rise to \*- $\bar{a}v \sim -\bar{a}$  sandhi forms (though \*- $\bar{a}$  is not in fact preserved for the *u*-stems); the expected corresponding locative for the *i*-stems would be -AI, with a prehistoric alternation \*- $\bar{a}y \sim -\bar{a}$ . The original identity of the *i*-stem and *u*-stem locatives in the preconsonantal position (\*- $\bar{a}$ ) could then have led analogically to an identity in other positions,<sup>4</sup> with \*- $\bar{a}y$  being replaced by \*- $\bar{a}v$ .<sup>5</sup> There still of course remain the problems, why the \*- $\bar{a}v$  form prevailed over the \*- $\bar{a}v$ , and why the \*- $\bar{a}$  alternant of the *u*-stems does not survive.

The only common exception to the invariability of initials is provided by initial CH, the voiceless aspirated palatal stop [W. 227]. After a short final vowel the ancient authorities prescribe a gemination ( $\div$  cch) in sandhi:

Ex:  $nA + CHidyate \div nacchidyate$ 

This process has an historical basis; for Sanskrit ch is almost always derivable from IE \*sk or \*skh (cf. Skt.  $ch\bar{a}ya$ : Gk.  $\sigma$ xiá, Skt. chid-: Gk.  $\sigma$ xiíζω). It is thus descended from a group of two consonants, and medially in intervocalic position it is in fact regularly double, f as e.g. f as e.g.

The fact that the double *cch* is regularly prescribed only after *short* final vowels has a clear explanation. The double consonant has the effect of ensuring that the preceding syllable retains its prehistoric value as a *heavy* syllable, in spite of the changes under-

paper to The Philological Society in London Prof. O. Szemerényi has suggested that the original ending of the *i*-stems in PIE may have alternated between \*-eyi before a consonant and \*-eyy before a vowel; the latter would have developed, by transfer of length, to IE \*- $\bar{e}y$ , and this alternant would have been generalized; the same pattern would then have been transferred to the *u*-stems.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Note the replacement of y by v and vice-versa in Prakrit  $ka\bar{i}avam < kati-payam$ , Pali  $\bar{a}vuso < \bar{a}yu\bar{s}mant$ -,  $migad\bar{a}ya < mrgad\bar{a}va$ -, which doubtless reflects the common interchangeability of y and v in this position (see p. 61); similarly in ModIA, Sindhi  $ch\bar{a}wa < Skt.$   $ch\bar{a}y\bar{a}$  (cf. Marathi  $s\bar{a}vl\bar{i}$  and, within the Rajasthani group, Harauti  $ch\bar{a}vl\bar{i}$  beside Mewari  $ch\bar{a}\bar{i}l\bar{i}$ ).

In which case the analogy is Indo-Iranian (cf. gara/garō as loc.sing. of gari-).
But for this reason commonly written single, since the indication of the double value is graphically redundant.

gone in Indo-Iranian by the consonant-group whereby its quantity had originally been determined. It exemplifies a not uncommon tendency for prosodic features to be preserved in spite of phonematic changes. But the double consonant was essential to the preservation of quantity only when the preceding vowel was short; for, as in Greek and Latin, a long vowel in itself ensured the heavy quantity of a syllable.

This is in fact a case where a historical feature is better preserved by other than the "basic" alternant. The descriptive need for a derivational process of "gemination" (as in  $nA + CHidyate \div nacchidyate$ ) arises only from the choice of the more frequent alternant (ch), which is also the post-pausal alternant, as providing the basic initial (CH). The historical process has rather been one of simplification after long vowel or consonant.

The rule relating to the double cch is also extended to those cases where it is preceded by the prohibitive  $m\bar{a}$  (not, however, in the RV) and the preposition  $\bar{a}$ , in spite of their long vowels. The junctions in these cases commonly involve a verb as second element; the combination is then virtually a single word? (having in Vedic only a single tonal accent), and the consonant might thus be considered as in medial intervocalic position; and since in this position single ch never occurs, even (according to the grammarians) after a long vowel, the cases in question might be explained as conforming to this pattern.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> In classical Sanskrit prepositions qualifying a verb are inseparably prefixed to it (as also generally in subordinate and negative clauses in Vedic); and from earliest times combinations of prefix + verb display features of internal sandhi — thus initial  $S \div \mathfrak{s}$  after final I or U [W. 185], initial  $N \div n$  after preceding R [W. 192.] There are in fact only three prefixes with a final long vowel, viz.  $\bar{a}$ ,  $par\bar{a}$ ,  $acch\bar{a}$ ; of these  $\bar{a}$  is by far the most frequent (W. 1077a), and in any case is the only one occurring with verbal roots having initial ch.  $\bar{a}$  has also an exceptionally close relation to the verb in that when a verb has two or more prefixes,  $\bar{a}$  practically never precedes the others (cf. Renou, § 381, " $\bar{A}$  est considéré comme partie intégrante du verbe").

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> In fact in the vast majority of cases internal intervocalic *cch* is preceded by a short vowel. Most if not all cases where a long vowel or diphthong precedes may be explained as the result of lexical innovation or of internal sandhi or derivation (e. g., *mleccha-*; *aicchat*; *aicchika-*, *pauccha-*, *kāccha-*).