deśīnāmamālā* every *deśī* word is referred to a Prakrit *tadbhava* one, Hemacandra considered that it was important, and perhaps necessary, to accompany his work by a Sanskrit self-commentary in which every *deśī* word is linked to a Sanskrit one[25].

7. In conclusion we can look at the traditional analysis as a device at the disposal of the various authors to learn Prakrits, giving them a very efficient tool to convert one variety into another. All this, besides being founded, as we have seen, on the eternity of Sanskrit and on its predominance as a literary language of India (Pollock 2006: 102-104), has been done however in a period in which Sanskrit was not the only literary language of India, because alongside it there were Prakrits[26]. I think it is on this basis that the vast amount of *deśī* material collected by Hemacandra in his *Deśīnāmamālā* and used in many Prakrit literary texts must be examined. This material presents a complex, multifaceted area of study and, despite the suggestions by Bhayani (1988a, 1988b,

[24] As noted by Vaidya (1926-27: 63) and Bhayani (1988b: 3, 1988e: 156-162) the *Deśīnāmamālā* is not an original work, but based upon a large number of *deśī* lexicons to which Hemacandra has often referred. In fact from this author we know that a dozen or more *deśya* lexicographers preceded him, but their works are lost to us (Bhayani 1988e: 156). Among the earlier works on *deśya* words cited by Hemacandra it is possible to find a *deśīśāstra* attributed to an author mentioned in Hāla's *Sattasaī*, the anthology produced at the Sātavāhana court (Pischel 1965: 11). In this context it is important to point out that in the field of Prakrit lexicography the only extent work prior to Hemacandra's *Deśīnāmamālā* is Dhanapāla's *Pāialacchīnāmamālā*, composed in 973 A.D. (ed. G. Bühler 1879).
[25] With regard to this topic Pollock makes the following statements: "At a relatively early date, literary works in both Prakrit and Apabhramsha were equipped with *chāyās*, Sanskrit translations, and in some cases they were eventually displaced by their Sanskrit renderings" (2006: 104), "Sanskrit translation of Prakrit texts are especially prominent in the Jain tradition; a notable instance is the *Kuvalayamālākathā*, Ratnaprabhasūri's fourteenth-century version of Uddyotana's work." (2006: 105, note n. 69).
[26] Pollock (2006: 90-99, 108) mentions several primaries sources to show that according the majority of Indian authors of the first millennium A.D. the languages of literature are three: Sanskrit, Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa (e.g. Bhāmaha's *Kāvyālaṅkāra* I, 16). Daṇḍin adds the language called *bhūtabhāṣā* 'the language of the demons', elsewhere known as Paiśācī (the speech of Bhūta/Piśāca) (Pollock 2006: 92). Cfr. also Bubenik (1998: 16-31, 2001).

1988c, 1998b, 1998c, 1998d, 1998f) and some others (cfr. note n. 16 above), in part still unexplored (Bhayani 1988a, 1998e: 143). Certainly it can help us to understand the principles on which different ancient Indian grammarians classified, in their linguistic milieu and within the Indian literary context of the middle and late stage of MIA period, the various linguistic material in one category rather than in another one.

Dr. Andrea Drocco
Università degli Studi di Torino
Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici
via Giulia di Barolo, 3/A
10124 TORINO
andrea.drocco@yahoo.it

References

Aklujkar, Ashok, 1996, "The early history of Sanskrit as supreme language". In: Houben, Jan (ed.): 59-85.

Andersen, Henning (ed.), 2001, *Actualization. Linguistic Change in Progress* (Papers from a workshop held at the 14th Conference on Historical Linguistics, Vancouver, B.C., 14 August 1999), Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Banerjee, Muraly Dhar, 1931, *The Deśīnāmamālā of Hemacandra*, Edited with the help of two MSS. and Pischel's Edition of 1880 with an Introduction, Index to the Text and Commentary and English translation of the Text and Extracts from the Commentary of Hemachandra with a complete Glossary of Deśī words from all sources with references, derivation and meanings, Calcutta, University of Calcutta.

Beames, John, 1872-79, *Comparative Grammar of the Modern Aryan Languages of India: to wit, Hindi, Panjabi, Sindhi, Gujarati, Marathi, Oriya and Bangali, 3 vols.*, London, Trubner & Co. (reprint Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi, 1966).

Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal, 1988a, *Studies in Deśya Prakrit*, Ahmedabad, Kalikāla Sarvajña Srī Hemacandrācārya Navam Janma Śatābdī Smṛti Śikṣaṃ Saṃskār Nidhi.

Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal, 1988b, "Studies in the Deśīnāmamālā". In Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal, 1988a: 1-95.

Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal, 1988c, "Some Variant Readings in Hemacandra's Deśīnāmamālā". In: Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal, 1988a: 96-103.

Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal, 1988e, "Importance of Jain Literature for the Study of Deśya Prakrit". In: Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal, 1988a: 155-176.

Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal, 1993a, *Indological Studies (Vol. 1). Literary and Performing Arts. Prakrit and Apabhraṁśa Studies*, Ahmedabad, Parshva Publication.

Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal, 1993b, "The Prakrit and Deśabhāṣā Passages in Someśvara's Mānasollāsa". In: Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal, 1993a: 297-309.

Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal, 1998a, *Indological Studies (Vol. 2). Literary and Performing Arts. Prakrit and Apabhraṁśa Studies*, Ahmedabad, Parshva Publication.

Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal, 1998b, "The Prakrit of the Nāṇapaṇcamikahā". In: Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal, 1998a: 13-25.

Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal, 1998c, "A novel classification of literary Prakrit and Apabhraṁśa". In: Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal, 1998a: 44-49.

Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal, 1998d, "The rise of Apabhraṁśa as a literary language". In: Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal, 1998a: 26-34.

Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal, 1998e, "Lexicological and exegetical notes. Notes on some words from some Prakrit and Sanskrit Texts". In: Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal, 1998a: 134-160.

Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal, 1998f, "Notes on some prakrit words". In: Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal, 1998a: 161-234.

Birnbaum, Henrik / Puhvel, Jaan (eds.), 1966, *Ancient Indo-European Dialects*, Berkeley, University of California Press.

Böhtlingk von, Otto, 1890, *Daṇḍin's Poetik (Kāvyādarśa)*, Leipzig, Haessel.

Bronkhorst, Johannes / Deshpande, Madhav Murlidhar (eds.), 1999, *Aryan and non-Aryan in South Asia: Evidence, Interpretation and Ideology*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Bryant, Edwin Francis, 1999, "Linguistic Substrata and the Indigenous Aryan debate". In: Bronkhorst, Johannes / Deshpande, Madhav Murlidhar (eds.): 59-83.

Bubenik, Vit, 1998, *A Historical Syntax of Late Middle Indo-Aryan (Apabhraṁśa)*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Bubenik, Vit, 2001, "On the Actualization of the Passive-to-Ergative shift in the Pre-Islamic India". In: Andersen, Henning (ed.): 95-118.

Bühler, George, 1873, "The Deśīśabdasaṅgraha of Hemacandra". *Indian Antiquary* II: 17-21.

Bühler, George, 1879, *The Páiyalachchhí námamálá: a Prakrit kosha* (Edited with critical notes, an introduction and a glossary), Göttingen, Peppmüller.

Bühler, George, 1889, *Ueber das Leben des Jaina Monches Hemacandra, des Schulers des Devachandra aus der Vajraśākhā*, Wien (1936, *The life of Hemacandrācārya* by Professor Dr. G. Bühler, translated from the original German by Professor Dr. Manilal Patel, with a foreword by Professor Dr. M. Winternitz, Śāntiniketan, The Adhiṣṭhātā-Siṅghī Jaina Jñānapīṭha).

Burrow, Thomas, 1955, *The Sanskrit Language*, London, Faber & Faber.

Caillat, Colette (ed.), 1989, *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*, Paris, Collège de France.

Caracchi, Pinuccia, 2002, *Grammatica Hindī*, Torino, Magnanelli. (IVth edition).

Chatterji, Suniti Kumar, 1926, *The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language*, London, Allen & Unwin.

Chatterji, Suniti Kumar, 1960, *Indo-Aryan and Hindi*, Calcutta, Calcutta University.

Chatterji, Suniti Kumar, 1983, *On the development of Middle Indo-Aryan*, Calcutta: Sanskrit College.

Deshpande, Madhav Murlidhar, 1993a, *Sanskrit & Prakrit, Sociolinguistic Issues*, Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass.

Deshpande, Madhav Murlidhar, 1993b, "Historical change and the theology of Eternal (nitya) Sanskrit". In: Deshpande, Madhav Murlidhar, 1993a: 53-74.

Deshpande, Madhav Murlidhar, 1993c, "Rājaśekhara on ethnic and linguistic geography of India". In: Deshpande, Madhav Murlidhar, 1993a: 83-107.

