

logical developments of MIA had taken place, e.g. the replacement of *prāpnoti* by **prāpnāti* must have occurred before the change of *-pn-* > *-pp-*. Once the development to *pappoti* had taken place in MIA, there was no way in which the form *pāpuṇāti* could have been evolved.

(4) Suffixes

One of the most distinctive features of dialect variation in MIA is the difference of suffix from that found in OIA:

(a) Some differences arise from a change of grade in the suffix, e.g. the absolutive endings *-tūna(m)* and *-tu* are weak grade forms of *-tvāna(m)* and *-tvā*¹ respectively; the future forms in *-ihii* are to be derived from **-iṣ-i-ti*, which is probably to be regarded as a weak grade form of Skt *-iṣ-ya-ti*;² Pāli *-agga* “house” is to be derived from **ag-ra*, as <288> opposed to the more common *ag-āra*; conversely MIA sometimes shows a stronger grade of the suffix than appears in Sanskrit, e.g. Pkt *aṇa-cchiyāra* “unbroken” is to be derived from **chid-āra*,³ where Sanskrit has *chid-ra* “hole”; Pkt *poāla* “young animal” is to be derived from **potāla*, where BHS has *potala-ka*.

As before, variation due to vowel gradation must be presumed to be pre-MIA, as must any development which depends upon pre-MIA phonology.

(b) In Sanskrit, past participles are formed by the addition of *-ta* or, less commonly, *-na*. A number of MIA verbs form their past participles by adding *-na* whereas in Sanskrit they take *-ta*, e.g. Pāli *dinna* “given” < **di-(n)na*,⁴ cf. Skt *datta*; Pkt *ghusiṇa* “rubbed” < **ghṛṣ-ṇa*, cf. Skt

ghṛṣṭa; Pkt *ummilla* “opened” < **unmīl-na*, cf. Skt *unmīlita*; Pāli *ruṇṇa* “wept” < **rud-na*, cf. Skt *rudita*.

Since there was a general MIA tendency to produce “regular” past participles by adding the suffix *-i-ta*, we may assume that any forms with *-na* are early. They must, in any case, pre-date the development of the MIA phonological changes.

(c) There was a continual IA tendency towards the evolution of the so-called *seṭ* forms, i.e. forms with the linking vowel *-i-*.¹ It may be concluded, therefore, that any *aniṭ* forms (those without *-i-*) are earlier, and any such MIA forms are survivals from OIA, rather than innovations. We find:

(i) verbal forms, e.g. Pāli *kassati* < **kar-ṣyati*, cf. Skt *kar-i-ṣyati*; Pāli *viḥassati* < **viḥar-ṣyati*, cf. Skt *viḥar-i-ṣyati*; Pāli *gacchaṃ* “I shall go” < **gam(t)-syāmi*,² with the secondary ending *-aṃ*, cf. Skt *gam-i-ṣyati*; Gāndhārī Pkt *bromi* “I say” < **bro-mi*, cf. Skt *brav-īmi* < **bro-ī-mi*.³

(ii) past participles, e.g. Pkt *laṭṭha* “desired” < **laṣṭa*, cf. Skt *laṣita*; Pāli *bhaṭṭha* “spoken” < **bhāṣṭa*, cf. Skt *bhāṣita*; Pāli *patta* “fallen” in the compound *patta-kkhandha* “with drooping shoulders” < **patta*, cf. Skt *patita*; Pāli *tuvaṭa* “quickly” < **tvṛta*,⁴ cf. Skt *tvarita*; Pkt *ummilla* “opened” < **unmīl-na*, cf. Skt *unmīlita*; Pāli *ruṇṇa* “wept” < **rud-na*, cf. Skt *rudita*.

¹ Norman, 1958, p. 46.

² Smith, 1952, pp. 169 foll.

³ Norman, 1966, pp. 77–78.

⁴ Burrow, 1979, p. 38.

¹ Burrow, 1979, pp. 8, 92, 116.

² See Berger, 1954.

³ Burrow, 1979, p. 7.

⁴ Norman, 1965, p. 114.