Deshpande, Madhav Murlidhar, 2008, "Sanskrit in the South Asian sociolinguistic context". In: Kachru, Braj / Kachru, Yamuna / Sridhar, Shikaripur Narayanarao (eds.): 177-188.

Drocco, Andrea, 2000, *I nomi degli animali jarāyuja nella Deśīnāmamālā di Hemacandra. Deśī o tadbhava? Un'analisi etimologica*, Degree dissertation unpublished, University of Turin.

Drocco, Andrea, 2006, "La *Deśīnāmamālā* di Hemacandra e la tipologia dei vocaboli *deśī* nei pracriti". In: Monti, Alessandro / Bianchi, Sara (eds.): 61-99.

Dundas, Paul 1996. "Jain attitudes towards the Sanskrit language". In: Houben, Jan (ed.): 137-156.

Durgāprasāda, Dvivedī / Kāśīnātha, Pāṇḍuraṅga Paraba (eds.), 1886, *The Kāvyālankāra (a treatise on rhetoric) of Rudraṭa with commentary of Namisādhu* (*Kāvyamālā*), Bombay, Nirṇaya-Sāgara Press.

Emeneau, Murray Barnson, 1966, "The dialects of Old Indo-Aryan". In: Birnbaum, Henrik / Puhvel, Jaan (eds.): 123-138.

Granoff, Phyllis, 1991, "Buddhagoṣa's Penance and Siddhasena's Crime: Indian Attitudes Towards Language". In: Shinohara, Koichi / Schopen, Gregory (eds.): 17-33.

Grierson, George Abraham, 1913, "Apabhraṁśa according to Mārkaṇḍeya and 'Dhakkī' Prākrit". *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 875-883.

Grierson, George Abraham, 1918, "The Prākrit Vibhāṣās". *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 489-517.

Grierson, George Abraham, 1927, *Linguistic survey of India. Vol. 1(1), Introductory*, Calcutta, Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing, India.

Gune, Pandurang Damodar, 1918, *An introduction to comparative philology*, Poona, Oriental Book-supplying Agency.

Hinüber von, Oskar, 1986, *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*, Wien, SB Akad.

Hoernle, August Friedrich Rudolf, 1880, *A Comparative Grammar of the Gauḍian (Aryo-Indian) Languages*, Amsterdam, Philo Press.

Houben, Jan, (ed.), 1996a, *Ideology and status of Sanskrit: Contributions to the history of the Sanskrit language*. Leiden-New York-Köln: E.J. Brill.

Houben, Jan, 1996b, "Sociolinguistic attitudes reflected in the work of Bhartṛhari and some later grammarians". In: Houben, Jan (ed.): 157-193.

Joshi, Kanhaiyā Lāla (ed.), 1984, *Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharatamuni*, Vol. II (*Parimal Sanskrit Series* 4), Delhi-Ahmedabad, Parimal Publications.

Kachru, Braj / Kachru, Yamuna / Sridhar, Shikaripur Narayanarao (eds.), 2008, *Language in South Asia*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Kahrs, Eivind, 1992, "What is a *tadbhava* word". *Indo-Iranian Journal* 35: 225-249.

Kellogg, Henry Samuel, 1893 (revised edition), *A grammar of the Hindi language*, Delhi, Munshiram Manoharlal (1990: reprinted from the second edition).

Kunjunni Raja, Kumarapuram, 1977, *Indian Theories of Meaning*, Madras, The Adyar Library and Research Centre, (reprint of the 2nd Edition).

Lienhard, Siegfried, 1984, *A History of Classical Poetry Sanskrit-Pali-Prakrit*, Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz.

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

Macdonell, Arthur Anthony, 1893, *A Sanskrit-English dictionary: being a practical handbook with transliteration, accentuation and etymological analysis throughout*, London, Longmans, Green, and Co.

Master, Alfred, 1950, "Gleanings from the Kuvalayamālā Kahā I: Three Fragments and Specimens of the Eighteen Deśabhāṣās". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 13/2: 410-415.

Master, Alfred, 1951, "Gleanings from the Kuvalayamālā – II. Specimens of Prose Apabhraṃśa and Middle Indian Mixed with Sanskrit". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 13/4: 1004-1016.

Mayrhofer, Manfred, 1986-, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, Heidelberg, Universitätsverlag.

Monti, Alessandro / Bianchi, Sara (eds.), 2006, *Roads to Knowledge: Hermeneutical and Lexical Probes (DOST Critical Studies)*, Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso.

Nitti-Dolci, Luigia, 1972, *The Prākṛta Grammarians*, New Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass (translated from the french by Prabhakara Jha).

Norman, Kenneth Roy, 1983, *Pali literature: including the canonical literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of all the Hinayana schools of Buddhism*, Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz.

Norman, Kenneth Roy, 1990-1996, *Collected Papers*, voll. I-VI, Oxford, The Pali Text Society.

Norman, Kenneth Roy, 1990, "Notes on some deśī words", In: Norman, Kenneth Roy 1990-1996: I, 63-67.

Norman, Kenneth Roy, 1992a, "The origin of Pāli and its position among the Indo-European languages". In: Norman, Kenneth Roy 1990-1996: III, 225-243.

Norman, Kenneth Roy, 1992b, "The Dialectal Variety of Middle Indo-Aryan". In: Norman, Kenneth Roy 1990-1996: III, 115-125.

Norman, Kenneth Roy, 1996, "The development of the Middle Indo-Aryan dialects". In: Norman, Kenneth Roy 1990-1996: VI, 88-121.

Pischel, Richard, 1880, *The Deśīnāmamālā*, Edited with critical notes, a glossary, and a historical introduction by Richard Pischel and George Bühler, Pt. 1, Text and critical notes by Richard Pischel, Bombay, Govt. Central Book Depôt.

Pischel, Richard, 1965, *A Grammar of the Prākrit Languages*, New Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass (second revised edition, translated from German by Subhadra Jha).

Pollock, Sheldon, 1996, "The Sanskrit cosmopolis, 300 - 1300: transculturation, vernacularization, and the question of ideology". In: Houben, Jan (ed.): 197-247.

Pollock, Sheldon, 2006, *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men. Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, University of California Press.

Ramanujaswamy, Paravastu Venkata, 1938, *Deśīnāmamālā of Hemacandra.*

Introduction, critical notes, and glossary, Poona, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (reprint of the second edition, 1989).

Salomon, Richard, 1998, *A Guide to the Study of Inscriptions in Sanskrit, Prakrit, and the Other Indo-Aryan Languages*, New York-Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Scharfe, Hartmut, 1977, *Grammatical Literature. A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. 5, Fasc. 2, Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz.

Shinohara, Koichi / Schopen, Gregory (eds.), 1991, *From Benares to Beijing: essays on Buddhism and Chinese religion in honour of Prof. Jan Yün-Hua*, Oakville-Ontario, Mosaic Press.

Shriyan, Ratna Nagesha, 1969, *A critical study of Mahāpurāṇa of Puṣpadanta. A critical study of the deśya and rare words from Puṣpadanta's Mahāpurāṇa and his other apabhraṁśa works*, Ahmedabad, Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Bharatiya Sanskriti Vidyamandira.

Suru, Narahara Govinda, 1975, *Gauḍavaho of Vākpatirāja*, Ahmedabad, Prakrit Text Society.

Tagare, Ganesh Vasudev, 1948, *Historical Grammar of Apabhraṁśa*, Poona, Dissertation, 5, (1987 ed., Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass).

Thieme, Paul, 1994, "On M. Mayrhofer's Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 57/2: 321-328.

Tiwari, Udai Narain, 1960, *The origin and development of Bhojpuri*, Calcutta, The Asiatic Society.

Upadhye, Ādinātha Nemanātha, 1931, "Kanarese Words in Deśī Lexicons", *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 12/3: 274-284.

Upadhye, Ādinātha Nemanātha, 1965, "Languages and Dialects used in the Kuvalayamālā". *Journal of the Oriental Institute of Baroda* 14: 317-325.

Vaidya, Paraśurāma Lakṣmaṇa, 1926-27, "Observations on Hemacandra's Deśīnāmamālā". *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 8: 63-71.

Vaidya, Paraśurāma Lakṣmaṇa, 1980, *Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana (adhyāya 8)*, Poona, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (second edition).

Vogel, Claus, 1979, *Indian Lexicography. A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. 5, Fasc. 4, Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz.

Wezler, Albrecht, 1996, "Do you speak Sanskrit? On a class of Sanskrit texts composed in the Late Middle Ages". In: Houben, Jan (ed.): 327-346.

Witzel, Michael, 1989, "Tracing the Vedic dialects". In Caillat, Colette (ed.): 97-265.